

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

So we had the two meetings { }. And I wish you would write down a report of two pages on these two first meetings, every one of you, so that I get a little bit of your own handwriting. Who hasn't taken part in the first? So may you just go in for the -- the last one.

And with this break in continuity, that we ask you today to write something that doesn't -- is two weeks in -- a week before { }, you see how difficult it is to know anything about history. And I -- I think you will find this already an imposition, that you should know what went on a fortnight ago. Now you can imagine what we are in for with history that pretends to know something about a hundred years ago, or 10 years ago.

And -- what did we do last time? Does anybody recall? I mean, of course, never has any generation and any place been so forgetful as the people yet in Los Angeles at this moment, you see. You are -- have no memory. But -- please. (Well, one thing you said was that Los Angeles was a horizontal city, which might suggest in this city as representative of the whole American thinking, that our view is horizontal, rather than having a historical perspective of viewing things -- in relation to one another, rather than all flat and blended in. And you related this to other historical themes, throughout the -- the period.) Then there was -- what did we intend to do today?

(Discuss Samuel?)

Wie?

(Discuss Samuel?)

Quite. The Book of Samuel. First real historical book, I think, of the world's whole literature. But let me -- I have found a very strange quotation which may show you the very anti-historical bias of this country. You know who Mr. Kettering was, the inventor, who died recently -- a few months ago? And since one of his relations lives in our little village in Vermont, so I became very interested in the man. He was a very great inventor. What did he invent, by the way?

(The engine, didn't he? The combustion engine, I think it was. { } engine.)

(The starter engine. The -- yeah, the automatic starter, the solenoid starter. The -- the thing that starts the engine.)

Ignition, I think, isn't it? Well, he has of course made a number of -- of inventions. But -- I -- but I do think he delivered us from the crank, you see, so many inci- -- accidents have been eliminated by him. And of course, he became very rich.

Now he's a -- a man who graduated with him tells the story that when Kettering graduated from Ohio State in engineering, he received his sheepskin diploma, and threw it in the wastepaper basket, and said, "This is not what I have toiled for, for four years, at starvation level."

Now I think that no European, no Asiatic, no African will ever understand--except the Australian, he would--Australians and the North Americans are in line with this strange separation from the act and its formal declaration. That is, obviously, the four years in -- in Ohio State were very important for Mr. Kettering. It made him, you see. But the expressions, the declaration, the document in -- on which this is written he throws in the wastepaper basket. He's annoyed by the certificate. And by the way, the -- his roommate tried to rescue it from the wastepaper basket, and fished it out, and gave it back to him, and then he threw it -- it in a second time. So it was not a rash movement, but his considered opinion.

I can give you a strange parallel to this. The father of William and Henry James, you know who Henry James was, the novelist, and William James, the philosopher. Now they had a father who was greater than the two of them, Henry James, Sr. And when the two boys -- sons came to England, Bernard Shaw teased them on this, and said, "You know, you are nothing. Your father is everything."

And they su- -- surprised Bernard Shaw, who of course was a terribly ironical and sardonical mind and said, "Well, we know that."

So they were convinced that their father was a greater man. I think he was. And this man, when he went to die, in 1882, was asked by his daughter what they -- he should -- they should do at his funeral. "Oh," he said, "I'll tell you. You just come forward with one sentence, to be read by the oldest child -- the

oldest -- the -- the son. 'Here lies a man who has always thought that the ritual connected with birth and funeral is just hokum.'

Now here you have the -- two typical situations -- which -- are certainly anti-historical, because they go against the documentation of history, you see, against the form in which history is recorded. Because after all, what is a funeral? The record of a death. And a death in a family is a very important event. And a birth is, too, you see. In a birth, the new name is given. In a death, you are entitled from now on to treat this person as no longer, you see, to be reckoned with. And therefore, obviously, this has to be declared.

But in this country, which is strictly naturalistic--you can call this "naturalistic"--the -- the -- the declaration of the event is brushed aside as unnecessary. The fact of the birth and the death stand for themselves. And thereby history is destroyed, because history is the -- the weaving together of natural events in such a way that they make sense to each -- that they--although they occur in one or the other person--they make sense, so to speak, to each other. A birth is nothing unless the father says, "This is my child, and he's now called William Smith, Jr.," you see. And a death is nothing unless the widow now is called a widow from this day on. That's what we call a funeral.

So the -- between the event and the declaration of the event, there is a minute, or a day, or three days of lapse. And -- the American mind cannot deal with this amount of time. It destroys it and says, "We don't respect it."

In former days, you know, at -- at a funeral, the widow had to stay put in her house with the belongings of her husband for 30 days. She shouldn't make up her mind before, you see, what to do.

Now I have -- known a -- judge in New York City, and his wife. Very good people, and very happily married. And when they -- he, the man, came to die, the -- the woman--this poor widow--sold her belongings the day after the death, before the funeral. And of course, four weeks later, she was in a sanitarium, because she hadn't given the necessary time to her own soul to digest the event.

So it is a -- the -- what no American, it seems--pardon me for saying this boldly--seems to be able to digest is that an event, before it reaches the outside world, takes time, you see, before it is digested, because it becomes a part of history. That -- if Lincoln dies -- is murdered in -- at -- you see, in the evening, and he expires in the morning, and then Stanton, the secretary of war, says,

"Now he belongs to the ages," then this is still -- no reason why he shouldn't be buried in all the cities, you know, through which the coffin passed. There were celebrations. And this is part of his death. You can't -- you can't eliminate the waves that an event, the stone that falls into the water -- you see, mo- -- mo- -- mobilizes in -- in a pond.

But this is what the American mind tries to do. When the stone falls into the water, the idea of a wave theory by which these waves have to be accepted as part of the event is absolutely undigested, but it seems for Reader's Digest. And Reader's Digest is the stomach of America, as you know. I mean, we are all digested by Reader's Digest, so to speak. Or pre- -- pre-chewed, you can also say. So -- and this is your point where -- which you have to -- I think to start your historical thinking -- at this moment; here, in this place especially. Is there really, between a purely natural event--that is physical, I mean, in nature, like a death of a person--and its becoming an historical event, a necessary lapse of time during which this event must get the chance to work itself into the fabric of the -- a nation's, a city's, a family's consciousness, you see -- isn't this as much real as the so-called physical event? And all of you are inclined to deny this, and give the -- this wave mo- -- movement of waves around the stone that falls in the water no reality. Say, "Well, that's not real, that's just -- that's just"--how would you call it, I mean?--"mental, or psychological," you see, and how -- all these strange words are.

And we -- you live in this era--psychoanalysis is a case in point--where the -- the physical is divorced from its meaning. The death of a person has a very different meaning in the hearts of man, whether this person has been murdered, or whether he -- dies a heroic death on the battlefield, or whether he dies in a sick-bed in a hospital, and un- -- unconsciously, you see, doped, and -- and -- and kept alive for 10 years too long, as they do now, you see. -- You see, such a death leaves quite a different imprint. One -- death on the battlefield is so sudden, and so unexpected, because the lieutenant is only 20 years of age, you see, and it is not his natural way of dying, that you have to celebrate him for 50 years to come, by 4th of July celebrations, or Battle of Gettysburg celebrations, in order to do justice to this shortening of his life, by his bravery.

When a man, however -- I have such a dear friend. She wanted to die. She was 84, was a beautiful woman, and a -- widow of a great painter. And she knew that she had -- would have to die. And we all loved her. And if she had died at that moment, we all would have honored her memory, you see. And she would still be with us, so to speak, in spirit. But the doctors came and said she had

cancer, and so she had to be operated upon. She protested. They said, "You have to do this for the students' sake, so that the student can learn something," which is really bestial. And -- they were treating her just as a -- you see, a piece of flesh, to be studied.

Well, as -- at this age, you see, with all the doctors agreeing, she went to the hospital. She was a corpse for -- a living corpse for another two and-a-half years, and when she died, nobody remembered her. The -- every interest in her had been spent in the sympathy, you see, given to her sufferings for these two and-a-half years. She had known this, you see. And so she was destroyed in the hearts of men, by this ridiculous state of medicine which we have today.

And this has to do with the naturalism of the age, you see, because if medicine can separate the person from the body to such an extent, you see, then -- that the body is kept alive even when the personality is gone, then obviously, this is just the anti-historical bias of our age, which says, "The only thing that I consider valid is the -- the body."

Now history is not made out of bodies, gentlemen. But strange as it -- may show, it is made up of spirits, or of laws. You see, you cannot explain the -- the death of any person unless you relate it to -- to what happens after his death. Does he bequeath his fortune to somebody? Has his -- Mr. Dulles to be replaced if he should die now, you see, by his successor in a state department, you see? Is he that -- is he indispensable? Is he irreplaceable? This is all discussed today in the papers. And a physical world, as ours, you see, thinks -- in Mr. Dulles' case is desperate. There is no succession for the presidency; there is no succession for the secretary of state at this moment, because we -- we have not learned that all life is based on spiritual succession, and not on physical succession.

Formerly, this was very different. Any son would inherit his father's business, you see. A son at Harvard, I told you, I think last time, wasn't it here?--that he would rank in the -- in the -- in the--how do you call it?--in the syllabus of Harvard, in the album of Harvard, the almanac of Harvard, in rank with his father, because it was quite natural that the son did participate in the status -- the standing of the father in the community. In such a case, you see, death of course is an historical event. You can see immediately that it means the position of a man in the community that -- that has to be replaced. If the father is governor of Massachusetts, at his death, the -- everybody knows that death means succession.

Now you and I have separated the retirement and the physical death. And

what formerly, in a monarchy or in an aristocracy, you see, has to happen at the -- day of death--succession, you see, that somebody succeeds them--today is separated in two events. Retirement, on one hand, you see, or election; and physical death on the other. And for this reason, Mr. -- Mr. Henry James, Sr., could say, thinking in these terms of a -- of a -- complete division of the physical life, you see, of his and his office in life, his position, that funerals were formless events, that it was all crazy.

But gentlemen, if -- I would invite you to look it -- at this. There are really the four -- the cornerstone of history are four events. And there are no others. Out of this, all history is -- these are the bricks out of which history is made. There would be no history if people wouldn't die; there would no -- be no history if people would not be born; there would be no history if people didn't have to marry; and there would be no history if they didn't have to have a -- an office. What I call a "calling"; you can call it a "profession"; you can call it, you see, "an employment," today, you see. An activity, a -- a station in which you would do something.

So we come into this world passively, you see, and we go out, and we do act -- actively, we -- we act--I mean, "calling" is the most general term for it, but you can also in modern terms call it "employment." I hate it, because it is not self-chosen. It is foreign-directed, you see, "employment." And I all -- wish you all that you will -- never will feel employed, but always feel active. That is, you will always be -- I -- you cannot live unless you feel called to do what you are employed to do. If a man is only employed, he hasn't yet appropriated, so to speak, his -- his station in life. And then you have to give notice and go elsewhere. And marriage, which is the founding of the next generation.

All these -- these four events today are broken up into -- into separate events. If you take marriage -- as long as a man can only marry once, and specially a woman, there is one event in life, you see, one incisive event between birth and death, in your physical nature. Today, when you have four divorces and five marriages, and you have obviously the same event broken up into five -- it is the same with death. If you have retirement, and if you have dismissal, and if you have unemployment, you get this -- with death, you get it o- -- broken up into two events, at least: retirement and physical death.

Now in my case, you see, I came to this country in the middle of my life, in '45, and started a completely new life. Did nothing again what I did at home, and did everything different from what I never was -- had been able to do at home; so I think I have died very completely in the middle of my life, because I could

not take with me anything, you see, which I had achieved, or owned in -- in Europe.

Now most Americans know -- have in their families such an artificial death in some of their ancestors, you see, who in the same manner had to give up a full existence, a full life, you see, were retired in Europe, so to speak. You never assess sufficiently the historical break that this creates, you see, in -- most genealogies of American families.

With employment today, similar- -- formerly, a man had one calling. He was a doctor -- from -- and it's very significant: a man who had a calling down to 18- -- 1900, never went on vacation. The -- the -- the vacation is an invention of the time of em- -- mere employment, you see. Today people need a vacation, you see; and for the worker today, the struggle for the vacation is the struggle for a continuous life, for a meaningful life. It's I think the greatest social problem today: to give the employed people vacations, you see, and also to make them realize what they should make out of it, you see, and not just bus rides and tourist enterprises. And it hasn't been solved, yet.

Here, my friend, {Donald Meyer}, my colleague here whose -- who -- whom I here now, so to speak, replace at this moment with you, has a very good idea. He feels that the -- we shouldn't have a 40-hour day, or a 30-hour day -- not -- but it would be more important that any employed person could have a whole year off every four or five years, you see, to study, that this would be much more meaningful for his existence. And -- though he would waste all his time at juke boxes, and in Greyhound buses, you see, at weekends. And I think the -- the organized pleasure of weekends is an indication that people are completely ruined by their ways -- they are short-lived employed, you see. They are all shortcuts to happiness.

He -- on the -- what Mr. Meyer suggests I think is very -- has very much future. I have insisted -- I've just come from a -- address I had to deliver in Germany on January 30th for a large audience in the so-called Paulskirche, in Frankfurt, which is the largest hall in the city of Frankfurt, where the German parliament of 1848 convened. So it's a very solemn place. And I invoked there that industry of the industrialized spheres of the world couldn't go on unless every member of industry served the colonial and underdeveloped countries one or two years, you see, as a service -- in a service capacity, that the mere showering of industrial products, you see, on these countries would lead them to a tremendous upheaval, as you already see it at this moment. And so it was my point, too, that the modern industrialized humanity doesn't need weekends, but

it needs whole years of breaks in their existence.

By which I only mean to say that here again, the new thing which you now realize -- must realize is that down to 60 years ago, a man did not have a vacation, if he was a professional man. And a farmer didn't have a vacation. He had holidays, sure. He had a sabbath. But to go on vacation was simply unknown except for the luxuriously rich. I mean, for the bored people. And you know what God thinks of the rich people. You know it? Do you? Well, you just look at them, how He made them. So, they aren't the best.

So here you have again and -- this difficulty for you to understand history is that the brick out of which his -- history is built--people's lives, birth, deaths, marriage, and calling--are broken up. Here, by divorces, so that a man has four wives and more of course, if one -- a wi- -- woman has four husbands. And death, you have it broken up by retirement, and by emigration. Employment you have broken up by many employments, you see, by change of employment, so that your constant being in a station of -- where you represent a function like a -- like a brick ma- -- mason, or a jeweler, or a doctor, or a lawyer today disappears behind the fact that you are just in business, that you are just doing something, you have a job. The very word "job" has replaced the word "calling." And with birth, the physical, the medical aspect of this has overwhelmed people. The father is totally excluded. That he gives a name to the brat is today a mi- -- matter of minor consideration. The -- people do not realize that the historical event of a birth is that this child is recognized by the father.

You know, in former days, in former centuries, and I think they were very reasonable, a child did not exist in society before the father hadn't take it up -- taken it up and given it -- recognized it as his child. So the historical event for society was the recognition by the father; the physical event in nature, was the birth by the mother. The two had to go together.

This had very great advantages, gentlemen, because -- an idiot and a Mongol- -- mongrel, simply these people were -- these children were not accepted into society. And we haven't solved this problem by a long shot, who must live, you see. Where is the limit? As you know, we keep people alive who -- where it's very doubtful that we should. And you know how many families -- not how many, but that families are destroyed, because suddenly they are -- they are for the rest of their life, you see, beset by this problem of having their mongrel to -- to live with. And -- and no -- no softness of heart, gen- -- can -- can bring you over this problem, over this hurdle. Must every semblance of life, you see, be preserved? And it's again with this keeping alive of the dying person, you



see. You can overdo it.

I know a hospital, fortunately, where in such a case, the doctor simply says to the nurse, "You know what you -- have to do." And it's a bad society in which such virtuous doctor runs the penalty of death, or of -- deprivation of his office, you see, because he just does right. And the whole community is such a coward, and so timid that they -- doesn't dare to face the necessity that not every life deserves to be lived. And everybody -- you tremble. But at the same time, when you have 40,000 people killing -- killed in auto accidents. A very strange society. The 40,000 in -- in auto accidents deserve to live, because they are not idiots, you see, supposedly. But -- not one idiot can be killed, but all the people on the highway can. Very strange society. Life is very cheap for the people in the middle of life. And it is very precious for the newborn and the dying. I think it should be the other way around.

Well, I -- here I come to the fact that the -- the mother and the child in your imagination are the only people concerned with birth. And this wasn't -- is a -- quite a new thing. In former days, as you know, a father had even to go to bed with the woman in order to make him feel that it was his child, too, and that he acquired a tremendous responsibility for this child. And the -- the -- the break between the illegitimate child and the legitimate -- child was -- is just in this one thing: that a child had a father in one -- you see -- under -- in one place, and the other it hadn't.

Now today, there are no fathers. There are just second-rate mothers, I mean. The fathers play the role of the vice-mother, and vicarious mother, and -- push the perambulator. And since a father doesn't educate his children, and isn't their moral sustenance, doesn't give them their religion, they don't -- the meaning, of course, of the whole relation of birth to history is darkened.

But if you look at the Quakers, or the Baptists, even, "Theoretically," these people said, "nobody can inherit Christianity." And yet you know very well that there are Quakers stocks now for 300 years, and Baptists, you see, for 250. In other words, even in -- in the religious denominations--which say that nobody can inherit religion, you see--the heredity of religion has made itself felt. Down to 1800, you couldn't escape it. A father would donate to his child, you see, his relation to the universe. His spiritual heritage is ver- -- was very real.

I think nobody in this country ever mentions this riddle, how all these denominations, you see, become hereditary. But down to the Mormons, they are. It is only nowadays that the -- most religious sects, you see, have given up this --

this inheritance status, this heredity status. The Jehovah's Witnesses, as far as -- can see, are not able, you see, to go on into the next generation. Wouldn't that be true? And all the -- the -- the crackpots in this -- the secular sects in Los Angeles, they don't.

But from the -- all this religious heritage, and especially from the heritage of the Republican Party, I mean, from the membership in the party, in the Middle West, I mean, you just are a Republican or you are a Democrat by birth. And that is decisive for the parties. They couldn't exist without this. Don't laugh, Sir. But you have quite --.

(I'm not laughing at you. I'm agreeing with you.)

Good.

(Don't fight me.)

So I -- I want to give you the brick of history here. Now the -- the bricks out of which history is built is the experience of human beings, you see, that they are born into this world, into a heritage of law and order, which they are subjected to, because they have a father. And that they are allowed to choose an em-- -- a calling, a profession, an employment, whatever it is, a station in life, by which -- to which they contribute actively, you see, which they represent, where they hold office -- where -- you can call it today with a -- with a cheaper word, "function." But I do think that the word "office" is in order. Everyone has an office.

When Greta Garbo plays the -- Christina of Sweden -- have you seen this -- movie, still? Or is she forgotten? She played the queen of Sweden, and there was a shoemaker. And he visited her in her palace in Stockholm. And -- and the queen then had to put him right. He wanted to rebel. And he said -- she said, "You go home," you see. "My office is to be queen, and your office is to be shoemaker."

Now that's a good, Lutheran, of course, doctrine: that every man in his -- has his calling. And the lowest, as much as the highest, you see, has an office to fulfill in life, you see. We all hold office from a -- a commission from our maker. Today, however, it is very difficult to believe this, because if you have 52 jobs within 20 years--I had a friend who -- who achieved this record. I wrote -- published his life for this reason; I published the biography of this man, because

I felt that in order to understand modern- -- modern industry, you see, you had to face the fact that this man, you see, had had this number of jobs, and therefore was deprived of his relation to his -- to what he did. You see, he couldn't treat it as a -- as an office.

My comfort has been: I have al- -- also had many j- -- offices. I don't think I ever called it a "job" in my -- inside myself. But life -- your own life is your office, the whole of life. And all these various employments are little notes in the symphony of your office.

If you see that in your consciousness the fact that you do inherit tradition, politics, religion, climate, language, mores to an extent that is outranking anything you can contribute during your whole lifetime, you see, you would suddenly see that the entrance into the world of soc- -- of history is much more of a weight, and deserves much more to be balanced with a physical birth than at this moment seems to you valid. Even -- you can -- say that in your consciousness, the -- the -- acqui- -- acquisition of the English language, of the American slang, of your local traditions here in Southern California, of your school days, of your vaccination--of all the things that society does to you--of your learning, you see, being toilet broken, anything -- wearing dress, knowing what dress to wear when -- it's very important, you see, to know where you are. In a swimming pool, you are differently dressed when you are in church. That's a tremendous education, you see. All these things which you -- which you neg- -- think nothing of it, are your birth.

Now the baptism, or circumcision, or taking into the community -- any ceremony that marks off this event, that you now are growing into the traditions of the community, they are formerly -- treated as more important historically than the physical birth. Our church registers for this reason, registered down to 1870, I think, the baptism only, and not the birth. Because baptism meant the name around which now all the forms of historical life could crystallize. You as the bearer, you see, of historical manners, mores, convictions, laws, at- -- attitudes, dresses, customs, became the im- -- historically important person, or were made the historically important person.

So our church registers did register the baptism. And very often, we don't know the day of birth. With Martin Luther, we are not quite sure whether he was born on November 10th, but we do know that he was baptist -- baptized on that day, you see. So sometimes people would take the child right away to the -- to the fount, and sometimes they -- they didn't.

In other words, may I make myself understood? Birth, as an historical event also consists of a -- quite a number of events--and I would say it begins with the diapers, with the swaddling clothes, and it -- ends up with the walk to school. Now this is a long story, and it goes down to UCLA, that for 20 years you are born into society, into history. Because what does it mean to be born? You are not held responsible. Every mistake you make is more or less forgiven you. It's still an unreal, you see, a playlike existence. To be born means that somebody else is still responsible for you.

Now take mistakes made here in this section with -- of you. Can be forgiven. It's given to the wind, you see. It doesn't stay with you. Whereas later on in life, it's very different. On the highway, the mistake you make, you see, is held against you. It goes on record.

So it is overlooked by you, that you still rely on this historical birth. But it is also broke- -- fragmented today -- fragmentarized, broken up into these little events in life, and so not one of them looks very important.

So just as much as you have 50 employments, and just as much as you have five marriages today coming to you, the kindergartens, and the ch- -- school, and the high school, and the college, and the various psychological phases of a child's growth, you see, today to you are just separate entities. But for history, of course, they all mean that you are still prehistorical beings. Birth means the entrance of a child into a preparatory stage, and I call this intentionally--to shake you into consciousness--into -- you are prehistoric.

We are prehistoric as long as anything we do is not held against us, or in as far as it isn't held against us. You see, where things can be obliterated, where the parents simply can say to the child, "Well, we forget about it," you see, where you have this obliteration, you have fatherhood. And since God forgives -- this meaning of God's fatherhood, that to the end of days, we still are His children, and He obliterated, He forgets what we have done. And we can start afresh. But not -- in society. Society of course has to pin down some responsibility, you see, on somebody. And so we have a criminal whom God can forgive, but the law cannot. You see the difference? Quite surprising, really.

But all these doctrines from the -- from the -- see, from the realm of the religious tradition today I have to conjure up as your own experience, because modern society has managed by multiplying these stimuli--by speaking of "stimuli," instead of "events"--to take you out of history, to make you unconscious of your real historical position between the generations. You are in history only

if you can form a generation consciously between the laws of the past and the promises, or programs, or prophecies of the future. You are only in history if you can say, "This one thing is over, this order of society, and I'm going to start a new one." And for this you have to look backward, how you were born into society by these acts of, you see, training, education, breeding, what-not, and if you can also know that it -- takes a lifetime to leave any dent, that to th- -- your dying day, you are clothed with one office that is total. That the measure of your life is not of our own making, but that God--or the creative process, or however you call this; I don't care; I call it "God"--that God has invested in men His way of -- of continuing creation. You and I do the creating. That's our business. He has -- and therefore He has made men to live 70, or 80, or 90 years. And He has also allowed us to -- to -- to concentrate, to give away our life for a great cause, earlier, which --. So I would say when a lieutenant dies on the battlefield at 20, he invests 50 years of his life expectation, you see, into this event. And therefore it is much more effective than the day in a sick-bed, you see, after 70 years of life. He does something with his whole life. He compounds it, and it explodes; and therefore leaves of course a greater mark. If you invest 50 years, you see, of -- of unli- -- -lived life into such an act, you leave a mark.

All this to you, it seems to me, is -- has gone out of existence, because you are spellbound by the animal kingdom, by Darwin. You really believe that we live like animals. That is, our physical existence is the whole story. Obviously, my dear children, since man is in history, this isn't true. The same human stock, the same way of coming into this world, you see, has existed now for -- let's say, 10,000 years, 15,000 years. Yet every generation has changed the picture of the globe. And if you look here, at Los Angeles, I think you will admit that from the desert to the water tower, and to the aircraft factory, and to Hollywood, it is quite a march of events. And every generation has done something to change the human character; that is, the human activity, the -- and that is history.

And therefore, the physical death, the physical birth, gentlemen, the physical ma- -- act of mating, and the physical, playlike activity of running around in a desert, so to speak, you see, is not what makes man into an historical being and -- is the condition of history, but only that we are heirs, as I might call it, that we are founders, that we foun- -- form a group, and that we -- fill a whole office.

Now what's the difference? Formerly, of course, when a person married, he also held office. I mean, you -- you moved into a homestead, you see, and you began to farm, for example. And before, you were part of your father's household. So marriage, and -- and office, and employment formerly were very close

together, you see. Usually the day of -- the day of a man ceasing to be an apprentice, or a fellow becoming a master also meant that now he was ready to have a house.

I want you -- invite you -- marriage is forming a household. All this today is destroyed. Most people try, when they marry, not to form a household, but to live in a -- in a ki- -- with the kitchen and out -- go out for lunch. And so again, this is destroyed. Marriage today does not mean housekeeping necessarily. And -- especially when the wife also goes to work. Housekeeping and office-holding I want you to see as out -- the direction of a man's position in life to the -- towards the outer world, and towards the inner world. Marriage means to create an inward order, an interior, so to speak. You -- you go to an interior decorator if you want to furnish your -- your home. You see, this word is very significant. You want to have intimacy. Inside you want to be of something, you see, by which you brick yourself off against the outer world. Marriage is the forming of one cell out of two bodies. And the word "house" or "home" of course is the expression for this direction inward.

And the office-holding -- if you elect a president of the United States, why is he holding office, gentlemen? What is the -- the max- -- the simplest criterion for any office-holder?

Compared to a woman who enters the house of her husband--and disappears, so to speak, behind the doors, you see, there--and -- and doesn't want to be seen, so to speak, like the widow of Tyrone Power, I read yesterday, said -- she stated very bluntly: she would have nothing to do with the public, you see. Any office-holder faces the public. That is, private and public, outer and inner are the antagonisms, you see, in -- for the act of marriage, of intimacy, of intimation, so to speak, and the -- any office is extrovert.

I can prove this to you by the simple fact: anybody who holds office represents to the outer world the community in which he holds this office. If you are doctor and you go abroad, they say, "It's an American physician." And you can't help it. America comes under -- under scrutiny, because you are an American physician. You represent America, you see, in medicine, as soon as you go abroad. The same is true of an American student who goes to Heidelberg, you see. "The American students behave like that."

So all office-holding, all -- all -- represent- -- all--how do you call it?--all function is representative of the whole group inside which you function. Again, I -- I recommend this to you as a kind of rediscovery of historical -- the historical

bottom principle, you see. We all in our public functions are representing the community in which we function. If a governor of Los -- of California goes to -- to Mr. Khrushchev, or the senator of Minnesota, Mr. Humphrey, you see, Mr. Khrushchev doesn't speak to Mr. Humphrey per se, but he receives him because he's the senator from Minnesota, you -- obviously, you see. And wastes his time on him.

Why do I say this? Do we have another blackboard? No? We should have. The historical brick, which you and every one of us is asked to represent the -- the element out of which the--you can also say, the "molecule," this block of humanity which you and I are, you see--in the case of marriage creates an interior, a house, a home. In the case of a calling, it becomes representative to the outside world. Perhaps I should make this sign more clearly. Obviously the -- the most pronounced representative of the United States is the president. But he has only the highest office. Everyone of us to a minor -- to a minor degree is also representative of the group inside which he has this function. Now a -- a thinker, a philosopher, of course, tries to have a function for the whole of the thinking universe. So they are -- not everyone represents America. You can be -- a member of the senate in California, then you would represent California through this office, and not the whole of America.

But any office, whether you are a -- blacksmith, or whether you are president of the United States, is representative of the group within which you function. No blacksmith can function if he has no horses to shoe. So -- that he is a blacksmith inside the agriculture or industrial society, you see, only makes him into a blacksmith. They -- we -- nobody holds office, nobody can be employed, except as a representative of an order in which society cooperates. We all, in our division of labor, have offices which together form the whole of this historical pattern.

So the disagreeable thing for the -- for the American mind at this moment is that his representative function he will negate. He says, "I'm independent. I don't approve."

This happened to me Pearl Harbor Day, on 7- -- December 7th, 1941, I had a class. And I -- the 8th. It was -- this was Sunday evening. And Monday at -- noon -- as a matter of -- of fact, at 1:30, I had a class, and I was very excited, and I said, "Now we have war."

Up went a student in the true, anti-historical spirit of a good -- good, boy

and said, "No, we haven't. We still can deny -- refuse to go to war."

And I said, "Pardon. But there are two people engaged. The Japanese want war. And if they want war, you can be forced into it."

And he said, "No. We simply decline to -- to accept Pearl Harbor."

There you have the -- you see, the -- the i- -- the i- -- idea of staying outside history, you see. If -- if you do not agree, history doesn't take place. You understand? This is carrying it, I think, very far, you would agree. But I think it's the American first reaction: "Let's not be taken in. I want first to examine this," you see. "I am not representative, as an American citizen, of an event that has befallen the nation. If I'm not in it, I'm not in it."

And I think this is quite interesting, because it ta- -- it keeps you -- restrains you from accepting history, you see, as a process within which we are already, you see, found, whether we like it or not. Now the same is then true of the -- the other thing. We are shot into history by this process that from the stable in Bethlehem, and the--where the donkey and the -- the ox, you see, connive to accept the little baby--Jesus is shot into history year after year. And the scene in the temple where -- at 12, where He teaches, of course is an attempt to show this upward movement into -- on the historical scene. To you, a child that is born is already on the historical level. I decline, you see. The -- the physical baby that is born in the cradle, it has to be lifted up on this level in which it can become pers- -- a person through marriage and a person through office. And if this isn't done to him, you get juvenile delinquents, for example. That is, they tire on the way -- into history. This is, I think, the real fate today of the juvenile delinquent, that he -- he is fatigued. He has -- on this march, you see, he suddenly is at the age of 12 deserted, so to speak. He has his hands no longer lifted. One reason is that he is not -- no demands on him, of a real, you see, imposition on his -- on his character. And he's not -- he -- people from whom nothing is demanded are the unhappiest creatures in the world. They can't grow.

Just as you have to -- to tie a vine, you see, to the tree so that you can grow up, so a child has to be tied to the demands of the elders in order to become itself able to stand on its own feet. And our school system is, as you know, one of -- of making you forget that life is hard instead of showing you that it isn't. And I think our own society is so anti-historical--Los Angeles is a case in point--that most children no longer reach the level of history. They mate, but they don't marry. They confuse sex and marriage, which is two absolutely different things. And -- so they remain brute animals.



And if I -- put it this way, you see: here you have the baby; here you have the child; here you have puberty; here you have love -- capacity to love; and here you have marriage. Now these are every seven years quite distinct phases. And in order to be able to found a home, this takes maturity. You have to be able to distinguish between your passion of love, and your sobriety in love. You have to distinguish in love again -- between sex urge, and what is love, which is connected with your willingness to sacrifice for the -- the person you love. There is no love without the balance between lust and sacrifice. But sex is mere -- happening, so to speak. Sex is -- is before issue. You can do nothing about it. The way out of -- of -- of sex, as you well know, is selection, where you will sacrifice. I mean, I've seen many a boy saved on a Saturday evening, because he was on the way to -- to do anything to throw away his -- his physical strength. And then a good woman just on the street says to him, "Come and have a cup of coffee with me." And the whole sex urge boils down, you see, quiets down, and this day is passed off erotically, by affection, but not by -- with an -- act of sexual helplessness.

Now as you see, the importance of the historical fact of birth--that is, of baptism, of -- the relation of father and child--is that it did invite the parents to consider this road from birth to the child's marriage, and the child's employment in -- by the wider society as their responsibility. You understand, that the mores of the country, the customs, the laws--they couldn't be devolved on a school. The Parent-Teacher Association hadn't been in- -- invented, where the teachers tell the parents what to do. It's a very funny association. Do you ever go to a PT- --? Wie? You know this, how difficult it is, for the parents to -- to have a voice -- real voice in the matter. Isn't it true? Or, how do you find it?

(I think -- I think it does -- I don't think it's uniform. I think that in many cases, the -- the teachers are so -- so much abdicating their own position, that the -- then the parents tell the teachers. They have to tell them -- they some- -- something has to be said. And in other situations, I think that where the teachers have a strong organization, that then they tell the parents. So I do think it changes. I don't know what it is here, in Los Angeles.)

Anybody any experience with this?

(I have a -- I know of an experience of entire corruption of -- someone using your -- their -- their power for money, trying to make a teacher lose his job because he flunked his student, and went to the PTA, and the board of educa-

tion. And this teacher received calls from board of education, asking him to reconsider. And the case was really clear-cut, that the -- the kid was cheating. And it's just -- just sickening to see what could happen, especially when you think of education.)

Well, Mr. Sherwood Adams, a trustee of Dartmouth College, and his son went to -- Mr. {Goldfein's} son went to Dartmouth College.

(He was my classmate.)

He was your classmate.

(I know him well.)

And -- and {Gary Earl} tutored him. You remember {Gary Earl}? And I am still in close touch with {Gary Earl}. When the story of -- about Sherwood Adams broke in the papers as a secre- -- you know, private secretary to the president -- or assistant president, I was reminded by {Gary Earl} of the fact that exactly what you say happened. Mr. {Goldfein's} son was found cheating in the finals. And the faculty voted that he had to be -- you see, severed from college. And the vote was taken, and was unanimous for dismissal. Then the president suddenly stood up and said, "Mr. Sherwood Adams, trustee of Dartmouth College, wants you to reconsider the case."

And the votes were second -- taken a second time, and Mr. {Goldfein} was -- stayed in.

(This is better, because in the -- in this instance that I cited, it didn't even -- at the very beginning they said, "You know, don't do it." They -- the principal of the high school told the -- the teacher not to -- not to do this, here.)

Ja. Perhaps we -- you begin to understand that since we have no historical relation now to birth and death, but a purely physical, that many people stan- -- remain outside history. This is the staggering event. And I think if you go and see this humanity here, this -- your first impression, that they do not know where they are living, when they are living, you see. It's just purely accidental. They live from day to day. They live very well, as a matter of fact. And that's just the reason why they have absolutely no notion.

I was asked -- asked the other day by a group of very serious secretaries of labor unions what they should do to educate the young women between --

between -- before the age of 20. Could they send them to Bible classes, or -- lift their sights in some way, that they wouldn't throw away all money and everything for lipstick. And -- and I had to answer them, that if they couldn't interest these girls in the next five years of their lives, there was nothing that deserved to be put into their lives, by reading or so.

I said, "You can read the Bible in the life of 24 hours, as a stimulus, as an interesting story about Susanna and her bath, you see, and that -- then it ranks with -- with Esquire. Or you can make a child aware of the fact that she has a long life to live, and that the tensions which carry a person along, over 10 or 15 years, you see, should rule the powers that rule the day. Just as in -- relation between marriage and sex, this is absolutely necessary, you see, that sex is overruled by love, and love is overruled by marriage. And -- if a woman is sick, that doesn't allow a man simply to go haywire and to say he's no longer married. And if the -- his wife grows ugly, there's no excuse for him to run after beautiful woman, you see. So all the urges are simply to overruled by a higher law."

And -- I said, "If you cannot in- -- in- -- inject into these poor girls' existence something of this long-range sentiment, or expectation, or fear, don't abuse all the good things--neither Shakespeare nor the Bible--because they will all fall flat. And they will be never -- available, even later not. The terrible thing with -- with the classics is--and the Bible--is that if they come to you at an age where you live from day to day, their power is destroyed. And you will say later, "Never again will I touch these books," because you have this memory that you abused them, so to speak, for a momentary -- flicker of interest, in which, of course, they could never compare to the comic strip.

And I th- -- I would of course in this country abolish the reading of the Bible, of all serious literature, before 25 or 30.

[tape interruption]

If you have to read the comics, then read them. But then don't read anything else.

This is very serious, gentlemen. It all has to do with the idea that the whole process of -- of growing up is a process of your own action, that nobody is -- that you are all self-made, that you pick and choose. At the age of 20 -- 12, you tell your child, "{ } you go to the movie," then you go. Or you say, "I want to see television," then they have to allow it. If the child is not born by the father's spiritual, you see, historical act of proge- --or how would you call it?--procrea-

tion, or -- you see, if this is not an act of the parents, then it is of course -- becomes -- is -- thought of as being an act of the children.

And this today I think is the rule in this community, that the child is already considered somebody who selects for himself. I have seen children of 4 being asked to select on the menu in a restaurant what they want to eat. Well, that's madness. But everybody does it in this country. It's absolute madness, you see. I have also known a family where the child was destroyed, because it was asked to distinguish composers and conductors -- it was very musical. It was a kind of musical genius. The parents were so proud that they inquired from this child at the age of 2 who had composed this--Beethoven, you see, and Haydn. At 4, my son who is a psychiatrist, got this case; and the child was destroyed. Nothing could help him. It had been overstimulated, you see; it had been over-taxed. And here was a genius destroyed by this idea that a child, after it's born, it's all under its own steam. It's in his own boat.

Gentlemen, you are not in your own boat as long as something is not held against you. As people understand that what you say is not serious, because a person is in history when his word can be held against him. This is the -- the break in your si- -- social situation, you see. Wherever, the -- thing I say makes me, because I'm quoted on this, you see, and people say, "That's the man who said this," I'm in history. Before, I'm not.

This is the only decisive diff- -- difference between a playboy and a real man. Or a girl -- a woman and a -- little, laughing, ignorant girl. As long as you giggle, well, people say, "She's -- it isn't serious." But as soon as she has -- can cry and say, "Here I love this man, and I'll elope with him," she becomes Juliet at the ripe age of 14.

And of course the -- the limiting concept of history therefore is always this simple fact: in every one of us, there comes the hour where you have to stand upright and say, "You may take my life, but this I cannot do." You see, you cannot commit adultery; you cannot commit incest with your sister, even if the people say, "If you don't, they -- I will kill you." The Germans have tried this with the Jews in Poland. For their -- for their pleasure, they tried to make -- break down the morality of the Jews. Just for their entertainment, you see. Say, "We'll kill you, but in our" -- in their presence, perform, so to speak, you see.

There you see how serious this whole question of historical existence is.

There are limits to any man's endurance. And there are things you cannot do, even though they kill you. And -- this may be a limiting concept, but it is evaded

in this country, although this is the most bloodthirsty country in the history of the world. I mean, there have been more people killed in the settlement of America, you see, than in any other country. If you read the story of the Indians in this country, here in California, it is just awful. But -- the -- it is denied today that people can live in history without ever being -- having to decide the question: "You are -- will have to die for this cause." Yet no war is possible, you see. No public law can be upheld if there is not a policeman who is willing to take a chance to be shot dead -- down by the robbers. You see, it would break down your system of order.

And as long as you are -- you must -- every one of you, this is a very personal decision, should -- should begin to scrutinize his -- your whole upbringing is against every word I say. I am perfectly aware of this. But you have bought it at the price that you are outside history. You are all living, preferably, outside the historical -- you are statistically, you see, important. But in history, the -- only the people are -- who are statistically unimportant. Because the statistically unimportant at one point resist the trend. And -- if a crime is committed by everybody--everybody lynches Negroes--one person has to stand up and say, "No." That's how it begins.

My greatest historical story in this -- respect is the story of a -- McCarthy anecdote. McCarthy had his -- Mr. {Caspar} and other similar individuals going down South. Now I don't know if it was {Caspar} or somebody else, but it happened in 1948 in a city in the South. A small city, perhaps 10,000 people, in South Carolina. And this rabble-rouser came to town, and everybody went, because it was the McCarthy days. You haven't lived through them, probably, but there was real excitement in the country. And it was like the Sedition Act of 1795, you see, the whole nation was -- thought they -- they were betrayed. And -- and I think still there was some cause for this excitement. So I -- you mustn't think that I -- I have something to say in favor of the purge of McCarthy; because when I came to this country, I've been persecuted--because I was not a Communist--by the educated people. So I know there was this "fellow traveler" business to a tremendous extent. I was a reactionary, so -- and I was denied all promotion here, and all acceptance, because I was a reactionary. And a very wise man at that time said, "Why don't you join the Communist Party?"

And I said, "But I can't."

And he said, "Well, but -- then your future in this country would be assured." This was in '33.

So -- I only want to say, I'm not partisan in this story, you must -- you must understand. I'm only descriptive of what happened. Because -- of course, was a louse, he was cheap, and didn't deserve any personal credit. And this rabble-rouser came to this town in South Carolina, and set everybody against everybody. There were 1,000 people in this -- in this gathering. It was very great excitement. And you felt that one match, you see, could start a conflagration. And -- so everybody was on edge, what would happen.

And after he had ended his harangue, an old man--and they always have been the saviors of -- the historical continuity in this country, I think, the man over 70 or 80 -- like Stimson, and such people, you know, the secretary of war in -- under Roosevelt--and he said simply, "My friends, I have grown up in this town, with Protestants, and Catholics, and Jews, and Negroes. And we have always got along very well. I think the speaker has not understood this. So I propose that we all now get together and accompany him to the railroad station." And so it was done.

And I think that's -- there you learn how history is made, you see. History is made when an automatic trend suddenly is interrupted by a personal act for which this man takes the responsibility and allows himself to be quoted. It's very simple.

But you cannot -- now of course after this has happened, I go around -- into this seminary group here of yours, and say, "This is representative of America, of the American small town," you see. Because he simply created an office -- a function, you see, which is nowhere written in the -- in the -- in the Constitution of the United States. But I assure you, the Constitution of the United States can never -- not function one day without such an event happening, you see. If not one man comes forward, you see, and says, "This is not right," you will -- there will be no Constitution of the United States.

Take you another case. Down to 1939, the good will of the whole earth was enlisted on the American side by the missionaries that went all over the globe from America. Travelers of good will. They were journalists, they were real missionaries, they were doctors, they were dentists, but people all over the globe. And I have met with them.

And when I was a boy of 10, I was approached by an American in Switzerland. And I have never forgotten it. He tried to -- to proselytize me, so to speak, and to -- and was deeply impressed that -- a man with a -- with a great top hat, you know. That was still the way they -- he -- he traveled. All great -- a giant of a

man. Now, I was a very small boy. And here he was, bending over me, you see, and saying where I came from; I came from Berlin, Germany.

"Oh, that's a very dangerous city," he said, you see. "It's so secular."

And so I never held these expressions before, you see. He talked German.

Well, I only meant to say, this man traveled around the globe and everywhere represented America; and they were fully aware that their life was their office. A good American has this feeling, that his whole life is invested in this one adventure, you see, of doing -- getting God's commission. And I have met these people--and I know of many others--what an effect the existence of these free travelers of America-- from America had all over the globe.

In 1939, it was discovered by the department of state of this country that there was nothing in the Constitution saying anything about passports. From this, they gathered that since it wasn't mentioned, it was not the birthright of an American to get a traveling passport abroad. And they usurped, as you well know, by now the -- the power to say where you can travel. By this they controverted, they inverted the whole Constitution of the United States, because the United States had been founded as an open part of an open world. And obviously, if you give to an institution of the government the right to decide where you can travel, you reverse the whole situation. And from the open frontier, which is a passport problem, you see, we simply are now a closed shop. And we are not any better than Russia. My letters are censored when I write to Russia. They are censored not in Moscow, but they are censored in Washington. And nobody cries. Because you are so statistically minded, that you say, "But nobody says anything. Why should I?"

One man went to court, you know. And the Supreme Court now is, of course--it hasn't been quite settled, the question--but I assure you that your whole future and the whole future of humanity is at stake at this decision whether the state department can retain your passports, or whether you have a right to go to Holland whenever you want to go. That's very important for your own life. And -- and you are -- don't care. You say, "Oh, I can't do anything." The one person who cares makes this passport case into a stepping-stone in history. Can't you see this? If there is not such a man who says, "I sacrifice my fortune, my time for it, my lifetime, to go through with this, through all the different courts of appeal," nothing will happen.

I mean, if you -- I here, I do nothing. I arouse your interest in this matter, but am I really engaged in this? No, I'm quite aware that I'm only mentioning this to you, you see. I'm not yet in history. I'm playing with the idea, so to speak, that some one of us should make the sacrifice and stay put until this is solved. And you may see that a teacher of history is -- is still only fooling around with the story, you see. I'm not making history here in this seminar by telling you this. I'm quite aware of my very secondary role. But I think it's a beginning, at least. I have to tell you at least that it is an issue, have I not?

And if you begin to see this, certainly, you will have -- make an office -- a man becomes representative in history if he makes one issue his issue through his whole life, whatever that may mean. And the test of this is: is he willing to perish? Not that he should seek death, you understand. It's not a suicidal thing. But that he should be willing to pay the penalty. To -- he -- simply if he go -- I go now to the Supreme Court and say, "-- The state department has withheld my passport to China." As you know, you know, they -- they do this.

I have a friend, Bill Hinton, who went to China just the same. Now this had tremendous consequences. His mother has the -- had the -- was the principal of the famous Putney School in Verm- -- in Vermont. And many of the parents of course were good, you see, old-fashioned, wealthy people; and they were frightened to death. My son went to school in the same class with Bill Hinton at this school. So I know the story very well. Well, Bill Hinton said, "Come," you see -- water? or how do you say? high water or? Wie?

(Hell or high water.)

"Hell and high water, I go through with it." He's still in -- he went back to China. He testified before the -- foreign committee of the Senate. Well, he is still an old-fashioned American who knows what it takes to enter history. He said, "You can break me, but you cannot take away from me the decision that I have the right to find out what is going on in China myself."

Now the whole period of American history from 1776 to 1945 I assure you is at this moment jettisoned by your generation, because you don't give a damn for this issue. It is the one issue, because it makes America into a different nation. It makes them into a nationalistic nation, if the center office in Washington, you see, can decide where you move to. The whole legislation has been in this direction. I cannot live in Europe now without losing my citizenship, because I'm a natural- -- -ized citizen. The -- the people of the United States are so fed up with immigrants that you have made me into a second-rate citizen. I am now a citizen



since 1940, and just the same, for 20 years now -- after -- 19 years I'm a citizen. I came to this country innocently in '33 and didn't take out my -- came on a visitor's visa, because I didn't understand this whole rigmarole, you see. So I could have had -- become a -- a citizen much earlier. However that may be, that's my own mistake. But still, the law says now, you see, that a person who is -- under -- in the opinion of the state department absent from this country too long in the first 25 years of his citizen rights, can simply be deprived of his citizenship without due course of law, without any proceedings. He simply -- his passport is taken -- American passport is taken away from him. No answer given. No reasons given. I live under an absolutely arbitrary regime. It's just as bad as taxation without representation. Or even worse, because I even -- not a citizen. And I have no appeal.

The courts in this land have nothing to say in the matter. We are absolutely treated as second-degree people. Who cares? This law was picked over, you see, under the steamroller of the Republicanism of Mr. Eisenhower's jubilant entrée into the good old folk ways of 1750. And he became a Presbyterian, and that was all that was needed to set the country right.

The -- the intent not to have to do with historical problems, you see, is overwhelming. And it is a -- therefore quite exceptional that history can take its course. It is against the will of the majority of humanity, you see, to take upon -- themselves the burden, you see, of the question that has to be solved at any one moment. Now, look at the passport question. It has to be solved now. If you forfeit this privilege, you see, within the next five years, so to speak, the -- never will America be again an open country. I don't say a "free" country, but the condition of freedom is openness.

Now immigration has stopped, you see. But the -- the corollary to emigration, which is never mentioned in your textbooks, is not immigration. But how would you call it, this free roaming, you see? The right to roam over the globe is essential to the whole American story. Where would we be in South America? Where would we be in Panama? Where would we be in Mexico? If you read any American's reminiscences and memoirs, you see, how many people have -- have gone to all of these countries, you see, and made for good will? I mean, {Douglas Stier}, at this moment, the -- the Quaker, is -- is in South Africa. It's very important for the rest of the world, because here is a man of the -- you see, Quaker -- faith in this African turmoil, you see, terribly im- -- important. Now should he be made dependent on the wisdom of some official in the state department who says, "It's good to go to Africa," or "not good to go to Africa"? You see, what -- what difference it makes for your and my right to enter history. A whole field of

action is either, you see, left open to my decision, or it's -- I'm just a--how would you call it?--an instrument then of a -- of a deliberate policy of the central government.

And I feel very strongly on this, you see. Now that I depend for my passport on a decision of the state department, nothing that I do is completely free. So a -- an amount of dignity is taken away from my action, because everybody in the foreign world will say, "Oh, he got a passport from the United States government. Then they must like what he's doing. He's a propagandist." You understand? That I'm now tainted with propaganda.

I went to Yugoslavia, this last fall, which is a very important corner of the globe, as you can see. It's betwixt and between. Well, I was in a very -- I went on my -- at my own expense, but I did go as a delegate of the United States government, because otherwise I wouldn't have gotten a passport. And I felt denigrated, so to speak; you see, I felt belittled, made small. Can you see the -- the difference? Because the people said, "Well, obviously the United States have an interest that this man go. This is not a disinterested party to this. I -- They gave him the passport. They even allowed him to speak in their name."

So we are -- today, the -- the horror of the world is that any American who goes abroad no longer is acting as a free human -- a Christian agent, but he's acting as a representative of the United States government. And -- I think the poison comes from this. We would have had peace long ago if there were still this -- was still this overflow of free American agents. Yes?

(One thing -- the thing is that you are saying, we still are representative of our own country, whether they label us officially "Americans" --.)

Oh, pardon me. I said explicitly, you can be representative for Vermont.

You can be a representative for the United States govern- -- the United States. But any function has its own area of meaning. A doctor is not only an American physician. He can also stand for medicine. And -- you see, and a -- a physicist can be -- stand for physics. You know, Mr. Oppenheimer died for this. He was deprived of his position here with these -- with atomic energy, for the -- for what reason? You know the story? Because he said, "I can communicate with all physicists of the world," and so he talked to a Communist physicist in Paris. And this was the only reason why this man -- who's n- -- now the head of the foundation at Princeton, you see, of Ad- -- Institute of Advanced Studies, was not allowed to stay in the American, you see, atom -- Atomic Commission, and why we have this fool Teller now, instead.

So it is very bad, you see. The -- you represent different -- you always represent. I -- I stick to that, you see. But you -- you can -- represent Christianity, can you not? I mean, this man who talked to me in Switzerland, with his big top hat, this great top hat, he didn't speak as an American to me, but I saw that Americans still cared for the rest of the world. This is the -- enlarging this, isn't it? But now I don't think that Americans -- are -- can -- would say this, "They care for the rest of the world." I would say they carry their American interests everywhere. That is, it's America first.

Can you see this -- the difference? The slight overturn in -- the twist in this? Then I believe that Americans will go to great lengths to help the Armenian children, you see. Now I saw it's -- in the interests of the American government that some Americans should go and help the American -- the Armenian children. That's a -- quite a change.

And I can only tell you that propaganda is an invention of the last 40 years. Mr. -- Lord Northcliffe, you see, the English journalist, invented this. He had a kind of -- he was -- himself died from persecution mania, and from syphilis, and -- and -- this is not unimportant, because propaganda has re- -- is -- is a similar fever pitch. It's something of -- from which you -- we all suffer. And propaganda I think makes world peace highly improbable. As long as you have propaganda, everything is distorted. You can only hope that everybody will distort everything so that nothing will work any more. That's the only hope we have, that all propaganda will be -- will be, so to speak, counteracted by counter-propaganda.

But this has never happened in the history of the world. The word "propaganda" is only -- was invented in the year of the Lord 1916. I think this is very important for you to know this. The secular word "propaganda" is a word of very recent standing. And I think it has made man's historical role in society, you see, highly difficult, because anything we do now is treated -- under this aspect of -- of propaganda. And it's -- it is stay-collared, so to speak. And Heaven knows how you will implement any acts of yours to make sure that -- they do -- they do not rate you as a -- you see, as just a spy, or just an agent of -- of an -- of Mr. Ford, or -- you see, or of the government, or of some corporation. It is not propaganda only in politics. It's commercial agents, even more so, isn't it?

I -- can -- give you a nice case. A -- the chief of press of the -- Lufthansa, which is the German airline now--corresponding to Pan American; I mean, it's the only airline they have--wrote a very sensible letter to the paper, which I

happened to read, about car driving. And he's a -- driver himself of -- you see, of -- a man of 50. And -- and he has driven many different cars. And he complains that American discipline on the road is so much better than European discipline. Anybody who has been to Europe -- who has been to Europe? Well, you know this, how true it is. And he tried to introduce American mores. And so he said, "Cut down on your speed limit. You cannot go at -- at hundred miles an hour on our narrow roads. In America they only go 50 and 60 miles. Why don't you do this, too?"

Thereupon a shower of letters came to this paper. I read them. And it's just incredible. The -- the -- the climax was reached when the editor of an automobile paper -- motor -- for motorists, said, "Well, why do you listen to this man at all? He -- after all, he's with Lufthansa. Of course, he wants to slow down the driving of the cars. He's just making propaganda for flying."

And -- and -- it's only to show you: here was a man simply soberly discussing the problem of the road, and immediately he was considered a propagandist for the -- his bread--how do you call it?--his bread-and-butter employer. The -- it was quite interesting, because the -- then the paper itself got very mad indeed and upheld the right of this man from Lufthansa to say what he thought about car-driving on a road. But we live in this kind of world today, that nobody is believed for anything.

And -- since this is so, gentlemen, you will see that witness to the truth is the historical role of man. In order to get yourself in a position where people s- -- believe that you mean what you say, you have to strip yourself from certain securities, from certain niceties of existence, you see. They want to see this risk. This man of Lufthansa, you see, could only prove his point if he would still persist with his policy about cars on the -- on the highway--Lufthansa or no Lufthansa, you understand. Before, it could never be proven that he is not a propagandist.

Now you haven't to take a man seriously who has ulterior motives, obviously. And as you know, history in the last 50 years in this country has developed a tremendous search for ulterior motives. And this is why the whole story I think had to be brought home to you. You -- you see, the ulterior motives have abolished the whole American history. Mr. Charles Beard has said that Jefferson and Washington had ulterior motives in writing the Declaration of Independence. And this idea of ulterior motives has been -- made an attempt to make history into a science. And to penetrate behind what people stood for--or said they stood for, you see--into their being really instruments of propaganda

for ulterior motives is just { } that there is something you do not say. Isn't that true?

And "ulterior motives" therefore is just another word for treating everybody as a propagandist. And -- so the -- the -- this history -- school of historians--this is what I wanted to say today in the first place--this school of historians which surround today you in the -- your textbook and so, has tried, you see, to find ulterior motives, in order to get rid of this entrance into history by personal conviction. This is -- there are no personal convictions. Everybody says something but means something else.

In this moment, you see, the whole history is depersonalized, because then the man who fights for the passport against the state department, before the Supreme Court, is again acting for -- again for something else. You never know what people mean when they say something. And I think that's how you are treated, you see. Everything is just allowed to fool around with the -- with the words he said, with the laws he writes, with the letters he -- with the speeches he makes. We have a situation, of course, where the president doesn't make his own speeches. And so we are totally poisoned. Nobody believes anything what is { }. So why should a man believe when the girls propose to him, as they do today? You see, everything is perverted.

I saw -- did you see the squib in the paper, yesterday? You see, "Sure, I married her," somebody is overheard here on the beach. "Sure, I married her. She wanted me more to marry her than I didn't want her to marry me." That is, it's all minus. It's all negative, you see.

So my first word is: if you rediscover man as a brick in history, and would admit that to be born is not a physical act for the -- society, but that somebody undertakes--parents, guardians, you may even say in a very meaningless way, "society"--you -- take the responsibility of building up a baby's prehistorical situation into an historical situation. If you could bring yourself to see that to be born, you see, is the deed of the community to you, that you are prehistorical, that to be born is not something you do to yourself, you would have to destroy, of course, this notion of the self-made man.

You have to decide: is man self-made, or is he born? But birth is nothing physical, you see. Birth is something that takes place over 20 years. Man is born into society, because he's only man if he can understand under what conditions he can become a full-fledged member of this society. Before, he is not in history. If you could replace this, you would get rid of the two agonizing things of -- of --

America which are self-contradictory. One is: man is self-made. The other: man is just under trends and is statistically, you see, can be statistically be gotten. That is, he's not self-made.

You see, the -- the new child is said -- to, "Oh, you do it yourself. You select your -- your menu when you are 3." And the grownup person is told, "Oh, you are just a product of your environment." "We have statistics that will tell us how many refrigerators can be bought; you have nothing to say about it."

I once had a discussion with a man of Madison Avenue, one of these tycoons, you know. And I said, "But I don't care for a television. I won't have one."

And -- finally we discussed these things, and -- he was so annoyed. Finally he said, "Well, you are statistically unimportant." You see. And that finished me in his eyes. But it -- I began of course to look up, perk, and think I was a great fellow. I am statistically unimportant. Then I am important in history. Can you see this?

The condition for anybody to be -- an -- historical individual is that he is statistically unimportant.

So we have the -- the choice. Your tradition is--and it is the -- for 150 years the official reading of -- of man's existence on this globe--that we are self-made in our -- as children, and as young men. And then we enter society, and there environment, propaganda, ulterior motives are everything. Because if a man is a -- after all, the product, here, you get all these technical terms: trend, environment, propaganda, ulterior motives. Hypocrisy, by the way, is the most general -- common denominator for all this. It's the hypocrisy of the made man, but the self-made man is able to break through all this at the age -- at the ripe age of 6. How he does it, is a mystery. These -- I think these are mutual- -- two mutually exclusive concepts. I will say that a man of 60 may begin to be self-made, gentlemen, you see. But how a boy under the pressures of modern society at the ripe age of 15 should be self-made, I do not understand. That's against the official creed of this country. Yet it is believed.

You have the -- the story, you see, of the boy who -- you see, from rags to riches on the one-hand side, you see, that he can make good, you see. You know, like the blond girl who came back with a mink coat from New York to -- to her father and he said, "Well, have you been a good girl? A mink coat?"

And he said -- she said, "Oh, Papa, you don't know how good you have to be in New York in order to get a mink coat."

So let's have a break here.

[tape interruption]

Or you want to dance?

What did I ask you to bring to class? The Book of Samuel.

({ }.)

Anybody who is interested in this so-called scientific approach to history may do well. I don't want to make it prescribed reading. The History of History, by Mr. Shotwell, who was the great gun at Columbia University, and president of the -- the inspirer of the Carnegie Foundation for Peace, and a leading mind at the turn of the -- I mean, down to 10 years ago, Shotwell, History of History. There is an -- a rather astonishing misunderstanding of the Bible to be found. He called this book The Interpretation of -- The History of History. And as I said, I have respect for the man. He has achieved many things, and certainly has done a -- a lot to introduce the problem of a world history to this country.

But then he has a strange chapter on "The Old Testament as History," page 107 to 142. Now this is in the seminar room here. It's one of the few books on the -- ancient history which we have, "Gift by {Genevieve L. Morris}," God bless her, "to the library of the department of history, the University of California." And I'll take it back there, and every one of you ca- -- perhaps can read the few pages till next time on this -- on "The Old Testament as History." Pages 107, following.

It's the most radical -- or the most fashionable version that only in the last 10 years, so to speak, is beginning to break down, I mean, in -- in {Albright's} book, From the Stone Age to -- to Christianity, there is a very recent attempt to -- to digest this anti-historical view of the Bible by Mr. Shotwell.

(You're recommending {Albright's} book?)

I think it's a -- an important book. It's not the end of the story by a long shot. I think -- well, I have many things to say myself because I'm working in the same field, but I think it's a great step in the right direction.

(Was a Johns Hopkins professor.)

Ja. Who knows the book, by the way? You ha- -- you ha- -- have you read it?

(I just read a section.)

Wie?

(Just part of it.)

Well. The problem before us, gentlemen, before the house is: what's the contribution of the Greeks to history, and what's the contribution of the Jews to history? There is only history in the Christian era, in the full sense of the word. That's all -- three theses you will not believe at once, but I think it is true. And we are on our way out of history at this moment, if we do not, so to speak, recollect the contributions made by Israel to history, by the Greeks to history, and the unification of the two strands in the historical tradition of the -- of Christianity. The first thing that all pre-Jewish, and pre-Christian, and pre-Greek history has done is to add to the length of the historical process, arbitrarily, thousands--or more than thousands--of years. Now that's a fact you can test very easily. The Japanese history allegedly begins in 661 B.C., but in fact it only begins in 300 A.D. That's a typical attempt to add one millennium. Why that is so -- but I have found it true in several such chronologies, you see, that the mythical, you see, addition is by and large 1,000 years. Must be something in the human imagination which works in such a way. If you get to Egyptian chronology of the pharaohs, you have a hundred thousands of years added, you see. The Great Year of the Persians, that's an imitation of the Egyptian year again. Three hundred twenty-three thousand is the era of Zoroaster -- not Zoroaster himself, but the -- the Persian tradition which was then later built on this.

The -- the chronologies before the Christian era are all attempts to exaggerate the length of time with which they deal. "Mythical" means longer.

Now the boldness of the Jewish history is its brevity, briefness. Human history is --. And this now is very important, gentlemen. If you -- I ask you the question: which his- -- kind of history makes man more responsible, and which dispenses more with his own action: the longer or the shorter? What would you say? Wie?



(I'd say the shorter.)

The shorter. Wie? What?

(The shorter.)

What does the shorter?

(Makes man -- what was the question again? Were -- were responsible -- responsible?)

Makes you less responsible or more responsible.

(I think the shorter makes you more responsible.)

Quite. You see, all -- I went to Calgary, Alberta. I had to spend there a whole week, and was very tired. So I didn't know what to do there. I had to wait for my money. So it's a very obs- -- abstruse situation. So I -- the only thing you can do in Calgary, Alberta, except to go to the Swedish church, is to go--and that's closed on weekdays--you can go to the -- to the geological and zoological park there; they have --. And there are tremendous monuments to these primeval animals. And they are all there in clay, you see, in -- in natural size. And there the counting reads, "600 million years," "700 million years," "800 million years." And the more you read these figures, you see, the more you vanish, yourself. And I'm very convinced that the anti-historical bias of this country is embodied in this gloating over these alleged astronomical figures, you see, of the animal kingdom. And -- man before 100,000 years. We know nothing of any of these things. The history of man is very short. It consists of perhaps 50 generations. That's long enough to be interesting. And long enough to hold you responsible for it. All the rest is bunk. Not "history is bunk," but the elongation of history into these mythological depths is bunk.

Now I -- I can't give you all my reasons for this, but I want to bring out the fact that Greek and Jewish history have one merit. They have shortened the history that matters. That is never mentioned, you see. It's very important, because they have pinned down man to a -- a range of time within which your own lifetime matters, you see. And with 600 million years, you'd better give up right away, I mean. We'll just settle it.

I have always laughed at this Co- -- statement, "Since Copernicus, we know that man is -- is a grain of dust, of sand in the universe," because the vanity of this statement consists in that we are terribly proud that we know that we are a grain of sand on the universe. The contradiction is just as much with -- as with the self-made man and the environment. It's exactly the same contradiction. On the one-hand side, it took man 5,000 years until Copernicus found out that we were just a grain of sand on the surface of the globe, that was within a system of stars, and that was again and -- within a system of stars. So we're absolutely nobodies, but the whole history of man was -- is concerned with finding out that we are nobodies.

Can you see this? It's exactly the same relation between, you see, we -- we are able to find out that we are just products of our environment. For the individual, it's exactly the same story as -- that it took the -- humanity till -- down to the year 1543, until Mr. Copernicus--or later Mr. Galilei--did find out that we were absolutely nobodies on an earth that is nothing, you see -- the sun that is nothing, compared to 400 million light years in the universe. What do I conclude from that? I think it's all nonsense. It doesn't help me at all. I'm not -- I'm not the wiser for it. I'm not -- I'm just paralyzed.

But this is the American story. I do- -- can't open one American dictionary or book on Copernicus without--or Galilei, for that matter--without this stock phrase, "Since him, we know that man is just a grain of sand in the universe." You have heard -- seen this phrase, too. Yes, but the vanity consists in this: that now we know that we are a grain of sand.

So, you see, on the one hand, they give; and the other, they take. They have to leave something. It is, of course, the adoration of the human mind, you see. He is -- he is a { } nonsense on the -- in reality, in the flesh, and his mind is gigantic. He has found out about this -- it has found out about this.

Now I prefer to be somebody in my carnality, in the flesh, you see--real, now--and to hell with my mind. What do I give to -- for that, I mean? That's just vanity. Shall I stand before the mirror and say, "I know that I'm nobody"? I don't see -- have no interest in the matter. It gives me absolutely no measurement for my own behavior. Quite the contrary. It -- it elates me on the one hand, immeasurably, you see, as -- as a mind; and it dismisses me as a real person immeasurably -- on the abyss of nothingness. Can you see this? And you all are brought up with this absolute overrating of your mind, gentlemen. Your mind is -- is a scoundrel. You -- your mind can prove anything. And if you want to abolish responsibility, it will prove to you that you live a thousand million years on

earth, and therefore, you are not responsible for being inane, and a scoundrel, and -- and a paranoid, and so. It's your privilege, because who are you, after all, you see? A nobody. But if you are a somebody in a--I mean "body," you see--then you better correct your mind with all its lame statements.

It is the relation between body and mind that is at stake in this whole naturalistic approach, you see. If man is a -- is a -- is a carrier of historical life on this earth, his mind is in -- put -- has to be put to service. As you well know, the mind itself is indifferent: to good and bad, to future and past. The mind can prove anything. To tell you the truth, if the ladies allow the -- the mind is known to be a whore. And just as a woman is only somebody who -- if she can be faithful, the mind has to be ruled by the heart. And otherwise, the -- the mind -- if your heart is wicked, your mind will always prove anything to your heart's pleasure. Anything. You can prove anything.

There is no crime -- there -- slavery in the South has been proved by the most beautiful minds of South Carolina, that -- that the institution was wonderful. I just read Mr. Wilberforce's speech for the abolition of slave trade in the English House of Commons the other day, and where -- where he fights a Mr. {Norris} who said, "How beautiful for these Negroes to come to America, and to come to the colonies," you see, "and to work there, and to sing," and so on. And he says 50 percent of them were killed on the boat. Well, he rejoiced, Mr. {Norris} had said, because the mind can prove the slave trade very well.

So despise the mind. A mind that is not ruled by the whole human person and his character is absolutely worth nothing. It's a whore, a harlot. It's available. It's a -- like a juke box. I mean, you put in 10 -- 10 cents, and it plays. But we come from an era--and this is Mr. Shotwell's era--where the mind was thought to free. And the -- so the bodies were -- become despised now: all pagan chronology shares this, by making history longer than it really is. And mythical history, gentlemen, is always diminishing my own responsibility. Because if the world has gone on for thousands of years in one way, you'd better acquiesce. The myth is basking us in a rocken -- in a rocking chair -- rocking chair. I think you hear still in the word "myth" this quality of -- of unhistorical, you see, repeated movement. It's always there. You can't get out of it. It's just there.

If you say long enough that Los Angeles, you see, is the -- is the -- is a myth--which it is--your responsibility is all in the space, in Los Angeles. You can't do anything about it. "People in Los Angeles just behave like that," you see.

So the pattern is set, and it's from time immemorial: the climate, the climate, the climate.

And it's very similar with the mythical -- attitude to history, you see.

"From time immemorial." Whenever you say, "From time immemorial," you are adding to the burden of established forms of life.

When the -- Pope Gregory VII broke away from the abuses of the feudal era, in his famous struggle, you see, of investiture against the interference of the secular power, the -- the royalists, the imperialists, the adherents of the king of France, of the king of England, of the German emperor, said to him, "But you can't do this. For 5,000 -- for 600 years the Church has been ruled by the emperors and by the kings. And -- what are you going to do? How can you break away from this?"

He said boldly, "What? Does this make any difference? The devil, as you know, has ruled the -- humanity for 5,000 years before Christ came. Did this make any -- difference for the Lord? Just for this reason did He finally have to come."

Now -- I -- you see the boldness of the man's emergence against myths, against the immemorial, you see. The immemorial is not -- that is, by the way, the -- the true reason why the Bible and the theolo- -- -logians have upheld the theory of the fall of man. If -- because if -- if man has been rotten, criminal, environmental, the product of -- you see, of -- of his society, always as a creature, then history cannot take place, so to speak, in our own day. The fall of man means that we can do something about it, because at first, you see, there is no prescription, so to speak, for any abuse.

The importance of the story of the fall in the Bible has nothing to do of course with history, but it creates a condition of history. This is why the ancients -- Jews were so terribly hip- -- being his- -- in history and knowing that the future should be different from the past--that's what they stand for, the prophets, you see--they had to say, "Don't believe that anything that was, because it is there, is good."

And in this sense, I think you all must believe in the fall of man, the story of Adam and Eve, because it means that man has an act of freedom, even in the very first moment. There's nothing immemorial. You can never say, "Because it always has been, it must remain this way." I do not see how any naturalistic historian can get out of this, if he's the burden of -- of proof is on the changer,

then. Once you say, you see, "It has been there for 600 million years."  
So the length of history has been abolished by the Greek and the Jew--  
and the Jewish tradition. Now I think when we come to Thucydides, you will  
find that it is overdone. This history is -- just the own -- his own generation. He  
knows actually nothing about anything that is going on before. Have you --  
Thucydides already there? Well, it's just contemporary history, you see. There is  
no -- no other history for him.

And the Jews have been very careful--we have -- we'll see later in Genesis  
how they have gone about it--to emphasize the relative shortness of history  
without pretending that the present moment is lost of all continuity, is deprived  
of all meaning of previous stages or future stages. But it's a very complex situa-  
tion.

In the Book of Samuel, we have the first book that is contemporary -- and  
it's contemporary history, of which we can say that it was written. All the other  
books preceding Samuel are written later than they were recorded. That is, they  
were oral traditions, it seems, to a large extent. There were inscriptions, probably  
stone inscriptions, you see; there were documents. But that the book, the histori-  
cal book was written con- -- contemporaneous with the event is -- is not to be  
believed. In the desert, they didn't write the books of Moses. Bu- -- although I  
think the record is very precise, and much more genuine than -- than people  
have cared to admit. But -- but Samuel is written more or less in the way Thucy-  
dides is written. And that's why I think it is quite important for us to -- to look  
what the -- what is interesting -- the Israelites in history.

That I would say from the first the Jews are interested in the anti-mythical  
element. The Jews are the enemies of myth. This is so simple that it is really hard  
to -- to deal with people who now call the Bible itself a story full of myth, you  
see. The -- the whole Bible is written against myth. That's the tendency. You may  
say it's a very tendential book. And a partisan book. It certainly is absolutely  
biased against myth. That's why it was written. And -- that's the whole raison of  
the Jews. To this day, they stand against all mythology. They say, "Virgin birth?  
Myth. See? So we can't become Christians."

Now that may--from my point of view, still I think the virgin birth has a --  
has meaning--this is -- goes too far. But the Jews simply decline to accept any  
mythical story { }, you see. And that's their quality to this day.

So to call the Old Testament "a myth" is really an incredible aberration of

the human mind.

If you look at Samuel, he has to find out that's -- the problem. Yes. Why is this an anti-mythical book? Because it should show in this -- in these books, the two books of Samuel, and the two books of Kings must have been written under David and Solomon. And the reason why they could afford to have a library of books, and needed it, was -- do you know when -- when David governed, was king of Israel? Does anybody know?

(Around 1000?)

Ja. From -- he must have lived from taus- -- we know it, I think, not to the year, I would say, but 1030 B.C. to 960. And that's an important date, because, you see, it is much before Thucydides and Herodotus lived. And it's just a hundred years after the alleged date of the Trojan War. The Trojan War supposedly took place in 1187 B.C., and David has governed from 9- -- 1030 to 960. According to my own insight into the prehistory of this, you -- I may tell you that I believe that Moses left Egypt in -- around 1300 -- 1280. That's the usual time now, by the way -- given for the last hundred years, many hundred years to this event, because it was under Ramses that he left.

I have recently published a book on the relation of Egyptian history to Mosaic history, and so I feel a little competent to cope with it.

This is not unimportant, because the Jewish prehistory, then at the year of the Lord 1000, you see, or 960, when David dies, and when we can date Samuel -- place Samuel perhaps, around this time, is not so very long. The Israelites only had a -- as the -- the -- the people of the exodus -- of leaving Egypt only a history in the eyes of their -- of their childr- -- their grandchildren, of how many years? 1280 to 960 -- how ma- -- much is this?

(Three hundred.)

Three hundred -- 50 years. So by and large, like the American people at this moment, you see. From 1620 to 1960 brings you up, and just as you feel free to deal with the Pilgrim fathers and have Thanksgiving, so {Easter} in days of David corresponds, you see, by and large, to the celebration of Thanksgiving in this country with regard to historical continuity. You can see this.

And I think that's quite useful for you to realize that the story of the -- of

the existence of Israel, at the moment when they begin to write books, is brief, is not mythical at all. It's not li- -- as in Japane- -- Japanese history, dated back a thousand years more, you see, but in the full light of history around -- in the countries around, I mean. The Egyptians at that time had a history of 3,000 years. There's no attempt among the Israelites to lengthen their story artificially. Quite the contrary. It's very short. Because, as you know, the Jews even admitted that { } was a common ancestor, that they were only a branch of the Semite family, that the Israelitic history is inside, inside, inside any boxes of more complex histories. And no pretense made. The modesty of the Jews is that they have never claimed to exist from the beginning of the world. The -- the impudence of all other nations is that they call themselves "earth-born," { }. The Greeks, for example, "They { } in Greece all the time." That's how Thucydides begins his story, and Herodotus, you see. The -- Athenians said, "Never has there been anybody but Athenians in Attica." You see, the Jews know that this is all bunk. The greatness of the Jewish story, you see, is that it begins with Cain; and all other nations, except the Jews, have insisted that their own story begins the story of mankind.

Now the truth of the matter, as you have here -- how many tribes you have in California? Do you know how many languages -- tribal languages there have been spoken here in South- -- Southern California? Any idea?

(What's a tribal language?)

(Indian.)

Oh, you know what a tribe is.

(No, I was -- I thought -- you maybe had some other --.)

Well, like Hebrew, you see, a language by itself. Well, 138 languages have existed when the Spaniards came to this country here. Hundred thirty-eight in Southern California alone. Only -- as the tribes were only 2- -- 1,000 -- 2,000 heads strong. And every one of these tribes has a mythology by which it is derived...

[tape interruption; end]

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...the heart of the whole problem of the historical character of mere -- of religion. The Jewish people are infinitesimal small. In the Cambridge History of the Orient, it's -- they cover one page. And in -- in relation to page 26--I just looked it up {in} the most modern vol- -- { } not the Cambridge one, the German one by { }--and it's quite significant that these people feel that they have already done remarkably well by giving page 26 and-a-half to these little tiny specks on the map, called Palestine.

And in any sense of space and time, the Jewish history is minute. So it be -- remains a riddle. There two great riddles connected with the Bible in history. One: how this little, tiny, and insignificant group was able to reach us, and to -- impress on us its own vision of history. And -- but the second--equally interesting--is: how it was possible for the last 70 years to distort the Bible, and bound by the scientific outlook, to judge the people -- the Bible and the history of Israel as similar -- simply a story of one other country, or one other tribe.

Of this, this book by Mr. Shotwell is of course a shining example. And -- who has looked into this book? I'm very sorry that the rest didn't. I mean -- I -- {all right, so assignment} for next time. You'll have to read it. I think it's the -- a very good summary of this -- follies of modern history as a science. He has absolutely not the slightest understanding of what the -- the Bible tries to achieve. And that's quite a -- remarkable from a very in- -- ed- -- intelligent man.

And so I want you therefore to read, because it's a good--Mr. Shotwell being the great authority in this country on historiography and historians--it is very interesting that he didn't even -- didn't even try to understand what the people tried to -- to do when writing the book. As you know, there are -- there are -- there are these two problems. The Jewish Bible obviously is of an importance that has nothing with the -- with the quantity, you see, the power of this little, tiny speck on the map. Point 1. Point 2: this importance, however, has been denied, so to speak, and has -- it has been made, the attempt, over the last 70 to 80 years, to reduce the Bible to a local story.

We must make an attempt to -- at least find out why the Bible has this authority, this importance for us to this day; what their contribution to our -- to our experience of time has been. We began to read the first chapter of Samuel. We shall go on with it, but -- before plunging into this, I think I should -- draw your attention to a simple fact. It seems to me that perhaps otherwise we might



get lost. You have in your own mind three ways of dealing with the -- reality. One is: asking the question "Why?" -- ask for cause and effect. That's--you have learned in school--is the only reasonable way to do something. That's reasonable. Then there is a -- another question: that's "How?" And that's the question of techniques, as you know today, very -- government is a question of Madison Avenue techniques. That is, the know-how. So you don't know how, then you know how, and then you are happy.

Now the question of course, neither the -- the question "Why?" nor the question "How?" is of any interest to the Bible. And therefore the scientist and the technician meets -- miss the {boat}, I mean. Since the Bible doesn't ask the question of cause and effect, so -- and doesn't ask the ques- -- the question, know-how, you see, and is perfectly unworldly, the -- these two people who think this is the only -- reasonable way of dealing with the world, and the only technical way of -- of survival, do not understand then there is quite a different way of approaching reality, which everybody, by the way, uses for all his own important -- important situation.

I -- I met a lady -- "lady" is perhaps the wrong -- I have to be quite frank about it. She was the -- the daughter of a college president here on the West Coast. And she was married to a very rich Easterner who, as a matter of fact, owned the last primeval forest in Connecticut. So blue-blood and intellectual, you see, high-bred class she was.

And this woman, she had obviously married the man for his -- for his wealth and position--was a diplomat--and was one of these unsatisfied, voracious, aggressive women. And she always asked the question, "Why?" "Why?" And she told -- once she invited me to her house. I had to spend several days there. I left it like hell. And she played with everything in the world--lesbianism, and every other vice you could imagine, as she frankly told me--because she was so bored, that the only interest she had in life was to find out why. And she told me -- she shouted at me, in -- half an hour after I had entered her house, if people only could answer the question "Why?" then the world would come right. Well, she was just a witch; should have been burned at stake; and -- because she answered the question "Why?" which you and I are not allowed to ask. You cannot -- ask yourself why we love your mother. Once you ask this question you are in hell. That's not a question to { }. And "Why don't you commit suicide?" These are not questions that are permissible, because they are treated -- there -- there is the -- the real region of historical existence, gentlemen, why do you keep the laws of this country? You just keep them. As soon as you begin

"Why?" you are already on the way out. Better leave the country and go to Russia.

Most of you act of course quite plausibly on this quite completely different level which the -- which the Bible poses. And the question of the Bible is, you see, looked at -- from the angle of the technician and the angle of the philosopher, at best, if I want to state it in -- in worldly terms, I would throw the "What is the Bible import?" "What is the story?" Because these poor people, like this -- this bitch--or witch, or however you call this lady--the only thing you might find in the Bible is: "What funny story?" Creation of the world, and -- and -- and conquered s- -- kings, and crimes, and banalities, and so on.

Now you and I, however, have a -- quite a different question for our own existence, and our family, and our political future. That's "Who?" As you consult the Who is Who, it's also very important whom you meet. If you think of the importance, you see, of being introduced to the right people, of social contacts, and so, the question is not at all "Why?" and "How?" but the question is "Whom?" As "Whom do you people treat me?" You want to be treated as their comrades. You want to be treated perhaps even as their superior. You want to be a star in Hollywood. You want to -- to be treated as the future successor of your teacher, or of your -- of your father; or -- of -- you see, to inherit the earth. You all want to be somebody. This is quite a different question, and -- expressed in the times -- terms of the Bible itself, it is never even only "What am I going to be?" but "Who am I going to be?"

So the only -- approach in which you, in a secular sense, can get in a reading room of a modern library, a view of yourself is Who is Who. Because that's an honest question. The books, you know, the Who is Who, where there is a -- given a list. Because if you ask yourself, it's quite important who smiles at you, and who scolds you, and who is down on you, and who up- -- who encourages you. These are the real questions. "Whom do I meet?" you see, and "Who am I in their eyes?"

And so the Bible asks this question -- this tremendous question: "Who am I?" In the eyes of the world I'm often despised; I'm often neglected. Is there nobody who looks at me and restores my countenance to serve -- to serve -- {put you} security? And the divine face that man can only become a man by -- when people -- other people set eyes on us, is summed up in the -- in the case of God shining upon us. Man is a reflection of the divine countenance.

And everybody who has been in distress knows very well that he can --

goes crazy if everybody despises him in { } keeps him upright, that he knows that these eyes are not the -- final view of his own self. If you think of a -- of a man {quashed}, and -- and poked fun at, and -- because he's not a -- disliked in the crowd, or is sent to prison, or is sent to the scaffold, what holds him up that the passing views to which he is exposed are not decisive as to who he is. They do not finally determine who he is. Everybody knows this, and therefore, there is nobody who's an atheist. I've never seen one. Everybody expects that someone looks at him understandingly. At least he puts himself before a mirror, and then he's his own god.

So the question, "Who looks at me?" and "At whom do I look?" is the possessing question of every -- in a -- every -- life of humanity. People--the Russians, the Americans, the whole American nation--is for this reason one nation, because they all ask the same question, "How are we liked in the world?" We want to be liked. All Americans want to be liked. And they aren't. And they ask "Why?" "How?" "Who am I, that they don't like me?" And "Who is liked?" So the question, "Who?" gentlemen, never enters the whole discussion of a scientist, although of course in science, too, the Who Is Who is very important. Of course, Mr. Einstein, and Mr. -- Mr. Teller, and Mr. Oppenheimer, and so -- they all have a religion. The religion of the scientist is, you see, to be liked by your colleagues, and to be taken up on your word, and to be believed as a reliable scientist. They all say, "Who am I?" you see. They usually are satisfied that the -- that this little clan of scientists -- is affectionate about them, you see, and -- and treats them well.

So I mean, if you look at the -- the ambitions of a scientist, all these books now written on science--begin with Arrowsmith by whom? Who has read Arrowsmith?

(Sinclair Lewis.)

Yes. Who has read it? Oh, well, only three people, I mean. Arrowsmith. Never read Sinclair Lewis?

({ }.)

Well, did -- what did you read by Sinclair Lewis?

(Main Street.)

Wie?

(Main Street.)

Ja, but Arrowsmith is very important. He wrote it together with Mr. de Kruif, the microbe hunter, de Kruif. And they were possessed with the idea of giving the scientist his -- his place in American society. There is in Arrowsmith -- Martin -- yes, it is Arrowsmith, the hero is Martin, isn't he? The doctor there. It is Arrowsmith, ja? It is -- it is the scientists' novel.

Well, then when -- the problem of the scientist is not in his laboratory, but is of course with his wife and his colleagues. And I just received from the Book-of-the-Month Club a rather stupid volume, Sci- -- called Scientist. It's a kind of detective story, or a -- { }. Have you seen it? And -- I had to take it, because I wanted to have the Yale Shakespeare. But now you are -- I'm licked and we are in for this torment of the Book-of-the-Month Club selection. And -- I hope I can get out again.

But -- so I got this -- this very cheap novel. Novels about scientists abound today. It's a trick in this country, because people believe in science, so they think that books on scientists should be interesting. But they aren't, because the scientist of course, is -- has a starvation diet in all human relations, and is of course the last man of any interest in the sense of "Who?" He's boring, mathematicians. I mean, the greatest bore -- in humanity. Sometimes they are musicians, then you can talk -- fiddle with them. But why should they be interesting? They are -- they are -- good mathematicians. And for the rest, they are a semantic blank. So they get, of course, under the domination of presidents, and generals, and -- and produce bombs.

-- Because the question -- the scientists asks the -- the question "Why?" The technician asks the question "How?" And that's the difference between the scientist, by the way, and a technician, which in this country, of course, is constantly transgressed. Most people don't know that scientists do not ask "How?" but "Why?" And after they have found out why, then they hand it over to a plumber; and you call the plumber in this country a scientist. A technician is not a scientist. He's a plumber. That is, he applies, when you have learned the cause and effect, then he says he knows the way then of putting things together. Just as Edi- -- Thomas Alva Edison who invented the electric bulb when all the physicists' work had been done in Europe, you see, and he applied it.

Tinkering is -- the answer to the problem of "How?" So I think this is at

least important for you. Most of you are--it's not your fault, but--live of course normally in these two relations. Everybody cares very much whom to -- who is his friend, and whom -- who is maligning him, and who is hating him. We all are directed constantly by this. But you are -- don't admit it. You think that you are really interested in science, or in techn- -- -niques of social behavior. Don't help you at all. If you don't meet the right people -- I mean, you can live on San Pedro in a Japanese colony, and know everything about "how" and "why." If you don't meet the president and his wife, where are you? He doesn't come to San Pedro. So everywhere in the world the -- the faces of in- -- millions of souls have been directed toward the countenance of -- of -- that will relieve them from the fact that they are limited in their local and -- and chronological existence on this earth, and will never see kings, and royalty, and princes, and -- and -- and rich men, and -- and is that then to deprive them of bliss and happiness. But where are they? They are destitute. They are alone.

There's a very terrible poem, one -- a man who--like the -- Charles Darwin, sailed around the world for three years in the '20s of the 19th century, a German poet, Chamisso--wrote a poem on a man -- stayed -- who was left behind -- the Easter Island, on a destitute, you see, island. And later on -- that's the -- poem, there were impound- -- engraved in stone his sighs that nobody ever returned. And he was -- he died there -- he lived there another 40 -- 50 years. It's a very great poem. It perhaps even deserves to be mentioned in this connection. It is haunting me to this day. I read it when I was a boy. And I had to learn it by heart, voluntarily. I didn't have to. { }. It's the fate of a man on whom no- -- nobody any longer sets eye. And he finally curses life, as Byron's Manfred does, you see, and -- in -- out of patience, so to speak, with his fate, because that nobody looks at you is the greatest punishment a man can undergo.

With this admission that we are made by other people's liking or hating us, we move into the sphere of the religious problem. Before, if you do not admit this, that this is important to you, who looks at you, and how they look at you, you see, in -- with what countenance, you will never understand that history has to do with the problem of facing, of faces, of human faces. It hasn't to do with figures in mathematics. And it hasn't to do with -- with chinaware, and hardware, and -- and pans -- pots and pans, and forks, and Cadillacs, and -- and cars. Nobody cares. You can be the richest person, stark naked in the desert. If there is somebody who lo- -- looks at you lovingly and affectionately, that's all you need. And you can starve together, and -- and live it out, and be perfectly -- in perfect bliss.

But today, people -- people -- people really talk as though things--the house, and the causes--have anything to do with our historical existence on this earth. It has nothing to do with history. That belongs to the hardware store, and to the five-and-ten, and to the -- you see --.

So whenever you -- you -- you find people speaking of "whats," asking the question "What?" or -- today is also another way of getting out of this commercial world in the world by "values," laugh at them. The word "value" is the imported article from the -- from the commercial, technical world into the world of the divine presence. God is nothing to be joked about or be {left} out. You all believe in Him, because in any moment, where there is a lacuna in your existence, if people look at you as -- in -- as enemies, or -- you have to fill this out by a greater force which is not yourself, but which pacifies your -- your -- your -- your unrest that before, he doesn't look at you patiently, and peacefully, and expectantly, you don't know where to turn. You commit suicide. You go nuts. You end in the lunatic asylum. You have a nervous breakdown. However these expressions run. So there is any number of insidious terms, imported from the realm of science, and -- and causes and -- that is, reas- -- ration- -- reason, and this is "practical," you see.

Now history, gentlemen, has nothing to do with the practical, and has nothing to do with the re- -- rational, because it's a condition that you can use the ra- -- reasonable world of -- and can have the -- rest of mind -- the peace of mind that you can find out causes. A madman cannot study physics. He has to be -- first have to be -- peace of mind. The peace precedes his understanding. A neurotic person cannot study. You know this very well. Because sometimes on -- you just have to -- to leave your -- your desk, have you not, and get out of this, because it's just all running mad inside yourself. You have to restore it, your -- your inner security. And this can't be done by reasoning, because it is the condition that you may be reasonable.

The -- the people today in the -- it is very strange that they should confuse -- I mean, premises and -- and -- and superstructure. It's very nice to give -- tell a physicist, "You can become a physicist. I'll give you bread and butter. I'll give you a stipend. I'll give you a fellowship." But he's in the midst of a peaceful society in which he is allowed to go into his laboratory. And there, you see, there is a fire engine that protects the house from burning, and there is a police force that prevents the burglar from breaking into the laboratory. There is a military force that prevents the Russians of invading Ru- -- America. And all this is first, long before there is science. Can't you see this? That the "Who are you?" has to be

solved long before you are allowed to do "what" and to ask "Why?" Is this clear? Any question? But people are such cowards that as soon as somebody de- -- says that everybody believes in God, people say that's a -- that's -- cannot be proved. Well, I -- I -- all the other things--that we should have Cadillacs or drei- und-halb bathtubs--that's a very questionable proposition. Why should we? Perfectly superfluous.

But that -- everybody has to believe in God, because before he can commit himself into the multitudes of criminals, and follies of the day, where people tempt him right and left to buy unnecessary things, to believe unnecessary -- have -- to have unnecessary ideas -- wrong ideas, to mutiny, or to follow false laws, or false standards of behavior, that's up -- every one of you believes that he can survive all these temptations. Here, you sit and assume that I'm not going to do you harm, which is an incredible assumption, I mean. Which of course, in former days, couldn't have happened in any tribe. You would only listen to the man of the same platoon, of the same skin, of the same language. Now I have a foreign accent. Why do you listen to me? That's a -- very dangerous. I don't belong. Why do you -- because we have enlarged and enlarged our vision, that the same spirit moves in sundry places. Th- -- in all races and regardless of color--how is it called?--race and creed, you see -- that we still can be of the same spirit.

So the question "Who?" is the question of the Bible. And once you understand this, that this is of the -- the only interest in the Bible, "Who is man that you should be mindful of him?" that's the question of the Bible. And then every one of you asks this question every day, "Who am I?" and "Who am I going to be?" So the -- the Bible comes into -- is written, as I told you, beginning to be written down around 1100 B.C., when the whole earth is already peopled. You have always to keep in mind that in 1100 B.C., the peoples of this earth are already -- dispersed, you see, as they are today. That's the tremendous facet, you see, achievement. If you think of the South Sea, and all the difficulties of the ocean lanes, we have to assume that--except for perhaps South America, where I'm a little doubtful--the people already had reached out over all the oceans; without any railroads, and shipping lanes, and so on, they have done it. So the Bible comes into the middle of a global confusion. This you have to understand, that this exists. Then you will also understand why the story of the Tower of Babel, you see, is an attempt to -- to make people not disconsolate about the dispersal, to comfort them about it. That it isn't you see, just negative. That --

everywhere are people warring against each other no longer talk in the same tongue, and incom- -- total misunderstanding of each other, the complete magic that sets tribe against tribe, and group against group, and city against city, and empire against empire. Absolute warfare, and absolute hopeless. And in this moment, the -- Bible says -- asks these two questions, you see, "Whence?" and "Whither?"

Because the identity of man, from his starting point to his destiny, is -- is very questionable. Why am I the same person in the eyes of my parents--who love me--and hated I am tomorrow on the streets, and everybody scorns me, is there any identity of purpose? And every one of you falls out of the nest, just as I do, or everybody else since Adam, and finds himself in this question: Is there any identity between origins and -- and landings?

And this is the question then of the Bible, gentlemen: whence and whither, the question of history is its question. In a quite more {pungent} sense and you think at first, because it is man himself, every one of you has a history -- because he has to, you see -- to identify his beginnings and his ending, which is very difficult. You -- you -- you leave Europe, and you come to this country, you see; you leave Kansas City and you come to Los Angeles; you -- you come from a -- across the ocean, and suddenly you are elsewhere. Is there is any identity, and as you know the -- in America, the identity, the godlessness of man takes the form of this--how do you pronounce it?

(The alias.)

Yes -- the alias is the expression of this loss of identity. And you know, it still exists in this country as a real mental disease. Most mental diseases in this country are more numerous than they are in any other continent of the world, because of this lack of identification. Most people, when they move into a new city, join a new church, find new friends, forget everybody they have ever met before, never see them again, never hear of them again. And so the Christmas cards play a great part in this attempt of the Americans to remain normal, to remain healthy, to keep this identity. You know this very well. They are very important, don't you think? I mean, they -- they -- we -- we couldn't live in this country were it not -- through the Christmas card we testify that our old friends are -- have lived with us. They are out of sight, but they are not out of mind. And -- now if you ask a question, which no scientist, and no technician ever asks--the question of your identity--you enter into the problem of history. And the Bible has this simple question of -- asking this question of you and me



first. The Bible is very honest in saying, "I'm haunted with the identity of past and future."

Obviously, this is not complete identity, but it is -- cannot be complete lack of identity. So -- you see, I -- "Where do I come from?" "Where do I go?" is the -- is the central question of the Bible. And gradually, beginning with man -- with you your- -- with the writer of any chapter of the Bible himself, he expands his vision and says, "Well, in a wider outlook, the whole world probably has the same difficulty of keeping its identity as I have."

So the question of the Bible is always exper- -- exp- -- experimental -- exp- -- empirical. Will you kindly take this down? The problem of the Bible is to begin with your own experience. It is never legendary. It's never mythological. There is no such thing as a Bible except -- to be {fought}, so to speak. The Bible is written against the brand new stories of kings, and -- and tribes, who speak of their, you see, destiny as a special case. It's always starting with the confusions--consciousness of man's own failure to keep his identity--and now look into the world at large has it the same trouble. And it has.

So before we go back to Samuel, which I think is at the heart of the matter -- in the center of the whole approach, the lack of identity is the starting point. And the trans- --how would you say it?--the transfer of my own personal experience in this respect into the history of the world is the method of the Bible. Probably the writer of the Bible story said, "The world was created as I was created." That is, I was created, I got a name, and that's a great promise. And the problem of the -- the answer to the problem of whence and whither is that the first half of life is a promise, and the second half of life is its fulfillment. And that's the good life. And when the promise is not fulfilled, it's a failure; and when it is fulfilled, it's bliss. And that's how the world should be created. Now therefore, since many promises are not fulfilled, there must come something in between: the devil, the fall of man. The fall of man is the falling-out of the relation of past and future. It -- the -- the fall means that the promise is not fulfilled. and as you know, many promises are not fulfilled. A murder, like Cain, or the -- the desertion of -- of Eve, you see, by Adam, who says, "It's not my fault," breaks the marriage. I mean, if you read all these stories -- it's very funny how little people can read today, the whole fall of man consists in -- in Adam says -- saying, "It's not my fault," thereby defaulting his solidarity with his mate. God asks, "Who did it?" And she -- he says, "Eve." So of course he's in hell. And they are driven out of paradise, because husband and wife are one body, and he should have said, "We." That would have been his answer. Since he says, "Eve,"

the whole marriage is off.

It's all very simple, because this is the -- the whole -- every word in the Bible is written around this one purpose of -- of explaining that man keep his identity despite his fall, despite his not fulfilling his promise, despite his deficiencies, and how this remission of sins, how this deficiency can be cured is the story which ful- -- fills the Bi- -- it's a very rational book, Sir. It's strictly empirical. And it is strictly rational. And it just studies the question: how can you be re- -- re-stored?

For example, A- -- Adam has sinned against his solidarity with his mate. Capitalists sin against their solidarity with the workers. Americans -- at this moment sin against their solidarity with the -- starving people of the rest of the world. We have half of the wealth of the world, and we are one-tenth of the people. That cannot last, obviously. So how can we get out of this misery? It's not so simple. We give away our food, then all the other people -- shout that they -- the prices are dropping in the world market. So we cannot even feed the starving Hindu masses, you see, if we wanted to, with all our surplus food. It's a riddle. Can you solve it? And the people in Brazil burn the coffee to keep up prices, you see. All these scandalous things of Colom- -- but they cry to heaven. They are obviously the fall of man.

So there is a promise: there is enough food to go around; and it isn't fulfilled. And -- that may go on before we find the solution. I { }, you see. This will be a hard struggle. And obviously one day we'll say, "This terrible sin of the 19th and 20th century--that on one side of the globe people starve, and the other, they have too much--this was finally forgiven, because people recognized their solidarity." The same with the question of slavery in this country, as you know. And there are innumerable such questions where the fall of man always comes from a breach of solidarity. The whole point of view of the Bible was that man was created as a unity, in -- despite the dispersal of all mankind over the globe, and wherever he befalls his "Whither?" you see, his common destiny, there is bloodshed, there is despair, there is -- there is decadence, and there is dying-out. And you just look at the -- at the Fourth Commandment, you see, the -- the -- we can't help it. It takes three or four generations before such a crime is wiped out, you see. This branch of the human race then usually dies out. And it's not a question -- that's a scientific, empirical experience. There are -- some people say that's very cruel that the sins of the parents are visited on their children, but they are. The child of a drunkard just is visited in his constitution. I -- you cannot change that. But the hope is that he will have no children himself; and nobody will marry him, and so that this strand of life is so to speak, eliminated by -- self-

eliminated.

So the whole -- this is just an example. The Ten Commandments are the -- purely descriptive. If you do -- the thing, you see, if you believe in one God, then you can talk with the rest of mankind. But if you don't believe in one god, you have fallen idols, and you must go to war and kill each other.

So the -- the problem of the Bible from the very first is the uniqueness of the divine creator of Heaven and earth. You can't go back of it. And therefore, the -- since 1870, it is the fashion--especially in this country--to pretend that the Bible is the talk of a tribal god, "Him." We wouldn't mention the Bible if this was such an idiotic thing. Why should we intere- -- be interested in a tribal god of some 3,000 years ago? There have been innumerable tribal spirits. Nobody mentions them.

The Jews come in the middle of history. 1100 B.C. dispersal is already a long story. All the pyramids are built. The big empires exist of Egypt, of Crete, of Mycenae, of -- of -- of the Hittites, of the -- everything. And there in the middle of -- of all this confusion, and all this warfare, there is this tiny little group that says, "I'm not interested in this momentary power. Where are we headed for? Where do I start to express my dismay that all these countries are on their own, that they are walling themselves off?" It is the time when the Chinese empire begins to come into existence. I think Chinese history begins, by and large, 1500 B.C., and not earlier. And -- you know the Chinese have built this wall around their empire, just to express their complete lack of concern for the rest of the world. This is normal among Gentiles. It is -- the Romans built this limes, it's the same thing, the wall around their empire. And -- any family that it has { }, does the same with its -- with its family convictions, you see, that you cannot marry outside the clan, or outside money, or outside the white race, or whatever the -- the taboo is which you uphold.

And -- now the very first word of -- of the Bible is: the failure is always the same. The one high experience--that I am within a hostile world which does not like my face, which is set against me. If you read the Psalms, or if you read the -- any verse in the Bible, it is full of this expression of the dismay that I have so many enemies. They have held this against the Psalms as--the pacifists--as being too belligerent. Well, you -- you yourself are of the same complexion. I mean, you -- you -- you go here through these staircases and -- and floors, and who looks at you, and who hides from you, and who is indifferent to you, and who is supercilious, I mean? We are just exactly in the same situation. It's not our fault. If there are 2 -- 2 billion people on this globe, it is impossible for all these 2 people --

million people to like you.

Dorothy Canfield Fisher, my contem- -- my friend in Vermont--she died, as you know, last year, was an old Vermont writer. Have you heard -- heard of her, Dorothy Canfield Fisher? Well, she told us the story, that she met in Bennington a--the college, a very progressive college--a girl. And she happened to say to this girl, who hadn't been asked to dance while there was dancing going on, "Well, my dear. We cannot be liked by everybody."

And the girl began to cry desperately. She had never wanted to know this simple truth, that you cannot be li- -- liked by everybody. And it was intolerable to this girl. She had grown up under this, you see, millennia -- dream of America that everybody can like everybody. And then you don't need a religion, of course. The -- the American substitution for faith, and religion, and the Bible -- has been that everybody can be liked by everybody, so we keep smiling. And so we weep inside; and so the people sit in the lunatic asylums weeping day and night, and making up for their too many smiles which they have wasted in their -- in their purposive days of life, and then they break down. Because you cannot like everybody.

And the more you know it, the more likable you can then remain. And it made a great impression on me, this story of Dorothy Canfield Fisher's. And I -- trapped myself that I obviously was born on the side of the girl myself, instinctively. We all are. And religion, or faith, or the biblical tradition is an attempt to -- to -- to -- to tolerate the truth. It's always a victory over our own mythology that we can be liked by everybody.

So the ordinary situation, gentlemen, of the rational fellow in this university is purely mythical. Because he entertains the myth that if he ri- -- is right, thinks right, you see, is clever and so, everybody else will, so to speak, open up and say, "Please, go on." you see. This is his fictitious situation.

(Timon of Athens.)

Wie?

(Timon of Athens. Timon of Athens.)

Ja.

And I think you have there the -- the substitute of all Gentiles for religion.

It's this fiction -- fictitious state of mind. As -- as you know, the word "myth" is today -- bandied about quite a bit. It's a very useful term if you recognize that all the people who talk about mythology are themselves living a mythical existence, these rationals who -- superior to myth. They all live in this mythical, inexplicable situation, you see, that they are -- suppose -- never -- there must never be a war. That's just national mythology, you see. So -- because they do not admit that they are most detestable people. We all are detestable.

As you know, when John Bradford was led to the scaffold in England, he exclaimed--he saw another man executed in the Tower, you see, led to the scaffold, a real criminal; and he was there for religious reasons under Elizabeth--and he exclaimed, "There but for the grace of God goes John Bradford." Have you heard the story? You see, the -- -- first awakening, rude awakening of the human adult who ceases to be a child is this awakening that in the eyes of the world, we are detestable. And you can always find fault with me; reason enough to send me to the scaffold if you want to. It's just mercy and charity. I mean, if you think of all the ways in which people have been ruined, and have been eliminated from existence -- I just read the story of the six wives of Henry VIII, and the way he got rid of them, you see. These poor girls, I mean, including Anne Boleyn, as innocent as can be, you see. He was guilty, so he had to get rid of six innocent wives, because his own guilt, so to speak, cried to Heaven, and you have to expiate by scapegoat.

Now, since everybody is in the presence of other people who need scapegoats for their own crimes, or their own deficiencies, you see, it is purely accidental that they don't get {axed}. Can you see this? We are in every moment in the danger that somebody has to -- has to find a scapegoat. This alone would show you the -- the terrible dangers of our human existence on this earth.

The Jews know this very well; they have always been made the scapegoat for everything, for the last {2,000} years, because they have taken this position. That cannot be forgiven.

And so I want to tell you: the Bible is written around this fact that people who break into the myth of our existence make themselves hated. Don't believe that anti-Semitism has anything to do with race. It's a religious statement expressed in secular terms. The Bible -- the people of the Bible story are making havoc with the Gentile tradition. It's an aggressive faith. The Bible is not written for the niceties of -- of an existing order. It's totally aggressive. It breaks into the national myth that this whole group is likable as it is.

And you cannot understand history, gentlemen, if you do not see that there would be no history in your and my mind today--critical history--unless the self-consciousness of any group was put to the task, and thrown out by -- as wanting. Because any national group, any family, any clan, the Rotary Club, the -- the Free Masons, the American-Firsters, the -- the British Empire Imperialists, every one group in itself is impeccable, and finds all the evils outside, and always has to pin it on a scapegoat. The power to say to yourself, "I am detestable," is awakening to the true history. Can't you see this?

As -- as long as John Bradford is not exclaiming, "There but for the grace of God goes John Bradford," we live in mythology, and we don't live in history, because we are not willing to be s- -- to distribute freely blame and praise. The extreme case that John Bradford is that he says, "There but for the grace of God go I, myself." In between, the single John Bradford was a virtuous man, you see--though a heretic--and the criminal, with whom he identifies himself, lie all the little color -- shades of reality, every one of us, maybe 1 percent, you see, the criminal and 99 percent {-- you go} everyone in degrees. But you can only learn to shade, you see, and to distinguish degrees of merit, once you wake up to the absolute conflict of the world as it looks at you--and you, as you look outside of you into the world. Can you understand what I mean? The -- the extreme case: here am I, smug, you see, satisfied. Pardon me.

And down to the existence of the -- of the Mosaic revolt, which it was--it was a rebellion, a marching-out of the highest standard of civilization of that time. It was as -- as vast an outbreak as the Mormon upheaval, at least in this country, or much more so, I would say. It was a protest against all the national {sluggishness} in any group. Now here am I--"we" is better, because nobody ever is just an "I"; he's the child of his parents--and say, "We are -- find that the rest of the world has to be conquered, because it is less good than I." I mean, the conviction of any gentleman from South Carolina, that he looks down on the -- on the Negroes and says, "They have just been the" -- you see, "there to serve." So he -- the rest of the world can be conquered by war. And how they look at you doesn't count. If you, however, start as the -- these poor 12 tribes of the Jews, these -- this -- this really nothing. Between the empires -- look at the map where Palestine is located, or the bridge between Assyria, and Asia Minor, and Egypt, all the existing big empires of the day, including then the -- the -- the sea kingdom of Cyprus, and of Crete, and the Philistines. And if you put yourself here, as a minor -- a minority group, and say, "I must find the unity between all the -- of all this," you see, "I must find how all these people are -- between Heaven and earth still are held together by one common origin and by one

common destiny"--and this of -- the first word of the Bible is the last word of the Bible--then you see that they had to fix their attention from the very beginning on this, which these people avoid, that I and my neighbor don't look at the same thing with the same eyes; that as many people there are, there are as many opinions, And as many tastes, And as many likes, you see.

So that I have to find the unity outside of my own opinion. -- My own val- -- {table} of value, and the neighbor's {table} of value is making {law}.

And so John Bradford's sentence, which I recommend to you, as the summary of the whole biblical development, so to speak, {of 5- --} of 2,000 years, sums it very nicely up: "There but for the grace of God goes John Bradford," meaning that we all are capable to be transformed into everybody else. You see, the transformability of the human character into everything from hero to sinner is the story of -- is the attempt to explain who we are. And the Bible says -- explains this transformability -- I use this term because it isn't perhaps quite so used up as "metamorphosis," and "change," and -- it is an important problem. And the Bible says, "By every sentence that we speak, we are transformed into the man who has said this."

Now you and I here, sit, and you can think in many terms of naturalism, and say you are just that many cells, and that many weight -- that much weight, and hair color, and so. But maybe, I ask you a question, And if you are kind enough to answer it, you see, after you have answered it, you are either a liar or a truth-seeking person, because you cannot help making the decision in speaking, you see, whether you tell me the truth or not. And accordingly, you are stamped by what you say.

Now this is the relation, gentlemen, of identity between men's --

"Whence?" and "Whither?" We are transformed by what we say, because we come the -- become the person who has said this. You quote a man. You quote Lincoln for his Gettysburg Address. Lincoln is the man of the Gettysburg Address. Well, the day before he gave it, he wasn't.

So the incisive statement in -- in a woman's life is after {he} has said he will, at the altar, you see. She says -- "Of course, he will." And -- you know the -- the story at the altar when he asks, you see, and she answers him -- for him, "He will."

This word makes her, because from that day on, she has a new name. She has -- bears the name of her husband. This is never -- treated -- with the solemnity it deserves. We have -- if we invoke the public conscience and God Almighty

as our witness, we have the power to force the community to call us by another name. Imagine what this means! That you have the power to put into the mouth of other people, you see, a new address, that they have to change. You are no longer Miss. You are Mrs. People don't -- would -- will never understand marriage if they do not see that it is the power invested in an individual to force the community to give her another name.

And this is -- that's why marriage is not free love. Free love means you go off on a tangent, you see. But marriage means that you take Heaven and earth as best witnesses, that from now on, you have to appear as one before the world, and demand from them to give way to your decision. That's the difference between love and marriage. That's -- there's a great confusion about this in this country as you well know, because people no longer understand the whole biblical starting point, because the Bible has invented marriage in this sense of solidarity. Forceful solidarity, compulsory to the rest of the world, and it's breaking up because of your American attitude.

I give you an example. Hundred years ago, every loving couple who wanted to get married would have been saluted by everybody, and everybody would have en- -- en- -- entitled them -- whether the man was in prison, or whether the man was on a boat, the -- girl would have been {helped}. Now this so happens that a friend of mine who lives now in the little town of Hanover, New Hampshire, was an old vintner -- came from an old vintner's family, who for a thousand years had had vineyards on the river Rhine, in {Gunthersblum}. It has a name from the famous Niebelunglied, from King {Gunther} of Worms. It's near Worms and near Mainz.

Well, this family was Jewish, and he was engaged to a girl who was not, who was a Gentile in the next town. And when Hitler came, he had to leave the country, and he had to give up his vineyards; and his -- his parents were -- later were destroyed. And he went to America, and -- to build up a new existence. He -- he's a photographer now, has a -- has a camera shop, which was very hard on him, but he succeeded.

Well, when I came first to his -- this little town in 1935, he had just arrived, and he was -- asking his fiancée, and she was from { }, with -- already going out of Germany, because there were German laws forbidding a marriage between Jew and Gentile, and so she was anxious to join him. And she went to England, because he said, "I can't support you here in America. It's very expensive. Go to England; then you are out of the -- of the encirclement by the Nazis, and we can always get together."



So she became a governess in a home, and survived. But then the war came, and she was interned as a -- presumably German spy and Nazi, and put in a concentration camp in England. An "internment camp," I should think, because they were really not concentration camps. And so she stayed interned until 1945. Now this was -- 10 years had elapsed since they -- they -- he had to leave the country. Then he wrote and wrote, and the English still wouldn't -- the English would let her go, but the Americans wouldn't give her a visa. And he wrote to Bernard Shaw, and he wrote to all kinds of people, trying to --. And finally in '48, this poor woman came. And she was, by that time, I believe -- they -- they only could have one child, and then she was -- beyond the time of motherhood. And so the whole life of these people has been, so to speak, stigmatized by this tragedy, that they couldn't have more children, and that they had to live down 13 years.

Now I assure you, that with all the lack of communication, and all the deficiencies, this would not have occurred before -- 50 years ago or a hundred years ago. People would have helped these people to get together. Now they don't. They are so hard-boiled. Bureaucracy has so victorious, that a whole -- these two lives are -- they aren't totally destroyed, but certainly they have been marked. And formerly you had the smallpox, and now you get the -- the passport pox. Ja?

(In 1935, she was put into the --?)

No, in England, she was a governess for four years. But then she was a German citizen, you see; and since she wasn't Jewish, the English said, "Oh, she may be a Hitlerite."

({ } war came in '39.)

Ja. To England it came in '39.

Well, I mean to say that at this moment, many people are so -- demented that they have gone rational in their human relations, and that individualism is {rampant}. And that the unity of husband and wife is no longer safe and -- sacred. That shows you, I mean if bureaucracy can prevent people, you see, who are engaged to marry, from this, then you know that we are in great danger of losing the first power of man to form insoluble communities, because every marriage is the beginning of a new nation. But you have the opinion that you marry inside a nation. It's absolute nonsense. Abraham founded a new nation;

that's the Jews. And you do, too. How can you know that you don't have to emigrate, that you have to leave this country to go to another, that you don't have to marry somebody from a -- quite a different country? It's all nonsense that -- marriage takes place within America is true, but just look at it. But it is not true that if two Americans marry, they only marry as Americans. Then they'll get a divorce. You can only marry under God's sun, and under the open sky. Because it has to be stronger than the laws of this country.

This is so strange. The -- people -- actually in this country, although this is a melting pot, and there are all nationalities, if you tell them this, that they are quite surprised that to marry is the founding of a new people. Ja? No.

And this is the starting point of the Bible. That's why it begins with Adam and Eve. It is not a myth, because the fight against the myth is {itself} -- that this marriage vow, the power of man to establish a new people from the very first, is lost to him. What Adam says, you see, in -- in saying, "I didn't do it, but she did it," you see, we all commit adultery and fornication. But then we all leave our power to found peaceful societies, you see, by -- from fear, from -- from saying, "Oh, no solidarity. She did it. I didn't."

And th- -- this is the genius of the whole Bible story, that this experiment- -- empirical situation is carried backward, as the seed of all -- of all varie- -- of all multiplicity, so to speak, and then finally into the creations and wor- -- since God created us, man, obviously Heaven was created by -- by His word, too. The -- the whole story that God created the sun, and the moon, and the -- and the plants and the animals, has never been surpassed in truth, because it is an empirical transfer of your and my experience, how we come to life by the word that is spoken to us. Because we are different people after we have been blessed, or after we have been absolved, or after being -- we have been given the bachelor's degree, or after we have proclaimed that we are husband and wife. The whole community accepts you as different people after that. Suddenly you are M.D. And -- you know how a doctor is treated, you see; everybody bows and -- and accepts him as a -- the high priest of America. Well, we have only one priesthood in America, medicine.

So believe me. The -- your experience is never exploited by yourself. But if you would kindly do, you would see that words break the continuity and transform you in this one way in which we can accept our identity without loss of faith.

[tape interruption]

...and there is no loss of {identity}. "Whence" and "whither," if they are promise and fulfillment, they leave no scars.

So the -- the gentle way of -- of -- of history is by promise and fulfillment.

That's why you have to get engaged to marry, so that there is a promise that can be fulfilled. But you are, of course, promised, so to speak, a future of your own choosing when you are born. The promise is with any child. The fairies around the cradle all tell this child, "Go ahead and become what you are destined to become. You have to -- discover." A life of discovery.

And so the curve of life, from birth to death, from the creation of the world in general, and your own birth here -- to death and Last Judgment, which of course is the same for the whole and for you personally, Judgment Day, is bound up with what is said. Can we recognize in what has been said before the promise of what has to be said at the end?

And therefore the God of the Bible is the power that makes you and me speak, that makes all men speak. The "spirit of God" it is called in the Bible. And I think you need a--I'm sorry to be pedantic--you need a definition of God, although it is entirely impossible--the best I think then at this moment will shake you, so to speak, out of your slumber--is "the power who makes us speak." God is -- that's the third article of the Christian creed, you see, which in the Old Testament, the term "the spirit," and "God said, Let us make men" -- you and I become humans only as far as we can hear what we say, and change what we say. The mystery of an animal and you is that an animal doesn't hear itself. It conveys, shouts to the rest, you see; but you and I see what we speak. And that's man's humanity, so to speak, that we -- you can see what you say. And you can hear what you --. And if you look up the -- the Psalms, they are therefore written in responsory, because every word i- -- comes back from the -- from the -- second choir, so to speak, you see, the -- the -- the Bible is to be -- con- -- so to speak, read in responsories, because a man -- any man who says something hasn't said it unless he allows it to come back upon him, and he accepts it as being said truly. And the women -- women babble, and prattle, and gossip, and it doesn't mean anything, because they don't hear what they say.

And yes, you become a student as soon as you become aware of the fact that what you say counts. I mean, if you say -- stand in the -- before a higher council where the truth matters. To Mrs. {Duncan}, the truth { } doesn't matter. She doesn't -- she's babbling, isn't she? And I -- I mean, it's a very inter- -- she's a very interesting phenomenon. She is a primeval, pre-speaking. She has

learned to s- -- to use words. But I mean, the -- it is perfectly -- she can be free from identification with what she says. Isn't that true? It's a remarkable case. It always comes back, this archaic, animal state, if -- if people are not told that to speak is a -- is an entering of -- into history. That's the whole difference whether you lie or still -- stand by the truth.

Well, ever -- all I wanted to say, to bring out to you that the whole starting point of the Bible is purely empirical. Man within a totally estranged society, enemy to enemy, dog eats dog, finds -- tries to find the thread by which peace, and -- and -- and order, and -- and meaning can be restored. And finds that only if he can draw together all the original strands, and, so to speak, exploit the Navajo Indians as well, you see, as the Egyptian fellahin to their destiny -- to their desti- -- common destiny. You have to accept all the diffusion, so to speak, you see, as our "whither?" -- "whence?" And we have to patient enough until every one of these trans- -- dialects, idioms, creeds, et cetera, can come to its -- to its interment, or to its conclusion within a common pattern.

And the funny experience of the human race in th- -- on this continent is that the red man is still with us, his soul, unredeemed, before we -- he hasn't received some better spiritual acknowledgement than he has in America. I mean, the Indian -- question of the red Indian is not over by his elimination. He's still asking a question. And I think the solution will be that 200 years from now, no president of the United States can be elected unless he has Indian blood in him. I'm quite sure of some such -- some such -- strange superstition. Because innocent blood shed cries to Heaven. I assure you that anything once created has to be included into this identification -- process of identification. Because we have this feeling deep in us because we speak, that anythi- -- body who can speak is a part of us.

"There but for the grace of God goes John Bradford." If you exploit this one little sentence, you see, you will find it to explain to you the mysteries of the historical process. You see it now in the waking of the African Negro, I mean. It's the same thing. There is not -- no creature on this earth that hasn't to be included into the life process.

And to give you one example, which is never mentioned -- our whole chemical industry, pulp industry, paper, coal, plastic, what else is it but to include the dead materia- -- matter that was created before us into the life process again? Don't look at technique, and -- and factory system and industry as something not religious. It is highly religious to feel that all the substances of this earth, you see, have to be connected again, have to reconnected and have all to

enter the stream of life. But this is a religion -- that's a religion of a scientist, you see. That's the faith of any man who goes out to discover the energies of the globe, that all this was one -- at one time one glowing planet and we have to make it into one again. Half of it lies dead, you see, unused, like the -- the oil in the -- in Texas.

And so please don't -- don't think this is purely commercial, this is purely -- this is accidental. Man's mind is set on including again the more even of course his own -- or -- his human fellows -- and -- and brothers, you see, and sisters, than the oil underneath. One and the other is -- equally -- or at least equally important to us, because God is one. The only reason is monotheism. The only reason is because everybody is faced by everybody else, under the countenance of a common -- of a common faith, so to speak. The eyes of God are upon the whole creation. Gentlemen, this is -- just as scientific as that 2 and 2 is 4. You and I cannot keep our peace of mind unless you acknowledge that we -- acting in the face of somebody. And since I do not want to act just in the face of you, you see, or any special individual obviously, but have to be stronger, I have to -- to defy your anger, have I not at times? And your suspicion, and your aversion. Since a man has to live through adversity, the -- his -- our faith in God is the power that -- that retains our sanity. And you will always find that all these so-called atheists make themselves into their own god. Everybody has a god. The atheist is god to himself.

So I don't quarrel with him. Let him be an atheist. But he -- he believes just that his own satis- -- {-faction} with himself is enough. All right. Then he has enshrined the divinity into his own consciousness. If this is enough, let him do it. He isn't interesting, I mean. He is a limiting case, but today people bow to him; and in all good society, they don't mention God, because they say we know there are several people who are atheists among us, so we mustn't offend their feelings. I don't see why we shouldn't. Because they have their own god, you may be sure. They have god -- they are their own god to themselves.

If you would only see that you cannot talk of God without talking of man, and you cannot talk of man without God. Because, who is God? To ask once more this question "who?" Well, you -- He's the condition whi- -- who allows me to ask, "Who am I?" Who I am. You and I cannot ask who you are, unless there is a God. Because nobody else, including myself, can hold the scales, so to speak, of impartiality, and of judgment. The others are biased, but I'm biased, too. And I know this. I'm biased perhaps in favor of me, you see. Or I'm so abject that I'm biased against me. But I'm biased.

So it is an assumption then, and I think, very, very presumptive on my part to speak in this matter, because it isn't done--but it is a scientific premise for all social science, that men and God are corollaries in our human language. If you omit God from the -- the human presence, you get a bundle of nerves. And you get -- he's ripe for -- for the lunatic asylum. And this whole attempt of the social sciences to speak of -- of man without his belief in his creator to me is just silly. I mean, it's the -- the antechamber of the human wisdom. I call always the social sciences "the Old Testament" of the social sciences, you see, as they are today. Psychology, and sociology, you see, and so on. But it leads nowhere, you see, because man then moves in a vicious circle. What everybody -- take a questionnaire. Why should I accept what the psychologist says of me as more relevant than what I say of the psychologist? I say he's a fool; he says I'm a fool. Where are we?

You know the story of the drunkard's wife in -- in -- Long -- Long Island in the slum. And the social worker comes to say -- to see her and says, "Oh. Pity here. I understand that your -- that your man has taken to drinking."

She says, "Not mine. Your, perhaps?"

In -- that's the only answer, you see, between equal people, you see, that she asks the social worker that. This talking back -- in the human society is the -- is the -- it's a real problem. And it is only if -- if the two, the sociologist and his victim, look up to a third countenance that they can ever settle their conflict. The sociologist is not in any higher authority than his victims, his objects, or cases, or how you call them. And it's very significant that he is God Almighty, because he calls with the biblical expression the victim his "case." There are {the} cases. Now what is "case"? That's the fallen man. Take this very seriously. A case is man in isolation, taken out of context, and left, you see, as he is, as a -- as nature, unredeemed, unredeemed, without a pray- -- remission of sins.

This is very serious, gentlemen. "Case" in law is a criminal. A legal case that's -- that is paralyzed, that stays there on the docket. And his life cannot go on. It's just a case, fallen down on the job. And the social scientist in his naïveté has taken over the legal method, and -- and makes you and me, when he asks us, into cases. And that's anti-historical, because in history, the -- what would be -- in -- in -- in history the real solution? I -- always -- I have been a lawyer myself for 20 years, but I always held that the only solution of the criminal law is that every judge is only allowed to judge one case and has to go off with his -- with his accused, with the defendant and live with him for the rest of his life. That's the only way of settling really any such case, by -- because then a whole life

would be committed, you see, to the re-entrance of the criminal into reality. Now we put them behind prison bars; and they're worse off than before, because we treat them still as cases, after they are judged. Now the whole problem of -- of a crime obviously is to -- from the very beginning to -- get this man back into the stream of the full life which he has left, because he has -- because he has fallen down, as we say, on the path. And as long as the judge can sit and -- and decide 231 cases in one -- he -- he -- you see, prolongs the agony. He -- they makes them -- in --. The -- the only Christian solution is that this judge says, "One case in enough for a lifetime." And invests his lifetime--I mean, I'm exaggerating; but I'm explaining to you what's the difference between a case and a -- {history}. And so you should revolt against the term "case history." There is no case history, if there is no future. History is -- the past seen in the light of the future: that's the biblical story. History sees promises and waits for their fulfillment. And therefore there is -- must be never a case history.

A mere case history means that there is no investment of future responsibility. First, if you become fast friends, then you can look back together at all your errancy of your youth.

Case history is a contradiction in point. You can have history; and you can have cases. And cases are such events that have left the stream of life and are like shells on the beach. No sea life, Sir, but sea death.

So now therefore, you will perhaps now begin to understand the -- the problem of the Bible then is to distinguish between fall and ful- -- and promise. And the Bible is indifferent to the glories of the kings, and the glories of men, and we have read one chapter in which it was brought out that the -- Hannah is desperate. She has absolutely no -- she is despised. {David} thinks she is drunk, you remember. And that's why she had just the real history, because she is not in a myth of her own contention, and her own smug satisfaction.

To give you a parallel of this { } of course, the first -- the New Testament is written in the same vein about the birth of Jesus. And -- take it this way. In the first chapter already, the hero is telling against himself. The essence of the invention of the history of the Bible is the power to speak of man not as a hero of the story. There are no heroes in the Bible. But there are very weak, fallen men who are brought back into the stream of life. "There for the grace of -- but for the grace of God goes John Bradford." That's the whole story of the Bible. And -- for example, the Gospel of Mark is the second Gospel in the New

Testament, and it can be recognized as being under -- written under St. Peter's influence, because the one Apostle who is -- who is held up to derision there is Peter, his -- his slander, his--how do you call it?--his denial of the Lord, you see, his { } denial is only given in Mark. Now in -- in the Bible, you can recognize a book, because the author talks against himself. That's unique in the literature, you see. All pagan, all Gentile literature talks up. The author justifies himself, and the heroes are justified. They are always right. The whole problem of the Bible is to show that man is betwixt and between. Peter is not wholly, so to speak, judged or -- or condemned. But the only book in which Matthew is called a publican is the Gospel of Matthew. The other three Gospels, being written by other Apostles, saved this very -- you see, indecent label of a usurer, which it was, you see, oppressor of the people, publican. But he calls himself a publican. Peter speaks of the denial, you see, in Mark, because he dictated the -- the -- the -- these pieces to Mark, and -- according to tradition. And so we can go in the Bible by this very simple indication that he who is held up to criticism in the Bible, has something to do with the authorship of the book. That's a very original, so to speak, situation.

Let us now go into it. Wie? {Robert}. We need a break now? Wie? Yes or no?

(No.)

(Yes!)

Now who has said the truth? {Make it} a vote? Who wants to have a break now? Well, we stay together here. Out you go, with the rest. Five minutes. And we'll meet at half-past, again.

[tape interruption]

...that is unheard-of in any pre-biblical { }, this attitude, the smallness, so to speak, of the -- the -- that she is not a heroine, she is not inspired, she's not just an instrument. But she has this double-ness of cheer and -- and -- and despair, this alternation. Here she is full of complaint and grief, and then at the end, "For this child I prayed, and the Lord has given me my petition which I asked for." And so you see in a small way in this chapter already, you have this tension. You begin with identity of bliss and despair, of low and high spirit -- is the problem. Whereas all primitive existence of man is trying to eternalize, perpetuate one attitude: either ecstasy, you see, or wailing. Here is the whole problem of this one chapter is to put 2 and 2 together, and to see that the same



person goes through this ups and downs, this high and low. And keeps her {animism}. Now perhaps we go on now. Would you?

(Read Chapter 2?)

Ja.

("And Hannah prayed, and said, My heart rejoices -- rejoy-- rejoiceth in the Lord; mine horn is exalted in the Lord: my mouth is enlarged over mine enemies; because I rejoice in thy salvation.

"There is none holy as the Lord: for there is none beside thee: neither is there any rock like our Lo- -- like our God.

"Talk no more so exceeding proudly; let not arrogancy come out of your mouth: for the Lord -- for the Lord is a God of knowledge, and by him actions are weighed.

"The bows of the mighty men are broken -- the bows of the mighty men are broken, and they that stumbled are girded with strength.")

Now, may I put in this word immediately? Our -- the recognition is that there is a time element in our empirical experience, you see, that it takes time for man to understand. God is knowledge, because He can weigh, as you see, the actions. We cannot. Therefore "no -- not arrogance come out of your mouth." You don't know what you're saying, if you only live from moment to moment.

History covers the change of mind of people. The "transformability of man," you see, is liter- -- can be taken literally. Those who--how do you say in English?--"Those who sow with tears shall reap in -- with joy"? What { }?

Make that the content of course of this whole chapter, you see. And it means that at any one moment on our pilgrimage, you see, we are too elated or too despondent. And therefore, only if we keep the memory of our humiliation in the days of our exultation, you see, and tie them together shall we not to -- go wrong.

With this -- the word with which you perhaps will -- best arm yourself against the common misunderstanding of the divine presence is "perseverance." It's a lost word -- you may recover it. "Perseverance." It -- the -- the Christian creed has tried to say that it takes time to know who God is. That's why -- they speak of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, because you cannot at one moment see all the aspects of the divine action. At one moment you are yourself

the genius who does it, you see, and another moment you are far from having any influence on the -- on the history in making which you are involved. Just as Hannah here. She's despondent, and she is elated.

Now she says, "Do not be arrogant," because she warns herself against this momentary excess, because the whole story is longer and long-winded. And you may arm yourself against the physicists. In physics, gentlemen, we try to discount the time element. We shorten everything. To be a physicist means to attempt to understand everything, you see, with a minimum of expanse of time. That's why you have electricity now, and you have -- shoot a -- at 1700 miles an hour, you see, you shoot something into the moon. Speeding up is the problem of physi- -- of natural science, and slowing down is the problem of history. Because over 2,000 years, you know more about man than you know about -- this moment. And you know about your own story over 70 years than you know about -- in one year. And what you need is perseverance.

That's why it is nonsense to take examinations in the history department, because that breaks up your historical instruction into four months' periods. That's not long enough. You have to live into history, you see, for years and years before you can say anything about it. That's why I'm -- the whole carrying over of the examination system into the humanities department and social science department is poisonous. It destroys your brain. You shouldn't -- be examined, you see, in the same way as you can be examined in chemistry. This is possible. In physics, too.

But we -- the whole immersion into the process of historical experience is an immersion into a longer and longer spans of time, and not the breaking up of these periods. And that's why we are in a bad way with -- with history in this country, because everything is done to treat it as though it could be reduced, you see, to five minutes' experiences, to facts and dates, objective examinations. You cannot.

I had a colleague, whom I hated--and still hate--and he gave a course in comparative literature, and I overheard him saying to a student, "What do you want to know about Goethe?" you know, the German poet. "I can tell you everything about him in 10 minutes." He literally said the -- he was a professor of literature.

(Who is it, Sir?)

Wie? Oh, no. No names, Sir. And -- { }.

Wherever you meet such a -- such a -- no, butcher of the spirit, you know that he is just killing the spirit. Because obviously any man you meet in history deserves to be met permanently. May -- become a -- a friend of yours, like Abraham Lincoln -- and I hope you converse with him quite often. And the over -- the longer the time, the more you come to know him. And there are any number of { }. The same with -- with -- a figure in Shakespeare. I mean, Hamlet you do not read once.

Not like the student who came back, how -- you know, and asked his professor -- Professor {Lambeth} on the -- Main Street in Hanover, you know this story, you see. "Professor!" ten years later, you see. "How did you make out with Hamlet? We never went before -- beyond the Fourth Act together."

So he never had -- of course had read -- finished the Fifth Act, so he hadn't known -- learned yet how -- how Hamlet made out.

All historical books deserve to be written innumerable times. And this again you do not know. You think that an assignment means you read a book once, and then you are over with it. Then it doesn't deserve to be read in the first place. All the books you read only once are technical books. And any real book that deserves to be read has to be read often. That's why the Bible is the standard book for real historical -- why it's written constantly -- read constantly, because you read it each time with a different slant, and a new understanding.

And this is one of the things why you can't get an education, because you actually believe that if you have learned something -- read something once, you have read it. I read Homer to this day every year. And I'm always surprised. I am now finally -- I -- and I began in classics, so I -- I mean, I've been { } classics { } all my life, I've now been -- allowed myself to write this in my history book -- in a chapter on -- on the Greek poets. But I wouldn't {have dared} if I hadn't read them time and again. You can't judge them after read -- reading them once. That's absolute nonsense.

And this is again in this -- in this story of the -- this famous Mag- -- this is the Magnificat which returns in Luke, in the New Testament, you see, in which the Catholic Church praises to this day, you see. This -- the Chapter 2. So it's more than a -- it is the -- the historical, I mean, foundation of the praise of women for their faith. "The bows of the mighty men are broken, and they that stumbled are inspired -- girded with strength." Go on.

("So they that were -- were full have hired themselves out for bread; and they that were hungry --")

"Full" would be -- ja, rich, of course, you see, of "satis-" -- or "sati-" -- "satiated" would perhaps be better. Ja?

("-- so that the barren hath born seven; and she that hath many children is waxed feeble.

("The Lord killeth and maketh alive. He bringeth down to the grave, and bringeth up. The Lord maketh poor, and maketh rich: he bringeth low, and lifteth up.")

Now perhaps you again see that always the bad is put before the good.

The whole problem of -- of course, of -- of our faith is that despite the fall, despite the misfortune, the promise still can be fulfilled.

And therefore, you will do -- most people do not understand today religion or Christianity, because they do not know that unless death is put before life, we don't live in history. The problem of history is that somebody dies, and yet something survives. As long as you be- -- say, "The Lord maketh alive, and giveth," you would be in nature. Because an animal and a tree, they come to life and they die by themselves. History means that the dead leave a trace, that despite the fact that you and I die, we haven't lived in vain. You understand?

And therefore, this is the whole -- it's very good New Testament; there's -- there's no difference between Old and -- Testament teaching and --. If you take these words seriously, you see: "The Lord killeth and maketh alive. He bringeth down to the grave, and bringeth up." It's all in reverse. History begins where we bury our dead. And remember them. First He makes full, then He makes rich; first He brings low, then He lifteth up; first she's barren and has no child, and then she brings -- comes forth with child. It is always the -- the surprise that man's idea of himself is -- is defeated, so to speak, you see, that his self-consciousness is not the real story. Will you go on from there?

("He raiseth up the poor out of the dust, and lifteth up the beggar from the dunghill, to set them among princes, and to make them inherit the throne of glory: for the pillars of the earth are the Lord's, and he hath set the world upon them.

("He will keep the feet of his saints, and the wicked shall be silent in darkness.")

You can see how the Pilgrim fathers would enj- -- rejoice in this verse, you see, going to the pillars of the earth beyond the English -- the British Isles, and establishing there the -- His kingdom here on these shores, I mean. That's a good Puritan verse.

("For by strength shall no man prevail.

("The adversaries of the Lord shall be broken to pieces; out of heaven shall he thunder upon them: the Lord shall judge the ends of the earth; and he shall give strength unto his king, and exhalt the horn of his anoi- -- anointed.")

Now here, that's the end of the Magnificat. "My" -- that's the first verse, you see: "My heart rejoices in the Lord" That's the Magnificat. It magnifies the Lord, you see. That's why it is called "Magnificat." My heart magnifies the Lord. Ja. -- Now comes the history again.

("And Elkanah went to Ramah to his house. And the child did minister unto the Lord before Eli the prince -- the priest.

("Now the sons of Eli were sons of Belial; and they knew not the Lord.

("And the priests' custom with the people was, that, when any man offered sacrifice, the priest's servants came, while the flesh was in seething, and a fleshhook of three teeth in his hand;

("And he stuck it into the pan, or kettle, or cauldron, or pot; all that the fleshhook brought up the priest took for himself. So they did in Shiloh unto all the Israelites that came thither.

("Also there befo- -- also before they burnt the fat, the priest's servant came, and said to the man who sacrificed, Give flesh to roast for the priest; and he will not have sodden flesh of thee, but raw.

("If any man said unto him, Let them not fail to burn the fat presently, and then take as much as thy soul desireth; then he would answer him, Nay; but thou shalt give it to me now: for if not, I will take it by force.

("Wherefore the sin of the young men was very great before the Lord: for the Lord abhorred the offering of the -- for the men abhorred the offering of the Lord.")

We have "the men" or "man"?

(The "men" -- "for men { }".)

("But Samuel ministered before the Lord, being a child, girded with a linen --.")

Now, here may you perhaps also understand the {fact} of this. It's the constant problem: can spiritual service be paid for? All history, as far as I can see, has been not centered around land, or around all this wealth and so, but around the problem whether human relations can be bought for money. As you know, in the Middle Ages, you -- there has been the so-called struggle of -- for investiture. Have you heard of this? The Gregorian struggle { } empire. Well, it was the question whether the bishoprics and abbots could be bought by money from the king, from the { }.

And the salability of -- of human worth is today again -- with our foundations. You { } because Rockefeller and Ford make people think that you can buy science. You cannot. And -- your whole problem in this country is -- we are in very bad shape, because teachers are underpaid. That -- because teachers cannot get wages. I am paid only so that I do not go into industry, and make money and get rich. I'm supported by a salary, or honorarium, or a stipend, so that I can concentrate on human relations. You must never think that you can pay me for what I'm telling you here. You cannot buy me. Not for sale. Not for money.

I'm -- very serious about this. A very big question. I have always tried to tell the teacher's conventions why they cannot go to strike. They are on -- parents' stead. As a parent cannot go on strike, and a teacher cannot go on strike, you see. You have to get so much dignity, and esteem, and respect in the community that they will give you -- pay you as much as they earn themselves. As in England, where a man in Oxford is paid by the lords of the -- country enough to keep up the standards of a lord's existence, because the lord says, "My son can only join with lords," you see, with the lordly society.

Here in this country, the rich man thinks that the -- that the -- his -- the teacher of his children, you see, can be of the lowlies, like -- like a -- like a nurse. And so he underpays him. But you cannot strike, because I can never say that I sell for money. I sell my identity with the people whom I teach. Can I? Impossible. But I can be paid for not caring for -- for -- wealth, for not going into industry. That's what the meaning of the word "salarium," "salary" and "honorarium" originally mean. You persuade a man to forget his commercialism. And of course

he -- since he cannot starve, you enable him to turn the other way, to be interested in your growth, and in your instruction, you see, and not to think of my own -- my own financial gains.

But as soon as you treat me on a wage scale with a factory worker, you see, an engineer, you get me wrong. It's done all the time in this country. And believe me, the whole economic system of this country is misunderstood. As long as you try to classify a teacher for what he says. I have nothing to sell. You must understand. I have nothing -- really nothing to sell. But I allow you to listen to me, { }, instead of going to the stock exchange and speculating.

When I told my boys at Dartmouth that I could have just as much become a bank president, and -- which in fact was offered me when I was a young man, this career, they didn't believe it, because in this country, they -- you think that a man who teaches is such an idiot, that he cannot make money. "Those who do -- can, do; and those who cannot, teach." And this is why in America I think this is an utterly corrupt society. As long as you believe that teaching can be bought by a high salary, you get me all wrong. There cannot be truth in this, because a salesman is not committed to handing you over the truth. You understand that selling and buying has nothing to do with speaking the truth.

And this has gone through history. And I only meant to say it's here exactly the same. What the people resent is that the services to the Lord can -- presumably be bought, that these people, you see, get rich on the -- on the surface of this. And that's corruption. It is called with a -- with a word from the New Testament, simony -- s-i-m-o-n-y. Have you -- anybody heard the term? Now I only want to tell you. Simony is nothing of the 11th century or the 5th century of our era. It's constantly with us, you see. Any society breaks down in which spiritual truth can be supposedly bought for money. That's the end of it. The -- Reformation, as you know, Luther came about -- got up wie -- when this was told his poor peasants, you see, that they could buy salvation for money. That was the beginning of Protestantism. But we have today -- see the same thing, gentlemen. You see, I -- today the -- the -- the foundations in this country are destroying America.

I tell you a story. I had a friend in Harvard. And I was called there to lecture to -- before this group of 25 graduate students. One -- this friend of mine invited me to do so. He was the chairman of this little club of historians. And when I came there and we tal- -- I talked, they told me that they had just composed a memorandum for the Ford Foundation. And they had written down reasons why they should--every one of these 25 men who had signed this

memorandum--should be given 5,000 a year--at that time, that was a lot of money, 10 years ago--\$5,000 for the next three years, each. You see, three times 5,000. And it was a wonderful program. I said, "Do you believe in it? Do you think it should be done?"

"Oh no," they said, "But that's what they want to get. And we want to get the money."

Now here were 25 Harvard scholars -- who were not ashamed to sell their souls for the next three years, you see, to the highest bidder, and to cheat deliberately. And so it worked of course more havoc, because once you are cheated, such a foundation gets very disagreeable indeed. And I've never forgotten the scene. Here were 25 otherwise decent people, who only--because they were American--did not see that the spirit is not to be bought. And the foundations have gone off in this country on the wrong foot for the same reason as here described by Mr. -- by verse 16 and verse 17, you see: "The Lord -- men abhorred the offering of the Lord." They -- as soon as they know that this can be bought, they would have nothing to do with it. We have therefore no -- the teachers in this country have no authority, because people are convinced that they can be bought. How can you trust a man who can be bought? You must see this.

As soon as you think that a man's services can be paid for, he is no longer -- deserves to be listened to. Why should you? Anybody will say what he -- expected to say if you pay him a sufficient number of -- of -- of ounces of gold. And there -- you move in a vicious circle in this. As soon as you would agree that men are independent -- made independent, you see, by the support they gi- -- the community gives them, because we expect them to be disagreeable, you see, and competent, and telling -- unpleasant truths, it will be different.

But I see that in -- in -- the churches are in the same predicament in this country, you see. The -- my -- the big shot in the -- in the -- {just} among the -- the -- vestrymen, you see, will not hear a sermon that is preached against his livelihood.

So we have no class, and that is the deeper reason for an independent clergy, and an indifferent -- you see, and for private property. That's why inflation, you see, will damage the business community without their knowing it, because inflation takes away all the saving from the middle class.

Now when I was young, even as an instructor, I had to {glean} from my salary to build up my own library. Therefore I was independent in my research.



No longer is anybody today able to do this. He's completely dependent on the -- you see, public library. Therefore he's less dependent for changing, for example, his field of interest, because he has not his own library. A library means that I'm moving out afield -- under my own steam, because I collect the material, you see. That means -- is the meaning of your own library, that you are flexible, and you do not depend on your appointment in a department for being allowed to make recommendations about the books which you can buy.

So all the new fields of science, gentlemen, in the last 150 years, have been established by people who built up their own libraries in unheard-of directions, in fields that didn't exist before. Can you see this? Ja?

Now if you inflate the means by which these libraries were built up by personal savings, are destroyed. Workers, and capital- -- and entrepreneurs together--the corporation--exploit then the middle classes, their savings. And the spiritual leaders of the community are completely then unable to -- to move even the slightest degree under their own steam. They cannot even afford to buy a book. So they are not independent in their information. They are not independent in their judgment. Everything is through the big trumpet of the television producer, et cetera.

And so -- inflation is played so lightly of -- in this country -- gentlemen, if you do not establish a middle class in this country that is relatively indifferent to the vicissitudes of prosperity and depression, how can ever the truth be said that perseveres over the rich and over the poor? Take these verses. They are very modern, that the "the Lord killeth, and maketh alive," the "Lord maketh poor and maketh rich," "He bring us low, and He lifteth up." Who is going to say this, if you live in a country where everybody is completely subject to the moods of the daily currency, you see? You have a real inflation, you see. Any cent you have has to be spent right away, because in -- tomorrow, the money, you see, loses its value. And any human spirit can only persevere if he is relatively independent from these vicissitudes of fortune. And so -- this hasn't been solved in this country. We have a -- quite the contrary, established a system in which more farmers, more shopkeepers, more professors are involved in -- to the price level and wage level, you see, of everyday. And if you get an inflation, there is nobody who can escape it.

Now such a country goes mad. It's complete insanity, because everybody has then to struggle for the naked revival -- survival, whereas we have to try to establish certain levels, you see, of -- of security for different groups in the people. The teacher, the minister, and I {see} the doctor, perhaps, too, and writ-

er--they must live on a -- on a longer wavelength than the man at the stock exchange, and the -- the weekly wage- -- wage-earner. And now we try to put them all on the same level, and I think we are -- we are -- we are inflation-bound to this day, still. And then the country can be written off, as a policy-making agency. Then you're just {numbers}.

You cannot have a policy unless you have a sufficient number of people in this country--in a democracy, especially--who are not scared -- overscared by the momentary distress. Can't you see this? If you involve everybody into the immediate catastrophe, then the cries of despair and the cries of impatience must overwhelm everybody.

So here you see -- I hope here I have shown you that the applicability of such a remote chapter and very -- I mean, you may say, obsolete, archaic chapter of the Old Testament is an eternal problem. The -- the -- are these spiritual services for sale? Or isn't your whole problem to make them -- people who serve you, a -- administrate you -- so inde- --. Take a woman. If she is out in business and has children, she is much more involved in the sorrows and scares of the commercial community, industrial community than is good for her upbringing her children. Because her children should be -- remain in an atmosphere of 30 years' future, and not of an immediate, you see, crisis, whether she loses her job or so. That shouldn't interfere with -- with the -- with the goings-on in this family.

What should be told in a family has nothing to do with the -- with the moment. You should prepare a child for the years that come after the 13th year of this child. How can you -- if this woman is totally involved in the great question whether you will -- fired or hired tomorrow. I don't see how you can. Anything can take the aspect of -- of daily living.

Well, I only -- would like you to -- to generalize on this term "simony." If you have a better word for -- for corruption, it's all right with me. But it is in every century, the "trahison des clerics" -- treason of the clerks is the issue. And you may have heard that Mr. Benda -- Jules Benda in France wrote this famous book, *The Treason of the Clerks*. Have you heard of it? *Le Trahison des Clercs*. It's another word for "simony." And it's very -- everybody uses -- here in this country, you use it, you see -- it's the treason of the intellectuals who can be bought. An important term. It's another term for "simony." *Le Trahison des Clercs* by Jules Benda. It's standard -- a standard term. Everybody in the inter- -- field of letters knows this term. Jules Benda. The treason of the -- of the literary -- of the writers, which means -- the people who sell you truth.

Well, Dr. Zhivago is a case in point, you see, because he -- Pasternak's

story, that he didn't commit the treason, you see, demanded from him by the -- by the powers that be. And I don't think there is anybody in this country who would have done { }. I mean -- in this country, if you -- if the publisher promises you \$10,000, you just write the book.

(Uh, excuse me. What are you saying? I understood that he wanted his story revoked, but when he found out that there was disapproval for it, but the publisher wouldn't do it. It's already on the press and he wouldn't give it back. An Italian publisher { }.)

Ja. Oh, you mean in this sense, yes. Well, he would -- they would have just killed him if he had not officially asked for it, but with the tongue in his cheek -- I mean, he was very glad that the Italian publisher didn't give it back. You must understand; there was this double dealing. Wie? You put it there, and then you say, "Not my fault." Don't you see?

He had managed to get the manuscript before the decision came from Moscow, you see, so it is very obvious that his -- the only salvation to play it on double -- to play it double.

You mustn't forget. Pasternak is the greatest Russian. I knew that Pasternak was the greatest Russian poet as far back as 1930. If you look at the American Encyclopedia, published in 1935, Pasternak is treated as the greatest living Russian poet. So I mean that's not a man who comes to celebrity, except in this country where you have only -- you only live by politics, and because he's -- now political case, so -- and the Russians, you see, have sinned against him, you read his book. You never would have read the book otherwise. I mean, nobody reads here any book on literary merit.

So I -- and that's rather hateful part of it. And -- you cheat yourself when you think that you would ever have read the book unless this had happened -- had happened. It would have bored you stiff. {It is} a very boring book.

It's still a great book. But boring; that doesn't mean { }, that you wouldn't have read it. Have you read it? Who has? Only two? Is that all? Gentlemen, you are outside history.

{ } give you a final story about this importance of the -- the selling of -- of the spiritual goods. In 19- -- 1849, a great Italian, Giu- -- my own predecessor, I would say, in my historical activities. Giuseppe Ferrari was in exile in--from Italy, because there was then the -- the Austrian prince's governing--in Paris. And he

saw how Victor Cousin, the man who invented the French school system of today, that this man accepted the position of minister of instruction and faith for the Napoleonic government -- Napoleon III then being installed as the president of the republic, and then later became emperor.

And he wrote a violent pamphlet, "Les Philosophes Salariés," the philosophers who can be bought. "Salarié," you can, you see, be had for a salary. And that is a brilliantly written, eloquent pamphlet about the danger if you have a society in which opinion can be bought. And I went to Dubrovnik, in Yugoslavia this last year to a con- -- international conference on the university today. That's exactly 110 years later after this pamphlet -- this violent pamphlet by this independent and very poor, destitute American ex- -- Italian exile was written in France. And we discussed the university to {death}. There were 23 nations. And there were the Russians, and the Poles, and the Czechs, and the French, and the Norwegians, and the Swedes, and the Americans. And so it was quite an exciting meeting. But very depressing, too.

A French student from Paris got up and said, "We no longer want to be students -- called "students." We no longer want to have stipends, or fellowships," or what they call "bourses" in France, first. "We want to get salaries like wor- -- workers."

So I got up and said, "My dear man. What a tragic story. In 1849, there was just one bought philosopher in France. Now you all want to be bought." And it silenced him. He didn't know what to -- he had never heard of this brochure, of course, of this pamphlet, you see, written 110 years ag- -- before. And it was most depressing. All the students at this conference had sold out for a quiet life of being paid for, you see, of getting a salary, taking their exams, and that was their relation to the truth. And so it's nothing to be he- -- hoped for more -- I am -- I'm very serious--I know what I'm saying--from the modern university as such. Because it is taken for granted that you can buy and sell the services. And in as far as this is true, there is no {understanding}. The truth has to be stated, regardless, you see, of -- of -- of profit. Because the truth is the beginning of the next benefit, of the next profit. The truth has to be said, because it doesn't fit into the s- -- into the picture as of today. New truth can only be added under the one condition that in the existing frame of reference, you see, it hasn't yet received its -- its gratification, its recognition. And therefore, there is no salary for it at this moment, because it hasn't yet proven its value. It's unproved value, is it not, truth?

Ja?

(Well, isn't the Soviet Union -- isn't the way they're making education the -- the --.)

Oh, shocking, shocking.

(They give you --.)

Oh, the -- the clown that existed there at this meeting in Dubrovnik, in Yugoslavia, this Russian commissioner. We just laughed at him, because he said of course nothing can be investigated and -- that the government doesn't want to be investigated. And research has to be governed, and directed, and -- and on it went. No, he was just -- well, I thought you -- you would expect that from them, from the Communists, you see. But that a -- a man -- a student from Paris should parrot this, this was the -- { }, so that the whole western world, you see, so to speak, went -- went down in dishonor.

(So they pay you more for better grades, I think.)

Exactly. Oh, pardon. Then there was the question: should you stay in the university after you are -- have graduated? Is there a place for research, for free study? I mean, after all, you are in this position. And -- because they wanted to -- I mean, to deal with the problem of graduate study, you see, post-graduate study. And I wouldn't trust my eyes and my ears. Up went an old Austrian professor from Prague, because the Communis- -- the Czechs are the greatest -- with the most terrible servility, and these were farrer-gone, so to speak, than any other satellite in -- in the whole Russian orbit. They are -- they are really traitors to the whole western idea of freedom. And this old man, perhaps my age, director of the polytechnical institute of Prague, rushed forward when this question was asked, and said, "Of course, why should anybody study unless he's paid in -- paid for, right away? So for every examination, a man gets an increase of 20 percent."

I wouldn't have believed it. Here was a man who had been -- still lived under old Francis Joseph. He was, after all, my age, you see. He had seen the glory of the great Hapsburg empire, you see, with real science, and real truth -- search for truth. And -- and here he rushes, because he had of course his -- his hangman behind him, his commi- -- the commissar, you see, was there, too. And -- and he -- could have stayed silent. No, you see. {Tacitus}, the old Roman historian, speaks of ruere {in servitia}, who rushed forth into slav- -- slavery, you

know, mental slavery. Great sentence.

And so I give you a collection of phrases, you see, for your benefit, to know the importance of the -- these dangers that beset us. "Les Philosophes"--pardon me--"Salariés" is I think an important one. I give you the Trahison des Clercs. I gave you "simony." Now, what did I say with --? (That this one { } rush into slavery.)

Ja, ruere {in servitia}. That -- that's how Tacitus calls the -- the -- the surrender of the whole {Roman} nobility, and -- and literary men under the caesars. The ruere {in servitia} -- rush in for servitude. So that you go even faster than the -- than the -- than the tyrant wants it.

If you read the history of Henry VIII, of course, this happened with the Reformers, I mean. There was no Reformation in England for this reason, because it was all done, you see, from fear that otherwise you would lose your head, under this bloody tyrant, Henry VIII. And they outdid themselves in denouncing each other, and it was exactly a {ruere in servitium}.

My Italian friend, Gaetano Salvemini, was -- an enemy of Mussolini. He was a professor of history in Florence. And he had a wonderful library. And when he had to leave the country, because he had first been arrested, and been a year in prison, and then he got out--and so he saw that he had to leave the country in order not to be executed--he wrote to the University of Florence that he gave -- donated his beautiful library to them, as a gift. And his colleagues wanted to please Mussolini. So before answering his letter, they telephoned to Rome and said, "Mussolini, confiscate his library. Then we don't have to thank him for the gift." That's ruere in {servitium}. That's McCarthyism. And we had it in this country just exactly in the same spirit.

I had a -- I have a club there, a little gathering, a so-called Ticker Fel- -- Tucker fellowship in -- in -- at Dartmouth, where 35 professors meet. And when Mr. McCarthy came along 10 years ago, with his { }, he thought everybody was full of suspicion, and the FBI came, and everybody was investigated. And before then, when -- in 1950 to Europe, I met this man in the last evening, farewell party, and he said to me, a professor of history--of modern history--and he thinks he's "honest old John." And he said, "You know, I -- now I can tell you, since you are leaving for Europe, I volunteered to inform the FBI about the..."  
[tape interruption; end]

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...one main, { }, he lived openly to the various { } sta- -- stages of life, admitting that { } philosopher alone, that -- and he -- wasn't simply a writer. You mustn't think of him as a writer. But again he felt that after Christ he was { } tried to live out the full life of 80 years in its variety, in its ad- -- contrast- -- contrasting and contradictory stages to the full.

And under this impact, you must understand, did he grow up -- as I think that America is at this moment in a situation in which he begins to grasp that against the mechanism of the production here, you yourself have to become organic substance. You and I, we are garden soil -- we are topsoil. If we can think of yourself as willpowered or as mind, will all have to go the analyst and end in a lunatic asylum { } philosophy of despair. You can only thrive if you know what thriving means. And "thrive" means to be planted, to be rooted, to be organic, and to be patient with oneself, and to give oneself time so that one thing follows after the other. One step. And I feel it in a -- in a -- in a world -- { } in a world of minerals, a world of -- of jets and -- and th- -- this empty stratosphere. The only -- the only harm -- the only organic substance that's left are we ourselves. Your brain is -- is not mind and will, but it's organic substance that has to be cultivated and irrigated like any orange grove. And it must bring -- its fruits to -- in its season.

So for example, I think the great { } that comes over our time at this moment is that here in this country--I mean Europe, by the way, too--people have cultivated the child prodigy, for 150 years. Do it faster, that's better. Now I hope we all {feel} that this is horrid, a child is ruined { } coming too fast, that God is with the slow more than with the fast. And -- as long as you allow people to go to college or -- at 16 or 15, I think they are completely wrong. { } of this -- at this most unhappy { } Mr. Norbert Wiener, the famous inventor of the IBM, was allowed to go to Harvard at fif- -- 14. And graduated at 17; and of course, he never grew up. So his brain is tremendous, but the rest of the man is -- is despicable.

And this child prodigy business may -- may signify to you: what we already were exposed to as a counter-attack, the -- as an attempt to live slowly. And in this connection--initiation, some form of hardihood, some form of decision, Sir, that's your { } -- what I am trying -- to which I am now trying { }, you see, between the age of child or adolescence and manhood, offered itself as absolutely necessary. And I don't think what we should do with the -- with

juvenile delinquents in this country, except initiation. If you do not demand a -- a period of hardihood, you see, and -- and I mean, {of}--how do you say?--proving themselves {to} these children, they -- they'll always -- we all -- we would be juvenile delinquents just ourselves. And -- I wonder that there are so few. Juvenile delinquency is the -- is the necessary result of our society, because -- children are allowed or asked to live from day to day. Now a child wants to grow. And a child wants to have a far future, and a long perspective. And you ruin any child if you give him too many presents, for example, for Christmas, then. It's ruined. A child must yearn. He must long. Otherwise, it cannot reach the next stage. Now everything is done in our schools and in our education to make the children happy as of today. And if you do this -- if you enclose a child into such a wonderful candy box as of today, he goes to pieces. He believes nothing. And that's what all our system of education at this moment does.

Now the -- the problem however is, if you can -- a tribe, like a red Indian tribe, or if you have our modern society of 6 million people living in Los Angeles, you will think of this initiation of something of a communal nature. You will say, "Well, the boys must go to camp together," or "They must go roam the Rockies," you see, "Or they must prove themselves in { }." However, when I grew up, the -- the individualistic era {grew -- grows}, which {draws} from the French Revolution and the Declaration of Independence to the world wars. That is, everybody is his own, you see -- is the captain of his soul. So the -- Goethe's -- and -- solution was that the hardihood, this transformation from -- from careless youth to a conscious manhood would have to take place inside one single individual, without any concern with the -- with the social needs, perhaps, of the community, like warfare, or like -- exploration, or going West-- you see, pioneering. In a -- in a closed-in country like Germany, with very narrow, you see, boundaries, we had to think up something which posed the question inside the human mind, totally, you see.

And so his solution was that he wrote the Werther, the famous Werthers Leiden, the book which accompanied Napoleon still when he was a young man on -- in his campaigns, was that Werther commits suicide, and thereby establishes the barrier between carefree youth and manhood by saying, "Here comes the point of decision: at 20, or 23, or 24, you have to make up your li- -- is the life worth to be lived? Then if -- it is wrong if you face reality and {feel not} up { } eliminate {yourself}. And you can hardly understand this fact that in our country, every young man was seriously exposed to the temptation of suicide, for 150 years since the Werther was written in 1770. And it was the same in Europe--but perhaps more in Germany, because this was Goethe's country. And whereas in



this country, businessmen at 45 and 50 very frivolously blow out their brain with a pistol -- revolver--and this is quite common here--we were asked to make this decision 25 years earlier. And most of us, of course, decided then, you see, we would throw away our revolver or we wouldn't play with the dagger. We wouldn't say, "Oh, if the worst happens," you see, "I can always go." But we would learn at 20 or 25, whenever this happened -- this maturing process, then we had reached this line of temptation, or this borderline -- boundary line, and we had decided that this was the will of our maker, and we would not longer be tempted. We would not commit suicide anymore, even in the face of bankruptcy, or indeed of -- of venereal disease, which was a great curse at that time, or all the other curses that come -- a man -- come on a man and woman in their years of change. You all know that women suffer, but I assure you that man of 45 and 50 is in exactly the same predicament as a woman who loses her physical beauty at that time. A man loses his -- his -- his imagination. He has -- he has seen all the pictures, and it's very hard to live a second life from 45 to 80 in repeating, you see, and always knowing that once before, you have done this already. This is the trouble, the difficulty of old age, you see, that nothing is quite -- and here in this country, think they can go on with novelties, tiger-hunting in -- in Africa. But the answer is that the Negroes will shoot them, I hope very soon.

I met such a -- Chicago tycoon out in Egypt, who -- who was driving down to she- -- shoot lions and elephants in Central Africa. This was eight -- nine years ago. And I would have liked to shoot him. But why has he to do it? Was 60, had too much money, and he had seen all the pictures; so you had just to go to the next flavor, you know, the next in- -- ingredient, and the next spice. And anybody who, after 45, is anxious, or curious, is not a man, is not a {sage}, is not a {wise man}.

And so -- here, this country couldn't live--the travel bureaus--unless this wasn't an American vice. And at 45, still be keen to go places, which I think is absolutely ridiculous. It's the time of becoming a hermit. It's the time for laying down roots. And it's certainly not the time for going 15 times to Rome and see -- make the pope. But I know too many of these people. They are people who have never grown up, you see, who still try to keep younger than 20, because at 20, you do discover: why shouldn't you?

You must know that -- on your generation lies the terrible burden, gentlemen, for -- I assure you this is from long experience, and many troubles that I tell you this: you are the first generation that has to advocate the forms of mature life, which is very hard on you, but which { } done by -- be done by a { }, although you aren't old, you have to think for this problem how to get old. --

Because the old know. They are either in old-age pensions, or in homes, you see, rotting, or they are fools who -- décolleté at 76. I have seen a woman of 76 here, belonging to the { }, and making love to Harvard students. And I mean love. And all of this passes here, without -- without any outcry.

So this is quite serious, you see. Since the -- this -- since we were individualistic, since everybody--all philosophy of the 19th century was, that salvation had no -- to be found by the private people, you see, by your -- in your own soul, and inside yourself--since there was in Germany not much occasion, so to speak, to -- do this by -- by exploration, and -- and pioneering in the West, or whatever we say in a narrow country, the temptation was to judge yourself and decide whether you -- were found wanting or not. And in my own class, we were 12 people graduating; after the first six years, three had committed suicide. And so this is practical, gentlemen; there's just this -- as historical --.

That's not a theory I'm talking of. And my teachers would tell me in Gymnasium--that's your junior college--that we risk boys, lest we not get men. And so the -- the losses in the universities in this -- in numbers of people who went to pieces in -- in many ways, not all suicide--you can wound yourself in other ways--was -- it was, I would say 36 percent. And we had no pity. And we didn't care for the -- lowest common denominator, and the feeble-minded didn't get any privileged treatment, you see. It was quite the opposite idea. It was "Prove -- yourself," you see; and if you fall through the net--well, I mean--there is no other way of selection.

You may call it cruel, and you may call it {heroic}, and you may call it stupid, I mean. But I'm descriptive. This is what happened. Now Kleist, you see, belongs to this first generation, who tried to establish such a way into reality. And Werther, who had been written 25 years before he wrote this -- Werther is the story of a young man who falls in love. And since his -- his love is married -- engaged to somebody else to marry, you see, he then eliminates himself from the contest. And it made all over Europe an incredible impression. I do think that the country here, America with its -- frontier, it had no reason to establish these inner processes. At that time, you became a man by just being exposed to the demands, you see, of life, here. And for this reason, I think it's -- was never thought necessary. But since the frontier has disappeared, and you are all now in this inside situation of schools, and examinations, and camps, and protection, I think you -- for the first time, there is perhaps a reason to mention, you see, this -- this strange arrangement of the European mind, and trying to -- to place this decision, you see: is life worth living? Is this beyond your own plan, you see, and

exposing yourself to the dangers and the judgments of -- of providence, is this -- do you have the stamina? You will have to introduce {in} your lifetime { } -- the last 15 years will have to find rites of initiation for the young. Otherwise you will absolutely find that all the good children must become delinquents, because what you ask them to live for and -- with is too poor. And if they have anything -- you see, either they'll be feeble-minded as some when they obey all these orders: {"Keep right,"} and -- and so on, and the good ones will -- will take to murder and -- and -- and perjury, just in order to have something to do. And don't be betrayed, I mean. You may -- you -- you do not allow -- I have a -- in my own village, I've--perhaps I told you this--I have a Boy Scout group. I told you this, perhaps. And there is a woman, weight 250, who -- who has the effrontery of taking out these 13- and 14-year-old boys. Of course, she's a busybody, and -- daughter of the -- our senator of our state -- I mean of -- of the -- sen- -- American Senate, so she's a prominent person. And nobody thinks he can deny her this -- this ruinous activity. But she'll destroy of course the fiber, and the sta- -- normal stamina of these boys. They must be with men at that age, don't you think? You have women teachers. And the -- they're {revolting} -- the boys -- but the good boys {must drink champagne} very often. They must have gangs.

This is all again contained in this story, you see, that Kleist, he's a -- in order to mark off certain boundaries of decision, of life, it only takes a few. It isn't necessary that -- that {a million} commit suicide, if the man is {hopeful}. Now Kleist is very famous, you see, wrote very great poetry. And so his fate, of course, stands out like a beacon in the sea. But as you need beacons in a stormy sea, so that your -- ship doesn't go against the rocks, so I assure you, the -- the negative lives lived are not one. These people do not stay condemned. They -- they -- are victims, you see, for our sake. And in this sense, Kleist is a mighty figure, because all my life I have known { }, and yet fully understanding why, you see. The double influence of such a person is great, because I have always lived with such markers on the map of life, you see. And I -- there's Nietzsche, who went insane. There is Hölderlin, who went insane. I have always felt that these people became insane lest I had to go, you can understand.

And -- and therefore, I speak with reverence of this very unhappy and miserable man, you see, because--it's more complicated, by the way, I mean--he wanted so much to grow up...

(and prove himself --)

...yes, that -- that he { } tried. He was never married, was very unhappy in his sex life, obviously, and -- many mysteries about this. But not very savory ones. And so he wanted to take somebody else with him, who, when he had become a man, who could make one { }. Because "manhood" means, of course, founding, you see, a company, founding a household. He never got married. He never was able to convey his passion to any one other person, but he was burning inside all the time. He was -- I mean, read his poetry, it's just a -- over -- overwhelmed with -- with sens- -- sensuousness and passion { }.

So he {firmly} persuaded an equally miserable woman to take his -- their -- her life with -- together with him, although they were not in love at all. There was no -- but it was an attempt to prove that he had founded a household, at least in {despair}. And his -- {his -- some} common bond in reality { }. A very strange story. And I won't go into all the details; I have written it up, I mean. And I've compared it to Hitler's suicide with this strange person, Eva Braun. He never consecrated his marriage, but he was quite incapable { }. But he had to have as his legal wife {a person}, you see, and whom he had to take down with him in order to show that he was not just the fanatic of his youth--which he really had remained, you see, a youthful person, a childish person--but then he was superior. It's very -- it's the same thing. So at a distance of 130 years, you know, Kleist and Hitler frame this epoch in which suicide was an important feature of Central Europe { }. It was a -- also in France.

This country is -- is very, very strange. But the impurified death motive, which you now {read of in the -- } from the analyst, that there is a desire, you see, for destruction and for death in every man. We all can commit suicide. No animal can, you see. It's the limit of our freedom, self-destruction--very strange thing--which pervades many people who have self-pity, for example. Anyone has -- element of this destructive, you see, desire to destroy himself, inside himself. We -- this -- this strange ambivalence, which only means that man is really free, because he can turn against himself at various points, and goes in this country completely un- -- un- --how do you say it?--un- -- without a sieve, without a { } -- filter, you see; "unfiltered," I would call it.

I have known so many suicides in the best Bostonian family -- that I -- it's appalling. But there it comes not as a moral problem, but it just { }, it just happens. It's never taken up as the -- the -- that one element which proves to a man that he -- is at the turning point of his own vision, that he can go one way or the other. And { } don't be frightened by my -- by my description of suicide. It is the highest moment in anyone's life, when he learns, you see, that his life { } cannot { }. And most people in this country never reach this maturity,

but they come { } into life and say, "No."

And Shakespeare speaks of those bournes -- you know, in Hamlet. He has the word "bournes" for the boundaries of life: b-o-u-r-n-e-s. That's just an older form, I suppose, of "boundary." Anybody knows the {statement}? ("Whence no traveler returns.")

Well, it -- it is when Hamlet thinks of suicide himself, I mean. In Shakespeare, you have this moment of -- of consideration.

Only to show you how important this is for this country at this moment.

Ja? You'll forgive me this -- digression, I know. But it has a little bit to do with the Bible, because it is the acceptance of the creature in us, you see, who is not his own master. Of course, that's the whole story of Samuel, if you think of the good woman -- the mother of Samuel, it's exactly her -- her position. The whole Bible is written around this fact that we cannot commit suicide. All Gentiles commit suicide and don't think it's sinful. It is only in the -- Judaism that it was created -- you see, considered a lack of faith in God to commit suicide. And today I think this country is going pagan, in as far as I find more and more people ready to help people commit suicide.

I have a dear friend. She's one of the nicest woman -- women in the community. And we had a terrible argument. She for a while didn't speak to me, because I said, "You can't do that." A man can -- a student or so in college, or a professor--we had two cases of suicide there. And I said, "Prevent it." And she said, "Oh no. If such a boy is in despair, I have to help him to do it."

That's paganism. I'm not asking so much the question about the candidate for suicide himself, as about the society, you see. As long as you admit that you have to prevent a suicide, you are in the -- you are in the { }. As soon as you say, as -- as in the case of a -- any Roman general, or a Germanic general or -- "Help me to die," like the sword-bearer has to present the sword, you see, to the hero so that he can kill himself before he's made a prisoner, you are -- that's paganism. There is -- that's the div- -- one dividing line and since 1800, the advocates of sui- -- legitimate suicide have been growing all the time. And it is very hard for you, I think, to realize that this was out of the question.

Suicide, I have tried to study the sources about this. It's very hard to find

any material. Suicides have been, but they have been hushed up. Whereas since 19- -- 1800, it's been spectacular, you see, I mean. And the press is going out for it more and more. And -- so a dear friend of mi- -- ours, a Britisher from Jamaica, was a professor at Dartmouth College, for 20 years. He had grown up in an orphanage, in a neighborhood, and had gotten an American education. But he had -- kept the sensitivity of an English boy, and so never was very happy. He had reached the age of 50 without marrying. And now he fell in love, or somebody else fell in love with him, {as it is}. And she persuaded him to become engaged to marry. And he didn't feel up to the occasion and was driven to despair, felt trapped, didn't know how to get out of it.

And he lived the last year of his life at our house. So we know a little about -- and he felt that in his -- and I think we -- we -- we helped him for one year to -- not to be driven to the extremes. But then he went to Canada; as an Englishman, he had relatives there. And -- the next day our student paper had the effrontery to have a headline, "Mr. Henderson Dead -- Death Was by Hanging; It Was Suicide" -- as a headline in a student paper.

And this shows you that suicide is not understood -- stood as a spiritual problem of all of us, just as an outer event, as a -- like crime -- in a Hearst paper -- paper. Now if a community, like a Dartmouth College or your college, is visited by such an event, the first reaction must be: "Here, but by the grace of God, goes John Bradford." You know what John Bradford -- Bradford said, "{ } went somebody else." And the first feeling about such a suicide must always be: "Preserve me from not being led into this temptation." And then you couldn't have such a headline. You understand, because you would identify yourself with your teacher, or with your student { } {would} find a -- quite a different expression of -- of discomfort or mourning. And that's the essence of mourning, {gentlemen}, you see, that you feel that -- it's our own fate that's { }. That's why instead you have this denial of mourning here with this famous Forest -- Cemetery. Or what is it called? Wie?

(Forest Lawn.)

Because there death is simply denied; so you don't have the Lord. "By virtue of the power invested in me by the trustees of this cemetery, I hereby declare you to be immortal." This is the -- the -- the -- the paradise -- the fool's paradise in which you try to live today. By abolishing death, you see, you spare yourself all these lessons of other people's death -- of suicide.

And to round this picture out, I mean, this is the story -- at Dartmouth

College. One is: "Death Was by Hanging." The second is: this good woman, Mrs. {Taylor}, who said that she of course would help any student who wanted to commit suicide, that was her sacred duty. And the third thing is: my own class--I gave a course in universal history--a boy got up at the beginning of the class and said I shouldn't talk about the Church or anything { }, because after all, Jesus had committed suicide. And I learned that this is the Nazi way in which it's very rampant in New Jersey, and therefore the Nazis are victorious in this country, and they are in many states, as you know. And it's much Nazism in this country, at this moment. And so this is a very -- summary of this new paganism: Jesus committed suicide.

Now that wasn't the whole story. I was furious, And said so. And -- then the -- the same class went on. And at the end of the class, there was another occasion for him to make a remark. And so the same boy from New Jersey got up and said, "Well, after all, Adolf Hitler has sacrificed himself for his nation."

Now grant you, this is -- the two sentences, you see, of course correlate, fits in. It's like saying that Mr. Hoover already did the whole -- New Deal. I mean, that's just -- that's a Republican {poison} in a small way; -- it's a similar way of turning the tables, you see, putting A where B belongs, and B where A belongs. Obviously Mr. Hitler in despair had to commit suicide. There was no room for him on this continent. And Jesus began His life, you see, through the Crucifixion, and has ever been alive after that. And that's why we -- you see, everybody knows this; everybody feels this. And in order to destroy the living Christ, you see, and in order to institute Hitler as a -- as having a future in his dogma, you have to say that Hitler sacrificed himself, because then he goes on living, you see, as John Brown, you see: "And his soul is living on."

Therefore, these expressions of suicide and -- and -- sacrifice are {important} -- even, you see, because -- I told you that Kleist, this man Kleist, or this Werther--the hero of Goethe's novel, you know this book, by name? that's a famous book, Werther, who's the hero--commits suicide. And they may be treated as sacrificial if we say, "What not? This never." You see, if there are these markers, which say, "Here is the cliff, don't come nearer," you see, "to this abyss." In this sense, I feel that Christ is, you see, an honorable victim, because in Him then comes to a -- to an open -- into the open, you see, a temptation of everybody. And I must -- must warn you not to become Pharisees.

The -- there are three situations: suicide meaningless, and saying, "Here is -- I have come to the end of my rope." And you can say that the Nazis played away German statehood in 12 years, and therefore they always had to speak of

the 4,000 years or of a thousand years ahead of them, you see. Just they gambled away exactly 12 years, which is quite a condensation of time, you see. The devil always sells short, you see. The -- what we call the devil, you see, nothing but the shortening of the time that anything real takes. You marry for your life. And you rape for the moment. That's the devil. That is, the act is -- is concentrated on one moment, and is fruitless, and -- and destructive. And you can do with any- -- what you -- we call "diabolical" is always a shortcut, is always an attempt, you see, to live less long than we are meant to live. The installment-buy- -- -plan buying, you see. It's diabolical, because it shortens. But I -- you want to get something which you may get in four years, but you want to have it immediately, so you sell out your freedom. And you are the slave of this immediacy, you see, for the next four years.

Now this is a positive sacrifice. And then we have -- and I have to introduce this, because it doesn't exist, it seems, in -- I don't know the vocabulary, although everybody knows that there is a negative sacrifice. That he is a warning: "Don't do this."

Now in a sense, Christ has made the same appeal. "Don't do" -- in -- the theology of the Old -- New Testament very articulate in the fact that it says, "It must never be repeated," you see. The -- it's the last sacrifice that is necessary. It's a warning to all -- of us who would like to burn at stake, and to crucify, you see. This is no longer necessary, because the worst has happened. It has been done once to the innocent. So all the less innocent, you see, are included in the path, so to speak. They must not be -- it must not happen again. So the -- our Christian theology has something to do with this negation of repetition.

And once more, the -- this is the -- the sterile suicide, which is not done in order to teach, in order to convey a thing, or because you have lived for others and with others. And I would say that the student who -- of his own teacher writes, "Death Was by Hanging," sterilizes the event, deprives himself of any way of learning something of -- it's just an outside accident on the road, you see. And it has nothing to do with our own {soul}. And that's why it is so absolutely gruesome in -- in an educational establishment, such cruelty and, you see, such callousness occurs, because then life has no relation -- the -- the -- lives are lived, you see, independently from each other.

So I -- I think it is perhaps worth your while to think in these three terms, and say one thing. What we call "paganism," and must call "paganism," is the right of man to dispose of its own existence between birth and death as though it was his own property. And this includes then the right to commit suicide



whenever it pleases him. And I think we all are in this temptation. And it's -- I don't know of anyone in this room who would say that there is no -- situation in which he would say, you see, "I'm quite sure that I won't do this."

So we are all in this temptation of going -- becoming Gentiles, of going pagan. And -- and I -- have -- learned from the concentration camps of the Nazis that you must understand when suicide is allowed. The concentration camps abolish the name of the person, gave them numbers. And they ceased to be anything but material -- human material. And -- comes from modern psychology, who has the effrontery to call people "good material." It's not -- it's forbidden, but this is done in this -- our educational establishment: "first-class material." Now all these people have produced this hell. The concentration camps are only the expression of 100 years of analysts' psychology. And -- and you live in this world already. And watch out. Because if a man is only -- be treated as a number, and has no name among his fellow men, he has no hope for being redeemed by their love.

Now sometimes despair is so terrible on us, that only the loving eyes of somebody else can redeem us, can bring us back into normalcy. Everybody knows this, that you just depend on somebody else's saying "Hello" to you. In a small way, we all do -- experience this every day. And when -- I have seen cases -- or have known cases in -- in concentration camps of Europe, where I would have said that the moment in which they were alive, some famous people like Edith Stein--you may have heard of this philosopher or so--when they were abducted, so to speak, you see, out of their communities--she was a nun -- a Catholic nun of Jewish descent--the abbess and the other nuns in Holland allowed the Nazis to take her away in her midst. The abbess didn't go with her. But now she is worshiped as a saint in this Catholic community. It's ridiculous. If there was anything about -- in a monastery and a nunnery, they -- others, the convent, you see, had to go with her. And she couldn't have been separated. That's the vow of a nun, that you are a sister in the Lord.

And so after this terror that the own abbess and the other nuns deserted her, and just sent her to the -- of their own fear to the -- into the hands of a -- of a gang that only counted heads and legs, and broke out their -- their golden teeth, as you know, and -- and cut their hair, and stole their clothes in order to make money out of them, I think -- such a person--she didn't, by the way--can commit suicide. This is not suicide in the sense in which our human existence, so to speak, is guaranteed by our creator, and asks from us to uphold. Because it's all within the word, the living word, you see, this speech, that we are only human beings, and not animals. And if no word anymore reaches us, because we have

been -- become number 11,022, you see, instead of having our name, a -- when this identity can no longer be hoped for and re-established, then I would say that suicide is -- it's not a super- -- you see, the -- the -- the commandment of no suicide is not a -- something superstitious, is not a taboo which cannot be discussed. But within the creative process of mankind, where we are spoken to, we are within a stream of power, a field of force that is stronger than we. That keeps us alive. And once we are thrown away like a -- like a skeleton, or an empty -- empty skull, it's a different matter. Then we are -- the world has cast us out. So I only meant to say, we have to find modern concepts, and words, and understanding for this tremendous problem. For 150 years, suicide has advanced as a moral permission, as something that is not permitted. That have made advance -- and advanced all the time. In the sentence of an American citizen, all by the way of purely of American descent, in my college -- in Dartmouth, three years ago, you see, "Jesus has committed suicide after all," and "Hitler has sacrificed himself for his people," you have, so to speak, the climax. You can't do more, you see. You pervert the vocabulary and the tradition of the human race. And when such a point is reached, only conscious effort can restore normalcy. You see, that's why I have to discuss these things { }. Because you are all exposed to this perversion of the vocabulary, of the { }. So you -- one day, you will have yourself to make up your mind: what is suicide? and what is sacrifice? And will have to be very careful. Otherwise you will get in great trouble in your married life, in the education of your children, in your professional life, and in your political life. Because if you haven't this {near you}, you will make terrible victims, if you think that a man -- you see, the savior of mankind here has committed suicide, and the anti-Christ has -- has sacrificed himself for his people. So pardon me. What's your name?

({Epstein.})

Now Mr. {Epstein}, you don't mind. But this is the consequence of your -- of your question.

(Well, I may ask more later.)

What?

(I say, I may ask more later. This won't stop me.)

Well, I think I owed you this, because it is after all the -- the condition under which the bib- -- Bible story is written is that man cannot commit suicide.

And the condition under which all pagan history, migration of peoples, Greek history and so, is -- written is that man make commit suicide. As you know, the whole Roman nobility from Caesar's days to -- to the days of -- of Titus and { }, to the destruction of the temple of Jerusalem did commit suicide, and eliminated itself from the scene. There was not one Roman nobleman alive in 1700 A.D. They all had committed suicide. And after this, no Roman citizen has ever become emperor of Rome. They were all from the provinces. That's quite a story. Suicide has {stayed} in Japan the same. You know the samurai has to commit {hara bushito}, they call suicide. -- It is still -- Ja- -- Japan is still one of the few {pagan} countries left where you can study what suicide is. It's the taking outside, by your own volition -- you see, yourself out of this fabric of -- of life, and of history.

Christianity of course has -- has made this very clear in the case of Judas Iscariot, who -- who commits suicide in despair because of his -- deep dec- -- deceit by his own -- by his own political energy. I mean, obviously {this would seem so} that he wanted to fall into {Jesus' hand,} to appear as the Messiah, you see, by violence. But his suicide of course is the turning point in the history of -- of a -- the whole world, because after -- Judas Iscariot's exposure, so to speak, paganism held that the noble spirit does commit suicide. That it is the way in ending life when your own {proposition} is crushed. Self-{will}, which advocates suicide, because if my determination cannot be upheld, then good-bye, { }. I -- I had not achieved what I wanted to achieve, therefore there is nothing for me to live { }. Hello?

And the Bible is the -- first word of the Bible, in the book of Samuel, his first chapter, is written around this one sentence, you see: not "my will," but "thy will be done." And this -- this is the difference, that the Bible is written as the history, how the --.

You see, suicide follows inevitably when your purpose has to prevail. If your purpose cannot prevail, commit suicide. The -- the Goths -- the -- the famous Goths defeated by Justinian's general, Belisar, at the Vesuvius was, you see, that when -- the Goths, this -- these victorious German, heroic people, saw that this battle was lost, they all went to their deaths, voluntarily, and eliminated themselves. And so the -- the end of the -- of the Gothic kingdom is suicide. Suicide, you see, {defied its} purpose. But the -- the Bible is written around the fact that man has plans, Sir. That's why, Mr. {Epstein}, I have to be a -- little other terms from you about plan and -- and Christ, you see. Purpose and

plans are our contribution to the future. But the real future is destiny. And destiny uses our purpose and plans, but twists them around and does something in addition, you see. You can never fulfill your own purpose without becoming the most dissatisfied and hungry beast in the desert. A man who gets -- who has his purpose fulfilled to get \$1 million is in great temptation then to go on and finally he has \$100 million, and he is the most miserable creature on earth, and -- and ends like Mr. Hearst, with this fantastic idiocy there. Have you seen this -- his -- his hunting ground there with a -- these wagons and wagons of not even unloaded treasures from Europe, because he didn't know what -- where to spend his money and where to put his energy.

So -- destiny is above my forehead. It's up there. I'm led, and I have to learn that my purpose is part of the -- of my life, of course, but very small compared to my fulfillment -- the fulfillment of the higher purposes which are not of mine. Any bishop who has to say -- the Catholic Church, "I don't want to become the bishop," you see, learns that it's not his will that has to be done, but a higher will. And the fathers of the Revolution in this country, gentlemen, were such great people, because they knew that it wasn't simply their volition. The rebels wanted independence, and didn't care for the future. John Adams and Jefferson knew how difficult such a future would be, that they would, you see, have to become like the British government themselves. And they hated the idea, and they didn't see any way out. And this is more than purpose.

And that's why this country still has today this hazard -- the same constitution which it { } received, because they were very shy of identifying, you see, their {wicked} purposes with the form of government which they had to inherit from the British {and had to} { } on this side of the Atlantic. This is quite a different proposition, which has nothing to do with your volition, you see, and -- and your wishes and your desires, or your plans for your own future.

So these are the levels on which the -- the place for suicide is decided. If you only live for your own purpose, and are the captain of your soul, the last -- in the last analysis, your complete freedom is evinced by your right to commit suicide.

If, however, all life is one, one spirit moves the earth and the heavens in one history of mankind, then even your -- the -- your own life is only as meaningful as a sacrifice within the whole. It can then, instead of living 70 years, lay down your life for your friends on the battlefield, or you can lie -- die as a shining example of what {not like} Christ, you see, but it isn't that your life ends with your suicide, but that it makes -- plays a role within a -- in a -- in a pattern of

life, a tapestry of life which has a much larger sense than your own mentality, your -- what you think, your own consciousness, what you know about your own {interest}.

You read these four chapters, did you? I said Chapter 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

What's in them { }?

{ } or you're saying I believe, it goes on to talk about Samuel being a prophet, actually { } and then how God, how He leads the {Jews and prophets}, and {hears that}, and the Jews say "Look at this neighboring land. They have a king. Why can't we have a king?" And Samuel -- Samuel's fears that this -- and tells them that this is wrong, {"You do have} God." And so he goes to God {with his problem} and he tells Him that the Jews want a king. And so God says, "If this is what they wish it -- wish, then we will let them have a king." And He tells Samuel who should be the king, but doesn't -- name the person, "Until an event {happening} { }, when this event occurred, you will know who should be the king."

(And so this shepherd or -- I mean, this boy who watches flocks for his father, is looking for some lost--I don't know what it was, oxen or something--and he comes to the town and they say that Samuel will tell him where they are.)

Was it oxen?

(I can't remember what they were.)

Well, { } -- many poems and dramas of -- of a later literature, this -- this story has been -- had been used. What are the animals? Wie?

(Asses.)

(Asses, yeah. And it --.)

One way of keeping the word "ass" alive, you see.

Ja?

(And so anyway, they -- he comes to the town {where} Samuel {lives}.

And so Samuel tells him that he will find his asses for him; and meanwhile, it seems that he asks him to stay for dinner, or something, and --.)

Not "something." Never say "something."

(Yeah, I guess it is. He stays -- he invites him into his home...)

It's vicious.

(...and he stays for dinner. And I believe that quite soon he is -- he is informed that it's the will of God that he be anointed king of the people of Israel. And then it goes on to {defend} how Saul is at first a -- a -- supposedly a good man. But when he -- after he attains his rulership, he begins to be a little bit more self-willed and somehow perverted, and contrary to the humility of -- of a pious man. And therefore is asking for God's wrath against him almost, and -- { }.)

Now, I have brought you here quite a valuable article on the book on Samuel -- of Samuel, in the Encyclopaedia, 14th edition, because it's still the good edition. The last edition was a scandal. And -- and -- I'm really sorry to say, the deterioration of this great work is sad. Best encyclopedia we have today is Italian. { } a masterpiece of 14 volumes. I advise you to look into it, even though you do not know Italian, because in its -- in its illustrations and in its pictures, it's the most complete book that's ever been published in any --. It's the last sunset, so to speak, of European civilization. It was finished in '39, I think. And it's the collaboration of an international staff of the highest order, completely international -- many Americans, by the way, { }. And this is very sad.

But here, this old edition--which is, I think, 1928 or 1929--is still very good.

And it's -- reflects--better than Mr. Shotwell's book, which I think is on a lower level than this article--it reflects the best scholarship of the time on the criticism of the Bible. The first brilliant book on -- on the Bible -- on these -- book of Samuel was written by {Wenthausen} in 1871. I think you should know his -- this period, because is the father of most of the biblical criticism which runs wild in this country as of -- in this moment. And by and large the biblical criticism in this country is far behind the times. It is still very much of 1871 brand.

And they have much genius in this, establishing -- the sources out of which the Book of Samuel is composed, and from this angle, there is nothing to be said against it at all. We have learned a lot about the way in which this author took from -- of course when he wrote this, from sources, I mean. He must have, as you would have to {go} by your notes--or somebody else's notes--if you want to describe what happens in this -- in this seminar. The funny thing is only that this pride of being able to look into people's footnotes, and where they came

from, has blinded them to the text, that is, to the -- to what the Bible is written for.

Now it of course has to be composed out of certain bricks of -- of reality, you see. But the funny thing is -- I give you this--that's why I brought you the book--one sentence, which may show you how careful you have to -- go about using these -- these -- these books of the last 70 -- 80 years. I think they are really {marvelous}, because he says, "The introductory account of the Book of Samuel, Chapter 1 to Chapter 4, first verse, is a valuable picture of religious life at the sanctuary in Shiloh."

That's all he has to say. That's purely external. I tried to tell you last time that this is -- could have been in Shiloh, or in {Biloh}, or in Los Angeles, you see. The problem is, you see, to distinguish between purpose and providence, between purpose and {destiny}. From the very outset, that's the whole content of the first chapter: to make -- see that the woman and the baby both don't know what this is all for, you see. They have to serve a higher purpose, and not their own. This is -- the Bible is written about. Now whether this is in Shiloh is absolutely external, is -- environmental. But this -- this biblical critic, of course, thinks that he has a second Thucydides here, or a second Herodotus, or a second {Bancroft}, or -- whatever your historian is as of today. And so he says, "It's a valuable picture of religious life at the sanctuary at Shi- -- Shiloh."

Now the three terms I recommend to your attention show you the total misunderstanding of the -- of the Bible that -- persists today in academic circles: "valuable," "religious," "at Shiloh." Now nobody would have to read a book about the val- -- a valuable book about religious life in Shiloh. It's ridiculous. Why -- what -- it had to do with the -- with the religious life in Shiloh? Nothing whatsoever. And -- throw the Bible into the paper -- wastepaper basket, if this is so. Obviously, the Bible hasn't made its -- its course through the world in 1,000 -- 1100 -- or 1100 languages, because it gives a valuable picture of religious life at Shiloh. Just incalculable. But this is all printed and you can get your doctor's degree for that.

You are sunk in superstition at this moment, gentlemen, of paganism.

And that's why suicide of course is -- is { }. It all goes together. If man is a purposive animal, you see, and his purposes are frustrated, he commits suicide. Unless he's taken up by a man who asks \$10,000 a year and calls himself a psychoanalyst.

You -- you live in a -- in a dark world of complete darkness. The sor- -- the

sorcerers of Egypt govern in this -- in this community. That's psychoanalysis. They -- they -- they interpret dreams, just exactly as it was before the Exodus. -- Don't believe it. I'm not really laughing. This is true. Mr. Rollo May admitted that much, when he -- when he spoke. That's exactly what he said. "Don't give up the biblical story about anxiety and -- and guilt," you see. The sorcerer of pharaoh says to pharaoh, "No guilt," you see, "no anxiety And it's all in the stars." And -- and -- and -- and Rollo May, did you go to him? Who -- who listened to Mr. Rollo May? Anybody?

(This -- this was only by invitation { }.)

Oh, I see. { }. That's another {hoax}.

Well, wh- -- why is this all wrong about the Bible? Because the very word "religion" for the Bible doesn't exist. They {type} { } the religions of the many nations. You must know that "religion" is a generalization. And the -- the Bible fights for faith against religion for the elements that are in every moment in everybody's life, regardless of the outer forms of worship in any one national sanctuary.

And therefore, the -- the -- to say "a relig- -- valuable picture" says that the Bible is one out of many. Whereas the Bible makes an attempt to show concretely how man in any religious environment, any form of worship--which, of course, goes by place, and time, and architecture, and -- and mores, and dresses, and -- and costumes and what-not--has to communicate with the creator's will as the creature that at this moment has to be created. The who- -- the Bible is written around the fact that man is in creation, still. That's why it begins with, "In the beginning, God created heaven and earth," you see, "and now He goes on to create man. And we are the sixth day of creation, today," you see, and the -- you see, the Sabbath, the end of creation, is still -- the word "Sabbath" is still ahead. And -- the whole story of the Bible is an attempt to make man -- you and me aware that wherever we come from, and where -- we are in the making, in the -- in the process of the --.

And that's why this first chapter is very eloquent. This woman, you see, cannot fulfill any requirements at Shiloh. You see, that's not enough. But there's something new happening for the first time, and unique. It will never happen again, the birth of her son Samuel, you see. That's the whole story written about. And to say this is a "valuable picture of religious life in Shiloh" is omitting the whole reason why the book is written. It is written around the fact that despite the religious life in Shiloh, something totally original was about to happen, that



has never happened before, you see, will never happen again. Uniqueness. And as the God of Israel is unique, because He is the creator of this one world in which we live, which can never be repeated because it's still in process, so against all the many worlds in which the Hindus, for example, live--worlds within worlds circling around--the -- the Jews have established -- in the Bible established one simple fact that all the heavens and all the earths, you see, are one. Only one process. This -- that God is unique, and man is unique in as far as he believes in God. If he doesn't, then he becomes a thing, like anybody else. And if you say, "We are an American," then you have to live according to the pattern of the Joneses. If you say that you have a soul, you can live a unique life. And anybody who wants to hold -- hold up with the Joneses is a Gentile, you see. He has gone -- he has lost the unique process of creation in which you and I are created at this very moment, you see, which has never happened before, which therefore cannot be established as a repetitive order. Now there are many things in our existence, like this -- here, { } which are repetitive, I mean. We all have to wear dress. And we dismiss them as -- as second-rate, I mean...

[tape interruption]

...and this is very simple thing, this --. And the masterpiece I think of Samuel is, because I do feel that it's perhaps the first book that was written down. I tried to tell you this last time, you remember, that it's written in this small, still voice: how does something unexpected, you see, happen for the first time, which has not happened to any tribal, you see, lore? In the tribe everything is repetitive. Everything has been -- happened before, everything is {taboo}, familiar {to him}. You do exactly what your forefathers did.

And -- so Judaism has a terrible time here in this -- between these tremendous empires, these tremendous -- and these tribes of Canaan, where everything is done by precedent. And so she has become ridiculous first. She has to think she's drunk. Because the only way in which a free future is reached is always by antagonizing the Joneses. Can you see this? It is perfectly normal that she should be inspired, and you see, and -- excited. But he has no explanation because something happens for the first time. She had -- he has never seen an inspired woman praying for -- in such -- with such devotion. So he says, "She's drunk." Now you will always be exposed in any free man's decision. He is the growing point of creation. Any decision you make--you want to study, you want

to marry { }--at that moment, you are ahead of everybody else in the universe with this decision. And you cannot complain that the universe is not prepared for this decision. And it is this lag which modern psychology tries to eliminate by telling you that you don't have to get hurt, that if you act right and adjust yourself, then everything is wonderful. It's nonsense. To grow is painful. Because it means that at one moment, your decision, you see, is still un-understandable to the next person, because you haven't been -- had time to convey it to them. And this conveyance had to be first created. Now this is true in small ways, when you suddenly tell your parents that you are no longer of their opinion and have to do otherwise. And it is -- goes on all your life. And it goes in politics, it goes in the sciences, you see, a new discovery. You are the growing point of creation. And this is the content of the -- you see, of the Book of Samuel. Here is she, the mother; then there is Samuel; then there is the kingdom of Israel. So there are three things, you see, three {times}, that something happens that is quite disestablished. Because Eli and his sons are the legitimate prophets, you see. Here the woman who, by hook and crook, receives the blessing of the legitimate prophets, and thereby is able to bring her son, you see, as a spiritual successor, so that somebody can inherit the office not by the flesh, carnally, you see, but through the spirit. That's the important thing.

Since this -- he is innocent of the corruption of the office of Eli--the story you told us, you see--he is able to represent real prophecy which means future. What is prophecy, gentlemen? Take it all away, it is the power to see to it that there is a promise that must be fulfilled. The word "promise" is a better -- the American translation for "prophecy." And you should use it. And you should know that it is. "Promise" is the translation of the American language of the Old Testament idea of "prophecy." Under this new dispensation, we call this "promise."

Now promise demands fulfillment. Now the tremendous story of Samuel is only how then the -- the -- the next step in the -- in the tradition of this people, who are weary of being so dis- -- dispersed in the -- and living among the other nations. How can it be fulfilled? And it can be fulfilled as long as Samuel is -- with the king, you see. Therefore the establishment of the prophecy in this Book of Samuel precedes the kingship. And if you read on in Samuel, you will find that this dualism is the -- the topic of the book -- the four books of Kings and of Samuel. Very simple.

I had to write for ano- -- other encyclopedia--I told you the story { }--and so I took great pains to work this out, you see. Samuel enables Saul. So

you have the beginning of Church and state. That's the essence in the Old Testament tension between prophet and king, you see. And that's why our modern division of Church and state goes back to the Old Testament, to this book here. To the -- the -- between Moses and {then} Samuel, the tribe simply overwent kingship. And so never allowed, so to speak, you see, the -- the -- the king to provoke or -- the danger of a relapse into tyranny and into idolatry, so that the king himself was, so to speak, God. Because that is, of course, the effect of despotism that you have to lick the -- the -- the feet of the -- of the tyrant -- and treat him as though he was the living oracle, I mean, as Henry VIII was treated in England, I mean. There was great danger for 10 years in England in the 16th century, that Henry VIII was really treated as -- as God. And even { } Burleigh, the great minister of Elizabeth, when he came to dine, said that he was sure that he would meet her -- as her leader -- his leader in Heaven -- in her and God's Heaven. So he was al- -- he was still blaspheming, you see, in -- in calling Heaven "Elizabeth's heaven," "the queen's heaven." So much was at that time the tyrant, you see, the -- identified with -- with kingship, I mean, with -- with religion.

This relapse is always with us. You have it now of course with Mr. Stalin in -- in Russia. And you have it with MacArthur in -- with Mr. Eisenhower in this country. These are all very dangerous suppositions, because they all invite the pope -- running together again of Church and state into one { }. You see, Mr. Eisenhower -- introduces prayer in his cabinet meetings, and so on, suddenly is standing for religion in this country. It's quite unheard-of. And very dangerous. And the division of Church and state is on what American liberty is founded. And it is disappearing fast at this moment, I assure you. As -- with suicide. Wherever you get suicide, wherever people live for -- for their own purpose, the whole must be kept together by violence. Because as soon as a man -- is no longer offering his life within a pattern of common destiny, as -- to bear fruit, as a seed for fruit, but thinks, "My purpose," you see, "my life," the whole must be taken care of by stern measures. And the more people are individualists, you see, the more tyrannical the community must be.

Now you get the second stage. Samuel recedes into the background and dies. And then you get this tension between Saul, David, and Jonathan. And in Saul -- and -- and the disaster occurs when Saul finally, I mean, tries to kill David, and to commit suicide, because he's so melancholic, because he's {a lone man}. Teaching's just too much against the spirit of the Almighty, because the spirit listeth where it bl- --how do you say it?--where it blows. Wie? It blows where it listeth.

And so the king cannot be the holder of the whole inspiration of a people. And this is the whole problem of, you see, the division of Church and state, that one -- has only an office, and the other has the spirit. We need both. And then you come to the solution, you see, the tremendous climax, the division between David -- David and Nathan, the prophet who is the kingmaker, through whose effort -- who is -- becomes king, because Nathan intervenes, after David? Who is the next king after David?

{ }.)

It's a great story, you see, that David appoints a successor and Nathan brushes it aside: "I'm the prophet." And -- imposes on David, the -- the son of the adulteress, of Bathsheba, you see. And that's why Bathsheba comes into the genealogy of Christ, you see. Genealogy as you know is full of illegalities and -- and crimes, because the -- the -- the spirit of God blows as -- where it listeth. And this is the whole content of the first -- these four books of Samuel -- two books of Samuel, and two books of Kings, how the dualism between prophet and king saves the Mosaic revelation in the desert, you see, when people had to live for hundreds of years in a settled order. And when the temptation of course is that they imitate their neighbors and get strong with a constitutional government. And so make their kings--because they aren't so very different from our presidents today--make their kings, you see, oversized.

So I feel that you would kindly for the next time -- go through the whole book -- two books of -- of Samuel, and bear me out on this story. You have to read on till you come to the David and Nathan, and then you have to go into the {First} Book of Kings for this purpose. But once you see this, you understand the -- the creativity of the books, because then you understand why Eli had to be purified, so to speak, from -- the -- his sons had to be eliminated, and Samuel had to be -- again receive his vocation as free as Moses did in the front of the fiery bush--how do you call it?--the burning bush.

You see, the problem of the Bible is how in every generation comes a direct command--an unheard-of, a unique command--which continues the story from miracle to miracle, or from decision to decision. Obviously, the history of the Bible is only valid if at every turn there is something unexpected that happens, and thereby proves that the purposes of man must be overcome, so to speak, must be woven into a higher pattern, a pattern which is not of their own making, which is beyond their expectation.

Yes?

(I don't -- I don't -- I'd like to get something cleared up. You just said that something -- when something unexpected occurred, it shows that man evolved in -- in a higher order than just a { } must fulfill his aspirations for this higher order by -- by including himself, by not depending on precedent, { } continually evolve toward the higher order. And then you said earlier that Eli rejected or didn't understand Hannah's inspiration {and thought} she was drunk, because he -- he was resting on precedent. This was an inspiration he didn't understand.) -- They never had it, that the wife was inspired, you see. That was not all -- admitted, so to speak. { }.

(So in that instance, he failed in his understanding a higher order. And then the Jews clamored to be like other nations. They looked around and they wanted a -- a united king and -- and so they looked at precedent for salvation and { }?)

Oh, very much so. They always -- in every generation, people ke- -- want to keep up with the Joneses. And it's our common illness, because it's -- makes for -- seems to make for happiness, { }. Simplifies matters { }.

(Well, wasn't this -- didn't you interpret this as being worthwhile, then?

That -- { }?)

{ } promises unfulfilled. The promise of America is something that is not represented by Mr. Eisenhower, but by the yearnings of unborn generations, and it will have to be fulfilled and it go -- goes beyond the present-day budgets, doesn't it? The budget of the United States for which Mr. Eisenhower is responsible has nothing to do with the promise of America. {They are two things}. { }, so to speak, shown up in this budget, would jeopardize the -- the promise of America, we would have to turn against him. { }. That's why he said, "They want to out-" --how -- how did he put it in his press conference? Did you see it? It was a very important press conference of course on this, my dear --. He said, "All the -- you want me to spend all the money now for armaments. And that would play into the hands of the Bolsheviks. We would forgo our own promise, our own future, and would just play up to the Joneses, to the Russians. They would like us to, you see, put all our eggs into this basket of armaments, and ruin our future."

And I must say I -- I had great respect for him, because it took nerve to

resist all these Democratic senators, you see, who have the majority in Congress, who say, "We don't have enough armaments in Berlin; we don't have enough bombs; we don't have enough missiles," and so on. And say, "I still will speak quietly, because I have done my duty." They {asked him} { }. Haven't you seen this? It was a strange conference. Two days ago. It's worth reading, gentlemen. I charge you with reading this, because you will find that there was a -- I don't know if it was the { }. I am myself in ambiguity. I'm -- as I told you, I think, I'm very interested in the Berlin issue, because they want to have a school in international -- a school established for me in Berlin. So my own future is decided on May 27th. And so I'm very much of a partisan -- also I'm a native of Berlin.

And -- but still I admire the president, although he was -- { } -- I mean, is -- {growing} soft, so to speak, and saying, "Don't get excited," and "Don't let's arm," and "Don't let's put atomic weapons," you see, "into circulation," and saying, "If I follow your daily -- the politics today," you see, "I destroy the real future of the United States." It's this power, you see, that the promise is much more, you see, in the future than the immediate { } government can hope to -- to act upon it. And they must keep the avenues open so that other peoples have the right to act.

Take our forests. If you cut down all the redwoods, you deprive all future generations, you see, of this participation in this treasure of nature. Conservation is based on this assumption, you see, that the present-day government is not identical with the creation of the world. You see, because there are creatures that still have to exist, after you have spent all your money on nonsense. Ja? (Well, what do -- you know, trying to show { } that you finally, I think, {described} in terms that -- that when they finally did -- accept the king, they didn't -- they didn't really talk { } the other countries, because for the other countries, the king was both the spirit -- he was one man, the spirit and the state; and {they maintained} the prophet and king jointly.)

That's why this -- this {prophet} statement is so strange. I mean, they wrote the books of the Bible, not the king. Although they {used} royal { }. {But they} -- the story of the Bible is that none of them is written, you see, by the powers that be. But it's written with criticism, { }. That's unheard-of, you see, that -- that you have this admission that these kings do wrong, you see. David has to humiliate himself, you see. Just incredible. {Moses --} the first great king of Israel; then Solomon again. And -- well, we may come then to the temple of Solomon, but I think that should be the -- our next time. Let's de- -- now th- -- go

into the -- we still have some time left. And I may -- think we have a break of five minutes, and then we have -- reading of the -- Samuel text.

[tape interruption]

...{ } just to get your question straight. Do you? Then we have to { } think about { } {shortly}.

(You've been answering the question while you were out of the room.)

What?

(You were answering the question while you were out of the room.)

Did it help?

(Yeah.)

How interesting. It's a very wonderful invention, yes. Well, I -- I -- you know, to me, it's just { } but it can be used just for such a purpose, don't you think { }?

Ja? Now, what is your question?

(Well, I'm trying to { }. I didn't understand that you were saying that this was a fall, one of the many falls that -- that society has experienced. This rejection of individuality and individuality of -- of aggregate communities. And when you rejected {this, then it would} conform to other modes {of society by combining Church and state} -- well, that is, cutting off prophecy and trying to {get} { } {singular promise} { }. Unfortunately...)

Well -- this is a -- misunderstanding about the word {"promise" here}.

{ }. You mean then program -- promise in an election is obviously { } {prophecy} { }. I meant that the word "promise" is quite legitimate today for our -- the old word "prophecy." That's what I mean. The promise of America is not of a secular nature, but a comprehensive nature, you see. It's the whole future of man in America, isn't it? -- What have -- I mean, we can disagree on the content, but the meaning is obviously universal. Would you agree?

(Yeah.)

(Another example of that would be, I think, that -- that Saul was in good standing with God until he went out in battle and took the spoils of the { }.)

Ja.

(So it wasn't the fact that he was { }. Well, it was the fact that resulted in the { }, { }.)

He didn't understand that this -- this group was meant to -- to have the power to s- -- act in a personal way. Or a unique way. It's always this problem of uniqueness, which today everybody boasts himself, he's "just a human being." And he writes off his uniqueness very often by this word. It's an ambiguous term, like "promise." It can mean the right thing, because if I am a human being, then I am a creature of God that is to be created at this moment, and has to do something unique, you see. You can also use it -- to say that I'm run -- run of the million, you see, one -- among a million, and how can you expect me to do different?

Ja?

(I think it's that, you know, people are prone to do when they read the Bible, { } a lot of the -- the statements and belief expressed--take, for example, that all men are born in the image of God. Ah ha, we're all the same; there's no differences, and so forth. And then, of course, when they { }, the -- they have a contradiction, because everybody is personally in God's eyes, and in His { }, and { }.)

You know, the image of God is quite {a unique one}, because God is unique. And He's the creator of Heaven and earth, and He is the redeemer, and He is the revealer. And so if we are in the image of God, the -- the -- the burden of uniqueness is so heavily on us, that most people run away from this. The image of God is not a minor proposition. It's {a terrible thing}. Because, you see, God is in the future, and isn't yet -- you see, we never know Him from what He has done, because He's still unrevealed. And so man is unrevealed to himself. I mean, the -- if you would -- however take this seriously, the image of -- of God, we would be frightened to death. -- It's gigantic. Wie?

({ } it's not interpreted in a fashion { }.)

Of course not. Well, if you -- I have a -- did you take this down? I -- I think -- you should use this as a -- as a shield, because if you { } of the {circle},



the introductory account of Samuel, from the first dedication and calling of the { } Book of Samuel "is a valuable picture of religious life at the sanctuary at Shiloh." Thereby the whole thing is, you see, generalized, and you -- we can write thousands such stories, be no distinction. Because in Africa, there are 10,000 such sanctuaries; and in Asia, there are 20,000; and in America, I don't know how many, you see. And so it's just a valu- -- it's just curiosity that's served. This, of course, is the attitude of these -- critics of the last 80 years, treat the Bible as a chronicle, as annals, or as of any wild tribe. Therefore, the god of Israel is just a god of the { } tribes. Probably were brought up in this conviction, that this was a tribal god. That was very rampant in America.

Just like the sentence, "Jesus committed suicide," you see, the -- the -- corresponds exactly with the writing down of the Bible as the book of these henotheistic, it was called, tribal society, who had Jahweh as their individual god, whereas the whole setting of the Bible in the midst of a u- -- I told you, the -- { } strewn all over the earth, dispersed into mighty kingdoms, men everywhere talk in different tongues. And they have a different god, you see. Difference -- this little group had said, "For Heaven's sake, we go crazy if we would admit that God is -- is limited by -- by the countries and by the {kings.}" ({ } that would not mean { } that the difference between Israel's acceptance of Jahweh is that they accepted him as more than a national god. A national god is a { }. Supernational?)

Well, you just kindly look up the -- the table of nations in the first book of -- first book { }. Would you read the 10th chapter of Genesis, which {gives} the whole proposition of the Bible. In the midst of time -- { } in 1959 could you write it just as well today as if you write -- write an Encyclopaedia Britannica. And -- you have { }? Why not? You have to. It's assigned reading. Where is it? (I didn't bring it. I brought Thucydides.)

What?

(I brought Thucydides with me. I didn't bring the --.)

But I told you to read the chapters -- two volumes of Samuel. You -- you have committed suicide here in this regard. How about you, Sir? And you? { }. Of course, you have a trauma. Would you -- would you kindly read the 10th chapter? It seems very boring. And we will see why it isn't.

("These are the generations of the sons of Noah: Shem, Ham, and Japheth: and the sons were born to them after the flood.

("The sons of Japheth: Gomer, and Magog --")

Magog.

("Magog, and Madai --.")

There's still a -- a Lake Memphramagog in -- in our -- in this country, on the boundary between Canada and Vermont, a very beautiful lake, because of this. It is -- full of Bible -- Bible na- -- biblical names. Ja.)

("-- Javan, Tubal, and Meshech, and Tiras.

("And the sons of Gomer: Ashkenaz?")

Don't be frightened. These names are not wanton. I mean, I'm -- you may think that's all foolish { }. I think it isn't. Please go on.

("Riphath, and Togarmah.

("The sons of Javan: Elishah, and Tarshish, Kittim, and Dodanim.")

Now do you know what -- what -- which countries these are? The Kittim, and the Tarshish? That's the east- -- western Mediterranean. Ja? Go on.

("By these { } their lands; every one after his tongue, by their families, in their nations.

("The sons of Ham: Cush, and Mizraim, and Phut, and Canaan.

("The sons of Cush: Seba, and Havilah, and Sabtah, and Raamah, and Sabtecha: and the sons of Raamah: Sheba, and De--.)

That's Sheba. That's the Arabia {peak}; that's the region -- toward the Indian ocean, always from the standpoint of -- of -- {for} Palestine, you see. It goes around the periphery. Ja.)

("-- Sheba and Dedan.

("And Cush became the father of Nimrod, { } a mighty

man.")

That's the country of Mesopotamia, Nimrod; that's Babylon, Assy, {and Sumer}, that we know as kingdoms -- we know of {all} very little. So he is above, you see, from the -- around the -- Palestine, from the north to the west, to the south, to the --.

{{ } It's all in the periphery?)

No, he is in the periphery.

{{ } {Iraq}.)

Ja -- well. The { } would be { } I think. { }. It includes the islands of the western Mediterranean, Spain; therefore it isn't quite right to say -- it's not a country. It's even more. The who- -- known world, you see. Ja? "Nimrod was a mighty hunter," that's it, ja?

("-- Before the Lord: therefore it is said, by { } Nimrod the mighty hunter { } Lord.

("And the beginning of his kingdom was Babel, and Erech, and Accad, all { } around Shinar.")

Now the land of Sinar -- or Shinar, as we still it, is -- important, because Abraham came from this. So from the very first, the Israelites have established themselves as being in a -- the region halfway between Egypt and Mesopotamia. And so they never felt themselves, you see, as some- -- somewhere in a -- in a desert locality: nowhere, so to speak, you see, {independent}. But their whole meaning is that they are halfway, from Egypt, from the isles of the Mediterranean, and from Mesopotamia.

This is their universalism of the first -- the very first moment. That's why this geography is not boring, but is a tremendous achievement; it's the first time in the history of the world that a country and a people--how do you say?--look at themselves in their -- you see, as de- -- determined by the outer {world}, and therefore become free of it. All the people who say -- "We are earth-born," "We are natives," you see, try to establish their viewpoint, their world view without regard to the influence of the {outside} { }. The Israelites, however, are very latecomers to the game. Abraham comes from Mesopotamia, is educated there, in Ur, and in {Harar}. Ur being at the -- at the -- at the mouth of the rivers, the --

Tigris and Euphrates, and {Harar} being high up in the north, you see. Then he comes to Palestine the first time; then goes to Egypt and learns the ropes there; and then comes back. And so establishes by a circuitous route his being between them on this narrow -- on this -- in this narrow mountains, you see. It affirms the sea roads, the land roads, the main highway between the then-known world.

And this has never happened before in the world, the -- that a -- except perhaps the { } parts of America, that they were consciously feeling that they were dependent on the geography of other countries for their own salvation.

And this try -- an attempt to express this, making the rounds -- {around}, and then saying -- now we come to that. Will you kindly go on?

("From that land went Assyria and helped { } Babylon,

{ } Rehoboth { }, Calah,

("And Resen { }: { } great.")

Now be a little more merciful. These boys had to go to through { } -- all had to go to sleep anyway. So try to read to them as though they were children, who want to listen. They don't want to listen, but -- read as though they did want to listen. Will you?

Reading is a -- you see, is an act of affection. It's not just an -- a chore.

These -- these boys are without any hopes. They are illiterate.

("Mizraim became the father of Ludim, Anamin, Lehabim --")

Convince them!

("-- Naphtuhim,

("Pathrusim, and Casluhim (out of whom came Philistim,) and Caphtorim.")

And that's very important, because, you see, here we have the Indo-Europeans. When this book is written, it is still without human -- within human memory that the -- these -- these ride- -- horse- -- horsemen invaded Asia Minor first. The Armenians stay there to this day, the Armenian. The Hindus went ov- -- across the Himalayas into India, you see. The Persians, as you know, this branch, the -- in- -- invaded Persia. The Greeks came to the peninsula, and the Hittites came to -- came to Asia Minor. Now of this there is this memory. You just -- have

to penetrate through these things, because the Philistines are one of these Indo-European branches. We know that they overawed the people who -- there, because they suddenly landed there with their -- with their iron. -- Had no iron. The Hebrews had no iron at that time; they had to borrow all iron products from the -- or buy them from the Philistines, who held the seacoast. And they invaded Egypt, by the way, at -- at the same time. They took Crete, of course -- { }, you see, and {made it} Myc- -- Knossos, on -- on Crete. And so the -- the Indo-Europeans are comprised, and this one sentence, "Out of whom came the Philistine"--should -- it should not be "philistinim," but "the Philistine" you see. And the Caphtorim. And Caphtorim is -- are the people of Crete. That's -- the word "Caphtor" is the word for the island of Crete, which of course was very important at that time, because of its mighty palaces, which we have dug out. So this is full of -- of pep and -- and meaning here. Please.

("Canaan became father of Sidon his firstborn --.")

These are the Si- -- Phoenicians, you see. Sidon was of course the richest port in the Mediterranean. Yes?

("-- And -- and the Jesubites --")

Jebusites.

("Jebusites -- Amorite --.")

They are Damascus, the people in Damascus. They are alr-- they are named.

("And the Girgasite --?")

I don't know.

("And the Hivite and the Arkite --.")

Arkite.

("Arkite, and the Sinite,

("The Arvadite, and Zemarite, and the Hamathite; afterwards --.")

The Hamathite is still -- Hamath -- Arabia, Hamath is still part of Arabia -- the south -- { }. Hamath.

("-- Afterwards the families of the Canaanites spread abroad.

("And the territory of the Canaanites was from Sidon, { }

Gerar, as far as Gaza --.")

Gah-zah? Have you never heard of Gaza, where these unfortunate Arabs are in the -- in -- in tents there, the refugees from Palestine. All the rest -- reason for the unrest in the Near East comes from Gaza -- the Gaza Strip? Don't you know that? Don't? Really, that's applied knowledge -- reading is applied knowledge. { }.

("-- in direction of Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, and Zeboim, as far as Lasha.

("These are the sons of Ham, by their families, their languages, their lands, and their names.

("Shem also, the father of all the children of -- Eber.")

Now, now. Eber -- it's important to you -- what's the word "Eber," what does it stand for? Anybody know? It is very important. This is the first source for the word "Hebrew." Eber is the -- the tribal hero. You see, Adam lives a thousand years in the Bible. That means this is the tribal existence -- a form of tribal existence; and then comes Noah, you see. The -- it's always a thousand years. Now Eber is -- the name of the first generation is always given in the Bible for exemplifying a whole nation. And so Shem -- you see, the Hebrews are simply part of the human family. There is no claim for any extra position of Israel. This is unique, you see. they are not the promised people. They are not the great Americans. You see, they are not {David and Uno} or what's the other boy? {Jacob Proper}.

Well, all this nonsense, you see, of a -- of a native genius, you see. Here is an honorable attempt {and chapter}; you can't take it seriously enough. It has remained unique for another 3,000 years. It isn't even today that we have such an impartial attempt to distribute the one humanity over the earth, you see, without taking sides, without saying, "These are Caucasians," and "These other are yellow," and "These are the black," and make these distinctions. Here is an honest attempt to place everybody in his place to the extent that from Sem -- from

Shem--you see, the Semites--there first comes the Hebrews. Well, they are not the Jews by a long shot. They haven't received the revelation. They are just one other group. Will you kindly read 25?

{ }, no. Where is our friend { }?

("To the elder brother Japheth, children were born.

("The sons of Shem: Elam, and Asshur, Arphaxad, and Lud, and Aram.")

You see, this is the typical way in which the Bible is written, is by anticipation, as any journalist writes today. In the first paragraph, you have to say everything, you see. And then you -- elucidate. Most people don't read the Bible like that. And they think it's -- they don't understand that they have already the most modern technique of newspapers. Read the first -- the first chapter of Genesis. I'll show you an example where this modern interpretation, always { } out.

"In the beginning, God created heaven and the earth," and then says --

Verse 27: "So God created man in his -- own image, and the -- in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them." And so people think, "Now, that's one {story} { }."

And then comes the second chapter, in which the details are given; so they that's another {song}. But every newspaperman will tell you that he has just exactly to write the story in the same manner. First you give the whole story, and then go into detail. Now you go to the fifth chapter -- of this book, and I'll show you how important it is that we ex- -- we include the fifth chapter into the first.

In the fifth chapter, it reads:

"This is the book of the generations of Adam. In the day that

God created man, in the likeness of God made he him;

"Male and female created he them, and blessed them, and called their name Adam."

Now here is the introduction of speech, and that a man only knows himself if he is called by his name. { } of humanity as against the animal kingdom. Yet it isn't found in the first -- second chapter. So if theo- -- the modern

theologians, rabbis, popes, et cetera, tell you about this, they say they--or the critics even more so--they can limit themselves to the first survey. And there is man created without speech. And -- but only when a child is -- is -- is named--we talked about this before--is -- he's a complete human being, because then he can recognize, identify, assimilate, antagonize, and make love, marry, and so on. And so this verse in -- Verse 2 in the fifth chapter is a part of the family story. But it was postponed. Now we have exactly this in the 10th chapter. There the -- it's very important for the Jews of course to read about their own descent, so obviously he took a deep breath in Verse 21, and he says, "Unto Shem also, the father of all the children of Eber, the brother of Japheth the elder, even to him were children born."

And so he already has said, "This -- these -- is our progenitor," you see. But then, you get Verse 22. He postpones the -- the tension -- the attention. And then Eber only becomes the great-grandson of -- of Shem, you see. But he announces first already: Here we come to our own descent. That much he gives into the curiosity and the excitement of -- of the people to whom he tells the story. But it takes three verses before he specializes, particularizes. Can you see this? Eber only returns in 24.

So -- now we are on 25. You will read -- take a Bible, here and read. I don't see why you shouldn't { } read. { }.

("And unto Eber--.")

That's "Hebrew," you see.

("And unto Eber were born two sons: the name of one was Peleg; for in his days was the earth divided; and his brother's name was Joktan.")

Oh "Peleg" must obviously mean "{division}." I don't know this. But I -- does anybody know Hebrew? { } {You should.} But -- I don't know { } explanation. The Bible is full of etymological explanations. Ten times to say { }. Obviously "Peleg" must mean something { }. Ja?

("And Joktan begat Almodad, and Sheleph, and Hazarmaveth, and Jerah,

("And Hadoram, and Uzal, and Diklah,



("And Obal, and Abimael, and Sheba,

("And Ophir, and Havilah, and Jobab: all these were the sons of Joktan.

("And their dwelling was from Mesha, as thou goest unto Sephar, a mount of the east.")

You must think that, for the people of that time, Texas was Arabia, or Arabia was Texas. I mean, it was the largest -- it is still of a great immensity. I mean, it was, so to speak, the accessible Africa. I mean it had -- such a -- if you look at it -- on the map, it's just tremendous. And still inaccessible in its center, { } people live there from oasis {to oasis}. So I'm -- I am going to -- only to explain to you the bigness of Arabia for us is not very familiar. You don't think of Arabia as much -- you see, it's a desert: it's not important. It's just tremendous. It is bigger than Mesopotamia; it's bigger than Egypt, you see; it's bigger than Abyssinia; it's bigger than the islands of the Mediterranean and Greece, and Italy. And -- I have just to bring you up to this, because of the subdivisions he gives for the people who live in Arabia, that they are so numerous. For a man who lives there on the spot, Arabia is overwhelmingly large. Perhaps who has { } -- will you kindly look up for the next time the square miles of Arabia? And -- in comparison, the square miles of California and of {Texas}? Ja.

("These are the sons of Shem, after their families, after their tongues, in their lands, after their nations.

("These are the families of the sons of Noah, after their generations, in their nations: and by these were nations divided in -- in the earth after the flood.")

Now the next verse.

("And the whole earth was of one language, and of one speech.")

This is the -- you see, all wrong. You know, our chapter headings in the Bible are of very recent origin. They have nothing to do with the original. You must never be divided by the divisions of the Bible, as we have them. They are -- have nothing to do with the meaning. This verse of course belongs to the -- is the end of the previous chapter, and should never be in Chapter 11. It should be the end of Chapter 10.

Then you see that the -- what the Bible sets out to prove is: how can the

unity of mankind be restored? How can it be restored? Put there for us, that's the creation -- how Heav- -- how God wanted Heaven and earth to be created. And this is the program, or the viewpoint. And therefore, Israel has never believed--and how can it, with this chapter--in -- in -- in -- {the god of} {}?

That's today unknown. It's one of the devil's inventions. When you become an anti-Semite, of course, you have to show that they have another god. It's very simple. Now the Bible -- the anti-Semit- -- -ic {man} {}, the hatred of the Jews is always a religious {issue}. Whether the people who hate Judaism are the Jews themselves--and very often are great anti-Semites, as you know--or the Christians, or the Gentiles. Jews are persecuted because they pray -- know, or profess to know, or believe, that God created mankind as one.

You read Mr. {}, or you read Mr. Ellsworth {} of this country, The Parting of the Great Race, you see -- they say that every man who is not an Anglo-Saxon in this country must be sterilized, because there {} the human race. Or you get the racial laws in this country where a person cannot -- marry an Oriental. This is all, you see, written against the Bible. And -- so to -- to support this, of course, you have to turn against the Jews and they have to say they are just -- just another creed. "We have a religion, they have another religion." The whole intent of -- of the Bible, is -- from the very beginning, is to enable us to see that the creati- -- -tion of the world takes place beyond and through these divisions, into these divisions. But the creation is still in process.

As man was created, so we are still in -- we create all the time. And it is one of the most ridiculous inventions of the -- of the devil to say that there was ever a {} a special god. {} just against this heresy. If their own -- their own father, Eber, is put in the midst of a family tree, you see, it has no prerogative whatsoever, except what happens is that one day Moses is called to the burning bush and says -- God says to him, "I am not the God of yesterday; I am the God of tomorrow." And with this, He creates promise, prophecy, future, you see, openness; so creation goes on. This is the whole, famous name of Jahweh. And the -- Bible is very careful to say that {} Adam and Eve, and Shem, and Eber didn't know this name of God. They thought He was the name of {this land} or the name of {this}, you see. And so the -- the new name of God, which is perhaps able to draw the -- the people together again, must be of the future. And so the true title of God, "He who shall be who he shall be," that's the name Jahweh. Now this god could never be the -- the -- god of one tribe, or one people. It would have abolished, so to speak, the purpose for which the book was written. {Whoever} can find the Psalm in which it very simply expresses {}. I think it's the {96th} Psalm, but I'm not {}. There is the {seventh sentence} which ex-

plains to you the whole problem of the genealogy of all nations, and the whole situation of Samuel, you see, of the promise, prophets, { }. Because it's a very simple verse. He says, "And God is the God of the people that is to be," that is to be created. And so Israel then is always in coming, and never in existence; very strange and simple expression. I -- I'm sorry I -- it's either -- perhaps you read this through, 94 to 96. One of the { }.

{ } in every Psalm, if you attempt the -- understand how to read it, I mean. But nobody { } -- everybody's ears are today absolutely deafened by this biblical criticism, which has tried hard to prove that the Bible is a chronicle of the Jews. It's the one thing it isn't. It's absolutely uninterested in {Chino}. And uninterested in {Eliai} and uninterested in the -- in statistics of -- of {Panmen} or so. It is interested in the unique events that only happened once in order to -- to bring together, despite the divisions of men. The honor of our { }.

The whole 96th Psalm is written about it. But I think I can find it { } this one sentence which is very strange { } : "He is the God of the people whom he is about to create -- which he is about to create." That's by and large the literal translation.

So the -- now comes { }. Are you satisfied?

(Oh, yes.)

Ja.

{ }. You'll probably develop that more throughout the semester in L.A.

{ }, that { } and yet { } that Eli would reject uniqueness. And yet --.)

Well, Eli is a routine, gentlemen. He is corrupt, and he is -- old, perhaps he isn't too corrupt but for his family. And when -- { } in -- in -- on the way of inheriting the office, you see, the whole problem -- always that you just go on by routine and --. Repetition, you must know, for -- in all life. Repetition is not wrong. We always repeat. But repetition always diminishes fire or energy {in life}. Repetition has to be, because things would -- they deserve to be repeated. But what is lost the second, third, and fourth time, you see, is the tremendous act of faith that is in the first act. So the act that is repeated is not quite the same act bec- -- when it is repeated. From the viewpoint of the investment of faith in the person who has to do it.

So in every moment when we do something, take { }, the first man who

flew, the Orville Wright brother. He had tremendous faith. It doesn't take much faith to you and me to -- to fly now. But still there are people who haven't even inherited the {state}.

I understand he's the richest man in his town, had his son dying here, and he was in Arabia, and he couldn't take an airplane, because he -- he fears to fly, you see. So he couldn't go to the funeral of his oldest son of 14. You know who -- whom I mean? Ja, exactly.

{{}.)

No, he's sitting. { } boy's idea.

{{}.)

Well, { } everywhere.

(Getty, that's the one.)

So we can -- he -- he is not repeating { }. He is excluded, so to speak.

{ }. We all follow blindly, so to speak. After one man has paved the road, we all -- there's this trailblazer, we all follow suit. With everything you do here. You sit here, of course, because other people have gone here and {been ruined} for college, { } you think that's the way to do it. It could be the wrongest { } history. "{In God we trust}." When you trust, then we know the way, and then you { }. It is of course pure superstition, Sir.

Because we all have to follow until we come to the parting of the roads, where we feel that these men lead us to a dead-end street. And then you have to break out of it. And that's very disagreeable { }. And the fiction story of this country is that everybody can do everything for the first time. You cannot; 99.9 percent of what you do { } repetition, is paved road. Your body is already in -- in { }. All the muscles, everything we have inherited in our body { } is just of course an inheritance. Isn't that true? Other generations have paved -- trained -- {been glorious-} --how do you say?--blazed these trails. And we follow in our -- in our { }. You think of all our development of a -- that we have a central nervous system and so on. That's { } whole { } and we just follow it. It may not be the best. I just read a story that -- that if we had wings -- developed wings, we could have a much, much better understanding. All the { } wonderful article by { }, that we were all wrong, because we don't -- { } if we { } wings, we could have become much better human specimens.

And so repetition is the fate of man and the fate of { }, by the way. { }. And the pla- -- the problem is where to innovate, {obviously}; when to innovate { }. And -- Eli is routine, is not prepared for any change in the history of Israel. {Here he is a cheater}, and he thinks that these rotten sons who corrupt the service of the Lord, who can be bribed and bought, you see, without any reference themselves, who are outside, so to speak, their own -- their own routines, as having no longer believed in -- in the {living} God, but do this for money, and for a reward, and a -- and a paying proposition. These people who have no faith { } if anything that should be saved from the former form -- first revelation, from the uniqueness of God and this one history { }, unique history. It cuts through all divisions and in this 10th chapter.

So he is made the instrument. He first mistakes the woman and is -- is quite unimportant; he's just one of the {drunkards}. And then he wakes up to the fact that { } she has a special { }, and grateful for this experience. It's very tender { }. With his first step of experiencing novelty, he's then willing to do something for her son { } -- which out of the way and which in fact is against his -- his carnal interest because {now he privileges}, you see, Samuel -- as against his sons. And he rediscovers the holiness of the office. And that's how of- -- {very often a} renewal, rebirth, regeneration takes place. There is no innovation in the total sense. Eli is still able to -- to employ Samuel.

{ }. But I wondered, is this why he had the -- Eli told Samuel that it was God calling, and this was a sign he was acknowledging that { }?)

Well, you see, the powers that be--what you call "evolution" today, it's a very poor word--means that life can be renewed as long as the powers that be recognize that they need a refreshment, and as long as the refreshing elements are willing to take upon themselves the yoke of tradition. I mean, you can -- Mr. Eisenhower could have come back at the head of his troops, and started revolution and said, "The Democratic Party is totally corrupt." He didn't. And the -- you know, the temptation {was Washington's, too}, that he should just establish such a -- an army government in -- in 1783. He declined, because his kingship would have meant this, you see, that the army would have governed the 13 colonies, and then we had to wait. De Gaulle had the same temptation, I mean. A very parallel story. De Gaulle came home in 17- -- 1945, had conquered France victoriously, had liberated it; and he could have stayed on and had his government right away. But like Washington, he retreated, you see, let them show what they could do without him, and after 10 years, he has been returned, because they -- the proof was there that you had to have the constitution of a different --

you see, which was suitable to the experience of the Second World War, and the First, too. Washington and -- and De Gaulle have behaved quite similarly. Which means that the first attempt would be an abrupt innovation only of the -- the new group, so to speak, the people who enter the scene after the 13 colonies are incorporated, the army, and the supreme commander, as something new in the history of America. That hadn't existed before. So the new {office} can say, "We { }." { } very modestly went home, allowed the old powers that be, the 13 colonies, to try their hand, you see, as though nothing had happened, as though the war hadn't occurred, as though the Continental Congress didn't have to have martial powers, you see, and welfare powers, et cetera, et cetera. And so finally, the 13 colonies, you know--by the way, a little bit at the -- at the -- urging of -- of Washington, did get together and allowed the central government to come into existence, and Washington to be first president. Now that's exactly what happened with De Gaulle. Same story. And I'm -- I'm just amazed about the ignorance of the American public that hasn't sensed the identity -- speaks always of the Fifth Republic, and all this nonsense. There's no Fifth Republic. It's just the first time that experience has been allowed to dictate the French constitution, whereas before, everything was theory. Idiotic. But this is {experienced history}, that Mr. De Gaulle was necessary to save to country. Now this is the recognition. This word is very important. In Greek, you know, the word "recognize" is the same word as "read" { }, because the Greeks thought that reading was the recognition of what had already been known before. You read, and thereby, you see, are introduced into the stream of things, into the -- this -- that what has already been known before. They had a -- they thought of reading as entering the living stream of -- of -- living truth, of -- of -- of perpetuated, articulated, enacted truth. That's -- was the meaning of "read." -- And it should be your meaning, too, and my meaning of "reading." You have to read that long the old dusty texts until they begin to speak. Isn't that right? If you would understand that reading is recognition, you would suddenly become aware that history is a process of a Virginia Reel. You know how a Virginia Reel goes. Here you stand, march in, and then comes the next couple, and marches though and you allow them to pass you by. It is always that the people can only enter the future if they have recognized the previous {one}, and move through that. If -- De Gaulle and Washington hadn't allowed the 13 colonies and the French constitution to be tried once more, you see, they couldn't have marched into the future. It would just have been a breaking off, a revolution, you see, with a complete forgetfulness of the experience of the past. It

would have been a new beginning, but no inheritance, no tradition, you see, no continuity of history.

The problem of the continuity of history from the very first day since Cain and Abel, you see, left their...

[tape interruption; end]

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...came to my college in peace. And my colleague -- and he called himself a philosopher, and one day he was president of the American Philosophical Society. That's, so to speak, the highest rank among the idiots. And literally there was on his -- on his -- on his assignment board, there were the following items. And on it went. I have seen it with my own eyes. And he meant really that out of his own textbook, which he had composed, every -- for every meeting, you had to read three pages.

Now gentlemen, you cannot read a book like that. And he defied of course his {own} -- he just showed that he has no right to write books. Because, you see, a book, if it is a book, has to be written -- read whole. And then one book is like one sentence, you see. And to cut it up means that it is no book. That's no -- not deserves reading. But most of you do this. You -- treat books as though you could split them into three pages {for a beer}. My dear people, every book is a breath of God, of the spirit. And you will never understand speech, language, literature, history, politics, religion, what- --art--if you do not know that a book is nothing but one sentence, in a more artificial way, you see. And then you can read the book for the second time and analyze it. But first you have to read it through. No -- not one of you does this, except with obscene novels. You really think that -- and of course, these textbooks fall in with this, and they are written in this -- in this butcher-like fashion. But here, I want to bring you back to the normal -- experience that --. As we begin -- originally, you see, one sentence in the old tribe was -- one chant was a whole book. That was as big as the Bible, or The Iliad, because it was all the tribe had to be said about the hero who had to be celebrated.

So if you say -- take grammar, we -- you treat grammar as though it was, you see, elementary. I assure you that in the sentences and in our forms of grammar, all the problems of poetry are hidden, you see. That is, every one sentence is already a whole book.

If you treat -- if you -- and if you only would do this with your own experience, you would again begin to write poetry and {to sing}. But my boys tell me in my college--I always was despondent--that after 12, they don't write poetry. That is, they become cynic, stupid.

The whole is earlier than its parts: this is the first fact of history, and the Bible is written around this probl- -- topic. And I come back, I mean, here to the



Bible. The miracle of the Bible is that it has such a breath, that over a thousand years, it's one book. And we have to try to find out how this is possible. This is my -- my problem with you, you see. And I have tried to show you that over the last 70 years, the approach has been just the other way around. One sentence, and then 10 sentences, then a chapter. And -- if you read Mr. Shotwell, or if you read the Encyclopaedia Britannica, the Book of Samuel consists of -- of seven or six strands, and it's patched together by some idiot, as -- as a textbook today is glued together with the scissors.

But that -- why would -- should we read such a stupid book? But -- inexplicable that to this day, -- it is still mentioned. I mean, do you think that these textbooks will be mentioned as long as -- as soon as the superintendent of schools does not -- does not get a discount? That's today just a question of -- of graft, how -- your textbook business. The greatest racket in the United States. It's a purely financial proposition.

And -- so everything is now judged from your experiences with textbooks.

And of course, if my colleague, Professor {Wright}, if he could afford to -- to -- to say to a student, "You can read a book by -- by -- reading three pages every day," you see, certainly -- first of all you should know that such a book doesn't deserve to be read. Second, of course, it was never finished, you see; and never did anybody know why it was written or what was in it. But it was good for an examination.

To spit it back, I mean, to vomit it.

-- And you should be ashamed. Don't read a book -- read the -- even if you read the end first, I prefer it -- as -- though you're just -- looking at the book, and see the title page and read the review, and then say you have read it. I mean, most people help themselves today by reading just the review and then saying they have read the book. Isn't that true? Because a -- review at least pretends that the -- that the critic has read the whole book. Don't believe it. They don't. I mean, criticism in the -- in the modern -- western world is perhaps the most prurient, and the most putrid profession that there is, I mean. I have great contempt for -- for the sick state of the reviewing trade. And -- but here it is -- connected with the publisher, the big writer, too. You are in, every book that the publisher publishes is praised; if you are not in, you can't do anything.

But you ought to know these things, that the -- Bible is written to pre- -- to preserve, to -- so to speak, to train every generation in its power to judge books. Because the -- criterion of a book is: is it one sentence?

We have a famous philosopher in -- in Europe, Mr. Schopenhauer--you

may have heard his name--the great pessimist who first introduced Buddha -- Buddhism in -- in Europe. Now when Schopenhauer published his system of philosophy, he said, "Dear public, I'm very sorry, but you will have to read the whole book first, and then begin to read it a second time. -- And if you have any difficulties in reading it the first time, go on! Go on! For heaven's sake, don't give up," you see, "because it's one thought I have tried to express in this whole volume. And I'm" -- of course it was a stroke of genius.

Now genius means fresh, means creation. And how can you stop --. You -- you cannot -- first look at the little finger of the "Piet..." of Michelangelo, and then afterwards look at the head. Who -- that would be very funny. Any picture you embrace, and any -- and any piece of music. But with books, you are so corrupt by specs- -- book -- the textbook, which is the opposite from a book, which should never exist--and you, as seniors, should not read textbooks. You are too good for this. You should read the -- the highest and best literature. Instead of learning common textbook, What to Think about Shakespeare, isn't it much better that you read Hamlet instead? But you don't. You all read this chlorine faucet water. That's what you drink instead of going to a real spring. You never receive the first things first, and the second things as second things, because you -- in your way there stand always this second-hand literature. Dictionaries, and grammars, and textbooks, and examination papers, and assignments. And therefore it is very hard to talk to you about anything that real men really think, and really write, and really do.

Now I have tried to build up the under- -- an understanding of the Bible by beginning in the middle, where the Jews were forced to begin to write. They had lived 300 years after their flight from Egypt, obviously, in -- in -- in an oral society, in protest against the sacred -- writings on -- in Egypt. If you've ever seen a -- seen a -- a temple of Egypt, a pyramid, you know it is scribbled and covered with sacred signs. And the cosmos is -- is magically bewitched.

So the -- Moses, seeing the horrors of this astrological prison, take -- went out of it and founded this nation under God. Just as we Americans think they are a nation under God, that was the same idea of freedom, that no outer form--neither Communism, nor capitalism, or any other form of system--could be identified with -- with the life of a people.

And you are in great danger at this moment of backsliding into Egyptian darkness, because I hear more and more people say that capitalism is identical with the American way of life. It isn't at all. Americans are free to adopt any way of life, and to have many ways of life. And as soon as you think that capitalism

has anything to do with America, I can only tell you that you are back to the sorcerers of pharaoh. And we have every moment -- at this moment, from 1910 to 1945 or--in brackets, to the next election--because it always only shows 50 years later--you have a definite attempt on the part of the American intelligentsia to forsake the freedom of the children of God, and to backslide into Egypt. You have psychoanalysis, which is exactly what the sorcerers of pharaoh did--interpret dreams, and predict, and tell people, you see, that they're just pieces that can be put -- taken apart and put together. It's again this building up out of elements the person; whereas the person is first, and the elements, you see, come later. The word "analysis" tells us this -- you see, this heresy. And a machine you can build up out of parts, you see, but not without the vision of the inventor how the whole machine works. So it isn't even true that in an -- in an elementary way that machinery can be built meaningfully out of parts. You have first to know how the whole thing is going to function.

Now obviously the same is true about the human character. Your life, your 70 years, you see, are God's melody which He tries to compose. You are His poem. You are His piece of music. You aren't yet ready. I mean, the poetry you have -- can --. The movement -- the movement is at this moment perhaps vivace, or allegro, you see; and the adagio is still to come.

But you are in the midst of it. You have to hear carefully whether this composition will come off. You can break it off.

Now you are told that you consist of the parts that have already gone before, you see. -- This is exactly the Egyptian darkness against which the Bible is written. The Bible is written around the simple fact that man experiences himself as divinely complete. If you -- if the meaning -- image of God has any meaning, then must mean that men -- God and men begin with the whole, because you cannot subdivide God. If you can, you have superstition. You get the Greek gods, or you get the Hindu gods. God is one, indivisible.

Now man is of course, too. You hear today "Peace is indivisible." How can anybody believe that who believes that man is divisible, can be analyzed, you see?

I warn you against one word that has played in this country a tremendous role. That's the word "synthesis." It has comforted all these analytical magicians, and sorcerers, and -- and witchcraft doctors, and devil -- devils. Whether they are in politics, or whether they are in -- or gradually develop { }. Huh? What went

on?

(Um, I was helping out a friend.)

What?

(I was helping out a friend. I was helping out a friend. I was applying -- yesterday's lecture.)

What was yesterday's lecture?

(Ah { }.)

Nice.

Now, the -- Bible is not a synthetic, glued-together thing, as people make it today, you see. It's the same through the ages. It's one spirit moving through the ages. If it isn't, then it isn't the Bible. And it doesn't deserve to be listened to or read. You can reject it. But don't help yourself by saying, "It's an interesting synthesis."

What do we call "synthesis," gentlemen? You have A, B, C, D, uranium, and thorium, and plutonium, and -- and -- and all the metals. I mean, gold and silver, and then you syntheticize something. That's the idea of "synthesis," that is, that the parts are older than the whole. Now what all -- we all do in our science--what any engineer, by the way does, Mr. Feringer--is something quite different. We live and we are a stream of life, so to speak, like the Colorado River, on this earth hu- -- the human stream. And we have this vitality to bring into the bed of the common life all the dead materials, by getting -- coal, and electricity, and -- and -- water, and what-not working with us. We -- in this sense, there is synthesis. We bring them back. We add them to the -- stream of life which we ourselves constitute, but we cannot make life. Synthesis is a bringing-in, an endowment of our mainstream of life which we here constitute in our naked bodies, and our living bodies, and our living souls. We syntheticize indeed--if -- you would give a new notion to the word "synthesis," you see--to add to, to join with. That's what it -- you can mean, also, and then it's a good thing, you see. We make deader things join the march of life, the march of time.

So the word "synthesis" is to me the great divide between the heresy today which tries to con- -- construe life out of death; and the other, which says that the deader parts--like a machine, you see, like the metals, you see, like the --

bridge which you build--is an attempt to join, to incorporate dead -- dead -- dead things into the living substance of our existence. And that's the true meaning of engineering, you see, and having the genius of expanding man's life into the outer world, because -- engineering has to do with genius. And it means "to create," and to in- -- generate. And we generate. We bring up high voltage in electricity, or whatever we do. That is, something that is less vital, you see, can be joined into the -- into our own existence.

And therefore, I invite you to -- to redefine this word "synthesis." It's very popular still today in the modern American analysis, history, and --. For example, historians think that they syntheticize their filing index, their card index, and they write the whole book. That isn't true. They must have had {firtis-} -- a sympathetic -- experience of the whole they want to write, you see. And they must join this experience. And then they can subdivide it, and articulate it. And the word "articulation" shows you what we really do in thinking and in studying, you see. "To articulate" means to have a whole; to hold onto it; but to subdivide it; to give it limbs, members, you see. This is articulation. And all we do in the humanities is to become articulate. And "artus" in Latin--articulation--means "limb." That's all it means. But it's very important, you see. If you stick to your guns and say, "The humanities make us articulate," then you can never forget that the whole is older than the parts. Because you can only articulate if this whole experience is with you.

-- Take any person. If he has really something to say, he's embarrassed, and he's shy, and he is ashamed, and he blushes. And then under the pressure of this embarrassed feeling, he begins to articulate, you see, because articulation frees us from this embarrassment. You are overwhelmed by a great experience. You are in love. Well, if you can write this poem, you see, you articulate; and then you can say it. But you can't take a sledgehammer -- and kill your sweetheart, because that -- of course you are so overwhelmed. You have to become articulate in order to be expressive, because the subdivision, the articulation, the -- the -- means that this whole ceases to be a terror, and ceases to be something that you cannot, so to speak, live down or survive.

Articulation is our way of dealing with the future. And I come back to the Bible, you see, because the Bible is written so that man shouldn't be terror-stricken, but should be able to articulate what God has done to him. And otherwise he would be so awe-stricken, and would just fall down -- in -- in embarrassment, or exhaustion, or terror, or panic. All these words are -- as you know, are the -- the real experiences of a child, and of a --. If you are honest with yourself, you have to appreciate your panic, your inner terror, your horrors, your fears, your anxie-

ties.

Mr. Rollo May here gave this lecture the other day--have you heard him? did you go?--in which he admitted very nicely as a -- as a revolutionary analyst said, "Anxieties and guilt were necessary things for life," that you couldn't amputate them, because that's the way we -- we have something to articulate, and to conquer. And a -- a man who has no guilt feeling, and has no anxiety certainly is just an impudent pig. That's all he is. Because we are all guilty, and I, too, everybody is guilty for having sinned, and everybody has -- is anxious not to make good. And all the people who tell me that they aren't, I just think that they are very impudent. And shamelessness is the end of life. -- You can distinguish in any society its future. If the -- it's impudent, and shameless, and -- and naked, it has no future. Because what is shame? It's the power to grow, to take time. That's all it is. It's the -- the cover under -- over a -- the growing plant. Like the -- I mean, around the -- around the flower -- the bud, you have this -- this sleeve which covers it. And it can only go after the -- the thing has taken place. Now articulation, gentlemen, therefore is embarrassing. While you haven't {articulate}, you are trembling. As you know, Kierkegaard could know -- called this "with fear and trembling." But as any poet who is writing his poem is trembling that he may not be able to articulate, you see, he has this tremendous shock, this experience, this blow on his head; and before he has articulated it, he's sweating, and he's trembling, and he's fearful.

And it is very strange that in -- in -- in your age, where you are fed on creative arts, and -- and -- what -- and museums, and concerts, that the -- the process by which anything is created--that is, being ashamed--is pooh-poohed and ridiculed. And people say, "You don't have to be ashamed." Well, a person who isn't ashamed doesn't grow anymore. The only way in which you grow is through shame.

But we have reached -- I have myself published a -- a -- a record, "Make Bold to be Ashamed." And I had a terrible experience in a women's college in the East. All the foreign students wanted to hear this--girl's college, it was--wanted to hear this disc. And no American girl. "Oh no. 'Make Bold to be Ashamed,' that's dangerous." It is. It changes your life, if you know that the -- the secrets of your life are gradually to be articulated. But then you begin to live.

Now the word "synthesis," you see, is therefore quite foreign from the 24 books of the Old Testament. The -- Bible is not a synthesis in your sense of the word, of 24 individual books. But it is an attempt to say 24 times the same thing,

in better articulation, more fully, more completely.

I tried to show you that the -- the Bible has this terrific task, to put this little man -- here, this -- this -- this little Jewish mother of Israel in the midst of all the people's history on earth. That is quite a -- quite a task. We -- I -- showed you in Genesis 10 the -- all the people, and in it the Hebrews a very little, little something. And then the sons and -- and descendants of Eber even more divided. And so who are these Israelites? Just nobodies. Just as today, I mean. A very small minority. And in this minority, a despised woman who is taken to be a drunkard, producing the salvation of Israel: Samuel.

So -- how -- how come, you see? This is the problem of the Bible. How can--within a context that is the whole of creation--how can you and I play any role? Now it is the opposite from all pagan history, who begin and say, "We are very important," and "the rest of the world didn't exist; we are the real McCoys. I'm from Missouri. And Missouri is the real country. And everybody who is not from Missouri, so to speak, is -- is in- -- is it's -- doesn't matter -- doesn't count." The Bible says, "No, I know the world is terribly large. And there are millions of people, and there are 10,000 nations. And yet obviously, in this little spark of my own heart, I am exemplary. I am also the whole. I am the image -- the image of God. I'm not God," you see. This is the problem of the Bible. Ja? (I think maybe I should mention -- you wanted me to look up -- you wanted me to look up the square miles of Arabia, compared to Texas and California, and so we could put it in dimension, now. Arabia 1 -- is 1 million square miles. California 158,693 and Texas 267,000.)

{ }. So you saw these people of antiquity were faced with this Arabia, you see, as something impenetrable. You can imagine -- four times Texas. Don't tell the Texans. And it is to this day impenetrated. I mean, there are no railroads going through. I mean, it's still desert. And therefore it is -- has -- I -- I think we underrate the constant awareness of antiquity that Arabia was the block, the one impenetrable thing. Of Africa, one didn't know much'; one hadn't sailed around it, and one didn't -- one had only penetrated to the Morocco -- to the Atlas Mountains. But Arabia was there, because there was the -- the mouth of the Euphrates and Tigris on the one-hand side; and there was the Red Sea, you see, on the other. So Egypt, Abyssinia, Mesopotamia, Assyria, the -- Sumer -- Sumerians -- everyth- -- -body knew of Arabia, you see. And it was in the midst of everybody, and you couldn't get into it. I mean, you couldn't get through it.

So it -- is a strange situation that the -- from the point of view of the ancient people, Arabia was the center, the impenetrable center--we look at Arabia as an appendix, somewhere, you see. And just as appendixes go, they can be operated -- away, you see, and -- and you can have an appendectomy. But -- and we think that the Fertile Crescent, you see, for the ancient people, must have been the center of the universe. This is not true. But it is just -- do you have a map there, by the way? I mean, if you think there -- there, Zion is located, you see -- and you get Egypt here, you see, and you get Mesopotamia here--{Shinar}, as it is called in our -- in the text we have read, you see--then you get Arabia, the -- the situation is very eccentric, you see, is very strange. The -- the -- Arabia is this impenetrable something which God created, too.

And from it, all antiquity, you see, has gotten this spur. The great -- one of the great declamations of the -- of Zi- -- of the Bible, which I may mention in this context right away, is that the desert is as much God's country as the fruitland. For the Egyptians, and for the Romans, and for the Greeks, and for the Sumerians, and for Babylonians, this wasn't true. The desert was just a stumbling block. It was something to be forgotten. It was not there, so to speak. It wasn't -- didn't rank with the real -- the real land.

And the Greeks, the--for example, and Romans and we, too--they had two words for "land." Land meant the cultivable, the arable land; and "bush," and "prairie," and "desert" were terms that meant the -- the -- the land -- the -- the soils who -- the --how would you say?--the ground over which you have to move, because it doesn't -- cannot contain you, you see. Just a stumbling block, an impediment. The whole -- all ancient people till the coming of Christ divided God's world into two quite different layers of land: the cultivated land, you see; and the non-cultivable land. And -- the great outcry of the Bible is that Arabia, the desert, the bush, the whole -- all the land is God's, and not just Egypt, and not just Rome, and not just Greece. So they created a new terminology, so to speak, you see, that "bush" and "land" was the same.

And in this connection you may understand -- the monk -- our -- the stories of the monk a little better. The Christian monks went into the Egyptian desert in order to prove that the Egyptian desert was just as high-rating in God's eye as the fruitland around the river, you see, that this -- that the two layers out of which the -- the earth seems to -- seemed to -- to consist for all primitive people, or for ancient people, all pagan people wasn't so. So they -- the famous story, the monk of the old Christian Coptic Church in the 3rd century was asked why he -- didn't come a little nearer to the Nile for his water supply, and why he had to stay in the desert.



"Yes," he said. "It takes me the whole day to go to the river and bring back the water. But I, with my long life, have to prove that God created the earth, and did not create just the Nile River valley."

And that was the only way of getting rid of the superstitions of an American god, or a god of California. And of course, if you live in Southern California, you are again exposed to this strange superstition that it is -- that you can pick and choose your climate, and that there is one region which you decide -- a man should live, and others which they shouldn't live. Obviously, we have to live everywhere. And -- so you live in this rainy -- on this rainy peninsula, don't you? (Yes.)

And I live in a -- in a region where we have six weeks in a row, subzero weather. And it's really hard to believe that one lives here. But the -- you take this equality, you see, of man on the whole surface of the globe for granted. And this isn't -- anything you can take for granted. It hasn't existed for a long time. And the first word of the Bible is written around this experience of the whole of creation, that in the beginning, "God created heaven and earth." That is no exception to -- here, to this stumbling block of the center of -- the experience of the man of -- of the antiquity.

Let's now read these -- these chapters of Samuel. What's the -- in this -- this -- these first six chapters? Hm? { }.

(Well, Samuel was born after what we talked about last meeting. And { } Eli { } got given a bad { }. And { } he { } Eli. And he falls over dead. And one of the sons' wife also dies; and there is a { }, because of the glory God has left to { }.)

Would you -- would you show me what is it?

(Ichabod.)

(The glory of God { }.)

(There is no glory.)

(Oh.)

Wie?

(The glory is departed from Israel. { }.)

Does -- does anybody know what role the word "Ichabod" -- plays in American history?

(Ichabod Crane, I think, is about as close as { }.)

{ }.

(It's --it's an old -- myth -- American myth.)

What? { } there are no myths possible. What is it? What's an old American myth?

(I was thinking of Ichabod Crane.)

What is Ichabod Crane?

(Oh, well, I repeat. It's an old American myth or folk tale.)

So tell us.

(Well, it -- there apparently at one time was -- it's a fantasy, there was a village, supposedly isolated. And Ichabod Crane, who comes from a questionable area in -- somewhere in New England --.)

There are no questionable areas in New England.

(It's a fantasy { } individual; it could be placed anywhere, is a -- a schoolteacher of small children. And he comes into this area. He's a very--oh, how shall I say?--superstitious individual. And as the story goes, he falls in love with the -- the town belle, who has a rather roguish admirer, who -- and he plays upon Ichabod's superstitions to get Ichabod to leave the country, so that he will have a clear chance at this girl who loves him, anyway. And was only messing around with Ichabod so that she can make him jealous. And that is the story of Ichabod Crane, the American myth.)

I mean, it's a typical, true story. I mean, it happens every day. No, but this is something more important. Does nobody know what the poem "Ichabod"

means?

(A poem?)

Has nobody read it?

(Is that Daniel Webster and -- and { }, when he -- before him --?)

{Proviso}. In 1850. Who wrote the poem? Wie? Benét lives today. It comes from 1850. That's hundred years earlier.

(Are we talking about The Devil and Daniel Webster?)

Oh no, that's Benét.

(Oh -- um.)

It's an important poem in the -- you see, I think that 1850 is -- and 1851, the year in which Melville wrote his -- wrote his -- Moby-Dick, is the great divide in American history. And so "Ichabod," since it is a biblical name, may help you to -- to understand this. When people in 1850, Melville, when he wrote Pierre, and -- and -- and Whittier -- Greenleaf Whittier -- John Greenleaf Whittier, when he wrote "Ichabod," thought that the light had departed from Israel. It was the falling from grace of the United States of America. And therefore, this is a very actual verse in the Bible, you see. People in 1850 felt that the -- the same thing had happened. "The glory has departed from Israel." And I asked you all to read Greenleaf's -- Whittier's poem "Ichabod," because it's a biblical poem.

And you cannot understand American literature if you do not understand this relationship, that the -- the whole -- all your ancestors thought in the -- understood history in the light of the Old Testament. And you don't understand history because you have no -- absolutely no criterion when the light has -- has gone out of a country and when it is shining. You think prosperity is the light of Israel. This would -- the Bible would call the worshiping of the gods of Canaan, and of the idolaters. And where is your { }?

(Where? The one on Israel?)

"The glory is departed from Israel." And when Ichabod was given as the name to Daniel Webster, it meant we had lost him. And it's perhaps the last moment in American history in which this identification with the -- with the

biblical situation, you see, got hold of a whole people. We have one -- no, we have one later, that's the "Battle Hymn of the Republic," by Julia Howe. That's the same feeling that here now, in the Civil War, the same situation, you see, is reached, that the Bible tries to describe in the hearts of man. And I assure you the greatness of the United States people, in the eyes of the rest of the world, depends on this relationship. Nothing else is interesting. Yo- -- {bastards} aren't interesting for the rest of the world, you see. But this power to say "The glory has departed," or -- how does the "Battle Hymn of the Republic" begin?

(Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord.)

Now, you can see the relationship, you see. It has been -- you see, the two go together. And here you have a typical--that's why I'm mentioning these things--here you have something of the relation of the books of the Bible. Here is a -- a lady -- poetess; -- and -- and here is a man, Whittier, you see--absolutely different background. And one writes in 1850, and the other writes in 1864, I think, the "Battle Hymn of the Republic" is written. And they jibe, they dovetail. And it is the same vision. One is, you see, "I have seen the coming of the Lord," and the other is, you see, "The glory has departed from Israel." And you have to stri- -- string the two together in -- to understand American history.

That's how people felt, that after 15 years, they -- I don't know if they know -- knew each other. Certainly Mrs. Howe must have known Mr. -- known the poem by Whittier. This I would suggest. But the main thing is, of course -- is quite a spontaneous creation, the "Battle Hymn," and she didn't read "Ichabod" for the purpose, you see. But this is how the -- the people of New England at the time illuminated the march of events, you see, in the light of this knowledge that at every one moment, every s- -- little mortal could either keep the covenant, or could break it. And I feel the "Battle Hymn of the Republic," and the -- "Ichabod," they -- you bring the text next time, every one of you, and you copy it for your own purposes. And put it together. And you will be surprised, because that's the beginning of an American bible. This is how you should compose your American history gradually. You should see that all these events can be suddenly made to -- to -- to fit, if they are seen in this simple story of man's heart, and man's humility, and man's pride, and man's fall. This is nothing -- for 5,000 years old.

You are exactly in the same mol- -- mold today. If you get married, you have to know -- do you marry under God's heaven? Or do you marry for the candle lights on the table, and your dowry? Or do you marry because the -- the boy has a sex appeal? I mean, you can all marry on these different levels. And on one -- in one case, the light has departed from Israel; and the other, you have

seen the coming of the Lord. Is -- is this any -- the -- the level on which we move is at any moment at stake. You can always do it on the -- on the lowest common denominator, and on the highest common denominator.

You just have to think of Helen Keller, where there's a poor creature, you see, destitute, and she represents the whole of the human race in her striving and in her struggle, by the support of these -- these wonderful people whom -- who believed, you see, in this piece of creation, that God created this little brat, too, with all its impediments. And there you have a glorious story today. I mean, I would -- I would suggest that Helen Keller constitutes exactly such an example. And -- and the American worship of her is a good case in point. It's -- that's again unique. You wouldn't find this in Russia or in any other country, or you wouldn't find it that Franklin D. Roosevelt could have become president after he had polio, you see. It's a unique story in this country. It's still a biblical story: that the physical handicap, you see, is not held against him. And you should be proud of this. That -- that all comes from the Bible. It's absolutely un-Greek, you see; it's -- or Roman. You couldn't have -- a Roman -- a pagan could never have, you see, be advanced, if he -- a man who couldn't walk. Impossible, you see.

So please, "Ichabod" and the "Battle Hymn." You bring your text, and I think you will not find it ridiculous if I really request that you write it down in longhand--you may type-- typewrite it, if you prefer this--for your own sake, into your notebook, because it explains the whole story. And -- you will find that it is very strange. One is looking backward, you see, that's the past; and the other is the coming. And there you have the full notion of a history which is still incomplete, marching on.

And in order to recover your sense of historical proportion, you must get this period into your vein, the tragic period, you see, from 1850 to 1865, because -- this -- when the spirit leads the country, you see, and falls really among the thieves, and then -- has to be redeemed by this terrible, bloody harvest, you see, of which the Second Inaugural of -- of Lincoln speaks, you see. That's why I think the Second Inaugural of Lincoln is greater than his Gettysburg Address, because it is, you see, connected with this "Ichabod," with this fall of man. And his -- his rising again. You -- you know what he -- he says in the Second Inaugural?

Well, then this is Number 3 you have to read for the next time. So we go on from here. Please.

After the -- light has departed from Israel, you see, the -- where are we?

(We were here, where Ichabod -- was born.)

She of course, can only see the dynasty of Eli, this poor wife. This has ended, you see. Now the spirit has to come from quite a different corner. And you may take this down, gentlemen. The -- this is already of course the -- the great example of the sentence of the New Testament that the spirit listeth where it --?

(Bloweth where it listeth.)

Bloweth where it listeth, you see. You see, here this -- the Eli story is at an end. And it is -- and the wom- -- she says so, you see. "The light has departed from us," and where can it come from now? And, you see, the biblical story is of course radically -- exactly the same theology as the -- in the Old, as in the New Testament: the spirit of God moves freely, and no flesh and blood has a privilege to say, "We are the anointed. We," you see, "we -- we are -- we have it," you see, "guaranteed." In ever one moment where a man says, "Oh well, God will -- cannot fail me," you see, he's already gone. Down and out. Because the fear and trembling, the embarrassment, the power to articulate leaves him at this very moment, you see. He repeats, you see.

Any -- any one of you, you see --. I've seen doctors and quacks. Most doctors, you see, for example, you -- you -- you have the flu. Most doctors -- to give you an example of what the Bible means by this departure of the light. Most people who have a routine job -- you are a teacher. Well, you go to a school of education, and you take your degrees; and nothing can really happen, because you know how to handle these ruffians. And you -- you hand out papers, and -- and they are answered, and nothing ever happens. However, you can have a direct relation in this classroom at this moment to this child, you see; and you can feel that this child, for example, needs nothing more but not to be asked to write a paper. And if you have the power, and the glory of God is shining upon you and -- hallo? -- you -- you will treat this child not according to rule, but against the rule.

The same is true of a doctor. I have -- had one case where I saw a doctor act as a genius. -- Our minister fell sick -- our minister's wife fell sick with puerperal fever. And I -- ran to a friend, a Jewish doctor who was a specialist on poison, on the effects of poison, and -- a great authority on this. And usually he didn't practice much.

And so I persuaded him to take on this case, because here was a family, you see, and there were children. And it would have been just -- unthinkable that this -- this good wi- -- mother, you see, and her child shouldn't pull through. And he went to bat, and he took death, so to speak, as his personal enemy. And he fought it day and night. And she did pull through. She's still alive to this day. And that's 30 years ago.

And I have seen that this doctor treated this illness as his personal destination, so to speak. This was not something from the books, you see. He said -- didn't say, "In this case, take aspirin," you see. But he -- he just couldn't sleep. I mean, here was an acute battlefield and, like any general, you see, like Stonewall Jackson, this was a unique situation, and not from the book.

And -- the same with a lawyer. I read, when I became a professor of law, I felt -- "Well," I said to myself, "I must know how it feels to have a lawyer, and -- and how the laity feels about being served by lawyers. So I have to be -- get a lawyer and lose a case." And I did. I didn't pay my book bill, you see, with the bookseller, and he sued me. And I went to a lawyer. And I have never seen such a miserable performance. He didn't listen to my arguments. He knew all -- everything better. And I felt just as a bird in a cage. And most lawyers say to you, I mean, "Let me do this," you see. "I know how to handle it." And so of course the client never gets real justice, but the case is handled as one of 500 cases. That's how you are treated in the hospital when you have the influenza or so, I mean. You are Number 374.

But my friend, this minister's wife, would have never been -- have pulled through if I hadn't found this man who -- who took this out of the ordinary and said, "This has never happened before, and will never happen again. This is my case." And I always hold that our penal laws will not be improved unless we say that every case has to be judged by a judge who then has to live with this case for the rest of his life, so that every judge will only decide one case in his whole life--like my doctor, you see--which is {solved}. Then we would -- justice could be done. But you can't do justice if you mete out six months, two years, five years, life sentences, you just -- you see, on a -- a conveyor belt, I mean. This -- that isn't justice. That's just mechanics.

We take all this for granted, but we can't go on for long like that. If you see -- looked -- at our children, they aren't served with this kind of justice. You have to find people who take it upon themselves to say, "This is a unique case," you see. "And I'm in this unique position that it has fallen to my lot to live with this case."

And this is the biblical attempt to show that there is no such law and routine, you see, but that every event has to be built up into a complete, unique lightning and thunder from Heaven and has never happened before and will never happen again.

And all of our professions are sick from this. And if you go into a factory, a good -- a well-instituted factory, you will find that if there is still any spirit left, they'll take every campaign, every product as a unique thing and then go on to the next campaign. And you should think of a good factory as consisting of campaigns, you see.

And Mr. Henry Ford once said, "I made a great mistake in going on with the Model T for too long. It ruined my factory, because the people," you see, "over the years went to sleep, of course. They produced the same machine all the time." That's not a factory, he said. A factory is an institution by which you can cope with the new, with the new commodity, you see, with the new thing every day. If we don't, you -- we die, because it's repetitive.

And Henry Ford had -- had, of course, this immense capacity to see in every moment something that hadn't happened yet before. That's -- but that's what we call "genius." And so you can see that a child has genius, and our whole school system is -- is an attempt to abolish genius. Because the higher up you come, the more you are told, "Don't get excited," you see. "We know all about it." Isn't that true? But in -- at your age, you must be told, "We don't know -- nothing about you," you see. "You have never happened before."

That's -- perhaps you now begin to understand why these modern situation is -- is so dangerous, because everything you learn about man today is a generalization, you see. That is, it's toning you down, is -- is minimizing your uniqueness. And then God is not one. Then you have -- there you have -- everybody in this country is polytheistic. You believe in science; you believe in sports; you believe in arts; you believe in sex; you believe in nerves; you believe in anything--only not in God. Because God is the -- the -- in coming. "I have seen the coming of the Lord." And the Lord of course thinks it's very funny that you think because you took a doctor's degree in medicine that you are now allowed to practice medicine. That's not enough, you see. If you do not treat this sick man, you see, at this moment, you see, as a complete surprise, you will never be a real doctor.

I have a good example. I got a paper from a medical student in Cleveland,



Ohio, at this moment. A few days ago it came. And it's an old friend of ours. And she wrote that she had to -- to watch the -- the child's behavior in the first year. And as you know, the great event in a -- baby's life is that it smiles. And when it can smile, it suddenly can communicate. And she -- she writes about these psychologists who observe smiling as a physical reaction, you see, probably coming from the gas inside of the baby, or something. And ob- -- observe it. And she's very furious about this, having studied with me long enough, and -- and writes to her professor, you see, that -- it was a scandal that this observer did not understand that he was meant to respond to this smile, you see. That the child didn't smile in vain -- wa- -- didn't want to smile in vain, but it was an invitation. And it was, you see, forcing the other person to come around and do something to this baby. That's why a baby smiles. It's the first language of mankind, you see. The -- smile -- the -- child doesn't smile in the abstract. But it smiles because another human face suddenly seems, you see, to come under its power. And that's why it a child smiles. And this -- and this disregard for its creative capacity, that this child suddenly can speak to you, shows you just how even smile -- the -- the -- the great spirit of -- of -- of -- that wave that weaves us together can be just made an observation of this naked kind of -- of dead thing.

It was very -- a very eloquent plea on her part that the psychologist should at this moment, you see, be himself under the spell of this smile, instead of having the effrontery of treating this child as -- as a baby, and not as an ensouled being that has a right to make itself heard, and cannot be omitted.

Now you -- you, of course I -- I may -- may -- I cannot explain the meaning of the Bible unless you allow me to use these present-day examples. I'm sorry, but that's what it's written about. The point, however, being is that the legal, routine succession is defied by the Bible. Eli has no offspring. His wife despairs.

And now the -- the pedigree of the human race, in the eyes of the Bible -- it is constantly in this way, you see, that it somewhere peters out. Here, that's then the last twig, you see, the shoot. And you have to go back to the center to bring forth a new branch and a new twig. So the whole Bible is written about the withering of those twigs and shoots that go too far out on a limb. And the Bible is written about the varieties of human -- the human race, and its center. And therefore it has, of course, a tremendous racial ideology, you may say, you see, because it defends the power of man to return to the growing point, you see.

And -- I had a Jewish friend, a very famous Orthodox Jew, who always said, "Jew -- Jew- -- the Jews are here above the ground." How do you call this in botany? The -- we call it the "heart" of a plant -- or of a tree. Have you such an

expression?

(Stem?)

Wie?

(Stem?)

No, inside the stem, there is one living center, you see, from which everything -- you -- you -- you see, you see, the branches only spread above this, you see, and not below it. And it's -- higher than the roots, you see. It's in -- it's therefore not the whole stem. But it is this side of the -- of the branching out, of the diversification.

(It's called a heart of a tree.)

It is. So -- then he says, "Israel is the heart of the human tree, and all the nations, you see, the proud nations go out on a limb." And it is of course -- therefore, anti-Semitism is very natural, because everybody who is out on a limb--all the aborigines, all the variations, all the races of course--are terrified of being reminded that they are out on a limb, that they are specialists, that they have specialized. The Ger- -- Americans with mechanics, or with -- with the gadgets, or with money -- dollars, you see; and the French with ideas; and the Germans with scholarship; and the English with -- with mission, or -- or a navy, or the commonwealth; and you can -- any -- you can characterize any nation for its specialty. And Israel is the reminder, that's a -- very nice, these specialties, but beware: you have to be able to -- to bury the sons of Eli, and to write "Ichabod," and have to start again.

Exactly what happened in American history between 1850 and 1865, that the Webster era, and the -- nicety about South and North definitely came to an end in 1850. And then God kept His breath, so to speak, and the spirit of God didn't move in this country until Fort Sumter. And then it had to be done by -- by violence, and blood; because if the spirit doesn't move, then God's judgments work in another way.

And we are all -- the history of man is the -- the phyllogenetic history of man is not in zoology; but the history of man is this constantly being called back from our specializations into the mainstream of life. What I told you about synthesis for coal and electricity of course is true about our human specialty, too, you see. Just as the raw materials on this earth by technology, you see, are

brought back to serve, you see, to -- to join, so of course, the races of man have to -- brought back into the mainstream. And Israel is this very inconspicuous, and even ugly -- heart. -- The heart of a tree is very inconspicuous. It has no- -- not the great buds of civilization.

And that makes the books like Spengler or Toynbee so very funny, that these people describe only the specialties, and never ask how they are re-organized from the center. That's why they are very poor books in -- to my estimation, you see. What is -- what do we care for 23 civilizations, you see? I'm interested in the heart of the matter. How -- the people, in all these civilizations were human beings. Isn't that true? What do I care whether they were Chinese, or Egyptians, or Romans? I mean, it's a -- I think it's an unbelievable book, this book of -- by Toynbee, for this reason. It's an anti-historical book.

The problem of mankind obviously is: how do we remain men, despite the fact that we have water to- -- toilets, and -- and bathtubs, and all the specialties, and orange juice, you see? And -- and can afford all these things? -- Obviously, if we afford them too much, and become just Southern Californians, we are wiped out. The Southern Californians have to keep identity with the Russians, or we have a Third World War. Isn't that obvious?

I missed this, yesterday. I think the president made a very good speech, but he didn't include in any way the inhabitants of -- of the Eastern bloc into his concern. I think that's -- the time has passed when he can afford this, so to speak. He had to attack Khrushchev, so to speak, in the name of his -- Mr. Khrushchev's {subjects}, you see, because obviously if we cannot find some- -- something we have in common with the people who -- who live in -- under Khrushchev's yoke, you see, we cannot make peace. It's impo- -- impossible. Then we are just two blocs, then we -- we must hammer away at each other.

But that isn't true, I mean. Below the surface of being Americans and being Russians, obviously, we have still to belong to the heart of the tree. That's why Genesis 10 -- was written. Can't you see this? This is the meaning of this 10th chapter of -- of Genesis. But it doesn't help you to boast that you are Hebrews or that you are Assyrians. It doesn't. Very little { }.

So I -- I recommend this to you. If you want to have it -- today we have to use obviously biological terms to be understood. The Bible is not a -- has no- -- nothing to do with morality; it has nothing to do with the- -- philosophy. It has very much to do with -- with biology. It is an attempt to show under what conditions do the members of any body politic retain the plasticity--you can put this

down; it's a good biological term--retain the plasticity of representing the whole human race.

[tape interruption]

...can--and now comes my fulmination, so to speak, or my high point--if they can bury their dead and say that an era is at an end, because if they cannot say, "The light of the Lord has parted from the -- Israel," they cannot rise again. They cannot declare, you see, with "the light of Israel has departed," the sons of Eli were out on a limb. They were corrupt. Therefore, the -- the li- -- the life of Israel has to start somewhere else.

And in this sense, gentlemen, the Bible is written around man's power to end and begin periods, to end epochs, you see, and say, "This is over." The -- humanity is distinguished from the animal in the simple fact that we bury our dead. No animal dies in the face, if it can help it, of any other animal. They all run into isolation. The animal has its life to itself. It is finished. It is enclosed between birth and death. And that's its life.

You and I, however, you see, by the fact that you bury your parents--in a normal situation, you see, I mean, when you are old -- outlive -- outlive them--have to say to yourself, "All the functions of my parents now have fallen upon me." They are no longer, you see. So you become aware of the functions of other people, you see, and inherit them. And this constant in- -- heritage -- or inheritance of heredity is the real problem of humanity, and not the heredity of the -- of the genes of the biologist, you see. Our problem is that if we cannot say to yourself, "Now my childhood is over; I'm no longer the son of my parents. I'm now on my own, or I'm -- have even to substitute for them," you see, "and their function in society," or "for the older generation," you can say, you see, for the Enlightenment, or for the 19th century, or for the -- the -- the Reformation, or whatever you choose as having done its -- you see, having seen its day--you would think that you are no longer Puritan, for example, you see. Most of you are, of course, without knowing it. And -- because you do not know how important and eternal the function of Puritanism is in America. So I would advise you perhaps to ask yourself, if you really want to bury Puritanism, -- if it wouldn't be a good thing if you would represent the first Puritan again after The Last Puritan has been written.

You don't know your heredity, and therefore you are not in history. Only a man who has, like -- like this wife of Eli, at one time said, "The life has departed from Israel"--that's exactly what it means, you see--would know that the prophe-

cy in Israel, the function of the cent- -- at the center of Shiloh has now to be built up in another way. The sons cannot inherit the spirit.

It is in this very little feature that you are able to say, "The light has departed from Israel," you see, by which we believe in resurrection. This is the whole meaning of resurrection. The power to say, "This is over," you see, "therefore, the same spirit that has shone," you see, "has now to start once more. It has to be created in a different form." That's how the Church came about, when Christ has -- had departed from this earth, you see. And the Old Testament--only to show you this--is -- believes in resurrection in -- in this -- in this Book of Samuel, already, you see, that man has to say, "This is over." "The light has departed from Israel."

And all his- -- today, you see--it's the same problem with the two world wars--you have not had the power -- this whole country, this mighty country has not had the power to face the issue, to deal with the two world wars, you see, as one great crisis. And yesterday the poor president had to defend against this country mu- -- mutual aid. And he had to say that five soldiers of the -- of the Allies, you see, against one soldier in this {country}. So perhaps you better -- did something.

And I read these -- these resolutions now of the taxpayer of the United States who say that 3 -- \$4 billion is too much for the defense of the United States, when -- when 5 million soldiers, you see, of other nations defend us against 1 million soldiers of this country. And we are the richest country in the world. We have one-half of the wealth of the whole world. And -- and we -- and nobody would dare to reduce any other budget by 50 percent. And these people dare to reduce these -- just this mutual aid program, you see, because it's -- they still think it's the foreign aid program. And that shows you the complete irresponsibility of the American citizen at this moment, because you can of course reduce any budget by 10 percent or 5 percent. You cannot whittle down 50 percent. And it will be done. The Democrats will do it. And I -- I think they are traitors.

Because it's just cheap. The real situation of these two world wars wa- -- was that they were fought with all the Allies in common, with the English and the French, you cannot deny this. Even with the Russians. Now we -- after 40 years of this experience, we treat these people as foreigners, as outside our history. And I would say this is a -- the light would have -- would depart then from Israel, because it would mean that we -- the lesson of these 40 years isn't learned. And you will see. If -- if the Congress cuts even one cent out of this budget, the United States are in a bad way. They are dishonest. They do not face up to what

already has happened, that we depend for our survival on the identity with the Allies. And most of you don't feel like that. You are all good Democrats, and are all for Mr. {Engel}, and -- or Brown, or whoever it is, and -- and think that -- that you can be demagogues, and just play domestic politics.

So the -- this danger is always there. And there will always be the hatred of the people who are inconspicuous in the heart, and do not specialize. Whether they are Quakers, or whether they are Jews, or whether they are the Parsees in -- in -- India who play the role of the Jews more or less in the Eastern world -- community do -- always have to have an inconspicuous group that cannot afford to write a Greek philosophy, or great pieces of art, or -- like the Roman senators conquering the world, but who simply teach this humility of the inconspicuous, you see; who can hear that at this moment this little baby has to be treated as a unique -- unique being. That this illness is -- is a challenge, not to the routine performance of a hospital ward, you see, but to -- that this here -- somebody -- hasn't happened before. Who has been in a hospital?

Well, then you know -- probably know what I'm talking about, Sir. We are treated in a hospital. I've been there. And I felt I was treated like printed matter. Business papers, at reduced rate, yes, but --.

No, I mean -- like the smile, I mean. I was observed. But I'm -- you see, but I'm not included in this machinery there. I'm passing through it.

Well, we have a break now? Ten minutes.

[tape interruption]

...Now I would like to have an opinion here on -- from this group and --.

You can imagine there's plenty more to be said about the historical meaning of the Bible. On the other hand, I'm perfectly willing to go over to other things, other texts. And you could finish this today or perhaps next time. And what's the feeling of the sentiment here? May I hear your opinions on the matter? You can imagine that if I went on like -- as I have, unfortunately, then I'm always carried away with the -- this, because nobody seems to know the simple thing about the Bible. It has been completely buried under Greek, academic, I mean, distortion, and -- and so on.

Today I wasn't prepared to dwell so long on this -- on this story. But I -- and I think I would cheat you out of your -- the real truth if I wouldn't talk about it. So I would like to hear somebody. Are -- are you anxious to -- to move out of

this? Or are you anxious to stay in this? Honest opinion required.

(I personally would like to stay { }.)

Well, wha- -- what's the feeling of -- who -- who would side with him?

({ } in the Bible -- going to the other texts in the Bible, other books in the Bible, or to other { }?)

Oh -- we would go over to -- to secular -- to other history books. I mean, that's perfectly -- we are after all quite free to do what we decide here to do. And so what do you think?

(Oh, well, I've been talking to the gentleman here, and I think that perhaps stay -- stay with { } the Bible also but bring in Thucydides, which we talked about earlier, and draw comparisons like we -- just like we intended to, bring history and the Bible to them.)

Have I already -- ja, here is this assignment. Well, I feel too that perhaps it is wiser at least to step over into the other fields. One -- perhaps we come back to this, and -- in comparison. Ja?

(In other words, Sir, what I was going to -- wondering whether it wouldn't be wise to go on, and perhaps allude back occasionally in order to --.)

Ja, I'm quite open to doubt. I mean, I have no principle in this matter. You see, I've never -- this is a new thing I do myself. And only in going along, I am -- of course I've written on this--books, and so on--but seeing your need for -- I don't know what is the more urgent need, I mean.

So why don't we -- I get however these two texts written out by you.

Pardon me for being pedantic about it, because I do feel that -- for example, "Ichabod" is of considerable length and it's very eloquent. And as you know, Whittier was a Quaker. And so I think it's the -- one of the finest and most important documents of American history, this -- this "Ichabod." And there has been much discussion about it. I mean, Webster of course suffered terribly under it, and his -- Webster's friend argued the case with Whittier; and Whittier, who was a very -- tender-hearted man in later years, was quite willing to concede that it was very severe. But I have found that the later judgment is always the worst judgment in such historical creation. And I call it the "philosophy of the ashcan." That is, the -- the -- the id- -- the story because later a man says, "I shouldn't have

done this," doesn't mean he shouldn't have done it. It doesn't mean it at all. And most of you think this way.

I have a friend who is now high up in the state department. He was professor of philosophy when the Second World War broke out. And -- quite a man in his own right. He was a full professor at a university, married, and 40 years of age. And when the war broke out in 1941, he volunteered as a private. Then he took his corps examination with the highest standing of the -- in the corps area, although he was 40. So they are hard on him, being a corporal. And in due course, ended, the -- the war, as a captain.

And then he came back in '45; he came to our house and complained bitterly that he was such a fool to -- to do this. If he had a -- gotten a commission as a colonel in the first place, right away, he would now be influential and high-ranking in politic- -- a policy-maker in the United States. But a captain, that was just nothing.

And I said to him, "I'm very glad, because thanks to you, we won the war. And thanks to the corn colonels, the so-called, we nearly lost it. And I call this the philosophy of the ashcan, your motivation now. Now you think that you weren't clever. But for heaven's sake if, at the outbreak of a war, people are clever, you just can't win a war. And that's hard doctrine for you, but that's how life is."

I mean, it's much more important that this friend of mine did volunteer -- you see, as a private, than that he should have gotten a commission as a colonel. That would be of no interest whatsoever; and it would have -- not have helped the war effort. But it would have satisfied his ego, you see. And that -- he would have then -- would have been a profiteer, you see; and that's the worst kind of man who, in an emergency of his country, tries to aggrandize himself. I mean, such a man deserves our contempt. Nothing else. Contemptible.

I have a neighbor who is such a colonel, and I wonder that we won the war.

And this you have to decide, I mean. The -- historians -- if you ever go into the telling of a story to your children, or to your class, you will have to beware from this seemingly cleverness and sagacity, that because later on the thing looked different, it was stupid in the first place. Any sacrifice looks stupid in the first place, because you later -- because you can only make sacrifices at one moment in your life, and you usually aren't up to par. We are usually, of course, living on a -- in suspended animation, and in -- at 35 degree -- degree of -- of



Fahrenheit, we just don't act like great souls, but like very cheap poodles. And -- and so then to judge the great heart and the magnanimity of a man from this -- your poodle situation is just ridiculous. But that's what most students try to do. You sit back, and you are -- indifferent, and you are clever, and you are -- see all the sights { }, "How could he? How could he? What a fool he was!" Then you call such a man an idealist, which I take as a curse, I mean, is a -- is a -- I'm not an idealist, gentlemen. I don't think -- I -- I have tried hard not to be. Idealist? This is stupid, is illusion.

But a man has to do what a situation demands. That's "must." That's not idealism. Where there is a necessity, has it anything to do with idealism? It has to be. The human race demands this. The future of the human -- humankind, and if you have any love in your heart left for your neighbor, then you have to do it. Do you -- you -- you lo- -- save a child from a fire -- from a house on fire from idealism?

Don't misuse this word "idealism," because you bury all higher duties under this strange word of "idealism." Idea -- idealist is a man who doesn't know what life costs. He thinks he can get away, you see, and do wonderful things without investing his future, and without -- that's the idealism, you see. Cheap. But if he -- but everything costs its price in life. If you go -- jump into this building, you can be burned. And if you do it, just the same, then you are -- act right. If you are an idealist, you think, "Oh, it won't matter." And that's not -- you see, that's nothing -- nothing worthwhile. I'm neither materialist, nor an idealist. I think both are as stupid as pessimism and optimism. We are in this life here, and -- and -- and -- and are responsible for this growth of the tree of hu- -- the humankind. And whatever is demanded -- you are not an idealist if you bring up your child -- children right. You love them, that's all. Not idealism. You understand, Sir.

And of course the other is equally stupid. How can a man be a materialist, or how can he be a realist? All these -- -isms to me are useless for any decision you have to make in life.

But -- if the United States were to survive, people like my friend had to exist, who came forward and forgot themselves in the -- you see. And had no illusions that they might lose their lives, and -- might be ruined. He could have come back a cripple, couldn't he? That's the worst result of a war, you see. It's a -- much more -- much more easy to stip- -- {harden} yourself to be killed on the battlefield, than to come back a -- a burden on -- on everybody for the rest of your life.

Well, this is -- only to show you -- to tell you that the -- the -- the philosophy of the ashcan is not for you as historians. You are responsible for re-living the -- the moment in which -- the decisions have been made. And your rationalizing later is worth nothing. If an historian thinks that he should sit in -- judgment and say, "How stupid for Mr. Lincoln. Shouldn't have come to the theater. Then he wouldn't have been assassinated," you see, then -- then you are just as -- an ape.

And most historians and -- modern historians, these debunkers to me are just monkeys. They monkey around with something that's just beyond their comprehension. And they call this "science." I call it ashcan philosophy, you see. Half of what is called today "historical science" is analysis in trying to dispute the high { }, you see, duties and decisions of the man. And it is -- and the historian says, "I would have never volunteered." "I wouldn't have been Abolitionist." "I wouldn't have --." Of course, if you look at these historians, you wonder why there isn't yet slavery in the United States. If you read Charles Beard, you just cannot understand that anything has ever moved, because everybody is a liar, and everybody is just dictated to by -- private interests. And how any soldier ever went to war for the abolition of slavery is absolutely un-understandable.

-- You see, the modern historian, by -- straddling the fence of science and history and calling himself a scientist, has really just moved into the situation of a cynic, and -- of a skeptic, and has nothing to do with science. But it is low-grade intelligence. And the modern American intellige- -- intellectual is a despicable individual, because he takes stock of the human events from his easy chair, or whatever it is, and -- and -- and -- and judges these people af- -- before he has done anything himself. What has he done, that he has a right to distinguish between a -- between great moments and low moments in history?

And since he doesn't recognize Thomas Paine's sentence, "These are the times that try men's souls," you see, then he doesn't even know that there are times which try men's souls. He has no right to write history, because history is the chain of events which have tried men's souls. That's all history is. By definition. Other events do not have to be mentioned, you see. You don't have to be -- mention when blacktop was introduced into Los Angeles, and all these niceties that they tell in your book -- textbooks now. But the -- the -- the -- the times that try -- which -- men's souls, that have had -- these are the times with which you have to become identified so that you may not fail, and your grandchildren may not miss them out; I mean -- these decisions.

And that's why "Ichabod" is such a simple story, you see. "The light has departed from Israel." The whole content of the Bible, then to use the -- exploit this one seminar -- hour which we still have, is written about the discerning of the spirits, the discerning of the spirits. That's a rare expression, and I offer it to you, because it hasn't been talked down, so to speak, and it is not commonplace. And so perhaps you -- it makes you sit up. It's in one place -- in the New Testament it is mentioned, you see, that we have to discern the spirits.

And so you haven't discerned the spirit of this -- debunker, and of the skeptic, and of the philosopher of the ashcan, you see, and the spirit of a man who is ready to listen, to obey the orders of the day, for example. And so Eli's wife has to -- has to discern the spirit, you see. The whole Bible is written around the discernment of the spirit. Can you understand this?

You look so desperate. Wie? It's really very encouraging, once you know this, you see, because the Bible is written around the question: what's leading to death and what's to destruction? And what's leading to life?

And you all should know these stock phrases: "the more abundant life," and all this, "everlasting life." Well, these are translation -- petrified translations; and I warned you against all these -- these terms, because they don't convey to you something you have to decide yourself. What do we know of life everlasting? What do we know of -- of the more abundant life, you see? Then we think of the farmer's market. That's the more abundant life. But that isn't. The meaning of a -- of the Bible is very simple. The things that lead to withering on the stem, to the petering out, you see, and the problem of the central stream of life --.

All races, according to the Bible, are variations. And according to the Gentiles, they -- they -- they do not believe in one origin of the human race, because they do not see that the races are all deviations, and all in danger to deviate too much. And they have to be called back all the time into the mainstream of life.

But as I told you, whether you take "synthesis" for the things of -- the world, or -- you take regeneration for the races, it is always the same thing: to be watchful where the light goes, where life marches on, you see, where the mainstream of life is to be expected.

For example, in the last 15 years, I have seen many graduate students rush into service of the state department. Because they feel -- still thought that's elegant, that's fashionable, that's the future, you -- foreign service, you see. They

all, of course, find out how disappointing it is, and come back very, very quick; because obviously the state has no future. There may be no wars, and therefore statehood is very -- very ridiculous. It's obsolete, you see.

And in the 16th century, as you well know, I mean, the -- the -- quite the contrary. The secular nations became important. And so out of monks came the humanists. Erasmus ceased to be a monk and became a -- a humanist and a philosopher, you see. Out of theology then at that time sprung the natural sciences and the philosophers. Now today, obviously, if a man wants to make good, he has to go into society, he has to go into a factory, has to go into a colony, he has to -- cultivate international relations. But he has to avoid all mere state, government things. But government pays at this moment very well. It's a great temptation on the lower level of keeping your { }, you see; you'd better go to civil service. But if you are an adventurer of the future of the human race, I think there is nothing to be had out of becoming a second Mr. Eisenhower. If you offer it me, I certainly wouldn't try to become president of the United States, or foreign office, you see. He can't tell the truth to his people, to nobody; he's in diplomacy. Poor man. I mean, there's nothing creative about it.

But for the last 400 years, it was the dream of every secular man to become king: "Every man a king," you see. And I would suggest that this time -- these times are coming -- are drawing to a close, and this is the discerning of the spirit, you see.

That what was great in 1800, where the greatest minds of this country, you see, rushed into politics, might not be too -- I'm not, by the way, saying that I'm an authority. It's my own judgment that this is -- may be so. But I invite you to test me by discerning the spirit yourself. The "spirit" means the amount of futu- -- futurity; that is, on one -- in -- on one road, the amount of futurity of unsolved, you see, un- -- unformed things, the plasticity that's demanded. Genius is plastic. And where the life is not yet articulate, or formulated--you can also use instead of "articulation," "formulation,"--there of course is the futurity. And I would think that the relations of the human races and the human family -- inside the human family today are the crucial questions. And I think that a -- that a man settling in Georgia certainly is more courageous than a man running for the American senate.

He would -- will be probably killed there by the { } gang. And in -- the American senate, he would just be paid for his relatives.

Yes, politicians have to be -- come in. I think -- if you will -- only move

into a third era of human society, if the politicians, or if the -- state becomes an automat- -- -matic thing, negligible, I mean--that you have post offices, and postmasters. It's all right, I mean. They are very nice people. But it isn't -- of the -- of primary -- the primary decision, you see. After all, when Herman Melville became an -- an inspector of customs in the harbor of New York, and that was his -- the end of his life. That was his tragedy; that was a catastrophe. Before, he has been the greatest living American. And nobody knew it. And that was his tragedy.

So this is the discerning of the spirits, that you know the amount of vitality, or the mind of -- I think the word "futura" is in order, you see, that is on the path of your life, that which has yet to be created. And the less articulate it is, the more is it in the whole. You see, the more the things become specialized--a doctor today, you see, is such a specialist. In 1940, gentlemen, 90 percent of the doctors of this country were general practitioners. As of today, you know how many general practitioners we have left?

(One percent.)

Twenty. Twenty percent. That is, medicine has ceased to be interesting and exciting, because specialization is rou- -- is -- you see, is much less creative. You see, it doesn't represent the whole. You are in great danger today. You go to a hospital to fall into the hands of a dozen specialists, you see, so you are nowhere. You aren't treated anymore as a -- your parts are treated. And {there -- here}, the mighty have fallen.

Now medicine, in the book about -- of Arrowsmith, by -- by our friend Sinclair Lewis, is still holding the center, you see, of attention as the great thing. And -- the most wonderful profession. And I always say that the only aristocracy in this country we have is -- are the doctors. And -- and the only priesthood. We have no priesthood in this country. The ministers are low-grade. But the medicine -- the medicine man in this country is a medicine man. That is, he is a -- he bewitches the people. He is an authority. Doctors here are consecrated and --. But underneath, they have lost the reason for which they are consecrated, because they have become specialists. That is, they are so subdivided, you see, that -- that the individual doctor, he -- even tells you that he no longer is treating you in the old sense in which my doctor { }, you see. I have told you the story. He was still a doctor, although he was a specialist.

But -- today, we have -- are so organized, that he -- he is -- not one of them can speak up, so to speak, because the other nine have to be listened to, too. I

don't know where the -- journey in this country goes into --. We -- we have -- we have at this -- from 1910 to 1945, I think this country has lost its direction. It's moving in vicious circles. And you -- it is your generation that has to provide the -- the courage for the older people and it will be very difficult. But that's what you have to do: to open again a belief in this country, a faith in the real future of America. At this moment, everybody is left on the defensive. And this for the next year until you have a -- a recession. Well, let's -- is this important, whether you sell twice as many automobiles as the last year? I mean, is this the future of this country? This has nothing to do with the future of America. It's perfectly -- it's minor. But everyth- -- -body is talked into -- the mass media into the belief that this is terribly important. But why should we? We -- we are glutted -- gutted with automobiles. So if one year you have to sell fewer, well, it is not very important, you see. It can be one way or the other. But to make you believe that this is important, is -- is just to me ridiculous.

In the -- when we were in {Greenfield} together here, Mr. Chamberlain and I, there were two men, father and son from New York -- businessmen. And we wanted to start an adult education forum. And these men said nothing doi- -- was -- it made no sense to do this. We had a war anyway now on our hands. This was in 1953.

And we looked at him -- askance, and the two men said, "Well, everybody on -- Wall Street tells us that without a war, we cannot keep our economy going." This is only five years ago -- six years. Now they would deny it, of course. Every American denies the foolishnesses he said the day before. But here -- they said this, and they didn't -- were not chased out of town; they didn't commit suicide; they -- didn't feel dishonored. Now if -- two people in their sound mind, of different ages--father and son--can come from New York and tell us that you have to have a war in order to survive, then you'd better smash the Constitution of this country, because it is an abomination.

And this is -- allegedly a peace-loving country. This is one of the biggest lies in this country, that we are peace-loving. The most aggressive country in the world. It always has been. Americans -- are aggressive people. I don't -- I have nothing against it, but you should confess it. But you have this wonderful arrangement that here you sit, you see, and are all pacifists. And tomorrow you conquer the world. And there's no relation -- connection between the two -- situations of yours.

And -- and this I despise, because that's no discerning of the spirits. Do

you think the -- the -- the United States at this moment owns half of the globe, and half of the riches of the world, because it's a peace-loving country? Why not admit it? This is a great task. Somebody has to govern the world. And I think it has fallen to the -- to the Americans because of their debonair attitude that -- it's probably -- I prefer to be governed by the American government than by the Russian government. But somebody has obviously to govern all these countries. Do you think Cuba is a sovereign state? Or Puerto Rico is a sovereign state? And Nicaragua is?

The discerning of the spirit. Now, this can only be done in strict empirical fashion, because the spirit moves in sundry places. And now, I -- what I wanted to per- -- perform today before we leave it, is to draw your attention to the attempt of the Old Testament to transpose man's own experience, how difficult it for {instance} to get to this -- this courage to say, "This is over, and this begins," you see. The light has departed from Israel. We have to start on another track. We have to admit that we have failed, that this is dead -- a dead-end street, you see, this getting out of the dead-end streets, that this is the constant endeavor of -- from the first word to the last word of the Bible. In -- biology, you would always admit that the -- take the -- the pedigree of the monkey and men. As you know, the latest doctrine there is that man is in the central stream, and that the apes do constitute side branches of this mainstream of development, that we do not directly spring from the gorilla or chimpanzee, you see, but that they are out on a limb, whereas we kept going in the middle. And -- but I think that's sound doctrine; that's biblical doctrine.

The Bible tries to say that all the deviations, you see, have to be called, as I might say, to order. That every deviation that goes too far has to be paid for, because it's proved a dead-end street. And if you take shells on the sea, and if you take the -- the sauriae, the -- great big -- big animals, they all have proved that after a while they became so big, and so specialized, and so -- you see, so varied that they died out. All paleontology is -- is simply the story of the Bible, played backward. That if you go -- become too big--a dreadnought today, as you know, has been abolished in the navy, because it's far too complicated a vessel. The smaller the vessel today is, and more human it is, as you and I are, babies, you see, we are plastic. So in every generation we can take a new shape. Man is -- the weaker he is, the more powerful he is, because he can then take the necessary steps for adjusting himself to this moment.

{ } -- now I come to this fact that this is called in the Bible "history."

History is the step out of nature by which an individual -- centers not on the

shape with which it enters the world, but the shapelessness, so that it can obey orders as of today. Any animal is born under orders of yesterday. And any human being is born under the orders of today. And if he is a -- a creative leader of man, and -- a, so to speak, an aristocrat, a priest, he is born under the orders from tomorrow. If you become a postmaster, you obey the orders of today. If you become a social scientist, you may be obedient to the orders of tomorrow. So in the human race, there is a division between people from tomorrow, and people from today. And in nature, the natural beast in us is the man of yesterday, as we have been. And every one of us is under this discernment of the spirits. You have to know of yourself: how far you are of yesterday, and of today, or of tomorrow.

Every human being is a trinitarian. The Trin- -- Trinity of the New Testament is not an invention of some clever, subtle spirit. It's an experience. You and I all live under the divinity of the past, under the divinity of today, and under the divinity of tomorrow. The spirit we call -- that which beckons us from tomorrow, that God created the world long ago--it's a good world--and why shouldn't be comply with -- with what it is? That's yesterday, you see. And then we have the customs of our society as of today, so that this epoch, this century, that's -- as of our era; that's as of today. You can become a doctor, you can become a professor, you can become all this, you see; that's as of today. Because today is where you remember that at one time it hasn't yet been, you see, and where you know that it won't be always. This I would call "today," you see. But that you have to breathe, this has always been, you see; so that is yesterday. So the physical man in us, the natural man is of yesterday. The historical man is of today. And the Bible now calls the man of tomorrow the "prophetic."

And there I feel I have to -- can't -- stop, so to speak, about the Bible before I have explained to you why the Bible is a prophetic book. Not just the prophets in the Bible are prophetic. The whole book of the Bible is written around the fact that the future is as real as the past, and that a prophet is a man who judges -- today from the point of the ends of time. Prophets are not predictors, gentlemen. The great -- today a great confusion at -- the New York stock exchange because they think that to -- it is -- means -- is to prophesy, if you predict the business cycle, or the stock exchange, or the investment trends. That has not- -- prediction has nothing to do with prophecy. Prediction concludes from yesterday and today what's going to happen tomorrow. That is -- that is, you see, mere causality. That is deduction. But prophecy says, "This can't go on anymore," and all prophecy judges today from the viewpoint of the whole history of mankind, from his -- our destiny. Prophets are judging today and say, "Therefore all prophecy includes



disaster." That is, there is no true prophet who doesn't say that between today and the end of time there will be some disaster that will have to overtake the fools of today, the excesses of today.

Any prophet can be recognized if he has the courage, you see, to say, "I do not predict wonderful days, but the price for these wonderful days is that you give up certain things that at this moment obstruct the future."

And so prophecy and prediction in this country are strangely confused and mixed. The secular mind has only this thinking. Here, Mr. -- a physicist can predict that if he puts so many things -- you see, so many substances in a -- in a crucible, and then he will have a nice explosion, you see -- or whatever it is. What he calls a synthesis or some -- some damn thing.

So this is the view of time in the physics laboratory. Because we dominate nature, nature is as of yesterday, and it is always the same. And the conditions of the natural processes therefore all belong yesterday, even if they happen tomorrow. You see, this is still yesterday. Can't you understand? The creation has not been changed, but you and I are quite different. We can see that if this -- this bubble of our stock exchange doesn't burst, we'll have an inflation. And therefore, if we were real citizens of this country and thought of the -- of the middle class, and the poor, and our children, we would forgo this bubble, you see, and have no inflation. And a prophet can say that if you go on with this inflation, you will undermine the authority of your government. Because the -- a government that cannot borrow money anymore, you see, that is no government. And Mr. {Anderson}, as you may know, the -- our head of the Treasury, got a -- really panicky. Last summer -- he fou- -- he was a soft money man. He was quite willing to play along after {Humphrey} had left, you see, with the soft mo- -- the inflation people. But when he saw that the credit of the United States was impaired, you see, and he hadn't heard of this, you see, just -- you see; that if you have soft money, you -- then you -- the state cannot -- borrow money, because you have to pay it back, you see, in the same currency, and the public won't do it if they know that they only get 80 percent of their money later on, you see, paid out.

And so, he -- he had to learn it the hard way. Why such fools can be made secretary of the treasury, I don't know.

It's remarkable. You see, in this country, the whole future is mortgaged by the present. William James wrote in 1910 that no country and no era had -- had

wasted the future so much in favor of a -- the present, as our generation, our time -- does. That's what we call installment {buying}. That's just a similar way of mortgaging the future. You can see this.

Now the prophet is the man who understands that "future" means plastic, freedom. That if you mortgage your future for the next 30 years, you have to pay off your house, obviously you have that much less liberty with regard to your decision. And on it goes. And the more you do this, the less you can be footloose, and can start all over again.

For example, in -- in Ameri- -- the -- the workers cannot go -- strike, you see. It's very wonderful for the association of manufacturers, if they live by the installment plan, because the wife says, "We can't afford this," you see. "We -- we lose our property. We have to make these payments, and the strike fund isn't big enough to -- to keep our payments up." So if you have enough installment buying, you assure -- the -- that -- the strikes cannot happen. But that means that the freedom of the worker is impaired.

So prophets, gentlemen, are connected with the present by their inclusion of a catastrophe, of a minus, of something, you see, that -- the present does not end in the future, as in physics, but the present stands condemned, to a certain extent. The outgrowth, the excrescences, the abuses, the -- the mistakes of the present, you see, prevent the -- the true future to happen. That's what the prophet tells us, you see. That's why the prophecy, you must understand, comes from the end of time into the present. A prophet is not a man who lives in its spirit today. But you look at -- today in the light of the end. He's already with God, and looks back.

And if I may say this, gentlemen, if you are beside yourself, you can prophesy. Anybody who has to defend his own home, and his own interest is not able to be a prophet. But I have been able to prophesy. I have fore- -- foretold Hit- -- at the end of the First World War, I was in such a -- so beside myself, that is, I was so sacrificial I didn't care for my- -- myself, my wife, and my belongings. I sold my library. I gave up my position. I lost my fortune, I -- and everything. And even my dearest predilections--the Church, and scholarship, and state. And so I was able to prophesy. So I said in 1918 all about Hitler. It is printed. You can read it. And the prophecy came true. And so I know what prophesying means. Prophesying means to judge the present in the light of the future, you see. But it is very expensive with regard to the personal happiness, or emoluments, or advancement of the person who does prophesy.

And -- since people no longer believe that there is prophecy, I want to witness to you that I have prophesied in 1918. But when I came to this country and had to fight for my survival here, I did not prophesy the Second World War. My -- my prophetic qualities were -- were renounced, so to speak. The -- I was given to the fight for survival, to the struggle. So the same man--I myself--know that you can be a prophet, and that leaves you again, the spirit. And you become an earth- -- you see, earthenware, and -- and then you live on this {ground}. That's a good life, too. Then I live as of today. And I -- it is -- God doesn't mean -- want us all the time to be on one side of the fence.

But you ought to -- only to -- one person has to testify to you that to be a prophet is just as much a reality as to be a businessman. And if a man is only a businessman, he is just a -- a very -- a poor, very limited, very restricted. And if he's a playboy, he's just of yesterday, because he only plays with things that are already there, you see. "To play" means to be young, you see. "To be in business" means to fight as of today. And "to be prophetic" means to belong to the future. Can you see this?

And so in any i- -- decent society, you have to have the three branches of the human race represented. There has to be -- art has to be prophetic; teaching has to be prophetic; politics have to be prophetic, you see; the Church has to be prophetic. These are the priestly elements, you see. And then there are the fighting elements: a soldier, and the engineer, and the -- and the explorer, and the inventor, and the scientist, they -- they are as of today, and the workers. And the children, and the sportsmen, and the artists, they are as of nature. They are genius. They are born as they are. They are good -- and so they play with the -- with the world, you see. And that's why you can be an artistic genius, you see, at the age of 20. But pope you cannot be at the age of 20, you see. The -- this present pope is 76. That's not accidental, you see, because back -- all the prophetic offices go with renunciation of the physical life, you see, of your own life. That's -- you can -- it can happen that you are young. But it's an exception, I mean. And usually the -- your governors are people who no longer are self-seeking. You cannot have a fighting man as a president. Then he would just seek his self-aggrandizement. You expect from a president that he is regardless of {selfin-} -- selfishness, you see. So you have -- I hope you won't -- elect a president who wants to get rich on this, or who wants to have his family enriched by it.

Now how can you if -- if -- according to American definition, I mean, everybody is out for himself. Then you couldn't have a president, because the president must be a man who's not out for himself. Or why elect him otherwise?

And this is so terrible, you see. You have been taught that the one office of the president may be perhaps an unselfish office. But you don't believe in priesthood; you don't believe in prophets; you don't believe in teaching; you don't believe in priests. Teaching to you is a technique. And -- and priesthood is a routine. And that's dogmatic. And you have managed to -- and prophet- -- prophets of course are just illusionists, and they are idealists. And you have therefore made this tremendous realm of magistrates, and officeholders who date from the future of the human race, who represent your destiny. You have made them -- shrunk into this one tiny office of the president. All the others are self-seeking, fighting people, {Theotis}, you see, with elbows, in your imagination. That's why { }. Most people think everybody is out for himself. Gentlemen, if you think I am out for myself here, why do you listen to me? Go home. -- Isn't it absolutely ridiculous that I should be considered here a self-seeking individual who just wants to become famous and waste your time? You believe quite indi- -- instinctively that I'm representative of the future. And I have ap- -- been -- am appointed to point out to you the discerning of the spirits. What in the light of the future belongs to human history, and what is just, you see, the -- the fall of man? The earthly -- earthly nature, his -- his -- his fear, his panic, his cowardice, his ignominy.

You all -- you wouldn't sit here, otherwise. But if I -- if you analyze your own picture of the world, the prophets are not included. You think that prophets, gentlemen, are fools. They happen once in a -- in a lifetime, perhaps, or in a century. There's Isaiah, you say, and Jeremiah. "Oh, well, strange. How they ever occurred nobody knows."

Now I can only tell you that prophets are just as immortal, you see, as plumbers. And in -- there is a great poetess in Germany, Ricarda Huch, was her name, who wrote a very beautiful book. And in it, she simply says, "At bottom, every human being is prophetic." Just as he is a genius. Every child is born a genius, and every child is born knowing something about the destiny of man. And he knows very well, if he's not corrupted, and a wife knows very well, when her -- husband has fallen on evil da- -- way -- in evil ways, and has wrong company, and when he's out for his real destiny. You -- you trust her, that -- she can warn him and tell him, "If you go on like that, you miss, you see, your destination." Don't you believe this? How can she know this? Because she's prophetic. That's not -- deduced from his small beginnings as a boy in the village, but because she has, you see, a complete intonation what man lives for, in what direction we should go.

So please. Would you kindly -- the Bible holds that rulers, teachers--you can also say "judges," I mean; they are all included--priests, and sages, or dying men--that they are -- all belong to the prophetic bracket.

So I want you to enlarge the word "prophet" in the Old Testament. Moses is a prophet, of course, because the destiny of man is his problem, you see. The books of the Prophet are only specialized, you see, books. But the Book of Kings is just as prophetic. Kings in the Old Testament, it isn't said "ruler," but it means "kings," of course -- kings, and prophets, and teachers are all part of the -- of the prophetic kingdom, or the prophetic branch of government, you see, of man.

And so you have all the people: the young who play, the old -- or the grown- -- adults, you -- I would say, who fight; and the old. And the word "priest," gentlemen, is the Greek word for "old." A presbyter, you see; that's the full {term} of "priest," is an older man. Older; that is, he belongs to a third generation.

And what you -- you cannot understand the Bible if you do not understand that the -- five books of Moses, the book of Kings, which we are reading, and Samuel; the prophets--Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and so; and the books of wisdom are all four branches of the prophetic office. That's what nobody seems to know today. Nobody. Terrible.

But the Jews say -- the book -- if you read the five -- who has read the five books of Moses? May I ask indiscrete question? Who has? You haven't? You haven't? Well, you will see it's the last will of Moses. That is, I, in my sociology have now published a scheme, you see, of offices. And I have given to the -- exactly as I said here, four offices to the priestly age, of -- from 60 to 90, so to speak, physically speaking. The ruler, the teacher, the priest. Now comes the strangest man, you see; the man who makes his will. The greatest act of course of a man is to be able to create a successor, to be succeeded. In -- in Philosophy 59 it was, I think, I choose to call it the -- you see, to be succeeded, to appoint to a successor. But you can call it physically to make a will, to find somebody who will continue.

Marc Aurelius, for example, is a pagan emperor and is considered the best emperor. And he fell down on the job because he was a pagan, because although being a good emperor, he allowed his physical son to follow him, -- and all his -- he himself had been appointed as an adopted son. And because he hadn't the moral guts to prevent this rascal of Commodus--his son, you see, his physical son, his carnal son--to follow him, you see, he didn't make his will. And he let -- or he -- he fell down on his -- on his priestly office, you see, on his prophetic

office.

And the tragedy of Marc Aurel is that only Christians can know that he is a tragedy. The pagan spirit to this day, the humanists, praise him to the sky. "Marc Aurelius, the philosopher on the throne." And to me he's effete, and a complete weakling, because he couldn't -- his wife and his son intimidated him such a degree, you see, that he allowed--knowing that Commodus was a scoundrel, you see--to follow him. And the whole example of a whole century of emperors had been that you could only continue the Roman Empire by adoption. Because that was a selective process, you see. You could see who shouldn't be.

And there you have the difference between -- Bible and paganism. The Bible demands a prophetic spirit. And E- -- the sons of Eli cannot follow the father, you see. And that's what happened here. All in this little book of Samuel. But Moses is the man who makes his will. If you read Deuteronomy, the whole story there is--and these modern critics do not understand it at all--the whole story is how Moses was able to bequeath his vision to these obstinate Jews who -- so he had to herd them together for 40 years in the wilderness so that all the older generation could die off, because they wouldn't understand, you see. The whole story of Moses is the patience that he knew he could be successful. He wasn't allowed to see the promised land, you see. He only could make his will. If you want to have a man in modern times who had exactly the same fate, you know who that is? Cardinal Newman, you see. In his day, the successful Catholic in Britain was Cardinal Manning. He was the man responsible for the infallibility dogma. In -- in Rome in 1870, he was made--he's a convert also from the Anglican Church--and he was made cardinal very young age, and was made archbishop of Westminster in London, and he was a successful man as of the day. And nobody thinks of Cardinal Manning to this -- today. He is completely forgotten.

But in every -- university of this country, there's a Newman club. And the -- Cardinal Newman had to be 90. He was made a cardinal at 78. And he only had to live, so to speak, out these 12 years when he was already very old and broken, so that it could sink in, that this man, who had challenged both churches--the Anglican as well as the Roman Church--was a better Christian than the pope and the archbishop of Canterbury. And today everybody admits it that he has done more for the reunion of the Christian churches than anybody else. But he was out of favor with anybody in his time. He couldn't even become a little bishop. And if you look at the American bishops, you know it takes very little to

become one. And this is Cardinal Newman.

And in Cardinal Newman, you have the problem of Moses, that all his contemporaries had to die before he could come to fruition, you see, before -- before people could listen to him. All his contemporaries said, "Oh, Newman? That's just Father Newman." He was called "Father Newman" till he was 78. He had no title in the Catholic Church. -- You know, in a Catholic Church, when you are just a father, you are just nobody. And you aren't even monsignor. You are nobody. Nobody. You cannot imagine how despised he was, and how out of -- everything failed him, everything. And -- but now the only man who is interesting in the history of the Catholic Church in the 19th century, I assure you, is Cardinal Newman. And the rest is absolutely unimportant, because he left a legacy, and this is the prophetic office.

And so -- we -- for a man who makes his will, we have the word "testator," in Latin. Would you understand what I mean, to make a testament? I want to use a word that is not -- that is not dead. And so allow me to put in this word "testator." It's the hardest of all these four offices.

Now the Old Testament consists of four types of books. The first is that of the testament -- that's why it's called the Old Testament, you see, of Moses. And now perhaps you begin to wake up and see that the word "testament" is quite a good term for the Bible, you see. In -- in the five books of Moses, Moses makes this testament. Then in the next books, the -- Chronicles, in Kings, and Samuel, the people are ruled. That is, they are, through the -- through the { } there are people who -- who rule unselfishly in the light of the prophetic destiny of Israel. Then you get the books of wisdom, which are teaching--Proverbs, Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, and how all these words are -- books are called. You -- since you haven't read the Bible, it may interest you that there is a constant, a cor- -- whole Greek quarter of the Bible, you see, which is teaching, you see, wisdom teaching. But it is not Greek teaching, but it is wisdom, which isn't the same as philosophy. And the last, of course, the -- is the prophetics, where the prophets -- there are priests besides, I mean, some of the prophets of course were priests in their own right. The true priest is a prophet. And they are the prophetic books, properly called.

So I have only tried to -- to leave behind with you the simplicity of the Bible. It is the unfolding of the prophetic office into its vier -- four department of king, priest, teacher, and testator. This -- very strange. In this country, everybody endows universities and makes wills of the most complex character. And yet you have never -- it has never dawned on you that it is a specific feature of humanity,

you see. We are burdened with many meaningless wills. Think of all the family trusts, you see, where people are bound to the third generation, you see. Don't you see that this is the concentrated effort of reaching the future, you see, of -- of determining the future? And the true man, of course, determines the present from the future, and not the future from the present. And ...

[tape interruption; end]



{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

So may I have this text { } {report}? Just leave it -- leave it there { }. I

just wanted { }.

[tape interruption]

Well, wha- -- what would you say if we compare this harmless {place} in the Bible, where Ichabod is -- is named with this whole poem? What is the tremendous difference? Or what is -- may explain to you the importance the Bible has had -- through the ages? To compare the -- the text of "Ichabod," the poem, with the one sentence, where the mother of Ich- -- of Ichabod is provoked to call {him with} this name? I mean, what's the tiny, and yet very important, difference? What do we hear in the Bible about Ichabod?

(Um, well, that the glory of God has departed, and I think this -- I think represents the reality in all of history of the need for the great -- or the -- the favor of some greater power than our own selves. And that the recurrence of this, rein- -- every individual is always going to continue whether it be --.)

But what is the difference in the poem? I understand what you say, very eloquently, about the Bible -- the place in the Bible. But that a man should then write a poem on Da- -- Daniel Webster, calling him "Ichabod," with all this content -- don't you see that this is quite incongruous?

({ } the Old Testament --.)

What is the incongruity? Let's first state the incongruity between the -- look at the text, please. I -- what's the -- look at this one verse in the Bible. You cannot understand the history of the human race for the last 2,000 years, if you aren't very clear on this point. Because the whole human race, in the last 2,000 years has done nothing but write a poem on -- like "Ichabod." That's the whole content of your history, whether you read the Declaration of Independence, or whether you read the Bill of Rights, or whether you read -- the great proclamations of the popes in the 13th century, and the 12th century, and the 11th century. And since you are Americans, you decline to see any continuity. You are sick with this -- with this island-hopping of your mind. You think everything is just a fact here, and there is a fact. And if you read Nehru's history of the world, which is -- I recommend highly, you have the whole American mentality. Nehru is -- could be an American, you see. No sense, no continuity. No- -- everywhere

is spotty, I mean. Here is a fact; there is a fact; and there is a fact; and there is a fact.

Now it isn't that simple. Thanks to the Bible, you see, every chapter in human history has been spiced, and braced, and staved together with the help of "Ichabod" poems. That is, for every event, there has been an illumination -- somewhere in the Old Testament. And has gotten the title page, you see. {Cromwell}, I mean, that's the fifth monarchy, that's from Daniel -- { } of Daniel, for example. Anything you ca- -- anything you care for in the history of the human race so far -- I mean, Karl Marx is an old, ancient prophet of the Old Testament. It's very simple. Justice must be done, you see. Justice is more important than mercy. You see, that's -- goes against the charity ladies of this country. You cannot understand the pathos of Bolshevism, if you do not understand the fight of the Old Testament for justice is first, and mercy comes later, and you cannot run the -- the world -- on -- you see, without the 10 Commandments. But all Americans try very hard to say that the New Testament is enough, and the Old Testament isn't needed. In comes Marx, and reminds you of the completeness of the old st- -- the whole story that without justice to the worker, charity balls and charity performances are just horrid, as they are at this moment in this country.

So "Ichabod," after all -- how many stanzas? Will you tell me, how many stanzas?

(Nine. Nine.)

You see. Now I want to draw your attention to the fact that we learn from the story of the Bible with us what development really is. It's just one little crystal in this text, "Ichabod." "The spirit has departed from -- from Israel," you see. And nothing about the pre-history of this man. But here is a great man, Daniel Webster, you see. He has a wonderful story of genius, and -- and charity, by the way, and great tenderness, and great firmness, and has upheld the Union for 20 years, from 1830 from his great speech against nullification, you see, "Union and liberty forever," and now he's -- he's fallen. And the spirit has departed from Israel.

Now what has happened, gentlemen ? The whole story of the spirit is first in him and now it departs. So "Ichabod," in the case of the poem, you see, compared to the Bible, covers a generation -- two generations of life, you see. The -- the -- the final moment is only so terrible, because what was in the -- Eli, the father of Ichabod, was in this man Webster, you see, so that he comprises more

than one generation. You may call this a trick, but it is much profounder. You and I, my dear people, we represent the whole human race in many generations. You all can live the nine lives of a cat not only, but your mother's and your father's life, and your grandparents' life, and your own life, and your children's life, if you're led to.

And this is the incredible story of this poem "Ichabod": that practically, first the grace is shown you -- how { }, you see, and then the departure. He couldn't show it, of course, otherwise. But in the Bible story, obviously, first Eli is the anointed of the -- of the God, you see. He is a prophet. He -- had sanctuary functions. It's only the -- Ichabod, the -- where the mother says, "Now it's all over." But with Webster, it's one and the same man. That's incredible. Ichabod never had the grace of God, had he?

It is, of course, too simple a matter for you to consider. You are all so in travel, and dealing only with mileage, so to speak, and quantity, that such a small consideration that anything is here can topsy-turvy in this poem, the quotation. That doesn't even occur to you as important. It's too small a matter. You owe -- you -- you -- you cannot think. You cannot read a text. You have been absolutely ruined of -- by a course of your probl- -- idea of animal evolution. You see, in history, man himself--Mr. Webster--goes through all the stages of the Old Testament story. One and the same man is the evolution story. In -- as the animal kingdom, one is an ape, and the other is a gorilla, and the third is man, and the first is a -- is a reptile, and so on, you see. And it's all separate. And still in the Old Testament, a whole man has to curse -- wear the curse of Ichabod. This whole, poor -- boy, after all, he's innocent, isn't he? He's just born to Eli, and he calls -- the spirit has departed. And the whole man's life is signified. And the whole Old Testament, you see, is--compared to our era--still in this sense pre-human, or Old Testament -- "antiquity" as we call it, you see, the ancient world, before the revelation, before redemption, because every man is only one type, one thing. He's pharaoh, you see. Or he's Moses, you see. But already in Moses, by the way, I mean, the Jews always had this inkling that redeemed man lived through many phases and chapters, and that he is humanity, you see, that the man is not an atom, as you think of man. But that evolution passes through your own life. And here it is shown how the whole story of the Jewish sanctuary at Shiloh is -- has lived -- been lived through -- through Webster, and now has come to an ignominious end. It has -- a negative outcome, so to speak.

But this is -- has always struck me, the incredible -- Whittier, of course being a Quaker and being a poet, he lived through this whole Old Testament incessantly, you see. And the less he could use it in the liturgy--the Quakers, after all, have no readings, they have no texts, they have no sermonizing, you see--the -- the more it entered his spirit.

Now this is what we call really "evolution," gentlemen, in a -- in a -- in a s-- -- in the true sense of human experience. In our era, man evolves through these stages first of the Old and then of the New Testament. He's either condemned -- we call this the Judg- -- "Last Judgment," we call this the -- "hell" and "devil." You laugh at all these things, you think we are through with them. It isn't true.

Before a man comes to an end, he is judged. He stands judged.

A very wise minister, Mr. Frederick Robertson, a very great Englishman who died in 1851--if you ever come to his biography, I recommend you this book very great- -- very much--Robert- -- Frederick Robertson was a leading minister in England. It was said of him that he was a prophet, a poet, a -- a king, and a -- a saint. And that's all we can hope for, I mean, that he was a complete man, so to speak. And he died very young, I think at 38 -- 38 or 40. Forgotten what. And -- he said at a -- in a funeral oration once that, after all, if we were so lucky in our era that if we had loved each other and lived in an affectionate community, the judgment over a man at -- on his -- at his death and funeral were -- usually the right one, that people had come to understand each other in our common life to such extent that what was said, you see, honestly, at the moment of a man dying, was usually -- quite a right assessment. The good, and the evil, and the significance of the community, that we could hope for, so to speak, that sins were not buried, that they were not -- man wasn't forgotten, and wasn't misinterpreted. But if a man had -- at least in normal times, the -- finally it was all said -- all revealed. After all the revilement, and all the defiance, and all the battles, you see, people would come to peace- -- peaceful terms with each other. And the eulogy, or the feeling of the community--more than this formal eulogy at the grave, of course--was in fact able to cope with a man's role.

Now that isn't true in days of outlaws, and in days of -- of -- you see, constant enmity. It's not -- true of the Old Testament story at all. I mean, men are -- you see, enemies to each other to the bitter end. And you just have to think of vendetta and vengeance -- everywhere, and these people never forgive each other and see each other in the true light.

So to evolve seems to me -- evolution is the -- the story of "Ichabod" in the historical sense.

And what I can do in this seminar with you poor -- poor, demented people is only to wake you up to the fact that the scientific era is over. That is, an attempt to treat man as a piece of nature. That if you do this, you destroy a piece of your community. You are not parts of nature, because we are able to tie together ends and beginnings. And we can survive death. No animal can do this. We are regenerated. And Webster gets this poem in the hope that he too, even, this is -- his poem may still repent, you see, and be regenerated. Even beyond "Ichabod" there is still hope for Daniel Webster. You must understand that otherwise the writing of the poem made no sense. And that's a great story.

Ichabod is one, just this type, you see. And Eli is another. But the poem is written because of Webster being Eli at once, you see, and Ichabod now, and -- let's hope that God will forgive him. That's mean- -- the meaning of God's forgiveness, you see, which is unheard-of in antiquity, you see. That a man can be restored to his former honor, and -- and -- you see, just because he acknowledges that one phase of his life is without the divine grace. Can you see this? The -- the continuity of history is here carried into the individual life, and to -- I think most people in this country do live the li- -- nine lives of a cat. But they don't -- they only live it as a cat. You should live the nine lives of a human soul. That is, knowing these phases of each other, facing, you see, these phases, these chapters.

The whole problem of yours today in Los Angeles is: everybody here has nine lives. They came to this country, I mean, to Los Angeles once, either your parents or you yourself, you see. And you will not stay here for -- all life. We all lead today many existences. The real problem today is the -- despite this, which is now already the conquest of the Christian era--that we are allowed to live more than one life, you see, that we aren't stamped out a slave forever, a black man forever, a white man forever, a nobleman forever, you see, a peasant forever -- you understand--that we all evolve through these various stages. Your problem and mine is to live these lives as a human being facing these various phases. Having no alibi, and no aliases just, and not running away from our past, and not running away from our future.

And so you must see if we read this poem -- have this great poem "Ichabod," you enter history only if you keep the Old and the New Testament. Ichabod -- the -- the model case, one wo- -- man has to carry -- has to be the scapegoat, so to speak, you see. "He" -- "The light has departed from Israel." That's a whole generation. But -- to -- as our sins are forgiven, don't think this is a metaphor. Or don't think that's something for the Sunday church. The minis-

ters don't understand this for a long time already. They have -- they have all apostasized. Rabbis and -- and ministers do not know anything, but the poets still know it. And you -- still can know it. If you read this poem "Ichabod," you are in the New Testament, because it's the application of this Old Testament in which still every man was just one -- one -- one item, or one definition, or one -- had one meaning, so to speak, you see.

Not one of us has only one meaning. You all can hope for that you go on from one station to the other. From one light to the next, from one rebirth to the next. And you all take it for granted, gentlemen. Only I have to -- wake you up to the fact that in Los Angeles, which is perhaps the summary of all western civilization, you see, the -- the -- in a strange manner, this -- this Southern California is the extreme of everything the human race has -- has dreamt of for thousand years. You are in great danger to take this splitting up in evolutionary phases in your life so much for granted that you break up, that we -- we -- you s- -- you are like a -- the fission of the atom. That is, you live so many lives, that they lose unity, they lose continuity. You see, you just -- it is so easy for you to -- to start all over again.

I had this story, who -- we dismissed a man, a tutor in -- in our college, because he was a homosexual, and he threatened the boys. And so he went to another university, and they didn't know anything of his background. Of course, we shielded him, and tried to give him a new start. And what happened? He was made the -- the -- s- -- patron of one of the dormitories.

Now, you see -- in -- now, in antiquity, or in any -- in any Old Testament vengeance situation, absolute situation, or, you see, pre-Christian, this man would have been cast, you see, in -- in iron chains and either would have been burned at stake, as you know--perverts were not dealt very graciously with, you see. We do the {other} with the, you see. We make him the gardener, you see, the goat into the gardener, which is not a good idea, either. Because we -- we give him a chance to start all over again, you see. And everything is, so to speak, has never happened. And that's the exactly opposite exaggeration. So we are over-Christian today. Let me tell you this.

We have lost the power of the antithesis between the Old Testament and the New Testament. And so you all pride yourself -- you -- that's why you are, for example, all pacifists, you see. And all -- you allow any number of divorces, as in this {Duncan} case. That's the end of civilization -- you see. She is a prostitute who uses marriage as a -- as a shield for her prostitution. That's very serious. You see, if you -- if marriage can be abused by even by one -- you see, for such pur-

poses, something is very wrong with the way we enter upon marriage, you see. Because it -- shows that it is entered upon absolutely without any consideration of any -- any consequence. So I think -- that's -- the son can be with a lawyer, and that this law school student whom she married, you see, can be a lawyer, that's just all incredible. I mean, it's the end of the world, gentlemen. You can be sure that such a world cannot survive. It's -- has no longer persons who live -- but just little fragments of people.

So the old world of antiquity, gentlemen, has made everyone serve one -- in one capacity, and therefore has denied man's right to be reborn. There is no -- no ad- -- remission of sins in antiquity. Be- -- what we call "revelation" is the drawing away of the veil so that man can survive his own previous form. Be- cause any form -- you see, any state of will and mind, if you have any mentality -- in antiquity is final. And so man is under a veil, because that's -- what we call "the mind," you see, "My own mind."

You remember in class, I tried to tell you that mentality was fickle and that we had as many minds as we had chapters in our lives, I mean. I'm of a different mind, you see, very often. My mind changes, and it's given me for change. The mind is not -- the root of my -- of my ex- -- soul, and my existence, and my identity. You cannot identify yourself with your mind, because you have a childish mind, you have an adolescent mind, and you have a mature mind, you see. And therefore, the mind is not the point of identification.

So this poem, "Ichabod," you see, is suddenly posing the question, "Is not every one of you the whole story?"

And this has to do with the -- with the -- well, I give you a simile. The -- in the -- in the medieval churches, which tried to rec- -- recapitulate the anc- -- Old Testament, of course, you have the architecture laid out in such a way that it begins with the precinct leading up to the portals of the cathedral, and it's called the paradise. And then you enter the door, then that's the time of Noah, the c- -- covenant with God. And then you go forward, and comes the Old Testament and the Jews; and then comes the -- all the stages, you see: kings and prophets, the six eras of the world are laid out; till the apses, you have the Last Judgment.

So in a -- the people in the Middle -- Ages were quite aware that what they should inculcate in a man was the road from Paradise to Last Judgment. That's why at the so-called -- there is a portal in every cathedral called the port -- the gates of Adam and Eve. Because after Paradise, you see, fallen man enters here the Church and therefore needs the Church. In Paradise -- the animal

kingdom, he doesn't need any revelation or any speech, you see, or any word. Animals live unconsciously and unhistorically.

So the -- the -- the -- I only wanted to show you this problem of evolution has harassed the mind of people for the last thousand -- 2,000 years. And therefore, the Gothic cathedrals were built to represent our march through the six ages of the whole world's history, you see: three ages pre-Christian, and three ages post-Christian, to the Judgment Day.

This all strikes you to- -- today just as symbolism, as you dare to call it. Wherever you read the word "symbolism," kill the author, because it de- -- deprives you of the seriousness of the business, you see. This is not symbolism. This is impregnation with the -- with the power to live through ma- -- many ages. That's -- I -- I think the word "symbolism" is one of the most obnoxious terms at this moment, because the literati in the English department speak about it, and devalue it thereby.

This is not symbolism. That's experience. That's empirical. Now today, it's the individual. Mr. Webster--and you, too--you live through all these stages to -- which man has lived. And we recapitulate in our own life these various stages, especially the fall of man. And -- and obviously today, you see, the whole struggle between the -- the organized churches and the academic campus is that on campus everybody pretends in his lectures and in your examinations that you are -- God doesn't exist, that you can deal without him. He is never mentioned--it's just bad taste to mention Him in college. And it's very -- would be very bad taste not to mention God in Church, you will admit, you see. There you have to over-mention Him; and here you have to under-mention Him. There you have again this breakup of the various stages of your mind into absolute, separated entities. You see, on Sunday, God is -- praised from 10 -- 11 to 12, 10,000 times, and in the college, He isn't mentioned once. At least not in a way that you believe in Him; only in the way that other poor, benighted souls have believed in Him. I mean, historically, God may be mentioned. But that He's present in this room, gentlemen -- and ladies, you know it very well, but it mustn't be mentioned. But He's here, I assure you. And the devil is here, too, waiting for his opportunity.

As -- as long as you break yourself into these animal creatures, who are, from 10 to 11 philosophers, and from 11 to 12 theologians, you see, and from -- and from 2 to 3 at night, animals, and so on, you are the unhappiest of creatures. You are not in history, but you are broken into fragments of a zoological garden.



And that's how I see most people try to live. They -- they try to live in these -- in these absolute water-tight compartments without awareness that these phases are one wonderful life, the whole of creation.

So you -- you -- the only way in which you can teach children history is by pointing out such poems, you see, of "Ichabod," who have this double punctuation of -- the -- the -- the name is still taken from the great single case in the Old Testament, but it's already reconciled with the whole of life, you see, with a longer, continuous existence, you see. But since {I admit it,} Mr. Webster is a reborn soul, and he can be forgiven, you see. And Webster -- Whittier said on his deathbed, by the way--he was of course {wrung} by Webster's friends very often about this poem--that -- at the end, he -- he admitted that much, that perhaps Mr. Webster had lived down this poem, you see, that perhaps God in His mercy would not consider the poem as the last word about Mr. Daniel Webster.

Now this may not even strike you as -- as something unnatural, because you take it for granted that we go on from mood to mood. This isn't quite true, gentlemen. Remember, if a man dies unrepenting, like Mrs. {Duncan} probably will, she just goes to hell. You only must think that hell is a state not at -- somewhere -- else outside this world, but in -- in this community. She will be a blot on this community for a hundred years to come. And that's -- we call "hell." And you cannot redeem her. She is just there. And she's on you, this -- this -- city, this civilization, this age is identified with her. You haven't shaken her, you see. Of course, we have to do the minimum in showing our abhorrence, and our -- extinguish her. But since he doesn't repent and since she doesn't admit it -- the only contribution such a criminal can make is admission, you see, and saying, "Yes, I have sinned." Then it's all over, I mean. Then you can -- you can go on. Now the second story is of course, "The Battle Hymn of the Republic," and you have a similar problem, you see. Is history just -- has a -- has Jesus just died in Nazareth in -- in 33, you see, of our era? Has He? That wouldn't be very interesting. So in peacetime, people believe this, however. They write biblical criticism; they write novels about Paul or about Jesus, what a nice boy He was, and how obedient to His parents, and nobody understands how such an obedient boy could ever become a rebel, and could ever protest, and so on. But He did. Well, people who write these -- these -- these sugar-coated articles for Easter in the paper, which I now have to read in these horrid Los Angeles papers--the -- they don't care.

The only way in which you can express your belief in this new era, where man passes through all the stages from -- from Paradise, over fall, to redemption,

to rebirth, and to the Last Judgment, is of course when you still expect yourself judgment. And this is "The Battle Hymn of the Republic" written about, you see: "I have seen" -- "I have seen the coming of the Lord." That is, when you suddenly see that history is half the future and half the past, that you are in the middle of future -- exactly in the middle between the future and the past, you see. That what we -- call the present exists only--now may I put down this law, which I haven't formulated, but Goethe has formulated--man has exactly as much past as he has future, and he has exactly as much future as he has past. Modern man has no future, because he -- is impertinent enough to try to have a past of 700 million years. That's not given to the human race. You see, all this talk about geological man frustrates you, because there has to be equilibrium. Man has only that much past he has future, and he has only that much future as he has past, if he is a living creature.

And today, modern man has no future. I can assure you that. It ends just here at the beach. And you are already -- that's why you have the Orta- -- Oriental Exclusion Act, because you are so afraid of anything that looms from the other side of the water. Here is -- Manifest Destiny has come to an end at the Pacific Ocean. American history as American history ends. That's all over. You have no future.

And that's why Adlai Stevenson came out and said, "We are just fearful people. We haven't -- we are timid. We -- we don't think that the future is with us anymore. It is with somebody else. It has left us." Well, gentlemen, all the modern science is -- is trying to make you -- throw you -- off balance by telling you that -- that 700 million years -- light years, you see, are what matters. Well, then you don't matter. But if you have just a past of 6,000 years, then it doesn't matter very much if you would kindly help to add another thousand years to the story. Then you -- that's still worth a real effort. And what you -- we -- what this history seminar or any history teaching at this moment must try to do is to encourage you to give the next thousand years a chance, and not just your -- you see, your own pleasure, and your own retirement age, and -- and your own ins- -- old insurance. And you cannot even insure your old pension, you see, if we have inflation. And inflation means "no belief in the future." That's all what inflation means. Inflation means, "After us, the deluge." That's what the French nobility said in the French Revolution, you see -- before the French Revolution. "Oh, après nous, le déluge." Yes, you know. After us, the deluge. And that's what every American today says. And that's why the country can have no future. They say, "Oh, if I only make money today at the stock exchange, let's have inflation." All the manufacturers think that way; all the workers think that

way; Mr. Reu- -- Reuther and how all these lobbyists are -- are -- call themselves. Because people are not afraid of the Last Judgment anymore. They don't think there is a Judgment Day. They don't think that their sins have to be admitted. They never consider { } -- possibly Ichabod, "The spirit has departed from Israel," my dear, you see. All these politicians, if you call for -- tell them that Mr. Webster winced under the poem, they just laugh. If you wrote today a poem, "Ichabod," would they -- would they take it seriously? Would they apply it to themselves?

This is the dis- -- the distance we have traveled from 1850 to today -- to today. You cannot reach any of these men today in their conscience. What is conscience, gentlemen? The violence between future and past. It's nothing moral. Conscience means to be conscious of where we stand. And we stand always between the heir -- being heirs and being founders. Every human being has as much future as he -- thinks himself a founder; and every man has as much past if he thinks himself being an heir.

Now you don't think yourselves founders. You marry because your sex urge demands it. Not because you want to have children, or found a new republic, or -- settle a new island. So you are not founders. You are just heirs. And of course, you know it very well, I mean. A mere heir is a degenerate, a rich heiress. The most -- worst is Barbara Hutton, or who -- Gloria Vanderbilt, or so. Poor people, I mean, just heiresses. They get bandied around, because they have a fortune and they have a name, and they can never make a real life, because they -- the future and the past are not in balance.

And this is the Old Testament, and that's the New Testament in all of us. And the condition of a new phase in your life is that you acknowledge your inheritance, your heritage, you see. This is the strange balance. That's why every new phase has to be entered upon deliberately, so to speak, gratefully, ruefully, tremblingly--under this "fear and trembling," as Kierkegaard has said, you see--because you always know that you are losing something, that you're shutting one door { }, and it can only be done in the -- under the dire need of necessity, that we live on.

Old Calvin Coolidge, you see, a Vermonter, used to say when he -- asked if he should veto a bill, he only asked one question: "Is it necessary?" And any superfluous bill was vetoed. And that I recommend to you in your own life, you see. Ask yourself about the serious decisions in life: "Is it necessary?" It's the only guide you have. Not "Is it right?" or "Is it good?" Just "Is it necessary?" Because sometimes it is necessary to break the law, obviously. And sometimes it's neces-

sary to -- to -- observe the law. This is our -- your incredible freedom. If you found a new society, you will always have to break the laws of the old society. But if you don't found anything, and just have -- are pleasure-seeking, you fall under the law, and there's no excuse.

So the same act can be -- can be your freedom, and the same act can be your curse. Not two cases of eloping, or marrying, or en- -- getting engaged, or {choosing} { } are of the same character. It is just two spirits can, you see -- can -- the meaning can be absolutely different. One can be Ichabod, you see, and one can be the coming of the Lord.

Now without the reading of the text of the Old and the New Testament, I do therefore think that people are completely given over to their blind passions--in every generation, to the fashion. And so you get, since 1850, a rage of the spirit of the times. That is, we think that the times themselves contain men. And I've been to the library this morning to read up on -- on some American writers. And there is a -- a magazine called the American Literature. And the whole attempt -- you know this, probably, American Literature, you know? It's a very good magazine, it is, in its own ri- -- way. You know it? Who knows American Literature? Whew! How can you escape? All -- all these textbooks condemn you to eternal death. Ja. You've never seen it? { }.

That's where your professors -- your professors get all their knowledge.

Yes. Look at it. You will always get an A in their English courses if you read this magazine.

Well, we have here -- I'll -- just to give you an example what happens if you are not -- if you are not addressed as "Ichabod" or as "The Battle Hymn" -- with "The Battle Hymn of the Republic," I mean, of the battlefield of life, that there is a great moment at this moment -- either from the future or from the spirit that is departed. I mean, the two poems are so great, because one is on death, and end, you see, and the other is on the beginning, on a -- on a new foundation. I think that's so -- it so happens that these -- we came upon these two, but I think they are extremely opposite, and extremely -- significant, because "The Battle Hymn of the Republic" and the -- "Ichabod" tell -- tell you that every human being -- when I open my mouth or you open your mouth to a serious statement, we call into life, and we condemn to death.

You see, any gossiping monster, or any judge, or any student--you don't know this--that we -- that life and death are on the human tongue. That's why

the Gospel of St. John begins: "In the beginning was the Word," you see. You -- we cannot speak without saying of a part of life that it has died and departed, and of other elements that we still { } the future, because we must speak in tenses. We cannot speak as "I was," "I am," "I shall be."

So if you say, "Germany was a great country," and you say it has died, you see. If you say "Germany is a great -- country," you give it a lease on life. You say, "Europe was a great civilization," then it's all over. If you say, "Germany -- Europe has still a future," then you give it a lease of life, and you invite everybody who subscribes to this sentence to do something about it. Most people have no idea that by speaking, we commit constantly either childbirth, you see, or murder. And -- or execution. Some things deserve to be executed. We bury them. But -- men- -- mark this well: to speak means to call into life, as the wonderful saying is: we call into life, you see; that's done by speech. And the word "to call into life," just -- it should bring it to your attention that we speak us into being, or we bespeak us out of being. If you say, "This man," you see, "is a down-and-out," or "He's done in," you see, as you treat all the old people today after 65 -- "Oh, put him into a convalescent home; put him in an old-age pension, you see, and so on, it's over with," you no longer expect anything from them. To speak means to decide over life and death. And if you only knew this, you would know that the way you speak is -- is powerless, because you don't know that you are involved in the creative process of mankind by which we constantly re-arrange those things that have a future, those parts of life, you see, which we want you to carry into the future, and those parts which we put on the cemetery. To speak means to decide over life and death.

Now you no longer can understand the architecture of a cathedral as really meaningful. You no longer believe that man goes from Paradise to the Last Judgment. These forms in which the -- it is -- was expressed in -- in the Middle Ages is probably gone for you. I -- at least -- not for me, I mean. But I see you, and I think -- you will look at these buildings and say, "That's just" -- "That's just pictures." And you will not enter the cathedral with the feeling that you march through time. I -- at least I haven't found any American who is capable of this experience. All right. We have to drop it. But it's obvious that you and I must make an effort to give ourselves and future generations some corresponding evolutionary experience, you see, that vitalizes you, not in the form of the whole history of the human race, but your own march perhaps through your own ages of life.

And therefore, gentlemen, the curse you have to fight is that you are immersed into any one age, any one generation, any one spirit of your time, which is the great devil that today goes around and tries to devour you. You are told that you are the angry generation, or you are the postwar generation. Don't believe it for a minute. It's all nonsense. Your whole problem is to live through a number of generations, and to do your part to reconnect all generations in your own life, and in the life of the country, and in the life of the human race.

And here -- I give you an example what -- . Here, we have a great man in this country Mr. Lee Masters. You know probably who he is, the man who published the Spoon River Anthology. Have you ever read him?

(Yes, I have.)

Well, I think he's a very great man, and an important man, because he signifies a -- a note in American literature without which we wouldn't -- so to speak, this would not be any longer a part of the human race. It would just be America. I mean, Mas- -- Lee Masters in his pessimism represents the connecting link with the rest of the human race, because he's critical of -- of the -- American situation -- as of this moment. He's a wise guy, and as you know, he was completely destitute 10 years ago; he lived in a poor house and -- when he -- then people came to his rescue, and -- but he lived actually in the poor house. And that's how you treat your geniuses in this country. But you have always done this, I mean. Nothing has changed.

But -- if you do not speak of "Ichabod," and if you do not speak -- in terms of "The Battle Hymn of the Republic," this is what happens. That's why it seems to me so very important. I hope I can -- it is in this volume.

Ah yes, I know where it is. Now listen. Would you -- it probably wouldn't occur to you that it is a -- the fall of man here, of modern man in this article. A -- quite -- intelligent man who has written the article. I -- let me read it to you.

So -- Masters has, you see -- is simply a part of America. Have read Spoon River Anthology? Have you heard of it? It's a very good book. It's very important. Have you read it? Well, yes. He's a forgotten man. You do not expect -- poetry is eternal. If poetry -- Shakespeare has no meaning, if you don't -- isn't -- if he isn't even played at all, today. What is Shakespeare's meaning if he was -- just was acted under Ja- -- James I? And you accept it. In this one case of Shakespeare, you do not wonder how it is possible, you see, to -- to acknowledge him. I hope in the field of Donne, you are of the same opinion. He speaks to you, doesn't he?

Now how- -- Mr. Masters, however--although I think he deserves the same immor- -- kind of -- of timelessness--any great poetry is in this sense penetrating into any spirit of the time as a warning that there is more to life than this spirit of this one time. That's what Shakespeare means, isn't it? This -- the idea of poetry, that it reaches a -- a -- a penetration, you see, which goes under the skin of the uniform which you wear in 1959. Could you -- possibly think of time in terms of earth, in times of space -- terms of space, and say that man root -- is rooted in time? And that, just as a tree has to outgrow, by his putting down deeper roots--the surface of his soil, and go beneath it, and above it--in the same sense, any man is born in -- in the -- on the topsoil of his own time. But he has put to -- down his roots underneath this, and grow beyond it. Man is a creature in time. We have our roots, you see, in Heaven. These are our roots. The brain is our roots, not our crown, you see. It's our darkest part. It's our part which has inherited all the categories of the past. Here, in your mind, that's the most conservative part of your being. Your heart is much more exposed to novelty, and your touch, and your senses. The -- the mind is a conservative man.

As you know, the cells of the brain -- are the only part of man -- man's body that are not renewed. They are ir- -- unregenerators, you see. That's why without repentance, the human mind can never have a new idea, because the heart has to throw up such a violent denial of your prejudices, you see, that the -- a new chapter in your brain is opened, you see. You can only eliminate false ideas in your brain by closing the book, by moving into another part of your brain, because you cannot renew any memory in your mind. That's phy- -- I mean, that's -- the physiologists can tell you this, that the brain cells are that part of the human body that are not regenerated every seven years. Every seven years, you have a new body, you see, except for your mind, except for the brain. That's continuous. And that's why the renewal of the brain is something that cannot be brought about by the brain itself. It can only be brought about by great, strong passions of faith, and fear, and love, and affection -- that is, when the whole world -- body is worked up, when you are beside yourselves, then you can throw up blood into this brain and eliminate whole chapters of your mental life, you see, by saying, "That's Old Testament; that's bygone," you see.

This is how we renew ourselves. That's why rebirth is a physiological process. It is the victory of the rest of your body over the mind.

Here, now listen to this. I think it's -- I have never seen anything so cruel:

"It was somewhat of a shock to this reviewer to realize that

Mr. Masters, who has written his autobiography, is now 67 years of age, that he's contemporary with William Vaughn Moody, Clyde Fitch, and Booth Tarkington, and that 22 years ago have passed since the sensational Spoon River Anthology in 1915. The appearance of that book so definitely marked the success of the prewar modernists"--poor poet, "the success of the prewar modernists"; that's not a place for Shakespeare -- the -- the victory of Sidney and -- and -- and Marlowe, you condemn him to death--"the appearance of the book so definitely marked the success of the prewar modernists that it is still hard to think of its author as anything but a young radical.

"Yet even at that time, Mr. Masters was not young. Soon Riv- -- Spoon River was the culmination of many years of struggle to find expression for a thwarted and stumbling experience. And its attainment was never repeated. An era of literary history brought to a close by the Life Records in a Storyteller's Story, A Book about Myself, and Across Spoon River," all books by Mr. Masters. "Even though there may be still further to go in Following down Time and The River, the special kind of frustration of the generation which reached its maturity before the '20s and which reveals the sources of Mark Twain's dismay in The Mysterious Stranger has found its voices, we can never return to the faith of Emerson in nature identified with an all-good, because science has its clutches on the psyche, both social and individual.

"But the work of Masters, however vital, was destructive if utilitarian. It marks the recognition of the challenge of science, not the solution of the problems presented.

"The naturalism of Master i- -- Masters is not the naturalism of younger writers. This much we can tell, even though the scene is too close for us to have much perspective or judgment on the issues inse- -- itself. { }."

Now here is a man buried alive, because there is no -- nothing beyond the spirit of his own days. He is just catalogued. All this literary criticism in America is an infamous zoological garden, an attempt to bury people alive. You have to turn against this, gentlemen. Is your soul immersed in the year 1959? Are you obsolete because your first utterance took place in 1954, and now it's all over with? Has a man who wrote in 1954 -- need not the right to be as fresh as the morning dew in 1974? What's all this talk about belonging to a certain generation? You should despise this. That's how we begin. That's our prehistoric existence, you see. You all are born in a certain moment. And it's your damned duty to put down your roots so far that you cover the thousands of years since Adam. And Jesus is the first -- the second Adam, because He did just this. He was David's son. He was a prophet. He was a teacher. He was a Jew. He was a human



being. And He -- He -- was just as much a Gentile as He was a Jew, of course, and therefore He can -- speak of Himself as a second Adam. Because 6,000 years of history, or 5,000 years are all comprised in Him. That's your duty, too. You are the man of all ages. You are not the man of your own age.

And this is putting down roots. In -- the future, you are the beginners of an endless future of future generations, or you are a harlot, or you are a murderer, or you are somebody who obstaculates the -- the road -- to progress.

It is -- we begin, as I say, once more, you see, in time, as a plant -- begins in space. But that's not the story of the plant, and that's not my and your story. But if we have a seminar in history, and a history department in this beautiful university, gentlemen, then you are in this history department to learn how people put down roots; that is, how we absorb other chapters of history. And we cannot read a his- -- anything on history without posing the -- yourself the question: how much future, how much past, balanced between the two. How much do I get deeper into the various spirits of the time so that I can pierce the crust, the hard crust of my own time and cease to -- to belong of my time, and -- I wish everybody of you goes to Heaven as -- as Lincoln went when Mr. Edward Stanton, his secretary of war, said -- what did he say?

("Now he belongs to the ages.")

Ja. That's the meaning of it. Very simple.

Who cares when Lincoln lived? And you see, what we call "legend" is only the -- when a man has become so powerful that it doesn't matter anymore that he would die in 1865. Everybody of -- every one of you -- has to become legendary. To -- to become a legend means to rise finally above the encrustation by your own time. And that's what everybody has to hope for. Formerly call -- people called this, "He goes to Heaven." Gentlemen and ladies, you will have to find a -- a parallel expression, because whatever you -- wherever you turn to, you cannot be blessed if you are only a product of your own time, because you haven't then -- not -- spoken. And to speak means to make room for the past and the future, and to decide what -- what shall belong to the past and what shall go into the future.

And you cannot help -- whether you -- you open your mouth and you make this decision. If you say, "It is," and if you say, "It was," and if you say, "It will be," you create the universe. That's why we know that God created the world, because we are part of it. We -- we create it, so what's -- wondrous about

it that He created it? And still creating it, through us. It is so absolu- -- everybody knows it -- because everybody speaks. But when they sit down in these classrooms, and examine you, they turn against everything they do themselves. So -- pardon me. This is the story of Ihabod" and "The Battle Hymn of the Republic." And you can see that our history at this moment is in terrible danger, because it has no power to invoke against the -- these acts, these superstitions of the moment that man is a part of his own time. What is his own time? Of this fleeting moment, you see, like this poor Master, who stands condemned in the terms of Mr. {Muir}, you see, that he's 67 years old, and has to belong to a certain generation. Then he says, "{But I} -- in 1915, he was already"--this was written -- '37--40, so my -- it doesn't hold water at all, because my generation were then -- in 1915 used to be 25. And now here he was 40 when he came out with his Spoon River Anthology, you see. Now he's 67. Procrustean bed. { } generation, just the same.

And take, you see -- the infamous tone is, you see: "The work of Masters was" -- I tell you, that's condemning the man, you see, to death. "It was." If Shakespeare was -- St. Augustine and Shakespeare have a much brighter future than you and I. I can assure you that. They are still coming. I still see in -- the coming of the Lord in their works, but not in yours, and not in mine. We're just hang -- hangers-on, and dragged along with their genius.

Every -- what -- whom do we mention in history? Those who still have a future. Not -- nobody else has to be mentioned. But we have to sift this wheat from the chaff all the time to save all these people who have a future, more than you and I.

So I think this -- this whole -- this review is a -- is a very good ex- -- let me read it to you once more:

"It was somewhat of a shock to this reviewer"--then he shouldn't write a review of -- if he has no relation to Mr. Masters, you see, as a -- except as a museum -- curator of a museum of -- of -- of -- of fossils. "It was somewhat of a shock to this reviewer to realize that Mr. Masters is now 67 years of age." I'm -- that's -- that's the fashion today. I mean, I take this just as a typical review--"As I -- he was a contemporary with William Vaughan Moody, Clyde Fitch, Booth Tarkington, and that 22 years ago have passed since the sensational Spoon River Anthology in 1915. The periods of the book who -- so definitely marked the success of the prewar modernists"--you have even difficulty of getting oriented, you see--"it marked so definitely the success of the prewar modernists, that it is

still hard to think of its author as anything but a young radical."

Do you understand? You see, he -- he tries immediately to draw your attention just to -- here.

"That even at that time Mr. Masters was not young."

What of it?

"Spoon River was a culmination of many years of struggle to find expression. And its attainment was never repeated."

That's why it was a great book. Even in the dirty soil of this moment, 1959, you can { } can you not? And that -- then you can decry the -- the handicap of being born in a -- in a barren time, you see. That's -- would be your spec- -- spec- -- special greatness, you see.

"An era of literary history is brought to a close by the life record."

And that's all just for the museum. "An era of literary history." Is Shakespeare brought to a close, because Ben Jonson lived -- longer than Shakespeare by an accident? As a matter of fact, Ben Jonson survived him by 25 years. But who mentions Ben Jonson?

But according to this, Ben Jonson, since he comes later, obviously he must be closer to us. And you live all under this -- under this -- the auspices of this superstition, you see.

Put it down that man is a creature of time, and you begin to be shaken up by the truth, that the -- the moment is the smallest item, just as you put a seed in -- in -- as a matter of fact, you see, on top, only half-an-inch deep in your garden soil. But you expect this soil to put down roots. And you see, what is the consequence of your -- of this today? That most of you are at best grass, and not one of you is -- becomes the tree. That oak and linden should simply -- signify first men like {Philemon}, and {Bacchus} in the old mythology, that's un-understandable today. You are all too pleased if you are of one year, "Class of '58" or "Class of '62" you call it. And so you are reduced to a -- to a -- annual. But man is perennial. And the decision has to be made by you: are you perennials, or are you annuals? But you try to be 70 times annuals, that if you live every year -- a separate life, and it doesn't dawn on you that to live means to penetrate this crust of one year,

and become perennial. And these similes are not similes. We are organic substance. And -- in a machine age, you see, of steel and iron, all you and I can do is to reconsider our own existence as the remnant of the organic world, you see. We are -- have to represent the topsoil when the machinery keeps drilling 2,000 feet deep into the su- -- subsoil. And this is your and my honor that we live organically, that we live in the way in which organic life lives, you see, through many passages, and many forms of existence without ever losing our -- losing our identity. This you can only do -- you can only live the nine lives of a cat if you have access to the nine ages of human history.

And that's why I thought that--uncommon as it is--that even you people graduating in American history or majoring therein, should know something of antiquity. That's not wanton, because it is the -- antiquity is the mosaic, you see, out of which every one of us has to compose the phases of his life. We are cursed and blessed in alternation. At once we are Ruth, and at the other moment we are Hannah, and once we are Alexander the Great, and the next moment we are Jeremiah. And we have access to all these types, you see, of kings, and prophets, and -- and martyrs of antiquity in alternation. And we read it like an open book. And that's the whole meaning of the Bible.

Now where you -- what did I say -- what -- what Thucydides { }. Now here we come to a Greek who has gotten the Gentile mind out of mythology, just as the Jews. And he has created another aspect of history.

All people, you and I -- if we -- if you have to tell the story of this seminar, here, you see--that's why I wanted you to write a report--to make you aware how all history at first is mythical. A myth begins with the end of the story, and then goes backward, you see. And what you saw in Samuel was the achievement that the story began at the beginning without anybody knowing anything more than he knew at that time, you see. And that's the Book of Samuel. Can you remember? The modesty that it is -- that not one of the participants of the game is -- more, you see, has power over the future. He lives in -- on faith. We know already, you see, but the people there don't.

Now myth makes the people know ahead of time. And that's, therefore, because I know, so probably there you, too. Whenever you get a mythical story about railroad kings, or vested interests, you make them always all-wise. Most myth about American history is written about Mr. Rockefeller or Mr. Pierpont Morgan knowing what he was doing. I assure you, neither Lincoln nor Pierpont

Morgan knew what they were doing. They just do it. I mean, that is, the myth, however, puts tremendous, you see, plans and cunning octopus, spider into the minds of people. They aren't that clever.

You see, we -- but myth always begins backward. That is the normal behavior of boys, and cheap students, and classroom performance. Anything that is learned -- all your colleges are mythical institutions, because they know already the outcome, and think everybody did. And so they look at the other people as though they have performed on purpose. And the modern philosophy of, for example, utilitarianism is a typical academic idea, you see, that people all are purposive, and -- and get what they want, and do what they please, and -- and plan, you see, and all our wicked -- and there is always a nigger in the wood pile. And there's a boss who -- see -- he bosses everybody. And that's the intellectual attitude.

When Mr. Lindbergh's baby was kidnapped, you know, that's 30 years ago, the French had the same attitude, the intellectuals in Paris. A friend of mine went to Paris, and he was immediately interviewed about the Lindbergh case, and they of course in Paris knew all -- much better than the people in New York. And "Oh," they said, "He wasn't kidnapped. The boy wasn't kidnapped." "But he was. There was Bruno Hauptmann. He was really kidnapped. { }."

"Oh, no. No."

"Now what's the story?" my friend said, who was a -- is a professor at Harvard.

And he -- they said, "Oh, we know. There was a -- a will of an uncle of Mrs. Mo- -- Lindbergh -- Morrow Lindbergh, very rich man and," they said -- he said -- "the will said, that they -- she could only inherit money if there was a child." There -- for a childless marriage he didn't provide. "So they had to have a child, but they had no child. So they adopted this child, which was --. And when then, that -- she was pregnant, and had a child of her own, she -- they wanted to get rid of the first-born child. And that, instead of kidnapping -- poor Hauptmann was -- was paid for eliminating the adopted child, which they had only adopted in order to get the money."

Now my friend was so upset. He wrote home and -- to California where they had lived. There never was an uncle, there never was a will, you see. The

whole story was a hoax. And he told them so. He couldn't convince them { }. They said, "Well, if there was no will, if there was no money, the first child wasn't { }."

They know in Paris. This is the myth of the intellectuals, because then everything was planned, you see; it's a purposive scheme of things, you see. Everything is -- falls into the pattern of being known from the beginning. You will know -- see that all pseudo-history comes from imputing to the people that they didn't stumble on gold, but that they planned to find the gold in Klondike in the first place, for example. Everything is planned.

You -- it has been said of the British empire that it came -- got together in their sleep. And that's a much truer story. The English are a great people, because they have never believed in purposive schemes. And they don't. They -- that's why they got this big empire in -- in {sleep}. I think Manifest Destiny has played a role in this way here. People -- this wasn't planned. -- It just came by -- by -- by circumstance.

So myth is always -- will you kindly take down this rule of -- of knowledge? At the end, we are -- we know the results, and we are apt to know everything in reverse order. Therefore, we clothe the beginnings already with the results of the end. We dress up the -- the -- the mind of the beginning as though we knew the results. And it is very hard for us to understand that by faith and perseverance, results are brought about which have absolutely nothing to do with the will of the -- and of the -- in the beginning {phase} or the plan, or the purpose.

And so the people reduce, as Charles Beard does with his declaration of independence, they reduce the Declaration of Independence to purpose, that these people had to protect their property. It's childish, because people act -- do many things without purpose, but under necessity. You don't breathe for any purpose, but you have to breathe. And you sit here, I hope, without any purpose, because otherwise I couldn't teach you. You are unable to learn if you have a purpose. The more purpose you have in getting an A in an examination, the worse as a student you are. You have to surrender your purpose in order to learn.

And that's about any -- phase of life, I mean. If you cannot act spontaneously -- so that's why the Bible says, you see, that you shouldn't prepare speeches { }, you see, as the Quakers do { }. Because if you will stand before magistrates and authorities, God will tell you what to say at this moment. And the --

the more you plan it, the worse the speech will be.

Purpose is the curse of the student in looking into -- into history, that he carries the knowledge of the end into the beginning.

Now Thucydides is, like the Bible, an attempt to cure the -- the curious mind of later generations, the -- only curious mind from this superstition. What we call today "history," since the Bible and Thucydides, is an attempt to do justice to the contemporaries of an event by not putting into their mind anything that they couldn't know at the time. It's the innocence of happening which had to be restored.

You see, all the forecasts are mythical, which we find in ancient history, you see, that people were told beforehand the outcome of the Trojan War, and so on, you see. That's why it is not history. But in -- in the case of Thucydides -- we will see in which way he works. But the problem of -- this is the problem of the classroom. And -- here again, I want you to reconsider your statement. Today it's a great fashion to speak not only of symbols but of myth. Every second -- school-child has now to write papers on myth. But the myth of the school is the first you have to look through before you understand -- that myth is eternal, that -- everybody today is superior to myth. Don't believe it for a minute. We all live by myth. And it is --- only with an effort that we wake up from -- from our myth. We all impute to other people that are purposive, and shrewd, or clever, and intelligent. And they aren't; and we aren't. And one thing, you see, is -- is always mythical. The myth is empowering the participants in the struggle of having a -- a hold over the event, or should have a hold, you see. Don't be miscarried. Whereas in real life, there are always influences that are bigger than the event. Myth is also isolated.

Every myth is by itself. It cuts out. A friend of mind, a -- a great thinker in -- in Europe, Hans Ehrenberg, once said -- has said that all myth confines the powers at work in history, you see, to a specific place and a specific time. So the whole -- reviewer of -- of Mr. Lee Master is mythical, by putting Mr. Master in this box. You see, that's a myth.

The most outstanding example at this moment of the mythical treatment of history is -- is a book by Perry Miller on Herman Melville. Has anybody seen it? Perry Miller is a very good man. That's why I mention it, because it's so tragic. And he puts Herman Melville, the greatest American spirit we have--the representative of 300 years of American history--he puts him not only into the year 1850, but he makes him a part of the New York coterie, who tried to save Ameri-

can literature from -- from New York. And he says, "He was only there very minor star in the galaxy of New Yorkers. And I only treat him here as an appendix to -- Washington Irving and -- and all the greater lights." So poor Melville, not only, you see, is not expanded into the reality of his existence, but he is even lowered. He is no longer Herman Melville, but just, you see, Arcturus Beta in a constellation of -- of minor lights in -- on Broadway.

(This is the Perry Miller who wrote the biography { } of -- of Jonathan Edwards?)

Yes, yes. There he has fallen from -- that's "Ichabod." You could write a poem on Perry Miller entitled "Ichabod," you see. The greatness departed from Israel. It's horrid. And -- I'm, you see -- I'm dealing with Melville this week. It's probably -- right after Easter. And I -- I'm just horrified, I mean, that I have to come as a non-American to rescue Melville from the clutches of this. Bury him not only in space but in -- in time, but in space, too. Just making him an appendix of a little group in New York, of all -- what has this man who went to the South Sea to do with New York? He -- after all, he had to live somewhere. But -- is this -- reason enough to bury him in -- under the -- under the rubbish of -- heap of New York?

But myth is--that's all that myth is--an attempt to make one section of time, and one section, you see, of space single, universal, omnipotent. You will see, I mean -- I have tested it. It is of course -- perhaps to you a very strange definition. It -- it's -- it's capable of -- of real -- of universal application. And since the word "myth" today is so popular, you'd better make something out of it. Revelation is the courage to write the 10th chapter of Genesis. And to say the Hebrews -- my dear, that's not very much. They are just the sons -- the sons, the grandsons of -- of -- { } of Sem, and therefore Sem is -- {being} -- one brother only of Noah. That's a very small story, you see. That's anti-mythical. And the Bible and Thucydides are anti-mythical books.

Because they are quite aware that history begins anywhere without a purpose, that it has ramifications far before the time crust of the moment, of the individual, you see, and far beyond. And that the implications are more important than what this little man marks off as a field of action in his own right, and his own mind, and also what the onlooker, who looks back, you see, tries to impute, who begins arbitrarily somewhere, you see, and that this man's wicked plan, you see. Here, the father of the Constitution, planned the defection from England, you see. Or like Mr. -- Mrs. Lindbergh, you see, she wanted to get the money. You see, it's all planned. Whereas kidnapping is the disease of the



American body politic, you see, that has been brought about probably from the Indians, you see, red Indians, in a slow process of centuries. And it comes to a climax in the Lindbergh case.

So myth is an attempt to impute the knowledge of the end to the past, and puts time and space into separate boxes, so to speak. In this you can connect, you see, first cause and effect in such a way.

I think we have to make a break here.

[tape interruption]

Well, what I would like to do -- I have no finals for this seminar. So I have to put you to work during the -- of course during the term. And I would like you to write a biography -- or the life of--a "biography" is too proud a word; I don't mean this, but it's--the life of Thucydides and of Caesar. I think that's -- and with the life of Thucydides, I mean what we -- we only know of Thucydides through his book. All that is known of Thucydides comes from his own text, mostly. Nearly all. And supposedly the later life of Thucydides was written off -- up late in antiquity, simply composed, so to speak, of the facts mentioned in his own history about himself.

Now that's a very strange situation, of course, and it's very interesting.

You will have to go to the library and find older and better translations with indices about Thucydides. I see that this edition has no index, so you cannot be sure that all the places where Thucydides is mentioned are found in your text. So you have to go to the library and work a little bit more carefully about what he says of himself, and what we therefore have to conclude. Is it as much as in the case of Thucydides as in the case of Caesar. Very much light is thrown upon the book, if you understand who the man was and his position, I mean. In -- they are not learned men in the sense in which today a man becomes a professor of history.

And I think one thing that you should carry away from this -- our meeting { } -- to be a historian is not to be a professor of history. And to be a professor of history is not to be an historian. And to be a professor of philosophy doesn't make you into a philosopher. To be a philosopher is some -- one thing and to be a professor of philosophy who can teach other people's philosophies, you see, and systematize them; that's -- a different story. We are today in this handicap that the academic professions have swallowed up, so to speak, the original faculties of the human race, which are prophecy, and history writing, and poetry, and

so. And more and more poets are made now -- college professors, as you know, just to have a -- a roof over their heads for { }. And so it is possible that in 50 years, the American school children -- students will believe that the arts and sciences are really taken care of under -- in the shelter -- under the sheltered roofs of institutions. You see, that's the -- all the poets have become institutionalized; in other words, have gone insane. And this is a very great danger. Here -- to be an historian is an original capacity of man. Any grandmother has it who tells tales, you see. That's an historian already, the beginning at least of one. But to be a professor of history, and to be examined in history, and be a senior in -- that's something derivative, don't you see? That's second-rate. I won't -- I don't want to be -- be { }. I myself am in this position. But we have to be very humble and say that we take the existence of historians for granted, you see, and now build on them.

Now -- Thucydides is not of this type, and of course the Book of Samuel is not of this type, and Caesar is not of this type. And one of the {fatal} -- worst situations in this country is that there is a {defiance} that these are original faculties of the human -- human genius, you see -- to become a historian. And it has absolutely nothing to do with any status in the community. The same with poetry, I mean. It is -- it is hopeless to -- to demand and -- and, you see -- a literary recognition of a writer. This is still known, and --. But it's the same, of course: Benjamin Franklin was a physicist, but he was not a professor of physics, as you all know, you see. His was a direct relation to the lightning rod, and not a relation derived of -- from an appointment of -- by other people.

I -- I tell you why this is very important at this moment. Because as you know, we now have foundations who support now the arts and the sciences. And so it seems that they are all taken care of. They have the Guggenheim for creative effort, and so on. And we have the Rockefeller Foundation, and whatnot. Eight thousand foundations. Well, will you kindly consider that to have to go before a foundation is already proof that you think that you can make yourself understood before you have achieved what you do. Now any real achievement is something that hasn't been done, yet. And therefore it can never be approved beforehand by a president of a responsible foundation. He has to disapprove it, because it's uncertain. It's not safe.

Now all these people have to play it safe in these foundations. And the bigger they are, the more. The Ford Foundation has to give \$400 million away to all the schools, because that is safe. It's useless. Perfectly useless. Nothing has happened to this distribution of \$400 million. But if you would give \$5,000 to an unknown genius, you would be able to make yourself ridiculous. And probably

would. And people have told me that these foundations that they prefer to give away \$5 million than to -- to support a real genius for -- \$4,000, you see, because with \$5 million, they -- they support a growing enterprise, something that everybody already knows about and approves of. But \$4,000, that may be thrown away. Of course it may be thrown away. But perhaps what you do with it is much -- much further than if you, you see -- if you save Herman Melville for having to become a customs inspector in New York, that would be a -- certainly a greater deed than to support obsolete cancer research, as you do in this country now with hundreds of millions of dollars, just because Mr. Pasteur lived -- lived in 1879. Cancer research in this country is a great example of a complete waste. Just because the presidents of these foundations are obsolete. I mean, anybody who is not doing a thing himself is less knowledgeable -- knowing, you see, what can be done than the man in the front line obviously. You can understand this. So we are very much handicapped at this moment, because these people -- these foundations publish even their philosophies. The Rockefeller Foundation has the effrontery to publish the philosophy of the Rockefeller Foundation. Money has no philosophy. And -- how can they know what -- how to -- how to handle a growing universe and a growing spirit? Philosophy of the Rockefeller. I mean, nobody laughs. It's the most laughable thing I've ever heard in my life. Philosophy of the Rockefeller Foundation. That is really, I mean, the -- the -- the arrogance of money carried a little too far. Money has no philosophy. It's a means. Means have no philosophy. And -- but this means that this man -- these men in the Rockefeller Foundation, they have supported astrologers and the most subversive mentalities, so to speak, I mean, sectarians. Because that's -- they -- but nothing original. Nothing creative. Nothing that hasn't happened before that they couldn't catalog.

Geniuses are now only to be found in this country in lunatic asylums. Because there is an absolute abhorrence, except for jokers -- I mean. The only originality you have is Bob Hope, and such people, and -- and Will Rodgers, and so on. But they're -- clowns can be original; the Marx Brothers can be. Now -- so we have this, you see, the -- the story of -- you have the folklore. And then you have the historian. And then you have professors of history. And finally, you have organized science, or organized historiography, as we have it today with these foundations, and these magazines, and the American Historical Association: organized association. And there is -- everything serves a -- quite a different purpose. This is prehistorical, you see, folklore. The historian is creating history. They are reporting on the creation of history. And these people unfortunately think that the reporting on historians is more important than becoming --

being an historian. And so the -- the diffi- -- difficulty -- the difficult situation in which we are in every field of human endeavor at this moment, you see, that the organizations of history, of painting, of architecture--whatever you take--are in their selection of what you should support, always inclined to support the second-rate man as against the first-rate man. Because the first-rate man is an unfinished, a raw product, you see; and the other has already has the cellophane, and is salable, and -- and five -- six recommendations and everybody says, "Oh, that's Course 180, or 198," I mean. That's already, you see, catalog- -- in the catalog.

You cannot organize creative effort. You can organ- -- only organize derivative effort. This is important for you to know in your own life. Now that's not true of the historian only. It's true of any other field, I mean. It's even true -- true, I assure you--which will startle you--of medicine. But I have seen original doctors, so to speak, by birth. We talked about this here, didn't we? And I have seen, I mean, people who have a doctor's degree -- just perfectly indifferent. You can be an M.D., but that doesn't make you into a physician, in the sense of Hippocrates. The -- many doctors, the oath of Hippocrates is the only moment in which they are face-to-face with original medicine, you see. The rest is textbook. Anybody who goes home after an eight-hour day, you see, and says he has done his duty is second-rate. Take a nurse. They have now the eight-hour day. Now -- that's second-rate.

In our garden, we have a gardener. He is hired by the owner of the house. We have nothing to do with it. Now a friend of ours who's lame, limping, had carried their garden chair downstairs in the garden -- somewhere down below, and wanted to get it up when it began to rain. And she was afraid that it might get wet. And so she asked him, this gardener from San Pedro who was working there and his wife, both -- would they help her--she was limping, she's lame, had an operation on her--would she kindly help her to carry this -- the chair up? They said, "No," because they weren't hired for that. They were gardeners.

Now the danger of -- you see, of any such professor of history, too--or any professional man--is that it isn't within his -- you see, within his tariff, within his contract, so he hasn't to do it.

So, as you know, many people in the hospital there destroyed their family relations, because for -- 50 years ago, there was no social service for the relations

of the man who went to the hospital. My friend Richard Cabot started in Massachusetts for the first time a service for the family of a man who had to go to the hospital--or the mother, especially, you see, for the children. That's now understood that there is some such interest on the sidelines of a treatment. That's the usual -- surgeon, you see, in a hospital setting th- -- thought it wasn't -- that wasn't his consideration, what happened to the family. Of course in many cases, the patient couldn't even get well, because she was -- the mother was so much worrying in her bed in the hospital over the children so that even the medical effort was frustrated, you see, because the children were not cared for. This is now -- a case in point where the average professional man, you see, was not a -- you see, taking the situation in, but acted within the limits, you see, of a profession. Now you cannot become an historian if you act within the limits of what is expected to be a textbook in your profession for an examination. You see, that's a different story. That's derivative. Textbooks are one thing, you see. And original history is something else. Can you understand this? In -- for the historian, the boundaries of his task are to be discovered as he goes along. And for the professor of history, the boun- -- of a textbook, the boundaries of his task are all pre-established. That's why you are on safe ground in a textbook. Nothing ever happens, I mean. It's all delimited, you see. The limitations to the next department, and what doesn't go in, and what does go in, it's all predisposed. Can you see this. Really?

(I don't like textbooks.)

What?

(I don't like textbooks.)

You don't --?

(I don't like textbooks.)

Well. Good for you.

{{ } course { }.)

So Thucydides and Caesar are the stars of the historians. I don't say that you are -- I would have to write history as they did. But you understand. The principles of our own history could be different. But the originality, that we did

something for the first time, is important, I think. Just as the Book of Samuel is. Something was done, you see, in the discovery of the task.

And may I make this remark, that is against all -- all your evolutionary schemes? The first is always the best. Jesus is the best Christian. This can -- nobody can deny. You see, Moses is the best Jew. Abraham is. The first is the best. That's geht -- against all your grain. Any pluralization, the multiplication of a great model will always lead to a watering down, to a dilution of {type}. The first must be the best. Otherwise he couldn't be creative.

This is against everything you have imbibed. And therefore I have to struggle. Thucydides and Caesar are -- and the Bible are the best. Homer is the greatest poem of all time -- poet of all times, you see. {Very strange}. Hard to understand, but he is, to this day. There's no greater poet. I mean, I have learned this, I mean, by bitter experience. I grew up, of course, as you did grow up, with the -- all these superstitions, that later is better.

[tape interruption]

So in this sense, I think your going to the -- to the ancients for the -- for seeing what it means to create out of -- you see, of nothingness a picture is important.

Now would you kindly begin to read this text? And { } see -- in -- in what this originality consists, how it is, so to speak, on what it is based, or what makes Thucydides a -- a beginner of a -- completely new task.

(Read the introduction? Or --)

No, his own text. Not -- no introduction.

("I began like this {since} the very outbreak of the war, in the belief that it was going to be a great war, and more worth writing about than any of those that had taken place in the past. My belief was based on the fact that two sides were at the great heights of their powers and preparedness, and I saw too that the rest of the Hellenic world committed to one side or the other. Even those who were not immediately engaged were delibera- -- deliberating on the courses which they would -- take later. This was the greatest disturbance in the history of the Hellenes.")

Now will you take down this sentence? This one sentence. You have no

text? You write it down, this sentence this {weekend}. Will you kindly take -- say it once more? "This was the --"

("This was the greatest disturbance in the history of the Hellenes" -- how do you pronounce that? Hellenes?)

Well, you see, it's arbitrary how this man tries to do. We used to say "HELL ens" in English. Now people are more -- sensitive to the original Greek poem, so they introduce "HELL een ess." But how to pronounce it, the Greeks would say "HELL ay NEHS," as we -- in the -- that's the European pronunciation. In America, I think we -- we use what is called {iotacize}. That is, you prefer for the -- for the eta, the -- the sound "I." HELL en EE nes. Perfectly arbitrary, you see. You see? I can't tell you. It's a new invention that 50 years ago, that he would have spelled it -- the translator would have spelled it H-e-l-l-e-e-n-s. And, for example, Greece is officially not "Greece," but -- the "Kingdom of the Hellenes," at this moment, I mean, in -- in Hellas, I mean, the -- the newer kingdom of Greece, you see.

So I think the interna- -- would be -- somebody be good enough to -- to look this up in the postal directory of -- and go to a Post Office -- regular Post Office and ask them to give -- show you the international -- ja? -- list. And -- just as it is with the Netherlands, you see. It's called the "Kingdom of the Netherlands," and not "Holland." Or not "Dutch." So it is with -- I think that they call -- official title is the "King of the Hellenes," the king of Greece. It's not "King of Greece." Wie?

({ }.)

Ja. So obviously it should then be "Hellens" today, you see. But he said "Hellenes," and I don't blame him, because so many beautiful Greek forms have been transmitted to us through the Latin and then have been shortened, you see. (I've heard one pronunciation with that spelling, of "HELL een.")

Of?

("HELL een." With the H-e-l-l-e-n-e-s. "HELL eens.")

No, well. It's Hellene -- but the Greek -- it's the full Greek form without any transformation, whereas before, you see, down to 1900, we quoted the Greek names--that's perhaps useful for you, you have heard of this--Greek forms in

their Latin transformation. And as we said not Zeus, but Jupiter very often, you see, so -- you could find in -- in Swinburne, you can find still "Ulixes," instead of "Odysseus" even, and well, give me another -- "Hercules" instead of "Heracles," you see. It's -- Greek, it's "Heracles." "Hercules" is the -- is the Latin transformation. Well, I think that "Hercules" is only in Shakespeare. It's all "Hercules," and never "Heracles." And now everybody -- poet would write "Heracles," and it has disappeared, the Latin intervening form. I'm just looking for other such names that would have undergone the same -- the same -- wie?

({ }.)

You see, "Alexandros" we say today very often. But the Romans see -- say "Alexander." So you say still, "Alexander the Great," don't you? That's the Latin form. The Greeks never said "Alexander"; they said "Alexandros." That's just a -- one -- one more. Well, Agamemnon { } same. Yet you say Achilles, don't you? But in Greek of course it's {Achillois}. {Achillus}, you see, this is like Odysseus. And so it would be -- but the Romans said "Achilles," so we say "Achilles." And probably 10 years from now, we will all say "{Achillois}."

And -- and so any -- any Greek word has in the humanistic period of the Renaissance been adopted first in the Lat- -- in its Latin form, not in its Greek form. And it's only now that we recover, so to speak, our sense of pro- -- propriety and historicity, and give -- give the names back their -- their old splendor.

"Aristotle" is of course the Latin form, you see, instead of "{Aristotles}."

People will, I think -- well I don't know in this country, it's too popular, I think.

The popular -- more popular a name, of course, the less you can change it, you see. We in Germany already say "Aristotles," which is nearer to the Greek, you see, than "Aristotle." Because the -- Luther threw out Aristotle for good from the schools. {We} had persecuted Aristotle, so now he has been purged and can -- can come back in his pure Greek form. But you are still all Aristotelians; it's very benighted. This, you see, America is the only country in which scholasticism still holds sway over your minds, I mean. You still believe in the Aristotelian logic, and all the -- that was the great bible of the school-men of the 14th century. You have still colleges, you see, all the forms of the medieval university. On the continent of Europe, that all has been abolished. The Reformation destroyed all the remnants of scholastic forms of scholarship. You still have a master of arts. There is no master of arts in Germany, you see, there. You have a bachelor of arts. That's all medieval terms, you see. We have no bachelor of arts, you see. So Luther, and Melanchthon, and all the reformers in Germany turned against the school-men, against Thomas Aquinas, and against Bonaventura, and against



Abélard, you see, and said, "That's all superstition." And Aristotle, being the patron of the medieval university, was destroyed on the continent. And you here, and wanting to have, of course, all the good traditions of -- everything that {-- as found} in Europe, were -- have been very shy. You have the common law of England, and you have the -- the universities, you see, of the Middle Ages in this -- in your set-up here. It's very interesting. The is the old -- the -- the type of university life on this campus is much more akin to the medieval university than the life in Paris or in Heidelberg. That's much more radically changed.

So the more you come to a frontier, the more conservative features you get. The oldest English is speaking in Ameri- -- spoken in America. In America, it's "Berkeley." How is it in London?

(BARK ley.)

That's new, you see. "BER kley" is old. My town is called -- in here, in my own town, we call it "NOR witch." But in England, the town of Norwich of course is called "NOR itch." You see. The "w" is not pronounced. So we have kept the older pronunciation. And the Pennsylvania Dutch still speak 17th-century German, you see. The Germans speak 20th-century German. So the frontier is always conservative.

And the Moslem in Bosnia in -- in -- in Yugoslavia still have the fez, you see, the -- the -- turbans, you see, the -- whereas the Turks in -- in {Kemal's Atta- -- Turkey} don't have it. And they still have the harem for the women, you see, in these Mos- -- in these Moslem provinces of Yugoslavia. Because the more you come to the frontier, the more unable is the -- is any -- the region to change on its own, the more anxious it is to -- to show that it has still, you see, the old tradition. Since this -- again, this is unknown. You think the frontier is -- is modern.

Fortunately it isn't, because that's the only way in which old things are -- can be retrieved, from the frontiers. There they are preserved. Cockney English is three centuries more recent than the -- the English po- -- spoken in Pennsylvania or in -- or in Vermont.

Now what have I -- did I tell you this? Because I wanted to tell you that the historian here makes a tremendous statement. "It's the greatest occurrence in the history of the {warfare} -- of -- of Greece." This is the sentence you should single out, because it -- points out to -- the fact that history originated with the feeling of elation, that something tremendous has happened. The biggest is just good enough for history. Again, this is today, as you know, objected to.

And it's a { }, I mean, he doesn't even argue the point. Will you go on?

(Do you want me to read that sentence over again?)

This one sentence. Has everybody taken it down? I think -- it's unique. I know of no other historian who -- who only states, "That's the biggest event," you see. And it's the opposite from Samuel, of course, you see. It's bigness, the greatness, the exultation, you see. Standing out, show. Here, I mean, that's -- it's -- essence of secular history, that it is not moved by the little emotions, the small, still voice of the heart. But it is -- moved, you see, because mountains have been -- have been displaced, have been moved.

The Greeks had a special word for this, { }, it's the {showy fest}, you see, as they called it. It was something to be shown at the festivals of -- of the land. I mean, like on the Fourth of July, that's the Declaration of Independence. That the { } in all history, gentlemen. But it's very American to say this of -- about any event then: "It is the greatest." And this is a good reason to write history. Ja. Go on, here.

("This was a great- --)

{Limelight}.

(Oh.)

("This was the greatest disturbance in the history of the Hellenes, affecting also a large part of the non-Hellenic world, and indeed -- I might also say the whole of mankind.")

Now there { }. The greatest {under} all aspects. And he makes three distinctions: the Athenians have a history, the Hellenes have a history, mankind has a history. So again you get -- but in -- in the opposite sequence as in the Bible, you get the inner ring, the wider circle, and the extreme circle. It's all in space, you see. We { } here, in the middle, Athenian history; Greek history; human history. That's I think your vision of universal history. In -- in -- in cir- -- in concentric circles.

Ja?

("Although I have found it impossible, because of its re-

moteness in time to acquire a really precise knowledge of the distant past, or even of a history preceding our own period, yet after looking back into it as far as I can, all the evidence leads me to conclude that these periods were not great periods, either in warfare or in anything else. It appears, for example, that the country now called Hellas had no settled population in ancient times. Instead there was a series of migrations, as the various tribes came under the constant pressure of invaders, who were stronger than they were, were always prepared to abandon their own country. There was no commerce and no fishing, and ...")

Will you now kindly understand that what he's now doing is to reason why this is the greatest event. And he will now give you a glance into the -- all history that leads up to it, always with -- under the aspect: why is my event the greatest? You see. This is not very clear to most readers, that he's now building up his case to prove that this is the greatest case in history.

Ja, go on.

({ }. Oh, yes.)

("There was no communication and -- there was no commerce and no safe communication either by land or at sea. The use they made of their land was limited to production of necessities.

They had no surplus left over for capital, and already the...")

Well, this is -- "capital" is just infamous. That's not a Greek term. And that's just an invention of this New School of Economics, I mean. He knows nothing of this. Go on.

Capital is -- these translations are so impertinent, so impudent, because they carry back into the old history these -- the categories of these modern men. It's not right.

Ja?

("...since they looked" or -- "since they lacked production of fortifications, and at any moment an invader might appear and take their land away from them. Thus in the belief that the day-to-day necessities of life would be secured just as well in one place as in another, they showed no reluctance in moving from their homes, and therefore built no cities of any size or strength, nor acquired any important resources. Where the soil was most fertile, there were the most frequently changes of population. As in -- as in

what is now called Thessaly in Boeotia" -- is that how you pronounce that?)

Yes.

(-- "Boeotia and most of the Peloponnese, except for Arcadia and in the others of the rich parts of Hellas.

("For in these fertile districts, it was easier for individuals to secure greater powers than their neighbors. This led to disunity and often caused the collapse of the estates, which in any case were more likely than others to attract the attention of foreign invaders and { } the most interesting to occur in Attica; { } that Attica, because of the poverty of her soil, was remarkably free from any -- from political disunity.")

Now that's completely arbitrary. This is not a footnote; that's in the text.

But in your edition there, it has been put in a footnote.

(Well, { } he made a statement in his introduction, I believe, that he felt that had Thucydides been writing this book in -- in the present time, he would have placed certain passages in footnotes. Therefore he has taken the liberty himself.)

I know. But what do you say to that? Wie?

({ }. It would { } be included in -- into the text, rather than putting it in a footnote.)

No. And if -- if so, has he a right for this reason, because he invented footnotes, to change the text of { } and -- and do better? { } incredible. The -- the -- the arrogance of these people is just -- I can't understand it.

I mean, you -- because you -- you would not write the -- the Psalms today in this responsory mood, in one-half verse, you see, and one-half verse, as we do in our responsive reading. And so you'd better treat the Psalms then without the repetition. {Very} { }. That would be the consequence.

(I curious to know, how much did they use footnotes at all in the -- in -- in antiquity { }?)

No, no footnotes. But they would say, "Let me here digress." And then they would return. They would call it a digression.

(Couldn't we say that he's here just trying to make Thucydides into -- fashionable, so to speak?)

I'm afraid he's just trying to make him into a textbook. Not fashionable, a textbook. It's a lowering of the rank, you see. Fashionable, I mean, it -- it would be still excused. Ja? Footnotes are not fashionable.

Ja? Any question? Ja?

Now comes -- this footnote, of course, put it up in the text. "Certainly Attica" -- let me read it to you to see here how the famous Jowett translates it. He was the greatest translator of Greek texts in -- he was the master of Baliol in -- in Oxford. And it's a little boring now, because it's Victorian style. But I -- I still think that he was much more careful. He would never speak of "capital," you see, because capital is something quite different from the amassment of wealth. As you know, in Mycenae, we find these treasures, you see, so that the king could be liberal, and generous, I mean, in -- in giving premiums to heroes with the golden spear, or golden helmet, or what-not. But that's not capital. You see, that's a treasure, and -- or {work}, or whatever he calls it. And that's what Thucydides is speaking of. He's not speaking of capital. He does not speak of new investments, I mean. And so -- here:

"Certainly Attica, of which the soil was poor {and they} enjoyed long freedom from civil strife, and therefore retained its original inhabitants. And { } confirmation of my argument {supported} by the fact that Attica, through immigration, increased in population more than any other region. For the leading men of Hellas, when driven out of their own country, by war or revolution, sought as -- asylum as -- Athens, and from the very earliest times, being admitted to rights of citizenship, so greatly increased the number of inhabitants, that Attica became incapable of containing them, and was at last obliged to send out colonies to Ionia."

Now, go on, please. Who has the text? You have, do you?

("Another point which seems to me good evidence { }...")

What? Please, I -- couldn't follow, just acoustically. Please.

("Another -- another point which seems to me good evidence for the weakness of the early inhabitants of the country is

this. We have no record of any action taken by Hellas as a whole before the Trojan War. Indeed, my view is that, at this time, the whole country was not even called Hellas. Before the time of Hellen, the son of Deucalion?"

Deucalion. Deucalion is supposed to be the first man who created offspring by throwing steins after the Great Flood, in back of him, and then men would {arise}. So he is an important person, I mean. Deucalion is the -- is the Noah of the Greeks. And may I say this in passing? That the Greek mythology and the Old Testament had very many of these traditions in common. The -- the pounding of the gi- -- titans against the -- Olympus, toppling the mountains of Ossa and Pelion, one -- on top of all the other in order to storm Olympus, obviously is related to the Babyl- -- the story of Babylon, you see, building a tower that reaches into the sky. And we have every reason to believe that the Greek traditions, which were founded in -- between 1500 and 1000 B.C., and formulated -- must have been at that time, and the Jewish tradition, probably connected through the Phoenicians, went back to a common attempt to cope with the antecedents of the human race.

I mean, this is not limited to the Jews and to the Greeks. Of course, they all -- everybody--you, too, I mean--you have some way, even dimly, to look at our antecedents. And the Bible is not understood if you do not see that the Jews undertook to stabilize the minimum of common tradition in the first books, you see, in the pre-Jewish story, that everybody would -- had -- would, so to speak, admit -- would have to admit that. And so they, of course, being surrounded by people who had gone through similar experience of migration and settlement, the -- the first book of Moses is to be taken as the -- the summary of the common experiences of the human race, only in -- in such a way that the Jewish writer keeps it clean from superstition.

That's the whole story of the founding of Egypt, and the founding of -- Sumer and -- and Assy, and Sumeria, and -- and Nineveh -- Babylon in -- in the story of Noah. Noah is the purified founder of -- of a country, you see, with wine, and -- after the flood, then.

Well, I could go on. It's a long story. But I only wanted to tell you that the tradition here of Deucalion is not a purely Greek tradition. Just as we have traced the origin of the Jewish tradition in the Old Testament to a wider, you see, connection with Babylonian myth; you -- you must do the same about of course Greek mythology. That's not simply Greek, but it's an attempt in -- in -- in Greek terms to justify what was known of the power of people to -- to deal with flooded

land, to -- irrigation, with -- with turning the desert into fruitland.

Yes, go on. Deucalion.

("Deucalion. The name did not exist at all. The biggest parts were known by the names of different tribes. But the name of -- Pelasgian...")

Yes, Pelasgian.

("...predominated.)

Now the word "Pelasgian" -- there was a Pelasgian ritual you find still in the days of Caesar and Augustine in Greece. And it's a -- pre-Greek. And the significance, as -- as far as I can make out, is that it has to do with the { } -- tradition of using irrigation. "{Pelasgos}" means the sea. And as Poseidon was at that time the god of the pre-Greek population -- after all, the god of water. So it was -- it seems that the -- the -- how do you call the people who go down in the swamps, the -- the -- {stable building}, the --?

(Lake-dwellers?)

Lake-dwellers, you see. That "Pelasgian" is a term like "lake-dwellers," the people who -- knew how to cope, and how to put use -- to use water, and flood, and inundation. And that they were called "Pelasgians" from their art of dealing with the pelagos, with the -- with the water. This is -- cannot be proven. But I think the word "pelas" { } "pelagos" also means stork. Now the stork is famous for his long legs, that he can, you see, stand in any flooded area and still reach the ground.

And so we have reason to believe that the Greeks gave to these original inhabitants when they came there, a name from what they were doing. And what the Greeks were not able -- the Greeks came as belligerent, as warriors, over the mountains of the Balkans, invading this territory. They found a civilized, you see, countryside, with -- with fruit trees, and -- we know, and fields, we can -- and cattle-grazing, and -- and plowing, and harrowing, and harvesting. And it seems that they gave, in their astonishment, the name to these people as the people who knew how to fertilize land in regular, you see, circulation with water. I mean, it would be the same here, when you come to such a region, what strikes you in Los Angeles is the miracles water can -- can do, you see. So everybody has to have a swimming pool to waste a little more water than is necessary.

That's -- we are all Pelasgians here, you see.

Ja? Read it.

("After Hellen and his son had grown power- -- powerful in Phthiotis, and had been invited as allies into other states, these stayed {separate} -- {and} because of their connection with the family of Hellen, began to be called Hellenic. But it took a long time for the name { }. The best evidence of this can be found in Homer who, though he was born much later than the time of the Trojan War, nowhere uses the name Hellenic for the {whole force}. Instead he keeps this name for the followers of Achilles, who came from --.")

Yes, go on.

(-- pronounce it.)

("--Phthiotis, and who were in fact the original Hellenes. For the rest in his poem, he uses the word -- the words Danaan, Argives, and Achaeans. He does not even use the term "foreigners," and since in my opinion, it's because at this time, the Hellenes were not yet known by one name, and so marked off at something separate from the outside world. In any case, the various Hellenic states, { }. By Hellenic, I mean both -- {they were} both those who took on the names city by city, as a result of the common language and those who were -- who later were called -- and those who later were all called by the common name weakened themselves in my opinion { } with one another {in} those kinds of collective actions {brought about} the Trojan War. And they did not {cast any eye}, even for the Troj- -- Trojan expedition unless they had previously acquired great knowledge of { }.")

Now, look -- I can't -- draw really, but in order to draw your attention to the fact of the migration of the name "Greek." And that's quite important, because Thucydides' life in Athens -- Thucydides had his wealth up here. He had -- he is a mine owner, at the coast. And here is his favorite Chalkidiki, where the monks of Athos sit. And here it would be Saloniki -- Thessaloniki, I mean. You have heard of the city of Thessaloniki -- Paul writes a letter to the Thessalonians. And -- and even up there and this would be the Balkans and Macedonia. And here is Thrace -- Thrac- -- Thracia. Here is Troy. Here is the entrance to the -- to the {Marnae}, and here is Byzantium, Constantinople. And it will be no -- you don't have to go into this.

And Homer is written in a dialect which was obviously spoken here, in



Lesbos, and here at the shore -- south of Troy, of Asia Minor--here, I have put Miletus here, the island of Chios from which probably Homer sprang, the oldest man from whom we know anything about Greek, and whom Thucydides here is quoting, you see, as a proof.

Now the -- the motherland of Greece is Thessaly. Here is the home of Achilles. And Achilles is the hero of the center landsca- -- region of Thessaly, which is called {Phthia}. Phthiotis you have read in the text just a moment. And so { } here { } -- I have climbed it two years ago. It's very wonderful to behold the -- the way, and when you stand there, where the Achilles' home is supposed to be, you see the Ossa and the Pelion, and you see how people could think that if you could only put one on top of the other, you could climb Olympus, because in front of you, you see Olympus in the north, and on your right, you see Ossa and Olympu- -- and Pelion; and Ossa is triangular and Pelion is square. And so you are very tempted to put the triangle, you see, on top of the square and -- and reach up to Olympus.

And if you once have seen this, you understand that everything in -- ritual -- method and -- and mythology, methodology centers has been born, so to speak, in this Hellenic region, of {Phthia}, where Achilles' home is. And you have lost this connotation. You hear of Athens and of Sparta, and you never think that when the Greeks came across the Balkans in -- on these two pathways to the Valley of { } here, which is very narrow indeed -- here, at the co- -- here and -- I should put it -- up to { } and then they came down this valley here, they found the first agriculture, the first { }, and cultivated land in Thessaly. Today this is still { } -- big -- big agriculture. Thousands and thousands of acres are cultivated with American machinery. The Americans have -- agricultural implements are everywhere over the place, and in -- only in Thessaly, because only there you have these large fields in Greece. Everywhere down south is much smaller, you see, it's much more high. It's -- it's more mountainous, and there is no -- aren't even { }, so you can't combine the effort and -- and {really} combine.

Now what I mean to say, let us consider then, that at the time that -- that Thucydides writes, he is still fully aware of the full picture of Greece, because he is here, far away, as an Athenian citizen, however. But he is here -- has mining interests. So he is quite aware of the in-between, or the --. But the -- most people who live in Greece, and in -- live on these islands here, they are colonial, or they live in Sicily. The -- the -- one city of Miletus had 100 colonies in the days of Thucydides. One hundred other cities all having sprung, so to speak, the New England, you see, of England, Miletus. But just as the Anglo-Saxons came from

the continent of Europe once to England, so the Greeks--you see, the great colonizers-- had come from this bad- -- backwoods of Saxony called Thessaly.

And had long -- you do not think that these people -- of Anglo-Saxons as continental people. You think they are island people, you see. In the same sense, I would suggest to you that you have to think of the Greeks in their majority consider themselves as British--that is, living on islands or on peninsulas. But they had also come from the mainland, not only { } of Europe in general, I mean -- beyond the Alps, and then to Thessaly, and their superiority has been the horse. They had conquered Greece because they were -- had horses. And the original settlers in the valleys of the Greek -- of the Mediterranean, all around the Mediterranean, were all bull people, you see. That's why you still have in Spain the bullfight to this day. That's pre-Greek, pre-Indo-European.

The Indo-Europeans make -- conquer these countries by their superior cavalry, by their chariots. The Armenians, the Hindus, the -- the Persians, the Hittites, the Greeks, the Romans, the Celts, the Germans--they are, as you know, those groups who overrun all the old settlements of the world only because they had the superior armament of horses. That's all they did. Otherwise -- if you go to India today, the -- they -- they boast, these Brahmins that they are all from the -- from the -- white's -- man's stock. But they aren't, of course. They are all very colorful indeed. But they -- the conquest of India, you see, came from the horsemen who -- who passed the -- the mou- -- high mountains in the north -- northwest. And Mr. Nehru or Mr. Gandhi pretend that they all come from their stock. It was a handful of people. And I don't think there's anybody in India who has anything, except some maharaja, may have still some blood from these old conquerors, because this was a minute group of people. But they have imposed their literature, their poetry, their religion on these conquered people, you see. Now it's very similar with the Greeks. I -- I think nine-tenths of the people living in Greece in the days of Thucydides had not one pint of blood of Indo-European descent. They all were conquered by these horsemen, by these charioteers. That's why { } have become very proud of being like the -- like the Picts and the Scots in Scotland, who are not Indo-Europeans, of course. They are all pre-Indo-Europeans, you see, but they -- they are very proud that they are Anglo-Saxons.

And I think therefore the story of the -- the spread of the word "Hellen" is a very good story, because there is this little island of the Hellenes, and we find it still here in -- in Dodona, in Epirus. The priests there were called "{vellens}," that's the same name, we --. And they were still pre-nomadic people. They were

not allowed to build temples { }. The priests of Dodona are quite important for us, because they still represent the state of affairs in which the Indo-Europeans were nomads and therefore never built temples, you see. They prayed to their gods in -- in -- in the grove, in the -- in the forest.

[tape interruption]

So today we are very much aware of the intrusive character of the Greeks and the Romans into Mediterranean culture in which settlement, irrigation, astronomy, and temple-building was already, you see, prevalent. And for these medieval people--you find them in Sardinia today--they are quite fashionable. The Etruscans belong to this group, and are all over the Mediterranean, everything you travel in Europe -- in -- in Italy, in -- in the Mediterranean today is very much en vogue, when it can be pointed out that it's pre- -- pre-Roman, pre-Greek, I mean. Think of Crete, I mean, and Mycenae.

Now well, the difference is always that pre-Greek is without the horse, and without any reminiscence of the old warrior and tribal order. That had been uprooted already in the Mediterranean. It's a purely -- era of settlement, and of Isis and Osiris, and of -- sky-worship, you see. Flood -- the flood at the harvest time, you -- you { } you have to deal with the sky. The Greeks come in, and try to keep as much as possible their--because they are the victors--they have pre-Mediterranean mores and convictions, and call these people who are just given to the -- to the water problem or the irrigation problem the Pelasgians. And I think that makes sense to you. Perhaps you can learn to distinguish then three layers -- the Greeks are a special people, because they are nomads who enter a settlement and try to save from their nomadic features as much as possible by building it into the settlement civilization which in itself is later.

So the Greeks, you see, are modernizing the settlement civilization of the big empires by trying to rescue a part of the pre-settlement mores of the wild -- of the wild tribes.

To give you a very -- a stunning example. The -- the Phaeacians -- you know who they are--the Phaeacians in -- in Homer. Who are they?

(They have a little island on which the { }.)

And what do they do to Odysseus?

(They treat him as a guest; they are very gracious.)

And -- so it's the ideal country, don't you see? The best island in the Mediterranean, which is ruled by { }. And -- and in this shipwreck, Odysseus learns without great astonishment that the 25 sons of the King { } are married to the 25 sisters of him. They -- they had 25 sisters. That is, incest is a rule in Egypt. And it is a rule in all agricultural countries, because you don't want to split the property.

And that's a second, a later stage, you see. In any nomadic civilization that's strictly forbidden. People are put to death if they mix with their sister. So the -- this is a very clear case, where the Greeks supersede a later civil- -- which you would call a later civilization by abhorring themselves these modernized, matriarchical -- as you may call them, or better--I call them better "sorority"--marriage, and get accepted as a higher civilization, because while -- the Phaeacians are shown as the more advanced people, the more cultural people. And they have the elegance, you see, and the -- all the advantages of civilization. And what we find the -- as -- Greek culture, just as much as the Jewish, you see, Judaism and Greeks both appear after the earth is settled in the river valleys where there is irrigation, and after the nomads have spilled all over the whole earth.

So Jews and Greeks are third attempts. They come very late indeed. And you cannot understand Thucydides or Plato, for that matter--if you ever read Plato--without understanding that Plato, as well as Thucydides, and the writers of the Bible took it for granted that there were Egyptians and Scythians, that there were migratory tribes and settled cities.

These two layers, you see, were accepted. And the Jews and the Greeks both protest against these forms as in themselves impossible. And the difference between the Jews and the Greeks is the following: the Greeks prophesy a time when there will be neither incest-marriage and the deification of kings, nor migration -- mere migration and more constant warfare; but the Greeks try to mix the two. So if you have two states of life, you can say, "I compromise." That the Greeks did. Or I -- you -- "I will rise above them." That's Israel. But both have in front of them the same world of mi- -- migratory tribes, and in the -- in the river valleys, definite settlement, you see. As in Thessaly -- also final settlement, where people say, "We won't move."

To this day, the Egyptians don't migrate. Syrians migrate, Arabs migrate, Turks migrate. The Egyptians don't. You have no Egyptians -- Egyptians in the -- in the city of Los Angeles. You have everybody here, but the Egyptians still drink

Nile water, because Nile water is sacred. And when the Americans brought in Lux- -- into Luxor a -- a water supply, you see, with artesian wells, the Egyptians to this day wouldn't touch -- won't touch it, because it's not Nile water. They prefer the -- you see, the -- the old river civilization to this day. Now this is what -- what -- the name "Hellen" stands for. Helle- -- the word "Hellen" became so important, I'm sure, in Greek history, because it reminded the people of their pre-Mediterranean relations and rules, you see. If you said "Hellen," you meant a man, an invading horseman, you see, as if you say, "Anglo-Saxon" today, you see, in -- in this country. It's a similar ach- -- connotation of -- of -- of antiquity. That's why it has beco- -- a Hellen is a man who has not succumbed to the lures of the Orient, so to speak, to the soft-boiled ritual of the harem, and the pharaoh, and Osiris {ritual}, you see, and the cult of palace, and all the fertility rites of the Mediterranean. Who is still -- although he uses these means of existence, he is still superior to them with his free spirit as a -- as a warrior.

(The last passage in -- in the very last passage in Herodotus speaks of it, where Cyrus, after the -- the -- after the -- they had conquered the Medes, and made themselves lords of Asia, the -- various tribal chieftains came and said, "Let's--now that we can do it--let's go down and -- into the civilized Fertile Crescent and make ourselves lords of that country." And then he -- "No let's stay here; otherwise we'll become soft, because soft countries breed soft people.")  
Ja. Well, if you -- can anybody have a -- did anybody have to read Plato?  
Or did anybody voluntarily read Plato? Wie? Did you? Hallo. did you?

(No.)

Nobody has read The State by Plato?

(The Republic.)

The Republic. Well, in The Republic, Plato makes this distinction between the three -- three political orders--don't you remember?--of the tribes, and of the country. Only he gives them different names. But you have to just use our modern names to understand what he's trying to tell, that the Greeks are in a special case, you see. The Egyptians are the ones of the belly, you see; the warriors, the nomadic tribes are of the chest, of the heart, you see; and the Greeks must be of the mind, you see, of the -- here, of the front. You remember?

This tripartition is the -- is the way in which Plato recognizes that the Greeks are neither nomadic warriors, nor citizens, you see. City-dwellers. This is the stage -- way in which he puts it. But this is -- Thucydides' attempt here to -- to -- to say what is Hellenic. Hellenic is neither Persian, or -- or Assyrian, or Egyptian. Well, I could -- try eloquently. But you do not understand Greek -- the Greeks and the Jews, and why the New Testament speaks of having broken down the wall between Greeks and Jews, if you do not understand that in antiquity the Greeks and Jews both were beyond the experience of the majority of the people, you see, in the sense that they came from one order--the nomadic order--appropriated the benefits, the ad- -- advantages of the settlement order, and tried to -- to compro- --how would you say?--to syntheticize -- to synthesize, you see, the best of both.

This is not known to you. You take today the Greeks and the Jews, as they were just tribes or -- or on the other hand, countries. That's not true. Both were perfectly aware that they had to digest older forms of life and transcend them. That's the whole content of the Bible as you -- as you may now recall, that you must live in Canaan, but you must not stoop down to their -- to their native gods, to their idiosyncrasies, you see. And the Greeks were perfectly aware of this, too. That's why they were so proud of being Greeks, and not barbarians. The barbarians are sunk in one form of government. The Greeks are combiners. So the Greeks are proud of mixture of forms. And the Jews are proud of not being taken in by any one existing form. One is negative, so to speak. The other is synthetic. The Greeks could never, therefore, outgrow these two older forms. They could only have various states of mixture. But they kept them before us.

And this is not mentioned in your textbooks. But I don't know why, because the -- our whole tradition is aware of the fact: the Greeks are the summary of the previous historical life on earth, you see. And the Jews are the token, that this isn't good enough, that it is still broken up into frag- -- too fragmentary, you see. It's very -- it's not union enough. And so, whenever you open the New Testament, you will find in the letters, you see, that there is no longer Jews and Greeks, you see. The whole problem of the -- as you know, of the conversion of the Gentiles--why Paul had to go to the Gentiles--is that the unity promised to the Jews can only ab- -- come about after all the Gentiles, you see, have been fermented by the Gospel. And then the Jews can become Christians, too.

Paul only goes to the Gentiles for the sake of the Jews, to prove to the

Jews that they may now come to rest, because the Gentiles are no longer, you see, just sticking to their guns, but are willing to give -- to come to the -- the third order, so to speak, which the Jews had -- had prophesied.

The -- the Christian mission is -- is meaning- -- did not come about for the sake of the Gentiles--you mustn't think this--but to prove the Jews right. Paul -- that's what Paul says in the Letter to the Romans, that the -- the Jews were right, so far, you see, as long as the Gentiles were obstinate. But if the Gentiles should soften, then the special role of the Jews could of course, be given up. And that's the meaning of the creation of Is- -- the state of Israel at this moment, that after 1950 years, the -- the thing has come full cycle. Now the Jews may become normal nations, because the nations have been -- have ceased to be prehistorical, to be pre-Greek, and pre-Jewish. In as far as they have, this is -- this story is at an end.

So will you kindly read the -- the whole first book of Thucydides? It will also serve you for your paper. And I want to get this biography of Caesar and Thucydides in -- within a fortnight, because otherwise I can't -- or with -- a little longer. But let me have it on -- on April 15th. What? What are you laughing at? (That's the same day as the other paper in { } is due.)

Yes, yes -- to burn them all together. Make a bonfire.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

I -- unfortunately we have not enough to go around, because my friends in the other section haven't obeyed orders, and haven't brought back their papers in time. I had for -- have for you this article, and I think in contrast to what we have been doing here, this may supplement very well a- -- round out your picture of the problems of an historian. So I want you to read this, and write a paper on it during the month of May, so that I may have it back on May 20th. This is the -- quite off the beat- -- the beaten track. Twenty years ago, there was a symposion--or it isn't 20 years ago, I think--there was a symposion in London held about historical problems in general. And the -- this contribution is by the Italian historian, Mr. {Momigliano}, who had to leave Italy, when Mussolini was raging mad--in the Hitler days of Mussolini, when he already had lost his brain really. Because there are two Mussolinis, you must always think: one intelligent one in the first half, and one broken man in the second. And he -- {Momi-gliano} lived in Buenos Aires, as far as I know. He's now back in Italy. And he has done something unique.

He has put before any student of history, as he calls it, an unsolved problem of historical forgery without solving it himself, but only showing the situation. And so it's a -- like a quiz, or like a puzzle, and -- showing you the intricacies of our dealing with genuine -- or false sources. And I think this introduction--since you never will get hold of it; published in an Amer- -- an English publication of the {Warburg} Institute in London, I thought I should make it accessible even on the Pacific coast, although you are, of course, far out of reach of civilization.

And I have, all told, I think, 12 copies. Now, we are 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13. But my friends in the other section, just ha- -- as I told you, haven't been very good about it. They sh- -- were ba- -- expected to give it back to me yesterday. So I make an attempt to -- here. And you will have to give this back to me. It's quite precious. It cost me \$26 to have it made. So I spent a lot of money for you. And -- if they don't come around--I still think they will--you will have to share this. Every one of you will have to share with his op- -- opposite number here, you see. So look -- look at it.

(Yes.)

Will you?



(Yeah.)

That's your opposite number. So -- and -- so you here will you -- this will go here, this will go here, this will go here, go here, and then you two.

(You want me to pass it on?)

Yes, you two. You will be. You have one, haven't you?

(No, no. They didn't --)

Oh, oh yes, it goes across here, and you go across here. { }. So she is privileged on this side of the house.

(Now, one of you must pass one over to --.)

No. It's all right. We have 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 copies, and there are only 12 people.

(Oh, I thought you wanted us to look at them now.)

Oh no, no, no. This is to May -- for May 20th.

(I know that.)

I shall receive the paper, no. At this moment, we will put it aside, and we won't go into this now, because that would just be a waste of time.

I -- perhaps you make some -- yes, you -- I want you to review it and give your own conclusion, what you think of this situation.

Now the interest may -- I may have to say one more thing. It deals with our main source on the history of the 3rd century A.D. Now the 3rd century of A.D. on the one-hand side is the most important one, because it is the time at which the Roman Empire succumbs to the necessity of going Christian. At the end of the 3rd century, Constantine becomes a Christian and capitulates, and moves his capital from Rome to Constantinople, which is the biggest event of ancient history, you see. He says, "The ancient gods of my city of Rome, you see, will -- will pursue me, as a Christian. I have to leave and -- have to leave -- leave it to the bishop of Rome, you see, the pope later, to cope with Jupiter Capitolinus

and Juno on the Capitoline Hill."

Now this greatest exodus of -- is -- is never celebrated in your historical tradition, that the -- it isn't the Christianing -- Christianizing, the baptism of the emperor; but his exodus, you see, imitates of course the exodus of Moses from Egypt. It is the exodus from the false gods of Egypt, you see, to a new city. And it should always be taught in this way; it isn't. And I think all your textbooks leave you therefore in the dark. For the world, gentlemen, and the history of the world the mo- -- exodus from Rome to Constantinople is the -- the only -- the event of the Crucifixion, arrived. That is, it took 300 years before what had happened on Golgotha made epoch in the history of the -- visible world. Before, it was just invisible, lived in the basement of the -- history, so to speak, in the Catacombs. So the -- this is why I think: to cope with this document is just more than -- than coping with some historical document. The 3rd century is the darkest of centuries, because we only have this source of which we do not know how much it is genuine, and how much is a rhetorical forgery in honor of Constantine, the great Christian emperor, who is now already, you see, putting the finishing touch, so to speak, on the victory of the Christian Church. The "Historia -- August-" --how is it called? You -- you read the -- out the text. No, it's on top. It's on the top.

("{ } Historia Augustae.")

"Scriptorum." It means, you see -- it is the collection of the writers on the 3rd century--dedicated to Constantine, officially--to show that he was -- inevitable, so to speak, to show that the -- the -- the empire couldn't go on like that. So it is our only document purposely written as a history of the 3rd century. We have -- we have fragments of other historians, of course; we have inscriptions; we have coins; we have -- but we have no history. And this is -- has a -- something to do with our attempt now to dabble with ancient history, because it must make you sit up and think, "What is antiquity?"

An antiquity is still a time in which time can be dissipated, and break down. The later times and tales of antiquity are less known than the time of Thucydides, you see. That's an incredible fact. That is, the people in the last 300 years of antiquity, just as the -- perhaps the -- the -- the government of Montezuma in Mexico was one of terror, horror, human sacrifice, cruelty, and agonizing dissipation, and complete disintegration. Now it's opposite from your idea of progress. You think history must be a straight line. That isn't true. People have just as many times gone back on what they had known, you see, forgotten. As

you know, it was known 250 B.C. that the earth rotated around the sun. It was totally forgotten a hundred years later. And -- remained forgotten for another 1500 years. And don't believe that it isn't possible that this happens again. The -- the idea of progress is -- stultifying your brain. History doesn't go in this -- in this way at all. And the -- this 3rd century is therefore, as it is one of the darkest, one of the most instructive things of history, because something very great came out of it: the first time that an empire survived its own gods. Will you take this down?

You see it in China, how brutal such a -- survival of one's own god is. In 1911, the last Chinese emperor, you see, was deposed. Ever since, China has been in turmoil. And you speak of Communism and Mao. Don't be betrayed, I mean. -- The breakup of China is the story of the next 300 years, and nothing that happens now is very important. Don't read the papers with such exaggerated interest. These are all -- mome- -- momentary things. Developments -- if an empire, like China, with 600 million people, has to give up its pagan script, which they are doing now--its gods, because they were hieroglyphs, as in Egypt of old, you see, 40,000 literary minds--breaks, as the Egyptians did, when they got Christian -- became Christian, you see, breaks down its temples, and gives up its whole literature, which they will have to, because they take up now our Latin script -- that cuts very deep. And you can't be surprised that this leads to an incredible change and transformation.

And if you study the 3rd century, you may get a picture of what is going on in China now, and how long it will take them -- to -- to achieve this. They are giving up their gods. They are giving up their -- their history of 3- -- 4,000 years. And -- so don't -- don't think this can be done -- is -- these slogans, "Communism," or "socialism," or whatever it was, is -- is very important. They don't care. They want to get out of something. They -- what to get into is a very, you see, they can't -- they can't tell.

Now I -- I mention this because you may compare 1911 to something like the year 300 in Roman history. And if you read the history of the 19th century in China, you know wh- -- what a terrible story it is. Boxer in 1900, the Opium War -- against the -- against the British. And nothing, so to speak, counts. -- It's just disintegration, you see. No -- all the efforts made in every decade of Chinese history in the 19th century can be -- can be imparted too late, you see, or too early. Too late as far as the empire goes, you see--the inner -- the -- purely Chinese solution--and too early for any integration into the industrial world of the West.

So nobody can be successful, so to speak, you see. Now this is part of the story -- of the 3rd century. It is too early to go Christian, and to give up the Roman gods, you see, and it is too late to try to -- to restore Roman piety. The best emperor the Romans had is the last pagan emperor, Diocletian. And he governs, as you may know, from 284 to 305 -- and, what is it? -08? And he is -- known only for his Diocletian persecution, usually, in history books. But there's a law in history, which I'd like to mention to you, that never is a bad ruler the cause for a great revolution. Because revolutions are not made for people, for individuals, you see, but for a mis-rule in the bones, in the structure of a government. So Louis XV, who was a bad king, did not sta- -- lead to the revolution, because people said, "Perhaps a better king can still cope with the problem of the French constitution." But when Louis XVI came, who was a good king, then they have to behead him. The same with James I. James I was drunken every day. So they didn't make a revolution, because they said it has to be -- perhaps it's just the fault of King James I, in England, you see.

But when Charles I, who was a nice king, had to do the same tyrannical thing, they said, "Something is rotten in the state of Dane," and beheaded him. One of your illusions is, you see--since you are just moral people--is that wickedness leads to revolutions. The czar of Russia, in 1917, was a very nice person, and meaning well. That's why he had to be murdered, because the constitution of Russia was impossible, you see, and not the -- not the czar. The -- King George III, as you well know now, was a very decent chap. But the ri- -- the -- independence of this country was ripe for quite inner reasons, you see, so whatever they did, even when they -- took back the -- the Stamp Act, you see, it didn't work -- help any. After all, the -- the Parliament in Britain was very reconciliatory. The -- they revoked the Stamp Act, you see. But it didn't work.

Will you kindly then take down: revolutions have nothing to do with individual wickedness, because people will always forbear an individual's wickedness, hoping that the next will prove better. You didn't overthrow the -- the -- this government because of Mr. Harding. He certainly was an unscrupulous man. And Mr. Grant's misrule in -- was just horrid in 1870, following years, you see. And you wait until you elect another president.

So wickedness in high places, as it is called, you see, is not a reason for a revolutionary change. Now that is against -- against all your moralizing stories in the little red schoolhouse. Since you are all taught by women teachers, you all get a wrong impression of history.

History has nothing to do with morality. History is efficiency. And the individual can be very well rejected and forborne, you see, as an exception. But when -- after the exception, you see, has -- is tri- -- thrown out, and the rule proves to be impossible, something has to be done. So Christianity came after the best emperor of the Roman Empire had proved a failure, and not the worst. Diocletian is a very great ruler. And he was so wise that he even--as you may not know--survived the -- his father's -- his nephew's, Constantine's, Christianization. He simply retired to the famous -- palace in Spala- -- in Split, and -- and planted his -- his chard and his cabbage, and said, "Empire? Not for me, anymore." They called him back one time, and asked him to "Come back and for Heaven's sake, help."

He said, "Sorry. I'm only interested in my own garden now."

So -- God favored him, you may say that the mercy of God was on Diocletian, the last persecutor of Christianity, because he had no ambition of his own. And -- so he was spared. And -- in -- as a human being, as in the flesh, so to speak. Carnally he was not the -- again, not the victim of this transition. But Rome had to be given up, the city of Rome. And at that very moment, the -- the empire entered the history of God with man, instead of remaining under -- his private god, so to speak, under Romulus, and -- and Jupiter Capitolinus.

All these things have completely slipped your minds. For the last 50 years, people have been -- told about the Roman gods as though there were no gods. And the Christian gods certainly as though -- Christ wasn't God. But if Christ is not divin- -- divine, certainly the history of the world can absolutely not be told. The divinity of Christ is in the fact that 300 years after His Crucifixion, He rose from the dead and moved the emperor of Rome to Constantinople.

What is it? Please come in. Well, this is not a good place to sit.

Well, this is -- has all to do with my attempt to arouse your interest in the 3rd century of -- our era. It's the most -- the darkest, the most obscure, the most misjudged, you see. -- Hundred years ago, if you went to college in this cont- -- country, it would always have been taught that Constantine was the -- the receipt for Pontius Pilate, you see, that the Romans 300 years later knew better than what they had done in -- in Jerusalem. Today, as you all concentrate on a so-called "life of Jesus," which cannot be written, and which doesn't exist, you are completely unable to understand history. Because without the -- Christian era, history -- there is no universal history. There are only the history of China, or the

history of Japan, you see. All pagan history is disconnected. The only attempt to be -- get into a world history is -- has been made by the people who wrote the Bible, who prophesied that there would be one history of mankind, and the Christian who did it. And otherwise there is no -- just no history.

I have a friend who is a pagan. And he was very true to his -- to his paganism. He composed a world history, in five big volumes, in German -- Helmolt -- Hans Helmolt is his name. One is Europe; the second is America; the third is Australia; the fourth is Africa; and the -- fifth is Asia. Now you look at the Australia volume, and you can imagine how thin it is, you see. There is just no -- no Australian history. But nevertheless, he was at least true to his paganism. In paganism, space comes before time; and in Christianity, time s- -- comes before space.

And you take down this rule, you will look through all the paganism that is rampant around you, which disconnects the times, because it falls for spaces. All the American history which you learn today is pagan history, because every attempt has been made in the last 40 years to dissociate America and give it a special place, as though it had -- was an historical entity of its own, you see, whereas obviously it goes from independence to interdependence, from -- in 1776, it can only be explained as a revolt against Britain, and now it can only be explained as a pivot around which the world is integrated into one -- global system. And if you omit this, you falsify everything. This country, after all, is peopled by immigrants. They are no native Americans, except the poor Indians. You are not -- Americans. You are people who have come to America. Therefore America is on the run. It's a dynamic force. It is -- has been used as a bridge, to bridge over the differences between the various continents. As soon as you take today -- of a nationalistic American history, you try to become an ancient pagan again. And this is of course, with the Renaissance mood in all people's mind, the great heresy today, you see. You read Plato, you read Aristotle; and you read into your American history something in space, something local. It's all a racket. This whole university is riddled with this paganism, of course.

And what does it mean? That space dominates time. That's Mr. Einstein's doctrine, that time is the fourth dimension of space; therefore time can be neglected. You first take a -- take a -- here, a square, they call this America, and then say, "I write the history into this."

Therefore you find nothing that points beyond or before this space, you

see. The space is then not the crystallization of time, as Constantinople is the result of the Roman Empire becoming Christian, you see. But you look at the map and say, "Byzantium lies in such a wonderful position that of course it had to become one day the -- the capital of the world." But the force that drew the Romans into Byzantium, you see, it's simply omitted. It's all geography. You find this in all your textbooks today. You have to decide. Everybody has these -- this decision every day again to make: is -- is space dominant of time, or is time dominant of space? If you move your house, you see, then time is dominant of space. You decide where to live, you see.

If, however, you inherit an old farmhouse, and have a white elephant on your hands -- as I know a boy. He married -- he was a boy from New York. The only thing that connected him with his past was this heirloom of a white elephant. His father, who was a big bank president in New York, had rebuilt--because he came from this farmer -- farming community. The father committed suicide. He was left all alone: no mother, no father, no relatives. He was an adopted child, by the way. He lives now in this little house -- in this little village in New -- upper New York state. He has married the town's -- belle of the town. She's very ugly. And then he was so homesick that he had to find somebody. This girl has completely emasculated him. He's not allowed to go to New York. He wanted to go to Norway, establish a business there. He's wealthy. She is a poor girl, from a foreman there of the factory.

But she has stripped him of all her -- his locks, like Delilah, the -- Samson, because she insists that he has to stay in Granville, New York, because that's all she knows. She is a country girl; she's frightened by the big city. She couldn't stand up with the -- there with anybody, and couldn't hold her own. And this boy, at the ripe age of 25, we had to give him up. He was my student. And one of my colleagues, we were very close to him, we have seen him go down and go down, because the space nightmare, you see, that he has to live in Granville, New York, where he doesn't belong at all, has -- has destroyed him. Generation of wi- -- vipers.

And so I see this all the time going on in this country, now. The -- the -- the lure of mere space, you see -- it is the same as -- as -- as the mother complex, of course, similar, you see. The womb. Because the womb is also something, you see, not you choose, and you decide for, but you go back into. It's the same story. And as you know, this problem is -- is very much with --.

If you say at this a- -- ripe age of yours, "I have to live in Southern Califor-

nia," you can't have any life. You ha- -- can't -- you don't have to say, "I must leave Cali- -- Southern California," but you must be free to say, sometime, you see, "I don't know." As soon as a person decides that it is a certain s- -- place where he has to live, you see, he loses a -- part of his freedom.

In 1935, when the Oxford Group movement came about, I met a -- a number of interesting people in this connection. And one was a Mr. {Musselman} from Pennsylvania. And I tell you this story, because I think it's -- has very much to do with our being historical -- diseased today. The -- he said, "I come from the deathbed of my father. My father was a Mennonite minister in Pennsylvania; so am I. So my father knew that he was going to die, so he called me in and said, 'My son, we came to this country 300 years ago, because we didn't want to take arm -- up arms. We are peaceful people. And because the emperor of the Holy Roman Empire demanded from his subjects that they were ready to serve, and, you see, to be put consc- -- put into the army, we left, and came to America.'

"Now I am afraid. I look around, and I feel"--it was after the First World War, and before the Second--"that we may have conscription in this country. So you have to promise me that you will keep the congregation fit, so that if this calamity should occur, we can leave again."

Now my contemporary, my friend, the son, said to me, mournfully, "My father didn't consider our quandary that now -- to -- there is no place to go to. You could go to America, you see, 300 years ago, but what do we do today?" And so we are so space-ridden today that you live already as though space could contain you. And that's why you have to make a special study of the conditions of human freedom today, because if you cannot emigrate, you see, if the passport can be taken away from you by the -- our -- your state department, you see, then you are licked indeed. Then you are just cogs on the wheel. The free movement over the -- you see, the -- decide in which country to live is the great privilege of everybody who lives in this country, because in his ancestry, he has this one exodus of Constantine to Constantinople. Every one of your parents, grandparents, or so, sometime made a decision at one time to come to this country.

And I think one of the problems of the Negro question in the South is that the Negroes did not make this decision. They were kidnapped and brought here, you see. So there isn't this great event in their lives, that in one time in the family history, you see, they said, "We go." You understand? And if you could find for



the -- for the colored people in this country such a decision, the whole integration probably would look different. They have never, in their strain of blood, you see, made this spiritual decision, that time comes before space, that you create the next space yourself.

All the important questions of the Negro -- problem are never -- never mentioned in this country. It's a very strange situation. You write volumes, and you have Supreme Court decisions, but what it's really about, nobody ever cares to -- to know. There -- it seems that you don't want to know. One is, that everybody else in this country came as a -- not as a slave, you see, or at least nine-tenths. There have been, of course, servants, the indentured servants. That's a -- but that's such a small group, and it could be amalgamated with the rest.

So will you kindly read then this paper with some -- with some interest with the historical problem itself, this -- if you can penetrate into the darkness of the 3rd century, then you understand the eternal problem of history to move out of a given space into the next.

Today this is so difficult, because you have to move out of America as a mere nation, or as a mere self-contained isolated continent into its becoming a part of the universe, you see. This is a spiritual movement, which doesn't consist in your giving up the space here, you see. But looking at it in a new light, you see, as being part of the globe. You understand the difference? This is a new spiritual emigration, which is much more difficult to perform, because if you take a ticket, so to speak, your legs are informed that you are moving, you see. But mere thought will not do this. That's why I'm still advocating a worldwide service, because -- if you do not move into Vietnam, or -- or China, or -- or Tibet, you see, for defin- -- or Africa, you see, the globe will -- will not become a reality to you.

Today we have -- the decision has to be made in every generation. Some people put space before time. Their homeland before the -- that which is due at this moment, like the South in 1860. In order to defend states' rights, you see, they neglected the -- the -- the hour which even the czar of Russia heard in his ear when he emancipated the serfs, you see. The czar emancipated the serfs before the -- before the Southern gentlemen decided to do that. Do you know when the czar emancipated his serfs?

(In 1863.)

(-1.)

Wie? Before Mr. Lincoln. It's very important.

You -- we just followed the Russian example. And again, you see what paganism does. This is not in the American textbooks in connection with the Civil War. It's just not mentioned. You speak of Alaska, because that's space. That was bought in 1867. But gentlemen, what you bought from Russia is the example of the emancipation of the slaves, and you got it for nothing. That's not in any textbook. It's somewhere mentioned perhaps in a footnote, but not in -- in the -- under the real, spiritual pressures of the atmosphere of your daily newspapers. How can you read in a paper that the czar has set the -- the serfs free, you see, in 1861, without this working up steam in this country?

I think all American history at this moment is absolutely polluted. The people who wrote the history in 1870 give you a much better picture of the American Civil War than the people who write on it today, because the -- America has lost its faith in the unity of world history. It's now trying to have a nice, happy, national history, at a time when all other nations have to give up their -- their national -- national pride.

And so I think all history books written at this -- as of the last 20 years are lacking in faith and perspective. And there you have a good example of back- -- backward -- backsliding. Take the educational system. Since 1910, America has not made progress in edu- -- its educational system, but regress. Now you have to understand that nobody is the -- sure of progress. The more you say "Progress is automatic," the more you may be sure that it isn't; then you go backward.

Progress is a constant uphill fight. And the -- the tragedy of this great country is that since 1910, when William James died, and Roosevelt--Theodore Roosevelt--lost -- went out, this country has -- has lost its soul to pragmatism, as you well know. And pragmatism means there is no continuity. It all comes by itself, automatically. Nobody has ever before believed in automatic progress. But you are made to believe this.

So what happens is that you move in a vicious circle today, and -- and the issues are just endless, because nothing is ever solved. Imagine, that since 1914, this -- this mighty republic has not been able to conclude peace. Do you think the treaty with Japan is a peace treaty? Do they have anything to eat? Do they have anything to live? This is not -- this may be in paragraphs written, but that's not a peace, because we haven't given them a place in -- you see, no trade with China. Obviously the only peace treaty we can give the Chi- -- the Japanese is to give them a certain area within which they can -- they can trade.

One of the ridiculous phrases, this Treaty of Versailles. Is this a peace treaty with Germany? We said -- they said, "Peace is declared." Oh, that's not a way of making peace. With the Russians we are at cold war. For 40 years, this country has struggled desperately not to make peace. And it has succeeded. And this comes all from the idea that America can, so to speak, can hold off, and you go places. I mean, the Haiti statehood -- Hawaii statehood and the Alaska statehood shows you the unimportant steps that are taken by the Congress, you see. It's very nice that Hawaii and Alaska are states; will never be. This is, I mean, it's a pipe dream. It's very nice, we have two more stars. But they are -- they are not states in the original sense of statehood. You -- with 35,000 people in Alaska and--white people--you -- you cannot -- that's not a state. It's just -- a nice occupation for the Congress. And the aunts and daughters who write the letters there.

I mean -- Congress just does superfluous things at this moment, because the great solutions are too difficult. I mean, it -- that's -- that would tell the people that hard times are ahead, and not prosperity. So the poor president has to haggle over \$3 billion foreign aid, I mean, when it should be 15.

Because we are in a global situation, and we are not in a -- in a local situation. It has all to do with the -- with the sermons on history which you hear in your -- in your schools, you see. You see, if you dance around the flag, then of course the two more stars in the flag are the important thing, you see. But if -- if -- if America is a star-spangled banner -- inviting all the nations of the world to join the open sky of our real creator, you see, then the -- the -- the story is very different, you see. Then it isn't the two more states of Hawaii and Alaska, you see, that matter, but whether the other states would also feel -- stars -- to be stars in one galaxy with us.

And that is the promise of America. On -- all this to be told about the year 300.

So -- May 20th, may I have this paper on your -- what you think? And it -- as you see, it has great implications, whether you say this is written as the -- at the end of a -- of such a critical era, when -- when Rome was given up, or whether you think it's a belated forgery of people who had really no political standing. Did you get a machine?

(Yes.)

Well, after the recess then, we should do --. You -- we -- we plunged into Thucydides, didn't we? Did you find -- is there any- -- anything about the man in the book? Who is Mr. Thucydides?

(An historian.)

Well, is this true?

Here, the little word "F" is the -- the -- the -- stumbling block. What we call "history" has been determined by Mr. Thucydides. He's the first historian. Herodotus has been called the father of history, but I think Thucydides is the first brother of modern historians, the oldest. What we call "history" has been -- has been determined by Thucydides. That's quite a strange thing. What -- what our departments of history now proclaim is Thucydidean history. And so he's more than an historian. He's the historian, the yardstick of history. Ja?

(He's been called the father of scientific history.)

Ja. We come to this. Sure. It's -- it's the Greek aspect of history. It's the anti-Jewish aspect. And we have -- live on two strands. For everything we speak today, or we think today, you see; always the Greek, and the Jewish--the Israelite. "Israel" is perhaps better, because the -- only -- that it -- has the -- the spiritual connotation of a -- of a different language, of a different approach. The Israelites are indifferent to space, and the Greeks are given to space. That is, in -- for the Greeks, the history is predetermined by the people who carry it out. By the Israelites, it is the epoch, you see, which is determined, you see: "At one time, God sent His son. At one time, the -- Egypt has been relinquished. At one time, the great flood comes."

So it is always the -- Israelites have to do with the epochs of the world, with the eons of eons, with the ages of ages. The Greeks have to do with the fate and destiny of cities, of the individual entity, of the body politic and its history. So everything I have said against American history has of course its protagonist in Thucydides, you see.

You have to look through these two eternal strands of our human thinking. Christianity is an attempt to -- not allow one or the other to get the upper hand. It is the synthesis of these two. There is an American history, of course, as a

part of the universal history.

The Old Testament doesn't write such an interesting story as Thucydides about the individual, you see, story of the -- it's not interesting, I mean. It goes by. But the Greeks are. So Thucydides is the father of scientific history. That's Point 1 about him. When did he live? Would you tell me?

(Um, 455 B.C. to 400 B.C., according to the --.)

Well, is it known?

(No. I say, according to this book { }.)

Well, there is great uncertainty about his -- his life, as a matter of fact. But what is the outstanding event which makes him, so to speak, authorizes him to write the history of this? What was his position?

(Well, I -- { } he was a general --)

Yes, but on the basis of what?

(On his -- the basis of his wealth and citizenship.)

Wie?

(On the basis of his wealth and citizenship.)

I think wealth, yes. He was -- it mean -- there has even been a suspicion that he was not a simply an Athenian, but may have been mixed in with -- with the Thracians, with Thracian origins. That he was a -- so to speak, a -- half a native of a non-Greek country, which I think adds -- adds zest, because first-generation people--as I, really care to think, of course, very much being one, you see, an immigrant--are the best. Because they make the greatest effort. Thucydides has every reason to make a real effort to prove his Athenian value. He had to do more than the ordinary. So -- he had -- what was his -- he was like a '49er in California. He owed gold mines -- owned gold mines, you see, in Thra- -- in Thracia. And where is this, his -- his home? Where is this? Could you give -- show it to me on the map?

(I think I can show it to you on the map. Just I haven't got a map. But it's --

I -- I can tell you -- is there a map here? By looking in the book. Um. I guess -- the

closest to { }. No, it isn't. They show Macedonia in here. Yeah, I know that's here; it is. No it isn't, either. It's to the right of Macedonia. To the east.) East. To the east. On the way to Constantinople. Well, there is in -- I told you -- I asked you to look up the places in which he is mentioned, did we? Didn't I?

{{ }.)

Did I? Did you find his own participation in the war? Could you tell me? What does he do? I think it's very significant -- a very significant way of mentioning his own actions. Can you tell me?

(Well, I just remembered that in Thrace, he was supposed to --)

A little louder. Everyone wants to hear.

(In Thrace, he was supposed to go there as general to -- I can't remember the names right now -- to fight off this Spartan general. But he comes -- I think he came too late, or the day after the Spartan general had taken over, and { }, something like that, yeah. And -- and then he is put into exile after this { }.)

Well, "put into exile," that's not good English. How do you say that?

(Sent into exile.)

(He was exiled.)

(He was exiled.)

Always try to keep the verb a verb. Don't use these circumlocutions, will you? This is horrid. This is the death of language, I mean. That's really always the end, when you have to -- to kill the -- the power of the verb. This country is riddled with -- with noun-mindedness, you see. So the -- the language becomes brick. I mean this, you see. You treat language as consisting of bricks out of which you build houses and "mental pictures," as you even call it. And as soon as you treat language as visibility, it dies. Language -- nouns are subordinate to verbs. We speak because we have to describe the -- our place with regard to an act, you see. Language means--which you do not know, and again there is this complete pagan teaching about language in this country at this moment. You see, I can say, "I shall be exiled," "I am to be -- going to be exiled," you see, and "I

am exiled." And the three tenses describe your position towards an act. Language is not the power to say, "I am exiled." Or "I am green," you see, but is the power to place myself with regard to the time of another event. It has -- therefore the three tenses are pre-given.

We speak in order to be able to say what is behind us and what is in front of us, because we have to live. Now living means, you see, to leave something behind in time, and to go forward, to decide what is dead and what is living. That's why we speak. And therefore, if you can't say, you see, "I am exiled," you have mis- -- abusing language as all schoolmasters do abuse it today by saying, "We want to say that this is a book." We don't speak in order to think -- claim that this is a book. This you can throw on the table. And everybody sees what it is, you see. For this purpose, we don't speak. But we have to say, "I'm through with Europe," you see. "I'm all for Asia." In this moment, you decide what's the future and what's the past. That's why we speak.

So all the tenses of grammar are simultaneously given. We speak, "This was," because we want to be able to say, "This shall be," because we have. Otherwise we are suffocated as in a -- by the lack of oxygen when we dive into the water, you see. Life is full of corpses. Every human being at every moment has to breathe freshly and has to bury his dead. And we speak in order to decide what we have to leave behind, and what we -- is coming, at what we are in. So the three tenses of grammar give you the skeleton of speech, you see: "have been," "is," "shall be." And you have to decide where you are at this moment, you see, what you decide: my parents, that's the past; my wife, that's the future, and my children. If you can't do this, as most Americans can't, they can't speak. That's why most boys here can't get married. They have mistresses and mothers. Because they never can say that they have to leave their father and their mother, and cleave to the wife of their choosing. That's why we speak. The marriage vow is a good example; that means a break in time. And from this moment on, your father's home is behind you, is the past. And your home which you are going to build is the future. And that's why we have to speak. Any oath you take, the -- is -- is such a decision: from now on, this is -- alive, and this is dead.

You come to this country, here, an immigrant, you take an oath to become a citizen of the United States, you forswear allegiance to all the past gods, you see, to the -- to the emperors and kings of -- of Europe, you see, and you become a citizen of the -- America. For this you have to speak. Because it is only -- speech is made to mention breaks in time. That's why history is a natural with human

beings, you see. We are historical beings, because we have -- otherwise we will be killed by the masks of the dead. You could never leave Europe, never become an American citizen, you could never marry if you couldn't say, "This has been," and "This is now."

So I want you to understand that to speak historically is the first breath of life for a human being by which -- which makes that we are able to transform the world, whereas all the animals have to stay put and remain where they are. An animal cannot say, "Has been," you see. And we can.

And all you learn about speech, or what a -- what a lesson it could be, is all wrong, because today in this country, people undertake to tell you, "This is a newspaper," "This is a book," "This is an envelope," "This is a chair," and they call this language. For this, nobody would care to -- create language. But you have to create language in order to say, you see, "One thing has been, and the other thing is to come," because you have to date your life. You have to emerge.

So this is Thucydides' -- Thucydides' attempt to show that he is an Athenian. And I think now -- could you give me the chapter in which he speaks of this -- of this event? I think it deserves some scrutiny. Where is it? Where { } Thucydides { }?

{ }.

Well, I think it deserves scrutiny, how he puts his own en- -- engagement and his own participation. I think it's very subtle. What is subtle about it, { }? Will you tell me?

(Page 290. I think it's the page 2- -- about the gold mine?)

Ja. Now, by the way, what -- which chapter is this?

(288 -- Chapter 8.)

May I say that is one of the most horrid translations that exists, which you have? It's only cheap, but in every respect. Which chapter?

(I have 290.)

I don't mean the pages.



(Chapter 8. Book IV, Chapter 8.)

Let me try to find this.

(It's about the fourth paragraph, according to this translation.)

See? Are we with --?

(When he { } Sparta { }.)

Ninth paragraph. Now I have here an old, stodgy translation, by the greatest British translator of the 19th century, Mr. Jowett, who was m- -- master of Balliol. You may have heard his name here. Translated Plato, too. B. Jowett, M.A., master of Balliol College, Regis Professor of Greek, University of Oxford. And -- it came out in Boston, too. And it's infinitely more -- more trustworthy than this translation, which is -- which is made readable, and thereby forced to -- to simply go off from the truth.

Let me read then my text. "The appro-" -- now where is it? Paragraph --.

"The -- the -- the passage of the river was a complete surprise. Against Amphipolis now Brasidas led his army here."

Allow me then to bore you with the text, just as a case of -- of historical analysis, so to speak, of text analysis:

"Against Amphipolis Brasidas now led his army. Starting from Arne in Chalcidice, towards evening he reached Aulon and Bromiscus."

Do you have this?

(Yes.)

It is worth your while to compare, how it -- the two translators call it { }.

"At the point he reached Aulon and Bromiscus at the point where the lake Bolbe flows into the sea. Having there supped, he marched on during the night. The weather was wintry and somewhat snowy."

I make a -- I'll pass over this, and we go now over to the next -- para-

graph.

"The general to whose care the place had been committed by the Athenians sent for help to the other general in Chalcidice, Thucydides, the son of Olorus"--now Olorus, as I told you, is not a Greek name--"who wrote this history. He was in Anthasos, an island colonized from Thasos, and distant from Amphipolis -- Amphipolis about a half-a-day's sail."

Half a day's sail, I would suspect, means 12 hours. I'm not sure. But it -- whether it raises -- the question whether a day is 12 hours or 24 hours at that time, you see. I -- I -- I'm afraid the -- 24-hour day didn't exist, and it could well be there's just six hours. It's quite interesting, you see.

In a -- natural, I mean, for the -- human beings, day and night are clearly divided. That we speak of "day" as 24 hours, is the result of the last 400 years only, you see. And of the Coper- -- the abstract reckoning of modern mathematics and physics, it's very late. The daily laborer is a man who works from day- -- sunrise to -- you see, to sunset. And that's what we mean by a day, you see. "A day's work," and all these things. I think it's quite interesting. I don't know what they say in the Greek text. I don't -- didn't bring it.

"As soon as he heard the tidings, he sailed quickly to Amphipolis with seven ships which happened to be on the spot. He wanted to get into Amphipolis if possible, for -- before it could capitulate, or at any rate to occupy Eion."

Where's Eion? Do you have a map? I'm not -- not { }.

{ }.)

Is it near Amphipolis? Is it further -- out to the sea?

(Yes. Yes.)

It's so to speak, the -- the harbor of Amphipolis, is it? Like the Piraeus, on Athens.

"Meanwhile Brasidas, fearing the arrival of the ships from Thasos, and hearing that Thucydides had the wor- -- right of working gold mine in the neighboring district of { }, and was consequently one of the leading men of the country, did his utmost to get possession of the city before his arrival."

Now I -- there you have the subtlety. The tragedy of Amphipolis, you see, is now laid to the great respect which Brasidas held for Thucydides. So the failure of Thucydides to dis- -- you see, to -- to come to the rescue of Amphipolis is here turned into a merit of Thucydides, because he -- filled Brasidas such respect for his importance. I think this is the crown- -- I mean, if you understand this, this is clever indeed. It may even be true. We don't know. But it certainly shows that Thucydides turned a very awkward situation, you see, in his favor, because he's said -- explained now the victory of Brasidas, with the respect for Thucydides, you see. This I think is the -- is the subtlety of the -- of the performance. Without saying a word, without telling you that he's interested in Thucydides at all. It's all put at the doorstep, you see, of Mr. -- Mr. Brasidas.

"Fearing the arrival of the ships from Thasos," you see, and "hearing that Thucydides was -- one of the leading men of the country, did his utmost to get possession of the city before his arrival. He was afraid that if Thucydides once came, the people of Amphipolis would no longer be disposed to surrender." You understand the -- the whole logic of this? "From their hope would be -- for their hope would be that he would bring in allies," you see, such an important man, he could bring in allies by sea from the islands, or collect troops in { } relieve them. He therefore offered moderate terms for claiming that any Amphipolitan or Athenian might either remain in the city"--a very -- very mild conditions, indeed--"and have the enjoyment of his property on terms of equality, or if he preferred, might depart, taking his goods with him within five days."

It seems to me that since this is the only place in which he is shown as engaged in the history which he writes, we -- you should give a certain importance to this one and only case. And at the end of the paragraph after the surrender, then he says -- Thucydides says of himself:

"On the evening of the same day, Thucydides and his ships sailed into Eion, but not until Brasidas had taken possession of Amphipolis, missing Eion only by a night. For if the ships had not come to the rescue with all speed, the place would have been in his hands on the next morning.

"Thucydides now put Eion in a state of defense, desiring to provide not only against any immediate attempts of Brasidas, but also against future danger. He received the fugitives who had chosen to quit Amphipolis according to the agreement, and wished to come into Eion. Brasidas suddenly sailed to Eion, hoping that he might take the point which -- which runs out from the wall, and

thereby command the entrance to the harbor. At the same time, he made an attack by land. But in both these attempts, he was foiled. Thereupon he returned and took measures for the settlement of Amphipolis. The Edonian town of Myrcinus joined him" and we don't have to go into this.

"The Athenians were seriously alarmed --."

Now what is said about the fate of Thucydides?

{ }.

(Chapter 3?)

Will you read this, now in your text?

(The sentence, or -- ?)

All about Thucydides.

(All right.)

("The history of this period has also -- has been written by the same Thucydides, an Athenian, keeping to the order of events, as they happened by summers and winters, down to the time when the Spartans and their allies put an end to the empire of Athens and occupied the long wall and Piraeus. By then, the war had lasted altogether 27 years, and it would certainly be an error of judgment to consider the interval of the agreement as anything else except a long period of war. One has only to look at the facts to see that it's hardly possible to use the word 'peace' for a situation in which neither side gave back or received what it -- what had been promised. And apart from this, there were breaches of the treaty on both sides in connection with the { } and the Epidaurian waters, and in other respects, too. The allies in the Thracian area continued hostile as before, and the Boeotians were in a state of truce, which had to be renewed every ten days.

("So -- so if one puts together the first ten years' war, the uneasy truce with -- which followed it, and a subsequent war, one will find, reckoning by summers and winters, that my estimate of the number of years is correct within a few days. Also that, for those who put their faith in oracles, he re is one solitary instance of their having been proved accurate. I myself remember that all the time, from beginning to the end of the war, it was but -- it was being put about by many people that the war would last for thrice

nine years. I lived through the whole of it.")

So how many years would this be?

(39. Thrice -- 27 years.)

"I lived through the whole of it, being of an age to understand what was happening, and I put my mind to the subject so as to get an accurate view of it. It happened, too, that I was banished from my country for 20 years after my command at Amphipolis. I saw what was being done on both sides, particularly the Peloponnesian side, because of my exile. And this leisure gave me rather exceptional facilities for looking into things. I shall now therefore go on to describe the disputes that took place after the 10 years' war, the breach of the treaty, and the warfare which came afterwards."

This is the heart of the book, of the whole work of Thucydides, this chapter. And it is strangely interwoven with personal faith and his real concern, his concern is which? What does he -- against whom does he argue here? And the -- I may tell you one thing. It's the only place in which there is even the slightest hint of any religious interest of -- in Thucydides, religious in the sense of mentioning an oracle, which was given there about the war, beforehand, you see, some -- some connection with the priestly or templar traditions, or judgments on the matter. Otherwise, Thucydides, as -- being a scientific historian, is absolutely secular, I mean. It's just a question of cause and effect, and of reason. And he -- is really a Greek. But he has this one great concern. What does he want to prove? What's -- what does he want to prove?

(It's one, continuous war.)

Wie?

(Is it one continuous war?)

That it's one continuous war. And this is his stroke of genius. It's his inspiration. The Greeks are the nation of geniuses, gentlemen. Every Greek is, so to speak, whom we mention today--whether it's Aeschylus, or whether it's Prometheus, or whether it's -- Demosthenes--we worship the Greeks as a nation of geniuses. Now a genius is able to hold onto us a specific inspiration: the poem, you see. That's an inspiration, you see. Later, he may be very stupid, this man. Like Edgar Allan Poe, he may be -- even go insane, you see. Or he may --

up the spirit, like Melville, before his -- his death.

The inspiration is, in regard to history, the opposite from what the prophets, or the Bible tries to do. The Bible insists on the continuity of the history of creation. All creation is one breath of God. A thousand years are before him as one day. The Greeks say the opposite. They say, "I don't know anything of what has gone on before." Thucydides begins and say, "We know very little of the past. But this event I shall stamp with the inspiration of my genius as the outstanding event of all times." And he made it so.

And if we read Thucydides, we actually believe him, that the events from 431 to 404 are the Peloponnesian War. And he has made you believe this, as far as you are interested in Greek history at all. And this isn't true. From the purely skeptical point of view, you can just as well hold that in the year 423, peace was established for nine years -- the -- the -- the so-called Peace of {Artedimus}. And so he has here this one, you see, that's his great enemy, the possibility that somebody denies his -- his vision, that man should look at the times -- here, I have put them, the dates there--the three times nine, my dear man--as -- as being one.

Now in order to make you understand what importance this can have for the decisions of mankind, I am, you see, engaged in a profound battle with the pagans at this moment by -- who try to say that World War II is a war by itself, fought against Mr. Hitler, and that World War I is something different. And I insist that there was an armistice between--just as Thucydides, you see, in my -- you may say I don't claim great originality--but the inspiration which guides me in my historical attempts is to prove that 1914 and 1945 must be considered a unity if we want to understand what we should do about it, you see.

I have given an address on January 30, in Germany to this -- that was the -- the program, so to speak, which I developed there before a group of influential business people, and I tried to show them why, if the -- we do not -- we do not make this effort to see Mr. Wilson and Mr. Roosevelt as one, you see, having one and the same problem to solve, we will never understand that the -- World War II was not accidental, just the brute, Hitler. But that it did answer -- attempt to -- to -- like any vaccination, to bring back the virulence of a poison that's in your body, you see, and to make it virulent again, and -- so that you can operate now on -- on the patient there.

You know when you have had the {dysentery}, and the consequences are with you, there are doctors now--the doctor who treated Lenin, for example, had

the idea, the first man who operated on the brain, Mr. {Foerster}, that you should bring back the old infectious disease which had become latent, you see, in order to be able to cure it. You have a disease, you see, it -- it -- it becomes chronic, it weakens you constantly, but it isn't -- there is no fever anymore, you see. It doesn't work -- actually. So he had the idea he would vaccinate the patient with the same poison, so that he could treat it, you see. Then he would get the diphtheria poison, so to speak, or the scarlet poison, or whatever it was, out of your body.

This is the problem of the historian. The things latent, the things not mentioned, the things inarticulate, you see, and the first effort is: since you live day by day, by the daily news, you are inclined to think that one year is disconnected from the other. And therefore you do not see that we are paying the penalty for Versailles today -- for the Treaty of Versailles and the Americans' marching out of the Treaty of Versailles. And that's why we have the Cold War, because we have not learned to make peace. An historian has just published a book, *The Art of Making Peace*, and shown how it has completely gone by default. After Mr. Grant demanded the unconditional surrender at Vicksburg in 1864, it was, I think, or 1863.

(-3.)

Wie? -3, you see. This formula has poisoned all international relations, because Mr. Roosevelt had learned in school, you see, that Grant asked for unconditional surrender at Vicksburg. Now you can ask within -- in a civil war, you can ask for unconditional surrender, because allegedly you know where to go back to, you see. But you cannot ask for unconditional surrender and have no terms for the peace, you see. That's no solution. That's what we have done, you see.

Unconditional surrender is one of the most stupid formulas, because it has lulled to sleep, not as -- to ask it from the enemy is all right. But it dispensed, you see, on the side of the Allies with all mental effort to understand the future. And to write a -- just an adequate peace. And so it blinds the victor himself. It -- it makes him -- it paralyzes him. Oh, { }. Well, we have dealt with the red Indians in this manner, you see, and -- but you can't deal with the -- half of the world in this manner.

So the -- today we have this chapter of Thucydides. You should learn it by heart. It is the -- the -- the power of Greek genius to make you understand an epoch, the unity of an epoch; and that's the creation of the human spirit; that's

an act of faith. Nietzsche, the German philosopher who is -- I mean, is there still to -- with us, to plague us for the rest of our lives, I can assure you, said, "History will always be an article of faith."

Now you understand, this has nothing to do with any special creed or faith. It means that you can only write coherent history if you bank on the unity of an event. You create this { }. You can always also -- tear it apart. You can say that 1917, when the United States entered the World War I, you see, that's a new event, that's the American war. And you can distort thereby the whole picture, and cut it -- the World War I even, into little pieces and say that the first three years is European war, and the second -- last year is the World War. Obviously, it would make no sense, you see. The thing is a little more complicated. You cannot separate America's entrance into the World War from the previous events. You understand.

Still in your country, I think, if I read the books right, the attempt is always made to begin the history of the World War I, for America, at least, with the entrance in the war, which is not true, you see. If you want to understand the -- America's contribution to the World War, I will remind you of two -- two dates. And again, it's Russia and the United States who share the laurels of the event. Only to show you that epochs are inspired, insights, acts of faith.

I had -- we had this 1861 emancipation of the serfs in Russia, and 186- -- when is it, in America?

(-3.)

Now, look at these two dates. In 1914, the Russians make war. And they have no other way out, I mean. It wasn't a question of -- already they were in the throes of their own revolution for the last nine years. So the -- the government just simply couldn't go back down, because they had to -- at least had external successes, since they had only defeats at home.

And at this moment, Mr. Henry Ford of this country gave his workmen the \$5 day. That is, he solved for all practical purposes the cleavage between capital and labor in declaring that his -- his workmen were his customers. Which is an absolutely, you see, new idea, and which made the sol- -- for the solidarity of capital and labor. Because if the workman is himself the customer and can have a -- buy a Ford car, Mr. Ford is just as much interested in the wealth of the worker, you see, as in his exploitation.



In 1917, the -- Russians make a social revolution, and the -- America enters the war. And you have this exact reciprocity. The -- the Ger- -- Americans have first solved their labor problem, and then gone to war, to impart it to the rest, so to speak, their -- their possibilities, their industrial system. And the Russians had no industrial system, of course. So they first go to war, you see, then are forced to give up the war, and do something different. And -- industrialize, what they are doing ever since.

That's why Russia -- is really peace-loving, because it has paid the penalty of, you see, being -- having to go to war, and then finding that the work -- didn't work -- war didn't work.

Now you had again -- nobody in this country has the imag- -- the imagination, strangely enough; they look at events day by day, to see that when America did this in 1914, you see, that Henry Ford acted for the United States mo- -- much more -- was much more important in this moment than president, and Congress, and anybody else, you see. He changed the system of the United States, the social system. And you know how it -- how it is expressed? We even have a great symbol of this. We have Labor Day. In all other countries, including this country down to 1914, Labor Day was May 1st, and it was a day exclusively of labor, of the proletariat. It was invented in this country, 1889, May 1st; and it has now become the national holiday of the Russians, as you know. It is celebrated in Paris. It's celebrated in Berlin. It is celebrated in -- in -- in Rome. But in this country, it was quietly moved to Labor Day in September, because it is not a class day.

With the resolve of Mr. Henry Ford in 1914, you see, the -- the whole idea that it had to be an action of protest on the part of the workers against the existing order has broken down. And you know all -- what Labor Day involves in this country. It is no day of opposition. It's one of the grandest histories of the world, but the Americans don't care to write it up. You see, the -- the -- the dislodgement of the revolutionary May 1st, and its -- replacing it by Labor Day in September means that capital and labor in this country are reconciled. That's all what it means, but that's quite a bit.

And therefore, the Americans went to war with the good conscience to export an article of faith. And the Russians went to war in order to start their own revolution. I can tell you that the leading -- Russian Bolshevik in -- in Am- -- in Europe, a man who was shot then in Munich in 1919, as a -- as -- when he headed the government in Bavaria for a while, went into the barracks of Munich in 1914. And when he found that the Bavarian farmers were not at all eager to go

to war in July of '14, he said, "What? You do not want to help us to abolish czarism?"

He was so revolutionized himself, you see, that he thought these poor Bavarian peasants and farmers had to be very keen to abolish czarism in Russia. Of course, they weren't. But he thought this was the great global event, you see. The war was fought for the abolition of Russia's, you see, despotism. Only to show you the en- -- the universal engagement of men's hearts and minds in this struggle, you see; this is a true story. And it shows you that wars are always fought for spiritual {points}. They are never fought on -- for these -- what you read in the books, for economic purposes and so weiter, because you can't get people to be shot dead, you -- on the ground for somebody else getting rich.

[tape interruption]

Oh, very kind. Very kind. See you tonight?

(Yes.)

Here? So let's have a break here.

[tape interruption]

It means that genius has always to perform in every generation a task. People live through events and call all them "happenings." "This happened." Now happenings have to be transformed into events...

[tape interruption]

...because we -- we run through so many things. They may happen to us, you see, but they remain haphazardous. The Peloponnesian War is not an -- haphazard, thanks to Thucydides, in our mind, you see. It's a necessary event. And this has not yet been done for the last 40 years, I assure you. And this is why we are in bad shape. As soon as the stamp of inevitability, of necessity can be put on these last 40 years, you see, the Homer of this Trojan War has been found; and then the Trojan War can come to rest. And every event has to be made into an event, by this act of faith that we cannot have lived in vain: these sufferings, you see, "These dead cannot have died in vain." The Gettysburg

Address and the Second Inaugural of -- of Lincoln have done exactly this to the Civil War, you see. Then it became an event that had its meaning. And mere happening, Fort Sumter and so, this is all meaningless. It could have been wrong to -- to -- for example, to -- to -- to go out, you see, and -- call of arms after Fort Sumter was taken.

Why not -- why not abide by it?

I told you perhaps that in -- on Monday, December 8th, 1941, my students in class argued that we didn't have to go to war against Japan. They said, "Pearl Harbor? We just refuse to accept that." you see. "That's not war." Twenty-four hours after the event. Wie? Wie?

Now, will you --.

[tape interruption]

It is incredible that scientists will deny that they know anything of the future. Well, they know certainly that there shall be science. That's dogmatic. And then these same scientists rant about dogma. But they have a very peculiar dogma. They say, "Science comes first. Science is important. Science is necessary. Everything has to be sacrificed for science." Isn't this dogmatic? And isn't this absolutely -- hand -- stemming from the future? Because science is very imperfect of -- as of this moment, and only if it is later making progress is it the real science. Many things in medicine today, for example, are believed that--in my mind -- in my mind--are mere superstitions. Well, we keep going in medicine, because we hope tomorrow there will be the true medicine. So it is with, of course, with every -- with every field of human endeavor.

Now if you could see that the scientists are nothing but the branch of the human prophecy turned towards the earth, and earthly things, the things of matter, you would understand that we all--you at this moment, living here at -- UCLA--are preparing for the future. What keeps you here is the firm faith that it's worthwhile studying here and preparing yourself for the rest of your life. And as soon as you would give up this idea of preparation, you would become a very unpleasant hangover. You would become a student who could never leave this place, you see. And there are such individuals, but I think they are -- everybody feels that they have just missed the boat. Yet, according to your philosophy of time--if you go to the logical semanticists of this college, you see, and listen to their philosophy--time -- future doesn't exist. Nobody is here except as of the

moment. Every one of you is here, because he has a -- quite a firm conviction that for the next five -- 50 years, he should be equipped here.

So you know much more of the future than you care to admit. Everybody who is alive is drawn by the future. And you remember what we said at the first half of this meeting, that -- the pressure from the future is the -- the agent that makes us try to say of those things that are past, "have been." I told you that all human speech, all human articulation is this attempt to get your elbows in -- working both ways, moving in time, not moving in space. The scientist, who deals only with space and can tell you that time should be treated in the laboratory as the fourth dimension of space, at the same time, of course, is ambitious and wants to progress, and he believes only in time. And he has nothing to do with space in his own personal career, you see. He is called from one country to another, like Mr. von Braun, who goes from Germany to -- to -- to Florida. And it doesn't matter, you see. He wants to execute his -- his great dream of the future. So where is space with him? He is only making this progress from year to year to come nearer to the realization of his dream. That's an historical evolutionary -- process. And so I think all scientists themselves are just blind to what they really live. They have all -- the life of a scientist today is the outstanding example of an historical example -- of an historical existence which is dictated to, which is articulated by the future, and therefore takes a profound interest in the preparatory steps already done in this -- in this regard by people in the past. Any scientist is engaged in dealing with the history of his science, because he -- has to select all those data which are still there, so to speak, unfinished in -- by -- by -- former explorations.

I remember the simple story that in 1938, Mr. Otto Hahn, in Germany, the father of the atom bomb, of the -- of the atom fission, published his results. I mean, when uranium could be cut into halves. And they'd no idea at that time that there would ever be a bomb made out of this. But Mr. Fermi, Enrico Fermi--the man who's in this country now--he -- he had made the experiments leading Mr. Hahn to this statement four years ago. And he didn't know what he had done. It was Mr. Hahn's business then to go over the record, and to interpret these experiments. And they might have been done 50 years before, and say, "This is it."

And -- only to tell you that people in science -- in the history of science don't know what they are doing, why they are doing it, you see. That the reinterpretation of such an experiment is very often due to another man. And you find this time and again, in mathematics. Who is -- has anybody a special interest in

mathematics? You? Well, you may have heard of the -- of the quat- -- how is it called in English? quaternio -- theory of Mr. Grassman. He -- he made this discovery and his statement in 1849, if I'm right, or 1846. And he was so disgusted with the people of his time--no mathematician understanding what he had done--that he went off into Sanskrit and wrote then an equally elegant and important volume on Sanskrit -- Sanskrit -- Hindu culture for the last 30 years of his life. He just gave up mathematics, and became a reasonable man. And then 50 years later, the mathematicians discovered that this had -- was the next step, you see, in this study of higher equations. And Mr. Grassman, all -- all of a sudden, became a terribly important stepping stone, you see, for the new theory.

This is how science rediscovers the past constantly. And if you would understand that this is just an example as how we -- you have to rediscover World War I at this moment, you see, as the -- the cradle of all the problems besetting us at -- as of this moment, you would understand why I am long- -- waiting for Mr. Thucydides as of today, you see. A man who -- who makes all the schoolchildren see that they have to live after the last 40 years, and cannot go back to the orange groves, and the go- -- and the wild western films of 1900. And as long as you go to the westerners, you see, without relating these westerners as a mere past to your real, present problems, you live in a dream world, because there is not this intermission; there is not this break with the past.

I think our western movies are an excellent example of this desperate attempt of any -- of any group of people, you see, to hold onto something that does no longer exist, you see. And that's all right. I mean, fairy tales are all right. But you must know that they are fairy tales. As soon as you say, "These are fairy tales," you see, it's all right. But as long as you -- you take the sheriff there and the -- and the -- and the cow puncher too seriously, all our young boys will shoot each other, as they do.

And I think this is a dream world, most -- for most youngsters today. The -- the -- and -- and you should me- -- you should measure Sunday school and school instruction, both, by the power they have to break up the dream world of the youngster. If they enter this dream world and s- -- and sup- -- and support it even, entertain it, and don't make them into historical beings, they have missed their task. Religion and -- and history have this -- make this attempt to make us aware, shoot us into this decision, this decisive point that we decide at what time we live, you see.

Ja. It -- is there still -- you care to still listen to the rest? Or don't you? Then we'll -- we shall go on.

So may I -- add my criticism? I want you to understand, I haven't given back these papers. I would have to have been quite violent. And -- this whole list--past, present, and future--you have to throw out as a --. It's a curse of this naturalistic tradition, that people write these three things in this -- in this fashion. Try to always write "future" first, "past" second; and then see that the conflict between the two, that's the present.

Look at your own life. You live as a child at home, and in school under the routine. You fall in love. That breaks -- brings a break. All of a sudden, you have to -- to use subterfuges to stay away from home; you have to -- begin a life of your own. You can't tell everything; there are secrets. And there should be secrets, by the way. You shouldn't tell your { } such a thing. It is a secret. It's your whole life. And you cannot explain it to anybody else, if it is worth anything.

Now this little seed, which it is, you see, the more the seed is in the ground, the more hidden it is; it has to grow. And all of a sudden, you develop a tension, and you have to let the seed grow, and the old tree from which you are a chip that has to die of -- in your -- inside yourself, has to become less. You have to be able to give less and less to the authority of your -- your elders, and to -- trust more and more to { }. That takes time, and it takes 10 years, before you say -- {marry}. If you -- if you overdo it, you -- elope. That is, you make an artificial break, where you should make a transition, where you should -- you have no presence then. You have just the future, you see, as an urge, and the past as effect.

The present then, is the process during which we ab- -- are absolved and redeemed from the past, and are made ready for the future. So the present is all the time a process of -- of -- how do you call this? -- "abwickeln" in German--liquidation, you may say, I mean it's this -- you see, you have a firm that's already -- you know you want to close down. You see, the old firm, you want to establish your own firm, a new one, you see. And the process of transition in which you have to liquidate the old firm, and prepare and register with the new. That's by and large what the present is. It's a constant involvement. Here you are in college. You are still partly living on the -- on a scholarship, or on your parents, or on some sideline income, you see. You are preparing, and at the same time, you are liquidating links with the past. You are still in school, but it's a high school. We call "university" a higher school of learning, an institution which is definitely not simply an annex of the customs of the past, which was also as my -- I tried to say, contains some germs which -- which the older people

did not receive into their {care}. I mean, the university and a school are distinguished by this one fact that a school tries to transmit what the parents also know, the three R's, you see; and the university tries to transmit you certain things which your parents have not known, yet. That's the difference between high and -- and low.

All this is unknown, and therefore the present has this very strange connotation with you. In -- in nature, there is no presence. You must always say that in nature, while I am speaking here, physically, you see, my -- the second half of my word, which I haven't yet -- of the sentence I haven't finished yet, is a part of the future; and the first half, which I already had pronounced is -- is -- is past, and there is no present.

And would you kindly keep this in mind? All the natural scientists borrow from us--the historians, the theologians, the religionists, the faithful people--the notion of the present. All -- any scientist who talks to you of the present, as a scientific fact, lies. It's always an act of faith, present. Never is the present in existence as -- except on faith. You believe that you are between your parents and your grandchildren. But that's all. If it isn't in you as a power of the future now working into you, your grandparents aren't represented. As we say, "represented," you see.

Representation is by you only taken to be a local representation. You elect a representative and send him to Washington, you see. That's your representative. But my dear people, the present is the meeting ground of the future, which -- in which you believe, and the past which you have experienced, or which has left your -- his -- its mark on you.

And therefore, throw out the word "present" as often as you can. Scrutinize it. Use it not -- then you will only find where you have -- where this is legitimate. And I read, I mean -- you read all these gentlemen--Laplace, Euler, Einstein, Planck, I mean all the great physicists--they all bandy around this word "present" as though -- had any right to it. You see, because they need it of course for their scientific studies, for the laboratories. But that's an act of faith given them by the community. We believe that they should have their day in court, because we believe in their future vision, you see. We create the present.

And I give you -- perhaps it may help you. Or it may not. It may complicate matters, I don't know. The word "present" of course comes from the religious faith of the presence of God, that God is omnipresent. Present is always connected with the divine, with the superior spirit; whereas past and -- and future, in a

mechanical sense, you see, come from -- from physical observation. It would be too long a story to explain to you how the -- even the physicists stole this word "future" from -- from religion. That's { } -- a sidelight.

But the main point is: never allow your atheistic, agnostic colleagues in the science departments -- to use the words "present" as though it had any meaning within their mouths, unless they admit that they have it as faithful laymen, as citizens of the community, as -- as members of the human family. But not as scientists, you see. The scientist has no right to use the term "present," because it doesn't exist in any of its -- his experiments. You can never have a present when you look at things in a laboratory, you see. There are only past and future. Can you see this? I would even call the -- their future just an elongated past, because it's pre-calculated, and they say that goes on for another 60 minutes, or if -- it takes three days, or what -- I won't go into this.

But my main point is, as a practical thing of you, I think you will emerge from this smog, which today is not in Cali- -- so much in Southern California as it is in the minds of men. They -- they can only sell you science as a religion, because they have stolen this word "present" or -- to which they had no right and claim. Where is there any present in their scientific picture of the world? Everything is rushing on. It's just a mere maelstrom, you see, of constant change. Now here we -- meet, and they meet in their lectures in a good spirit of peace, of friendliness, of presence of a -- one spirit, you see, and that's an act of faith. I can -- here we meet for two hours; and this is one present, is it not? And that's a miracle. That's a creation of the human family. It has nothing to do with nature. It's not a natural event, that I can go -- and you allow me to talk here, you see.

Well, { }.



{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...sketch of a { } the second grade { } ancient historian wrote these -- one of his volumes -- there is Polybius. But before doing so, let us go back to Thucydides. I had asked you to find out, didn't I, what his personal circumstances were. We were just in the midst of it. Is that right?

(Yes.)

What have you written?

({ }. Well, it's just { }.)

Well, tell me.

(Tell you? Start from scratch, or do you just want the last phase of it?)

The last phase.

(The last phase, all right { }.)

("History contains those selected things which allow an event to occur at a certain time, which can never again occur.")

That's the last line.)

Well, pointing out the -- the uniqueness of the event, of course. Do you have it?

(Yes.)

Well, about this uniqueness in -- it may be well -- you will always run into this. There has been -- raging--in the 19th century, and at the beginning of the 20th--a philosophical discussion on the kind of the facts in history and the kind of facts in nature. And although I think at this moment this discussion is -- is rarely mentioned, I grew up under this cannonade, these big guns on both sides: the philosophers -- it had of course very much to do with Marxism, because if you have a revolutionary { } theory of Marxism, you are apt to -- to generalize, and the individual event is then just one phase in a -- in a process, you see, of which you have an abstract notion { }. And so people and places become mi- -- of minor importance -- always the same struggle. You can read the most fantastic

things.

I mean, if you read -- I read a -- an American writer's--what's the name? {Hacker}, I think--description of the -- of the Civil War, and -- in this country. It was written in 19- -- in the '30s, when here Marxism was the cheapest way out of all thinking, you see. So then, of course, the -- the South was -- slave- -- with the slave-owners and the North as the industrial had to be depicted as -- as making war on each other as two -- as two different class systems. It was very hard to think why a railroad man and a planter, you see, are really different classes. They just aren't. And then the third thing, he was still very despondent, this gentleman, because the workers of America just didn't follow his class patterns, but all supported the Northern course, you see, and couldn't be set up against the -- set up against the capitalists, the wicked capitalists. And he was quite despondent, because of course the pattern which he had in his head, from the -- from Marx's book on England -- English -- English {industry}, just nev- -- nowhere fitted the American {nature}. Which of course is the deepest reason why there is no Marxism at this moment in this country to speak of, you see. But it just doesn't -- it isn't true.

And the -- however, in -- this was as late as 1937 that this American gentleman wrote this desperate cry- -- outcry, so to speak; I don't -- so to speak, admitting that he didn't find in American history the simple pattern he was bound to -- or bent on discovering.

And so there was a school in -- the -- University of Heidelberg was at that time manned by two outstanding philosophers, Rickert and Windelband, and they were of the old Kantian tradition. And they said, in so many words, that all events in history were unique, and that made them into historical events. And as soon as they were not -- in as far as they were not unique, they were questions of natural science, and not questions of history. And so that's a very nice distinction for you, as a starting point.

Unique events are historical events, and with the sort of -- kind of -- kind of corollary, in as far as an event is not unique, it is not an historical event. That all people have to eat and to digest is not histor- -- historical. That's natural. So Charlemagne had to eat, and President Eisenhower has to eat; and that's not a part of history because it is something, you see, that befalls all mortals. But in as far as Mr. Eisenhower visits President -- Mr. Dulles in the hospital, you see, that's a unique event; and that's an historical event. Can you see this?

So then it helps you a lot at -- first of all to be shoved into the awareness

that the people who will make history, live history, or read history obviously are involved in this double process of natural -- nature and of history. And in as far as the thing is repetitive, we call it nature; and as far as it -- not repetitive, we have to call it history.

History is the story of the events which at one time did not form a part of nature, but entered the process of existence. The first steam engine of Mr. Stephenson is an historical event. Now we are so hard-boiled that all the trains that run every day on schedule--or not on schedule, you see--do not -- do not hit us as historical. But in as far as they depend on the invention of an inventor, on the getting-together of shareholders, on the la- -- a new law that allowed such companies to perform, you see, on government grants, they are still historical events, because this original law still has to be protected by the courts, you see. And in as far, therefore, as the unique beginnings are now established in institutions, these insti--stitutions, you see, depend, of course, on the will of those people who have once made these laws. And once you abolish this, you see, the -- and you turn the -- the right of way of the railroads--as they are -- demand now in California, you see--into freeways for the cars, the whole phase, the whole chapter of historical railroad building is, you see, is passed over, is superseded by another chapter.

So I -- I think the first law is a useful law. Historical events are unique events. Natural processes are -- always there. They are not unique. They are -- can be generalized. And since in this country--Mr. Charles Beard is a -- case in point, this man {Hacker} is a case in point, who tried to -- to exemplify the Civil War as a -- just a -- one case of the -- eternal class war, you see--since you have this tendency in this country to find the common denominator for all and everything, you can see that history has a very difficult time in this country, because all the time the psychologists, sociologists try to pretend that all this follows a certain pattern. For example, whenever you hear a person in this country say, "It's just politics," he has abolished history. What -- people mean by "It's just politics," I have never quite understood. It seems always to me, you see, to dismiss the thing as no problem at all. "Just politics," you see. Because I think then it just becomes interesting, because -- how can you transform it into a political history? That's the whole problem of politics, isn't it? So "just politics," it's no answer of any- -- to anything. But you hear it, don't you, all the time? And then people stop thinking and say, "Well, that's just as it is. Can't do anything." But obviously the thing becomes then interesting only, because then you have some- -- to do something about it, you mean. You have to form a third party, or you have to expose a politician, or whatever you have to do. Isn't that true? Would you agree with me?

So this is one of your stock phrases by which you -- you try to -- to e- -- to de- -- dismiss history as a natural process, because as soon as you say, "It's just politics," even politics has simply become a digestive process of greed, you see, and eating, and cannibalism, and dog-eats-dog, and whatever have you. And you have dismissed it in -- made it into a natural, repetitive process, you see, of -- like breathing, and -- and -- and sleeping.

The -- the catch of this neat dualism between history and nature is however in a little closer inspection of what makes it unique.

And this the Kantians, my friends there in -- in Germany, did not discover, or did not discuss. The -- event is unique because it has an irreplaceable date. It is only the unity of the history through all times that gives to this hour, to this moment in which we mention an historical event, the -- the quality of belonging to this event. That Mr. Eisenhower, as I read in the paper this morning, yesterday visited Mr. Dulles is part of the event. You cannot abstract from the time moment in this case. It isn't the same, you see, to say that Mr. Eisenhower frequently visited Mr. Dulles, for example, you see, or regularly visits Mr. Dulles. The historic significance of his visit yesterday of course is that he still treats him as secretary of state. And as you know, the question of whether he should finally hand in his resignation or not is quite a tragic question. The man probably would collapse in the moment he is -- it is because that's his life. He hasn't {aimed at this}. And so Mr. Eisenhower very -- very -- tries to prolong his life by allowing him to have the name of secretary of state. Here, his own -- the -- the surviv- -- the life of Mr. Dulles is involved in his being -- still thinking of himself as secretary of state.

And so this is a very human gesture on the part of the president, that he says, "I do not wish to withdraw the drug that keeps this man going." You understand? The papers never mention this.

Yes?

(Why do they allow some state department officials and newspapers to get hold of some information, and report it over the radio and newspapers, so that Mr. Dulles will get that information, like they don't think that he'll return to his job?)

Because they want to get -- I mean, it's an in- -- untenable situation for people in the state department. Somebody must have the responsibility. And

therefore, you -- I don't know this, but I -- that's politics again. These people feel that the regard for the private person of Mr. Dulles has gone too far, and that he must be forced out. That's a battle. You see?

(It's not very kind to him.)

No, but can you always be kind? War is not kind; politics is not kind. And you must never hold against a man that he is -- is -- stern. My dear man, you can go too far in kindness. Don't you understand? It doesn't help that you have an invalid, and want to be kind to an invalid. The country cannot be run by invalids. We have a dying president and a dying secretary of state. Well, it's very serious. It's terrible. Just look at the president, how he looks. So this -- people just say, "I don't care." It's more important, you see, for the summit conference. They must have a secretary of state who can resist the president. For example, I mean. Our president as well as the other. Imagine in -- in four weeks, this -- this meeting is going to start. What's going to -- is this really possible with Mr. Dulles? So there you have a real, historical issue, you see. The -- both parties are right. And perhaps you take this down as a -- as a corollary in history. You can be sure that in -- in an historical issue, all parties are right. The question is always in history "when," and never "what." Because both sides always have a point. But there comes a time -- well, once in every -- to every man and nation comes the hour to decide.

Now it is very difficult for modern man to -- to see -- give time the quality, which it is. You have black hair, but you also have only one life to live. And the uniqueness of your life in its being placed between these times. And your own time is the highest quality. The awareness of your time is the time -- the -- state of human consciousness most readily lost. If you go drunk, or take narcotics, the first thing you lose is the awareness of the time. When you go in -- on a spree at 11 o'clock in the evening, and you have one cocktail too many, you don't know what time it is; I mean, you don't care. You still know where you are, but you don't know when you are. Time just loses its -- its importance.

So it is like the perfume. The -- our -- sense of smell is the most easily stalemated. That is, you cannot smell for more than a few minutes a perfume. Afterwards, you -- you cease noticing it. Seeing is the difference. Seeing is not mate- -- staled. It stays with us. But the fatigue of our most subtle sense of life, which is smell, is most easily corrupted and lost. The same with the time sense. It has probably very much to do with each other. I think the sense of timing is exactly in the historical sense for larger units the same as the sense of smell; the

scent, the flair. That's why a politician, you see, can be corrupt and blind with his eyes. But he must have the flair of the events of the future. That makes a politician. And that's unknown to most people today. We live, as you know, in -- near Hollywood. And everybody is here put on a screen, and everybody is made visible. But life to come cannot be seen, but it can be scented. And the sense for -- historical future is flair. And it is completely destroyed in our civilization. And that's why you are out of history; that's why you live in a dream world, because you have no sense of the hour. It's just "plenty of time."

So -- the United States entered two wars too late on a battlefield which was strewn with destruction and corpses. And if in both cases, the United States had come in right away, the -- the loss would have been one-hundredth -- 1 percent of what it was, because you can't get the United States to get off from the sen- -- idiotic sentence, "Seeing is believing," which is one of the most stupid sentences I know, because seeing is not believing. Seeing is the opposite from believing. When you believe, you trust your scent, your flair. And if you -- if you want to see, you will marry a -- a -- a nice-looking whore, and you will be the most unhappy creature, because she looks nice, but she smells not well. And that has a spiritual meaning.

The -- the -- the good things that have a future may be -- tiny. A baby is very inconspicuous, but it has a future. And it smells much better than the grownups.

And -- so the sense of scent, I like to -- to introduce into your historical thinking, because all the people you deal with in history--take Lincoln--had flair. I have read in the last days a very saddening book, the most violent, anti-Lincoln book that has been written in this country. And it's quite useful because, when you study the most -- hostile writer, you see, you know then everything that can be said against your hero, and you can see, you see: is there anything the matter with him? Now he has -- he -- this man is -- is so full of venom, that there is nothing he -- he doesn't hold against Lincoln. And there is a nice story -- in 1956, Lincoln gave a so-called "lost speech." We have only the -- the notes taken by his friends, and we don't have a manuscript. It's called the "lost speech." And my author is this Edgar Lee Masters, rants about this, and says, "What a man! There, he goes to a meeting, and he has not one note put down. Obviously, he didn't know what would happen, and he didn't know if he should -- should speak, and he didn't know what he would have to say. And so here is this seclusive, and -- and very secretive man, you see, who doesn't want to -- make up his mind one minute too early." Now that makes a statesman.

It's the greatest compliment he could have paid to -- to -- Lincoln, because I -- you understand that to be in politics means never to say anything too early, you see, and never say anything too late. Because the whole problem of politics is timing. Nothing else. Everybody has ideas. There are the Abolitionists, who for 30 years shouted at America, "No slaves." But then comes Lincoln, and he waits until 1863 before he says the -- the word, you see. And this makes him the -- it's all the difference between a man like Garrison, the great Abolitionist, you see, or Lovejoy. And -- and these -- a president -- a president is not elected for ideas, but for the timing. And since nobody knows this in this country, our statesmen -- are ruined. They have to kiss babies, and they have to smile, and they have to look good, and they have to be shot when they go to church, and so on. And -- and this is nonsense, to -- to take away all their strength. Their strength is to retain the instinct for timing. The -- .

(Would you say that in the 1956 election, the issue of stopping hydrogen bombs, which was such a prominent feature of Stevenson's campaign, was too early? And poorly timed?)

I'm trying to get back to --. Well, I do think that presidents must never deal with means, but only with ends. And I still think the hydrogen bomb is a means. And therefore, you see, peace is an end. But hydrogen bombs are not on the highest level to be discussed. They are means. And all pacifists, you see, who are struck horrified by means, don't get the point. The passions which make war, after all, that's what statesmen are about, you see, to calm people down. But the throwing of the bomb is always instrumental.

Now of course, if you once suddenly feel that your arm is -- is tied back, and you cannot throw the bomb, because you destroy your own country, you see, that's -- be a phase that's reached. But I think the public discussion again of this will not do very good. I think Mr. Eisenhower, as well as Mr. Khrushchev, knows that there is no war, but can't sell it to their electorates. I mean, the people still would -- are running, and the departments are still running with the bomb. And they -- they -- {no one thought} that there will never be a war, as long as people are in their five senses.

(I was just trying to find...)

But it's hard to make it an issue in an election campaign. Marx had a -- one great wisdom. He said, "No parties will make revolution in the future. The -- the conditions of production will." So he, of course, Marx is the great deplorer of the Communist Party. I mean, if it goes on by Marx, you see, you can't have a

Communist Party, because it's not a partisan issue. The condition -- and the same is with bombs. The conditions of production, you see, of the bomb are universal, are worldwide. And we shoot them into international space, and therefore practically wars are already on the way out, you see. { } for -- your need for war territor- -- for war in the old sense you need territories which you can define. There will be struggles from -- most violent struggles, I'm sure, you see. But they will not have the territorial problem of boundaries. Because you -- {take} Berlin. Berlin is the first interspace problem. And it is exactly what Mr. {Reeman} said in mathematics, that we have now a mathematics -- { } of interpenetrating bodies. And who -- who knows a little mathematics? Who has -- wie? Wie? You must know that this is a special branch of mathematics to deal with the problems of interpenetrating bodies, you see. Have you heard of it?

(No.)

Well, better do, because that's the latest fashion.

Well, as a matter of fact, it's older than the international {confirmation} -- was -- Mr.--I think in 1857--Mr. {Reemann} published his first paper on interpenetrating bodies. But science is always prophetic, you see, it's doing in the spine what's happening in the -- in the flesh.

Well, why do you -- make such a terrible face? You're such a pretty girl, why do you do it?

(Well, I was thinking. I have Dr. {Gough.} He's been complaining that we've known about these non-Euclidian geometries for so long. We know Euclid's wrong. But the teachers just refuse to teach any non-Euclidian geometry.)

Well, you go on your own. { }. Why do you wait for { }?

(I didn't know about this in geometry.)

Well, you bring us some information next time, please.

(What's the name of this book that you talked about, Edgar Lee Masters, on Lincoln?)

Well, I -- you know, I'm not a mathematician.

(No, Edgar Lee Masters.)



(On Lincoln. You say ...)

Oh, Lee -- Edgar Lee Masters. Edgar Lee Masters, Lincoln--the Man.

(Lincoln--the Man?)

Came out in 1931. It's a very useful book. For example, he -- the greatest -- the greatest speech I think Lincoln ha- -- Lincoln ever made is the Second Inaugural. And this poor man, this Master- -- who comes from Illinois--and it's vanity that makes him write the book, because he has some personal traditions in the family about Springfield and Lincoln, so he -- he feels provoked to write this book, because he has this in, you see. He knows something. He's in the know. That -- that has -- I think is one of the awkward features of the book, that there is vanity in -- in -- in the man in writing it, that he can boast of some special information. But he doesn't -- there's no special information { }.

And then he comes to the Second Inaugural; he prints it--in part, I mean, the most beautiful sentence--and says, "This is sheer madness." And that's all he says. So the man is -- is so mutilated in his soul, that -- that the fact that Lincoln there says, "Both sides are wrong," is beyond him. You see, the poor guy is so violent, that one has to be right, you see. His hero is Douglas. He said if Douglas had been -- made president, then there wouldn't have been a Civil War. It's all so incredibly naïve. He has no idea that things got worse every year from -- beginning with 1845 in this country, you see. And since he doesn't know that history always operates in this strange law that things have to get worse before they get better, and has always this evolutionary streak, you see, if you just wait e- -- long enough, the thing will -- will adjust themselves -- see, always come out right, anyway. He of course has already this school, which is dominating in this country -- if you adjust, you conform, and never make a decision, and the decisions are then made by some -- nobody knows, you see. This -- not making decisions is, of course, the theory, you see. You don't make decisions. And you don't date. You don't say "Now." And you don't say, "Today."

But Masters -- he ended in the poor house, and I think he deserved it. He's a -- very terrible man. And he destroyed his marriage, and he destroyed all his love life. And a genius in -- in endowment. And it's a very tragic case. But if you want to study America's intellectual class, intelligentsia in its complete decline and -- and -- deserved contempt, I -- I think you- -- you'd better read Masters. He's the man of the Spoon River Anthology, and wrote a very beautiful book, Domesday Book. And he had all the gifts of genius, and destroyed himself by --

not -- by trying to sit outside history, and sit it out in -- by his intelligence, you see, and looking at things. So Lincoln--the Man is just to him a spectator from the outside.

I thought this very wonderful, you see, printing the Second Inaugural, and saying this is madness. And then saying, he comes to this meeting of the "lost speech," you see, because he hasn't made up his mind whether he shall speak, what he shall say, you see, and when he shall speak. Now that makes the -- the real man, you see, who -- who allows himself only to be the man of the hour. The New Testament of course says the same: Don't prepare your speeches, you see. When -- in the moment in which you will be put on the spot, God will tell you what to say. The -- the Quakers, you see, were not allowed ever to make a prepared statement about their case for this reason. They always quoted the New Testament for this. And the New -- of course, the whole problem of the New Testament is to give the -- Israel, which had lost its -- its place in history, its sense of timing, back this flair for things to come. And when the Church loses this, you get latter-day saints, and you get Pentecostal sects, because the whole of Christianity is the sense of what is dead and what's alive, the sense of life, and the sense for the dead. And I told you this, I think, in this group already. We speak in order to define what is dead and what is alive. That's our -- why we speak. That's the only reason why we must speak. Everything else could be done by sign language, you see.

But in order to say, "This has been," I need words, because corpses are not present. They are -- they are not visible, you see. So we all -- all the times secrete, or -- separate, or segregate not black and white, but past and future.

(I was wondering, you know so many theologians are always talking about transcending time...)

Ach, these idiots! They are just Kantians. You see, most theologians are poor philosophers. They borrow some frame of reference from philosophy, and then plunge into -- into their thinking. They never know that Paul -- the Apostle Paul and the New Testament have fought all the Greek notions of philosophy. Read the Letters of Paul. He's down on them. He says, "This abstraction of time and space," you see, "is -- is nonsense. Look here. Here we are in this hour." At this moment, we are now. We know that there is something that has gone on before and -- this. So we are rooted at this moment in this situation. And we look -- can look backward, and we can look forward, as students, at least. With regard to your home life, you have parents, and you can look backward to them as older, and you have expectations in your life, and you look forward to them, and

they probably are not connected with your parents very much. So you have one past -- which is -- is filled with -- with your family background--as we rightly say; "background" is -- is an -- appeal to backward--and so the true exper- -- the experiences of man is that he's all the time alternating between looking forward--as we dutifully say in our letters of -- when we accept an invitation: "We are looking forward to seeing you tomorrow night"--and we are looking backward.

Now you, however, live in a physicists' universe--that's an abstract time--in which you say, "There was a -- a beginning somewhere, and we go forward to today, and we go forward." That is, the people in natural science try to persuade you that you are always living in this evolutionary way. Look, our conscience and our experience in time is quite different. Our experience of time is awakened whenever we can make this break between backward and forward looking. And when you think of your head and of your body. I'm able to -- turn this way and this way. To be in history means to have the freedom of alternating between backward and forward.

This is quite something different, because it -- places you -- roots you.

Now the modern intellect is uprooted, completely extirpated from his fertile living ground. A child is rooted, because it looks up to the parents and say -- says to them, "When are you going to die?" A naïve child will ask such a question. "When are you" -- "Oh, you are very old," this child will say to his grandmother, you see. "When are you going to die?"

And the child therefore can teach us what the -- Christianity and what Judaism tried to teach: how man actually lives in time. He lives in time by alternating this point of view of looking backward, and looking forward. -- When he looks forward, he's frightened with all the dead corpses and superstitions he's meant to carry forward to the future, so he elopes. He -- he leaves father and mother and clings to -- cleaves to the wife of his choosing, because forward-looking, he's frightened by the past, you see. Then he's loyal again, and to the silver wedding of his parents, you see, he comes, because he has also an amount of tradition and loyalty in him, and he will not break away totally, but he has to balance the past and the future. Every one of us has to do this.

And therefore, the real experience of time, this -- this fine perfume of now, and what's tomorrow, you see, this feeling that a politician has -- smells. You see, "I smell a rat," you see, "fishy," they say. A very good word, you see, for the historical sense. "This is fishy. I won't touch it," you see. You {know where in the world} this is getting you. There is something rotten in the state of Dane.

This is the real experience of time which every child that is born of a mother re-experiences. The phil- -- big philosophers, however, and the Kantian philosophers, and the theological positivists -- I mean these victims by -- gangsters, they -- they tell you that they learn all about time from the laboratory, from physics. That is, they are far removed from the experimental, ex- -- empirical time, you see, of peoples, of nations, of judges, of families, of real people. And they go to the laboratory and they take out a stopwatch. And they say, "Abstract time is that we have -- call this now 9:30, and now I count up to 60," and within 60 this -- this -- this bomb orbits -- you see, circles the universe, or whatever it does, as this last shot there, the satellite. That is, this is dead -- the time of dead things to which we only add the time element. You can take one -- one definition. Dead things are those who have no time within themselves. You take this chair, you see; there is nothing of the time element in it. It has no time. It's out of time. Dead -- death means to leave the time process. That's what it means. Now if -- a physicist deals with dead matter. That is, his cloc- -- stopwatch adds the time element artificially, abstractly to what this chair in itself doesn't do. I let this chair fall; and then you count, then that takes half a second, you see, for it to fall down. But whereas you and I have this time sense inside of us, when we live, you see, the chair hasn't. You have to add it from the outside, mechanically. You have made the -- the clock. And the chair doesn't know anything about it. So in death, time and reality are separated. Or time and matter are separate. And in -- in -- in life, every element of the living process carries its own rhythm, its own death warrant, so to speak. You and I have a sense of time. He -- who is -- who comes under the Beatitudes in the New -- who is blessed? The man whose sense of time coincides with his given time, with his -- don't, you see. You are a lucky man, if you have to live 80 years, if you have something to live for during 80 years. The devil is the man -- is the power in us who tries to sell out quickly. I mean, the devil is always short -- you see, selling you short. That is, devil and God are not separated in anything but the time sense. This -- the devil says you can have this pleasure now, where you can only have it after you have served well.

The only difference between the diabolical streak in every human being and the divine is only that in the -- the divine streak, you have -- for example, have perseverance, you see. Until you have earned the money, you will not spend it. The -- the devil tells you, you can forge a check. So you forge a check, and so then you think you have the money. It's a very short operation, and you don't have it. Who- -- whole nations have been -- have been selling short and

buying short on the installment plan -- you see. That is, their sense of timing has not co- -- not identified itself with the given time, the creature in us and the creator in us must come to a harmony.

Everybody has a sense of his allotted time. And you find this with the con- -- consumptious people, you see, these -- the artist who knows that he has, like Keats, you see, or like -- like--who was the --? Chopin, you see, who had to go early; Schubert--I mean, such people know that they have just a very short time, and they spend it, you see, in a feverish activity in order to fulfill themselves. Other people live beyond time.

I have a friend -- oh, "friend," I -- saying too much. I mean, he was 40 years older than I. He -- I visited him every -- when he was over 90, every year, to his birthday, and to -- he had jubilees one after another, 50th jubilee of his doctorate, and 50th jubilee of this and that. And he always said to us--the whole faculty went to see him--he said, "Death has forgotten me." And it was his greatest punishment. He had -- his wife had -- had took- -- -en her life, she had thrown herself out of the window. And he was such a cold fish that when everybody went and tried to help and rescue her, he said, "Don't touch her. First, notify the police." And that was his reaction to the death of his wife, you know.

And so death had forgotten him. He had to live too long. And -- you must know one thing you can live too --. And that's a curse. It's just like a -- confinement in a prison. This man was in prison, and he felt it. And he told us so. He had no worries. I mean, not big -- but life had -- was not real. You see, so the man had to live to the -- his 97th day -- year.

And as soon as you -- begin to understand that life can be too long as well as too short, you will perhaps begin to understand perhaps: our problem is that God has given us as creatures a limited time, and that our will and our insight has to try to keep inside this allotted time, you see.

We have -- here, a gentleman who has written a wonderful play on -- on Newman, and another play on -- on Justice Holmes, about the no- -- nonagenarians, about two blissful people of 90. And they're two great plays. Miss -- by {Emmett Labery}. And I recommend them highly to you if you want to under- -- to come near to the historical problem. One is called Second Spring, and the other is called The Magnificent Yankee. I recommend it highly for your -- for your -- for all you do in your classes, eye-openers.

And now I found a story to triple it, so to speak. And I wrote it -- sent it to

him yesterday. You may be interested. There is in -- in Hungary, a hundred years ago, the revolution of the Hungarians, the Magyars, against the Hapsburgs -- were already once crushed by the Russians, just as it has been now. And this is a great tragedy that it has happened twice. -- What the Russians did in 1954, it was, wasn't it? Or '56? When was the Hungarian --?

('56. October '56.)

'56, they -- the czar did in 19- -- in 1850, when the Hungarians had thrown off the domination of the Austrians, for two years successfully, and the czar suddenly marched in his troops into Hungary from the north and forced the -- Hungarian army to surrender.

Now the commander-in-chief of this victorious Hungarian army that finally did -- had to surrender to this new army, and much bigger army of the Russians was Görgey -- Görgei -- von Görgei. This man had to live 98 years. He died in 1916. That is, from 1850, when he was pardoned and not court-martialed by the emperor of Austria, on the behest of the czar, the poor man had to live to 1916, hated by the Hungarians, because he was the only officer of the Hungarian army that was not shot. So they all said he was a traitor. And he couldn't disprove it, because of course, he said, "I have nothing to do with my -- with my being pardoned. The czar of Russia wrote a letter to the emperor and said this man who has surrendered to me deserves my treatment, you see. Don't shoot him. That's the { }. And I -- had nothing to do with my being pardoned." But he -- this man, imagine, to live 66 years, after you have been a leader of your country, in complete -- you see, ignored within Hungary. And he died in the Sec- -- First World War, which--I mean, was of course the opening wedge for the second surrender of Hungary to -- to Russia.

So this man Görgei is to me a great figure , you see, of the tragedy of -- of time. He had to live after his highest moment in 1850, for 66 years. That's an unheard-of tragedy to me, you see. And it's a punishment. It's a harder punishment than if he had been executed in --in -- right away in 19- -- 1850. Then he would be a great name in history.

Now nobody -- I asked Hungarians, and they didn't know that the man had lived on, you see. Just a ghost -- no, a forgotten man.

Well, as soon as you approach history in thi- -- as this problem of being up to date in our own given time, that my time allotted to me, and my will to do, and to time, must be harmonized, history becomes a concrete task of a nation, or

of a people. There is an allotted time spent, and in this time, you have to make the right decisions to fill this time spent fruitfully, or you are just, you see, put on the bier, and carried out without your having lived out your life.

(What would you say about -- Lincoln? Would you say he was rescued out of life by being assassinated?)

Well, certainly. I mean, the -- the tremendous thing of -- of -- of Lincoln is that. Well, that's a very strange thing. First of all, of course, the greatest miracle of the assassination is that he was assassinated after he had done his work. And it is absolutely un-understandable why he wasn't assassinated before. Because obviously, before, it was just as easy or even easier. He was -- I mean, un- -- unprotected all the time. And when he marched into Richmond, you see, he wasn't assassinated.

And again, by the way, Mr. Masters' attacking him for his going to Richmond and sitting down in the chair of the mighty, whereas to me, this is the most Franciscan act of the whole career of Lincoln, that he marched on foot into Richmond, you see. Mr. Masters, this devil, can even twist here the lion's tail and says that it was just terrible that he -- that did -- didn't do this, you see, and walked in -- unprotected into Richmond.

Your question is, I think, that this -- assassin was in -- some kind of coalition with God, obviously, because he helped a lot to establish Lincoln in the hearts of this country. And I think -- I put it this way. When Lincoln had to travel from Springfield to Washington, he suddenly saw that what he had wished to become president was not what he had wished to be. I mean, it was a wartime president, and in a torn country. And it was quite clear to him that it was tragedy all around, and he hadn't -- didn't have one cheerful moment after that, as you know, I mean. He -- he felt that the presidency was not a -- it was just a burden. And that dawns of course on -- any candidate very gradually that what he has desired all his -- the -- his life, you see, suddenly tastes very sour. And I think they had to pay this terrible price, and he was spared then, so to speak, more. The burden had become unbearable.

(Well, I was comparing him with your Hungarian general, then, because Lincoln had trouble with his own party...)

Of course he had. They would all have --.

(...they would all have -- made mincemeat out of him.)

Of course they would. No, it was great -- very merciful.

(Did Thomas Jefferson omit his presidency on his epitaph, because he had to change his attitude during the time of office. That is, before office and after office, he was agrarian, democratic type of -- thinking -- thinker. And in office, he had a change in order -- for expediency.?)

Well, you say "for expediency." But don't you think the office makes a man? I mean, as a party man, you have the perfect right to put one foot down and say, "Emphasis is on agrarianism, on sectionalism, on what-not," you see. On -- on -- on small farmers and so on. Then you come into office and you see that the office is comprehensive. And so I have always felt that it is the honor of -- of Jefferson that he took Louisiana. If he hadn't, it would be -- you see, he would have been a small man. He would have stood in hi- -- his mind would have stood in the way of his mission. And so I have -- I -- I feel that only as president does he rise to the stature of which, as a party man or as a -- and -- or as a man just of a program. He { }. I think you have to change program. I -- I cannot feel that programs are good enough.

I think Marx's insight, for example, that parties cannot solve the struggle of the classes, but institutions, you see, and the way we produce will bring up -- out -- about the new society is a much deeper insight than anything they have done with his memory in the Communist Party, because that makes him a very small man who is tied down to certain, you see, rules of -- some of which he has laid down before he has lived, before the society has lived, before the indus- -- industry has developed.

And so I -- or, for example, I would say that Marx--opposite from Jefferson--tried to be president in his private thinking, you see, and was then a party politician in his activities on the basis of his insight. Jefferson was a party man in his insight, and in office, he was a not-party man. Do you understand? Marx and Jefferson are mentally at opposite poles, because Marx dug deep enough to free himself from his own mentality, and to say, "These laws of history go beyond human mentalities. There are many mentalities involved, and used, you see, and function, because everybody thinks as he works." That's, after all, his great -- insight, you see. And so a philosopher at his desk has a certain -- has certain ideas. A worker at his loom has certain ideas, you see. A capitalist at his -- at his -- in his -- at his -- at his ledger has certain ideas. But they all have to, you see, collaborate. That's -- that's production, you see. That's society.



So I think, when later, the poor Marx in his miserable -- because he was very miserable in England, of course, and an exile, and no money. And his -- children died from consumption, you know. They died really, and his wife died, from hunger. And in such a tragic situation, you have to do something. So he founded this ridiculous International, you see. And -- and then he -- they have now parties all over the world. But that isn't {even} his idea. His idea was that the world wars were the big -- world revolution. And he would have only contempt for Mr. Stalin's or Mr. Khrushchev's claim that -- that the Russian Communist Party has anything to do with the -- with the world revolution. He would have laughed at them. Parties cannot make revolutions, he said. That's his dogma, his real dogma.

So it is quite funny. Here you have Jefferson, 1780--or 1775, if you want to--Declaration, you see, of Independence--that's his mind. And then he becomes president. In 1803, we get this big chunk of land, and he rises to the occasion and forgets that he has been the man of agrarianism, you see. And -- in Marx's case, in 1847, he is already the man of the Louisiana Purchase, because he dreamed of world revolution, all proletarians of all the world, solidarity, you see. Just as Louisiana Purchase means all of America, you see, the seashore, the Pacific Coast. And this -- so Marx, that is his anti-Hegelian, anti-rational, anti-Enlightenment revolt. This -- Marx said, "I must do opposite from Mr. Jefferson." You see, he's just as much anti-Jefferson, of course, as he is anti-Hegel, or anti-Kant, or anti-Voltaire. He said, "All these people reason out a good world. I'm not going to overestimate my own thoughts. I'm looking at the conditions under which people produce," you see. "And therefore I'm just one of the producers. I produce ideas. Other people produce wheat," you see. "Other people print money. Therefore, I'm only one of these -- the ideologists. And therefore I will not give a damn to my own theory." That's his greatness. You see, "My theory isn't good enough. I must imply the needs of the workers." And that's why he say, "Proletarians of all countries, unite." That's like his Louisiana Purchase. And--if you can stand this comparison for a moment--and then in 1865, he publishes his Kapital, and in 1867, you get the First International, and these are makeshifts of expediency to deal with the problem on hand, and to -- to -- to find a place for yourself in this soc- -- in the future society, which of course every man has a right to struggle for. And so, Marx is -- is really dialectically--as we said, you see--abolishing the rank of philosophy in Jefferson's mind. Jefferson had to learn by politics. And Marx, quite vice versa, you see, had to learn that there was still room for a little bit of will and philosophy inside the non-will, you see, historical process of economic dialect- -- materialism. Can you see my point?

And I think it may help you. Both are -- you have to live this out today. You have to distrust your philosophies, gentlemen. But you have not ceased to philosophize. I hope I have done this myself in my life, you see. I always said to myself, "That isn't -- that isn't my whole life." I have to -- been a soldier. I've been a worker. I've been many things. I've been unemployed. And life is more comprehensive than what my mind contributes to this. But it isn't worthless what my mind contributes. So the book of Marx, the Kapital or the International, are not worthless, but they are minor compared to his deepest insight that man has to root himself in time.

And I would say that, gentlemen, that Marx has rep- -- rescued from the biblical tradition the fact that man first is rooted in a unique time situation. Jefferson said that at all times all men are created equal, you see. All enlightenment is timeless, natural law. And all Marx is historical. And what I have told you today is simply in this sense, I mean, every human being has to be a Marxian, because Marx comes from the Old Testament. And this -- in this sense, the Bible is simply true, that we are rooted in time. And these great phases of class war are nothing but the translation of your time and space inside your family into the life of the peoples of this earth in -- you see, written in -- large. That's the human family. This is exactly the situation you meet yourself in your own upbringing and in your own growth.

And what I'm trying to tell you is -- is generalized Marxism, so to speak. I've never been a socialist. I've never been a Marxian. I've always felt it was quite arbitrary to put so much emphasis on the class issue. But the sense of history -- that's a different thing, you see. That is an act of liberation from the abstract idea of physicists' time, of -- of non-historical time, in the -- you see, with -- which only applies to dead things for which we have to put up an abstract time. (What you said about the class war, with regard -- I -- wasn't quite clear on that point. Could you -- could you repeat that?)

Well, I'm -- I have told you. I feel that we have to rescue Marx today from the Marxians. Kierkegaard and Marx, the two -- these two people, you see, went against the Enlightenment in the--and Nietzsche, by the way, too; and there are others, I mean: Ferrari in Italy, a forgotten man, partly; and Melville in this country, you see, I talked about him yesterday; Herman Melville has his great role in this country--that they have this deep feeling of the now, and that all we know about time is only the concrete time of our situation, between the past and the future. And what the phy- -- scientist tries to -- sell you as -- is an abstraction. That's not lived and experienced time. But that only applies to chairs, and -- and

walls, and bricks, and geology. Abstract time. And you know how far they go. They tell you that there will be no time in space, so that a man will not have to eat for 10 years if he's up in the air in this -- this is all nonsense. It won't go. It's today in the paper again. I just had to laugh. You know better than these physicists. They tell you, if you go in this abstract space, then you suddenly will stop growing, or shitting, or breathing, or -- or sleeping. I mean, they have gone mad, because they have -- they think this is dead, you see. Well, this is just empty, the stupidity of this.

And so -- will you kindly take this? What you know is that you live here in this classroom, the schedule of your studies. This hour is a part of your being a student, is it not? Therefore this hour is contained in your -- the term. And the term is contained in the academic year. And the academic year for you is contained within the four years you spend in this college. And if you look it all up, it's all your education, as you call it, you see. Now education has its own time process. The mind can be developed regardless of your social ties. At the same time, your family has a time. That's another time process that goes on. Your parents age, and your children -- your sisters and brothers grow up, and you grow up and you want to get married. And therefore, while the academic clan doesn't care for your -- for your biological time as a family man, that's a reality, too. That's another time. And it may be a tragedy {involved} { }. A -- a girl wants -- has to marry a year too early before she can finish her studies. Or opposite. She -- she thinks that it's so important that she gets her degree that she makes her man miserable, because she says she won't marry him.

And so there are conflicts. Concrete times are plural. We live in more than one order of time. Comes the war, the man is drafted, and you have to become a nurse, or a WAC, or a WAVE. There is a third time. The conflicts of nations, the history of mankind is quite merciless about your family, and -- and your studies, you see. So you get a third time. And I -- I have written many books on this problem of the plurality of the calendar, of the human calendar, you see. Man lives in more than one calendar range.

Now -- here is 9 to 10, and here is your working day, from 8 till--let's say--to 10 in the evening. And obviously my hour today here is embedded in this larger rhythm, you see, of mine and of yours. Then I'm -- we live in an election year -- my -- next year, perhaps, and then of course -- we perhaps -- on November 4th, there will be no lectures, because the political calendar of the country, you see, says, "No lectures today," and that crosses out this rhythm. And then another -- quite a different rhythm comes in, as your citizen calendar. And then comes the soldier's calendar.

This leads us too far. What I wanted to say is the abstraction of time per se is taken from the experience of more than one calendar. And when philosophers talk to you big about time and space, laugh them into their face. It is nothing but a generalization. All we know are definite calendars, definite times. There is a political calendar of -- in the life of the United States. There is a family calendar where your nephew has to be christened, or your sister has to be -- you have to go to her wedding as her best man, or what-not, I mean. And there -- and there is a funeral, you see. This has nothing to do with politics. But it has very much to do with your life, because at the funeral, and you may meet your future bride. I mean, these occasions of family calendars are of the first-rate importance in your biography.

I have such a colleague who -- who -- who married -- his best friend committed suicide. And for the funeral, the sister of this man, of course, came. And he as a friend, and the sister as a bereaved sister, went together to the funeral, and they were both 40 years of age, and both bachelors and never thought of marrying. And the shock of this event was so, you see, total that they surrendered their isolationism, and got engaged, and now they live here in Claremont, or in Riverside. And there is -- so far beyond their expectations this one event, you see, in their lives, this funeral service made history. And that's a real story. Don't -- I mean, this had to -- only this catastrophe of the brother, you see, opened their hearts to each other.

And so we would be all the poorer if we hadn't this family calendar.

These are important things. The best marriage is always the marriage concluded on the wedding of the -- on the previous wedding. I mean, the -- the friends of the bridegroom are the given candidates for marriage for his sister. And if this would happen more often, it would -- there would be better marriages. The reason for this is, if you have first a friend, and then you marry his sister, you have something to talk about, because the exchange with your man has been on intellectual grounds, very often. They have something to share. But if you meet the girl, you see, just for her good looks, that's not a good basis for marrying.

(That's unique.)

What?

(Unique.)

Yes.

(It was unique that they met at the -- funeral --.)

Ja, exactly. Weddings and funerals are matchmakers, should be. So they are epochal events in the smaller range of this calendar, you see.

Now, would you understand: what the philosophers and the physicists call "time" is the abstraction in the literal sense, the generalization of real times, in -- experienced by you. Because we have a political calendar for the great history of the United States; a family calendar; and an individual, educational calendar; a career calendar you may say; and a work calendar, there has of course been a natural instinct to -- to speak of time in general. However, my dear people, if you have here seven -- these books, everybody who then speaks in the abstract of "book," knows that he first had to experience books, you see, before he can give a general definition of a "book." However, with regard to time, these people try to make you think that you can define time without having experienced it in real life. And this is incredible. The abstraction of time is always based on the empirical experience of time, is it not? But nobody in the last 150 years, since Mr. Jefferson--he is of course one of the culprits in this process, you see; he is this abstract thinker, and that's why he's so dangerous--people have said that you can understand life by abstracting from the date from which it occurs. And you cannot. In 1800s, it's very different from 1959. Everybody knows that there is a spirit of the times, the rhythm of life. And what you experience at 20 is not the same as what you experience at 60. How could it be? And what you experience today is not the same as what -- when you did the same thing at the age of 10, is it not?

And therefore, the rule I want you to understand is: philosophers abstract from times really experienced. And you cannot therefore allow them to go along and define time from dead objects, and -- and astronomical time. They have to dig down to the experienced time, which they never do. They abstract -- the word "abstract" may have no horrors for you. For me, it has. God created the concrete world. He didn't create geometry. Geometry is the abstraction from real bodies, and real lines, and real points. Jefferson says that the geometer knows the thoughts of God better than the chair-maker, you see, or the carpenter. This is nonsense. God created things, you see, with time and space -- spaces, and -- and expanse. And what you call "geometry" is an abstraction.

(Is that the influence of Plato?)

Of course it is! Down with Plato! Down with Plato!

You see, I was called as a student, "Plato," and so I have some right to say that I have been imbued by him. And -- and he's a very great man. But today he's -- he's a -- does much -- just harm. The human mind is ruined. Plato replaced the five regular bodies, you see -- his mathematical {weight} -- discovery of the five regular bodies, and thought that was God's greatest creation. Imagine, a cube God's greatest creation! When -- when a baby is God's greatest creation, and a flower is God's greatest creation. That is, all the irregular things are His real creations, you see. And those regular abstractions, they are for this impoverished human mind who can only think in straight lines, and points, and squares, and cubes, and circles. And you can -- decide on -- if you meet a person who believes that mathematics is divine and creatures are distorted, so to speak, and irregular, shun such a person. Shun them, because they are doing an injustice to God's creation. God has created a world -- world in which in every moment you have to re-perceive His -- the beauties. There is -- everything is different, you see. Every moment is unique. Every flower deserves to be looked upon for -- on her own merits. You can't get away by saying, "Oh, this is just a rose." You have to write a poem on this rose. You have to talk her up, and not down, this rose, you see. And anybody who tells you "that's just" that, dismiss him. He's the enemy of the human race. Oh, "We have seen all the pictures," "-- That's just politics." This man, you see, doesn't allow this moment to become divine, to become alive. He says, "It's just politics," and he goes home. And -- you see -- and sleeps. And therefore, nothing is done.

The difference between the naturalist -- and the historian is: the historian says, "Think of it! It's really this!" And the naturalist says, "Oh, it's just --." And these are the two at- -- eternal attitudes in your own heart. You see, it's like breathing out, exhaling, and being -- inhaling. And that's why people today are so very shot. You have given up the word "inspiration," because if you would use it, you would know that we -- look at things as na- -- natural when we expire, when we try to get out of it. And we are inspired, and we get involved. Today they say "philosophy of engagement," you see, for this reason, "engagé." Philosophy of the involvement, existentialism. Well, these are desperate cries of people who want to get back, you see, into the empirical time. You have heard these -- these -- these slogans.

That's the old contrast between the biblical tradition of time and the -- platonic tradition of time, you see.

(But everyone's conception of God, for example, must be timeless. I mean,

He's supposed to be some...)

Oh, but it's all Greek. Don't believe it for a minute. Any person who has ever prayed knows better. How is God timeless? God becomes man. God comes to earth. History is His revelation. You -- don't believe it. God created the world, and He is still creating it. It's a process. How can He be out of time? These are all Greek words. Nowhere does the word -- does the word "timeless" occur in the Bible. Show it to me. It's the invention of the platonists. Of course, we are flooded with these neo-platonists, platonists, theologians, you see, who sell you their -- their -- their Greek philosophy as Christianity. It has nothing to do with biblical tradition. And it has nothing to do with Christianity. It's the -- it's the living truth as against the school-man's truth, you see. People who want to look at the world better abstract from time and space. But people who want to live, can't afford that. You have to hear the rhythm, you see, that tells you today to take a day off. That's a decision you have to make, you see.

I have a -- in Germany -- in German there is a pun possible between "man" and "when." And I had to -- made a -- gave a big address to -- for the industrialists of Germany on the -- January 30 of this year, and so it's quite fresh in my memory. And I -- well, I -- the whereabouts would lead us too far. But I made this pun -- or that -- this point there that industry -- industrialists themselves could not just outproduce them -- his -- their competitors. They had also to learn when to stop. And I said -- because this they had in common with the poor customer, whom they wanted to -- to -- to deluge, that when you are at your best in eating, you have to stop, not go on eating. When it tastes -- very well, stop. When you are tired, you have to know how to sleep. And an industrialist who doesn't -- can't sleep, and has to take tranquilizer is already, you see, destroying himself. Here I am told at the college they give you tranquilizers for the exam. If this is true, I mean, this college has to be closed right away. It's a de- -- diabolical institution, because the time rhythm is no longer relied upon, you see. It's not cultivated. Because "tranquilizer" means that the rhythm isn't functioning. You -- that's why you are not allowed to -- tranquilizers. Girls shouldn't smoke, I can't help feeling, because they have a deeper necessity for being in tune with the universe. Your rhythm, you see, is -- is -- is the most sacred thing you have received. We are -- far more apt to break rhythms, because man must create new rhythms, and you must preserve the existing rhythm. Man is the institutor of the next rhythm. For example, in a factory, there is a new rhythm of production. That's -- is man's contribution. But women have to cultivate all the existing rhythms. From holidays, you see, to -- to weekdays, and to sleeping matters, and so -- if -- if the mother doesn't provide enough sleep for her children, she's a

murderess.

Now I said, there is a man in us, and a when in us. Usually, in a good marriage, she is the "when" and he is the man. And the woman has to say to a man, "Now you stay home tonight, and that's just too much," you see. She has to -- to -- to cure the rhythm, when he breaks it by overwork, or by worry, or whatever it is, you see. In a good marriage, this is the case.

So I have a -- had a very intimate friend present at this speech, a head of a big school system in Germany. And he has many troubles at home -- in his marriage, and he said -- then we -- we had dinner together after this speech. And he said to me, grinning, "You know, that's all right with a normal marriage, that he is the man, and she is the when. But in my marriage, I have to be the when." So I was very proud, because it had so affected him that he immediately could see that -- that in his case it should be -- had to be the other way around. And obviously it's in many such cases that one has to play the role of the other. When and man.

All nature considers man without his when. Once you understand -- this, you will -- open up avenues into history which you haven't seen before. History says, "When was man created?" and "When were the United States founded?" "When was the time which tries men's soul?" And this greatness of Paine's pamphlet, you see, which made him a great man, is that he went to Valley Forge and wrote, "Now is the time which tries men's souls." And in this, he became just as the -- Jefferson of the Louisiana Purchase, bigger than Thomas Mai- -- Paine's little Reason. The man who wrote Reason, you know -- you know, he wrote this later, was a dogmatist and a fanaticist. He wrote this in -- in France. But the man who wrote, you see, the pamphlets of the Revolution War was in the thick of fighting, and he knew exactly what had to be said now, at this moment, regardless of what would have been said later. And he re-established his own freedom, you see, that you say different things at different hours of life.

So the unique character of the date makes then -- makes only -- has to be added to the theory that history deals with unique events, because very often, it is only that this happens, at this moment that the event is -- is unique -- becomes unique. It's enough for an event to be needed at this moment in the -- in the process -- in the creative process of the whole. So time is a quality of living bodies on processes. And where you have dead processes, it's the -- the quality is not inherent in the process, the time.



So never take nature -- natural science as the judge of historical processes.  
-- The natural process is impoverished by the time element that's lacking.  
Take a sleeper and a dead person. The sleeper at this moment has no consciousness. But he's fully alive, his rhythm, you see, is waking him up at one time; and therefore, as a sleeping individual, we still belong into history. And the person who sleeps well, or -- as you know, the Bible says, "To those whom He loves, God gives it in their sleep." And there's some great truth about it, because to be able to sleep well is a condition of -- of being a -- a fruitful and creative person. And therefore, all this overrating of consciousness is nonsense, you see. The secret of an historic -- person in history is that he is just as much at peace with the world when he sleeps as when he is awake.

And the -- so this constant improvement of Mr. Jeffer- -- -son- -- and all his adherents get more intelligent. No more, you see, solve all the quizzes, you see; become a quiz kid. And so -- this is all blöd -- nonsense. The problem is the alternation between consciousness and unconsciousness.

I had a big debate. One of my dearest -- or closest disciples is very down on me, because I -- I have no love lost for the Jeffersons, for the Enlightenment. And he wants to save the Enlightenment. And so our whole ar- -- he's quite a dangerous fellow, because he has the press at his fingertips, I mean, at his -- he has the means of production and -- in Europe. And so he -- he can print what he pleases. And so we nearly fell out. On the one-hand side, he -- he worships me; and on the other had, he hates me. It's a very heated-up situation, and a terrible situation, because you never know what's happening next. And in order to defend himself against myself, he has grown a terrible beard, and -- the -- and my psychiatrist friends s- -- tell me that I'm always in danger of being shot by him.

And I tried to tell him that God created just as much night as He cri- -- -ated day. And that to demand from a child prodigy to sleep less and know more is just murder. You see, you kill this child. And perhaps the plant in us and the animal in us are -- have to be balanced. And we have just too much -- you see, always sink back into unconsciousness as we have to wake up to consciousness. And that's just hateful to him. He wants to see more light -- more light. I can't see that. More -- neon light is blinding. I would -- don't want to have any neon light around my house. I want to have it dark at night.

And the -- I think we have reached this stage--you can understand this very well--that man has so much light and has abolished night to such an extent

that philosophers, certainly, thinking, have to add this condiment, this grain of salt, that this enlightenment cannot go on, you see. More light is not in itself a blessing. It has to -- have the right proportion of light, the right amount of light. And you have to sink back into -- into pre-consciousness. And I don't think there is -- is anything -- such thing as subconscious, I mean. That's an invention of the Enlightenment. If you have enlightenment as a normal state, that everything is known and conscious, you see, then you have to coin this phrase, "subconscious," you see. But I mean -- is -- since -- when -- I know that to be conscious is a disease, and that when I am sound asleep, you see, I must dismiss my consciousness, to get a new one the next morning. It has -- the mind has to be recreated all the time, after all. I have to dismiss it. I have to be able to forget. That's as -- as healthy as to remember, you see. If I cannot forget, I am sick. I can't -- forgive any -- my enemies -- I can't forgive my enemies if I can't forget. And therefore, as soon as you see that this rhythm is the problem of history, you -- you do not believe any more that to -- to know more, and to become more conscious -- informed, and I think -- and you will discover that the human soul has always been the power to change one's mind--has been called this way. That's the so-called subconscious. And you -- it is only when people are--as in Vienna, there were -- in the days of Mr. Freud, also whoing -- hewing this Jeffersonian line that to know more and more and to be conscious of everything you do all the time was ideal, then you -- you created a subconscious, because you were just unable to perform. Subconscious is, so to speak, after you over-strain your intention to be conscious of everything, then you can't swing it and the unpleasant things are dismissed into your subconscious, you see. You have tried to become aware of everything, but you can't swing it. It's -- they call this "repression," or whatever they do, you see. A -- a normal person can dismiss, you see, because it has never -- I have never thought that my conscious life is identical with my person. I'm much richer than my little consciousness. And as soon as you admit this, it has no need to speak--when you mean the human soul--speak of the subconscious. That's an area -- I think that is in a gray area, you see, between the realm of the soul and -- where we dismiss mental impressions and thoughts and say, "I've been stupid. Don't think about it. Forget about it." We say this when we are normal, don't we? And we can. And -- the -- Enlightenment however has preached for the last 200 years, "Forget nothing. Buy the Encyclopaedia Britannica." And "Read the Hundred Greatest Books." I've never heard a more idiotic proposition, because I read a book when it is time to read it. And out of time, the Hundred Books must not be read. They is -- are some mathematical books in the Great -- Hundred Books of -- of Mr. Hutchins which have to be read when you are out for mathe-

matics. And they are -- that's -- you can't read them out of time, out of your lifetime, out of your biography. They are devaluated. You are, you see, this -- this -- this is treating your intellect to a feast which will spoil your -- stomach.

All adult education has this tremendous problem to -- to teach these adults here -- this man is in this terrible labeled industry of -- of -- of -- of adult education. And the whole problem of adult education is to -- to -- to re-evoke in an adult the usually lost sense of the timing, or when he should now go on a hike, and when he should now study this and that, you see, to -- it is not the problem of a hobby, but when to have a hobby. That makes this difficult in adult life. You will all discover how difficult it is to know, you see, when to stop.

Well, -- I -- I think the last thing -- thing I wanted to leave with you today is -- is that the way you read in the papers about time and space should be criticized by you, and you should become aware that the times of which we know are all in the plural. I've written now a universal history with the title--it cannot be quite translated into English, but the title is quite eloquent, I think--The Vollzahl der Zeit, the "full number of the times." And I have put--although it is an historical book on the history of mankind from the caveman to today--this plural of "times," to emphasize that it is not a philosophy, but experienced time of empires, and peoples, and kingdoms, and cities, and -- and -- and families. The comp- -- I mean, the -- the Bible of course has this expression of "the fullness of the times." And I've preferred not to have any biblical allusion in it, and just to say -- speak normally today, the full number of -- of the times.

So the cure is use the words "space" and "time" always in the plural, and you can't go wrong. Speak of "times" and speak of "spaces." And never say "space and time." Doesn't exist, except in -- in the abstraction of the geom- -- you see, of the -- of the mathematician. There it's quite legitimate. But you are not allowed to speak of space and time, or you will destroy yourself. Your life is lived in this room, and in your living room, and in the library in spaces, you see, and in places. And in -- your time is -- is divided up into various rhythms of the calendar. You -- your -- your studies, and--as I said--and your military service, and your political career, and what-not. And therefore "times" and "spaces" are the historical expressions.

And Thucydides has created this stern epoch of the Peloponnesian War, this specific epoch. We -- we just ended there, didn't we? So forgive me, I think I have taught you something useful outside what I was going to tell you, but it is important, too.

[tape interruption]

So whose paper do I still have {to} get?

(The other side, too.)

{ }. But I'm -- I'm forgiving. So -- when are you going to {serve}?

(Um.)

(What time were { } --?)

(He has to check his paper for 180, too -- also.)

What?

(Also. He has to a paper for 180 also.)

{{ }. No -- Friday, Friday. Thursday. Friday. The next class meeting.)

But { } {is not writing}. What are you saying?

(No. I have to do the paper for 180 yet { }.)

Well, if you -- you are not very -- very cautious. If you had said, "I couldn't give you this paper today because I had to write the other paper," I would believe you.

(I did.)

But now you said you had to write all the three papers, and not one is on time. This makes no sense.

(No! Tomorrow -- the paper for 180 is due tomorrow, and I'm handing that one in tomorrow.)

Are you sure?

(I'm positive.)

Well, that you should have made more clear, you see.

So please.

(It'll be there.)

Now, I'm back to Thucydides. The -- I was asked by one of you a very pertinent question. He said, why is this { } a possession forever, if after all our life is in process, and how can anybody proclaim that his book on history should be an eternal question? I -- I do think that to come after an event is an educational problem. That you come after the Fourth of July of 1776 is something that has to be impregnated on every generation, you see. I have this disk, "History Must Be Told," for this very reason. People today try to go naked and to believe in nature only, and to be tanned, and -- and muscular, and -- and healthy, and what-not, and analyze away from all historical complexions and complexes -- are such -- try so much to believe the animal in themselves that you think history happens to you without a deliberate effort. And -- you see, into this abstract time which other people measure, you can be lifted -- you can be taken by the astronomer who tells you that you were born after 1940. But -- where's some chalk?

(You deposited some --.)

I usually put it in my pocket.

(I don't think you'll be able to grasp it.)

Thank you, thank you, thank you. And -- would you kindly begin to see that children are not in history, that they have to be lifted up upon this time level of historical -- of the life of nations, or the world of the human race, by education, by a deliberate effort? As long as you think that children enter the historical process automatically, you have not understood the difference between this pluralistic, experienced time and--where you have to take your stand between past and future by your own freedom to look backward and forward, by this experience, what the old people who converted -- who were revivalists who call "conversion," you see, by this power to free yourself from the accident of birth, and to become a decisive factor in the life of the race. However you express this--you can express it religiously, you can express it mentally, you can express it just by power of your own -- of your own power to doubt yourself, to -- to be shaken up, so to speak, to -- to split, you see, and -- don't be down on the schizoid. -- A certain amount of splitting is necessary for the human -- to become a hu- -- historical being, you see. You have at one time to say that part of you belongs to the future, and part of you is an eggshell that has to be -- that has to

be dismissed.

And therefore today that we have schizophrenia in these quantities is the result only of your not getting hold of your schizophrenia, because you should -- it's just as much a curse -- blessing as it is a curse, that we can doubt, that we can split into two beings, one being part of our mother's womb and our father's society; and one being a prophet of the future and of future things. Today nothing is made of it, because you are told that younger people are the future. I assure you one thing -- of one thing. Future people -- children are unhistorical and block the future. The future is created by old men. Mr. Lincoln is much more a man of the future, you see, than the children that lived in his day.

But this is the superstition I think one cannot -- that comes from our -- your pragmatic education, it comes from progressive education, it comes from the cult of the -- the child in the last hundred years, that you think children automatically belong to the future and old people belong to the past. It's just the other way around. All people in responsible positions create the future against the dreams of their children. Children are prehistorical. They are not in history. They are down below. They are on a level of a -- of playing with the past. And this is perhaps the most shocking thing to you.

But Mr. Thucydides knew this. If a Greek grew up without reading his history, he could assume that to go to the Olympic Games, or to ask for an oracle in Delphi, that was enough; that made you a Greek. He says, "People who haven't taken to heart the tragedy of the decisive conflict between Sparta and Athenian cannot in the future be called Greeks," you see. And this means that they have to face tragedy. Now who wants to face tragedy? You see, the Civil War came about because people couldn't face tragedy in time. And they could have. I mean, as you know, there was a proposition to indemnify the slave-owners. The -- the North was willing to pay two-third of the -- of the -- cost. And it is wasn't even debated in the South. You couldn't get the people to -- to anticipate, you see, to believe that the issue was -- was to be settled.

So most people live prehistorical. If I go around in Los Angeles, this is the ideal situation of a prehistorical humanity. You are all prehistorical except for your car, which reminds me that you are very modern indeed, and the smog. The smog is the history of Los Angeles, you see, and the people are the children. The -- you are all prehistorical. That is, you are far behind the decisions that would have had to be taken in the town against the smog long ago. And they're postponed, and postponed, and postponed; and things will have to get much worse before anything will be done against the smog. You know this, I mean. Now

they say it's too expensive. And when the first corpses will lie in the streets from too much smog, then they have -- will have to do -- do something, of course.

Nobody has yet died officially from smog, so nothing is done.

You can always say that before death is stalking in the room, people will daydream, and say "It isn't so bad." -- The Civil War, I mean. Before people were killed, you see, in a war, simply the -- there was no discussion possible, because people didn't -- think it was a vital issue. Vital is that -- something that entails death, gentlemen. Will you take this down? It's a good historical sentence. Now, the -- { } possession, vital issues are such that will not be faced before somebody has to die for them. That's a vital issue. And all the rest is bunk. And that's so -- when -- why history is so cruel. And that's why wars ha- -- have their way, because people will not believe the time in which -- at which they are living before the shots are fired. Before they say, "Oh, it isn't that bad." So they are out of history. They are out of the time stream.

And you have to decide it yourself. If you say children are -- these natural brats, these -- these ghastly people, the young, cruel, oblivious, reckless, ruthless -- children are not beautiful in themselves. That's nonsense. That's all sentimentality because it is very good for the modern adult to say that so that he can shift all the responsibility on the children. "They'll do it." They'll never do it, unless the -- old gives the example.

The old have to do the new things. The children? What do they do? A -- a girl plays with dolls. What are dolls? They are a reminder of old fashions and customs. You play wedding, and funeral, and -- and edu- -- and -- and school, and -- and birth. What do chil- -- boys play with? With soldiers, or with builder -- building stones, or with machinery that has already been invented. All children play with the old forms of life. They play themselves into life by using up the old historical forms. The oldest plays of the children are also the oldest institutions of mankind. A pawn -- have you ever -- you see, these pawn games. That's the old way in which justice was done. In the courts, that the party that sued had to put down a pawn so that the judge knew that he would comply, you see, that he wouldn't run away after the judgment. The parties had to give a -- an earnest of seriousness to the judge. That's the pawn which you -- you know these pawn games, with -- you still play it here in society? where everybody -- everybody puts in something into the common -- into the common -- ?

(Kitty.)

Wie?

(Kitty.)

Ja.

So children play with the past, and that's called "education." But the moment in which they take up a stand in society comes very late. In your life, it may never come, because you are employees. Employees are never asked to make a decision. And we have today a society where I have to tell you these things, because if people at the age of 50 and 60 are still just employees, they'll never grow up. They'll never make decisions. They always play another man's game. And therefore today we have--through spiritual means, through -- through deliberate teaching of the adult--to cover this lost ground. You have to recapture what industry denies you, by en- -- a tremendous effort to get into the -- your own time.

And this is what Thucydides feels the historian should do. Anybody who have read his book is now a Greek, because he has been able to live through tragedy. -- It's the same, as I told you before--I may repeat it, perhaps--that John Brown's Body, you see, was written by -- Vincent Stephen Benét in the hope that anybody who reads it would live after the Civil War, you see, would -- would know that these sacrifices cannot be -- have been in vain. And -- there are two parties today in the world. The one who says, "The future comes about automatically by the newly born," and the other who knows that the future has to be wrestled from the resistance from this prehistorical dream world of the children by grave decisions of the adult.

(Doesn't this all relate -- as an example of something which reinforces this, I was thinking of the film, "He Who Must Die." It's to me one of the most compelling films I've ever seen.)

Who has seen it? Only one. Well -- it's extraordinary. As you know, it's this Greek passion play. It's in the Egyptian Theater?

(No. It's the Sunset Theater, at Sunset and Western.)

It's an extraordinary play. You would oblige me if you would go there, because I think we could then really speak about what history is and what it isn't. It's a -- it's a great play. Have you seen it? It's unfortunate that such a great play--it's a French play on a Greek -- based on a Greek text--that such a -- such a thing should not go over big, I mean. I can't under- -- it's just so eccentric, you



see, the mov- -- a foreign movie, and so it doesn't seem to hit the center, the bull ring. I'm sorry. It's an important movie.

And our friend Thucydides has done this. The funny thing is, I told you, that he has created this one period as a period in which the -- Greek mentality gels. And we take it -- this to be the mature Greece. And after all, the Age of Pericles to this day is there and we only owe it to histor- -- historian. So for you people who study history, I think it is an -- an incredible experience to see that here, a man who writes history simply changes the living picture of the past as it lives in every human being today. This is quite some achievement. Mr. Nehru, who certainly -- you see, a purely Eastern man in his Glimpses of World History, is still influenced by Thucydides. You wouldn't believe it, but in this -- this tremendous power, history writing has, you see, that he thinks -- Nehru thinks that the Age of Pericles -- is great -- great time. And he only knows anything about -- Pericles from this speech which Thucydides makes Pericles deliver here in -- where is this speech? Have you found it?

Ja. Who has read it, by the way?

(Everyone who's got the book.)

(Thucydides himself admits that at some of these speeches he wasn't present; but {that he writes} others' opinions of what was said. Now how do we -- how do we know that Thucydides was present when Pericles made -- I mean, at the funeral oration { }?)

Oh, you're quite right. The authenticity in the modern sense of source research is most doubtful in all these respects. What I have, however, tried to make you able to believe--{perhaps you won't do}--is that the historian is the li- -- last tuning fork which revib- -- -verberates the events; that in him, they still work themselves up to such a pitch that he must witness to them. He is a witness of the events. Homer is the witness of the Trojan War {without which} the Trojan War cannot end. All human life has only been lived where it is told. This is the -- the essence of my -- disk, which perhaps for you it is very hard to get. You live in a scientific era so much that you think, "Here are the things," and then there is a science of these things, and books are written about it, you see, the history books; and they are just a -- apart as this is: event, and here's the book. And I can write the book, I cannot write the book, you see. Perhaps an historian or there are many historians who study this. But they are in some way of life here, and there is an event that is all closed and it has gone by.

My whole experience of history has been the other way around, that an important event also finds his -- its -- its singer, its herald, its historian. Its importance is measured by the greatness of the story that is told. That is, it is not arbitrary, you see. You live in this natural box. You see, here is -- natural man; and he can do as he pleases, with all the things he finds that may have gone on before.

I don't think we live that way. It is forced out of you. If there is a crime in your family, you have to bring it out in your genealogy, you see, if there is a mysterious story in your own {background}. The same is true of nations, and peoples, and humanity. A great event must become articulate. I always make this very simple point, which of course the modern sex -- sex { } do not understand that the difference between sex, and marriage, is that love wants to be declared. The declaration of love is -- is one phase of the love process. Sex doesn't want to be; it wants to be hidden. And that's why love is not sex, you see. Sex is a process in the physical realm. And it means that we are still separate and very unhappy, because in -- sex is not meant to be contained within the individual, but it is a bridge into the formation of social bodies. The declaration of -- of love is the step outside yourself, beyond yourself, in which you admit this. That's why you have to declare this love.

Therefore the declaration of love is a phase of love itself. Therefore it is not a description of love, you see, as a naturalistic process would have to be described by some onlooker. But it is me in the phase of declaring. And therefore love itself -- has this one phase of being declared. In the same sense, an event is only fully an event when it is declared, Sir. And the war is not fought before 70 years later it can be peacefully declared. And what we call "concluding peace" is nothing but the first word of this great song about the war. Because the -- we conclude peace so that we may lift this burden and begin to speak about it, because in the war, we are not on speaking terms, Sir. You know that's the -- all the whole story of war.

Love and war are the two great events, after all, in the human -- in human history. And both have to be declared. War has to be declared and love has to be declared. And marriages have to be -- concluded, and peaces have to be concluded.

And there is a great place is Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressid, which I recommend to your attention, where Shakespeare, who is of course, our master in all these things, speaks of the "married peace of states." Where he -- instead of saying "the concluded," he says -- calls them "the married." And you could say --

say therefore instead of "marriage," you could say "concluded," you see. Love is concluded. That's marriage, you see. And peace is married. You can have this interchange, according to Shakespeare, just as I tried to -- to interchange here Jefferson and Marx.

And therefore, to me Thucydides, you see, is the man through whom the -- the Peloponnesian War could make peace in the hearts of the Spartans and Athenians, and all the other partisans of Greece, could unite them. They could agree on this one issue. And there -- I assure you, Sir, there will not be peace on this globe unless you can write -- somebody can write the history of these two world wars in such a way that the Russian, and the British, and the German, and the American will say, "That's it." And that's exactly what John Brown's Body is written about. The end of Vincent Stephen Benét is "Don't argue. It's just there." Have you read it?

(Yes.)

You remember?

So Vincent Stephen Benét would agree that he is part of the Civil War, the last. He is the concluding chapter. He concludes it, which had never been concluded, because the armistice of Appomattox was not the conclusion of a peace. The United States have an unfortunate habit, as a purely naturalistic nation, you see, of immigrants, to say that when the shooting stops, the event is over. You see, you haven't -- you see, this -- 1865, it has happened this way; it has happened with the Philippines; it has happened with Cuba -- you see just Fidel Castro now and his relation to the United States; it has happened with Germany twice. The American people think history has not to be told, not nec- -- "the event -- it is natural thing, the -- the -- the mute things speak for themselves." They don't. And { }.

And it is so boastful, you see. The -- the Indian wars. Everything in this country is only written like Parkman's History of the Missions, you see, written from one point of view. That's not history. That's still -- I wouldn't say "vainglorious boast," but it is -- it is not the history. Because the history must be accepted by the warring parties. The -- Thucydides is an historian, because the Spartans and the Athenians, after reading the story -- the Corinthians, the { }--everybody, you see--could say, "This is it."

(Is this how Benét concludes the peace, as opposed to the end of the hostilities by the fact that { } its collective idea, that all sides saying, "This is it"?)

Ja. Haven't you read it?

(Yes.)

That's the last word. "It's just there," he says. I think that's the last line. Or "It's there."

He -- yet you could -- if you think of the procession in Thucydides, exactly the same terms, this. "There's lying something," you see, "in what you said." This is what Benét -- where Benét formulates it about the Civil War. "It's here, lying before you, I'm will enable you to pick it up and to -- to have it."

I think your generation has a tremendous task to fulfill in this country, to restore the power of the -- of the telling, of the -- of the saying of things. Is today not an angry generation, or a lost generation, or a beat generation? It is a generation that is destroying human speech for its proper purposes, you see. Go to the logical semanticists. Who has taken a course with them? They only know the indicatives. They never know the optative, or the subjunctive, or the imperative, you see. They think speech consists of saying, "This is a book. Let's then analyze." I told you -- tried to tell you this is not speech. For this purpose to say, "This is a book," or "2 and 2 is 4," speech would have never been invented. Speech has been invented to -- to get a group out of the grave into the future, to say, "He is dead," or "They are dead and we are alive," or "This is the future," "God is coming," or whatever you express it, I mean. And -- it is this decision which the historian made, because he says, "Some things must never be fought about again." You see, the Civil War cannot return; you will admit that. But three years ago, there was great prospect that in our Little Rock, the Civil War would get started again. This is -- I mean this. People had forgotten all about it. The governor of Virginia laughed and said, "After all, it still seems now that we have won the Civil War."

And -- this backsliding is -- is at this moment not yet quite overcome. I think the young -- the young generation in -- in Virginia and -- and so has just grown up with so many different influences that they no longer understand their -- their old -- not quite.

There was a -- speech given by a -- by a student in Charleston about -- on the -- the -- saying to his elders that they had never lived in the solid South. They lived in the liquid South. But I think the solution has not been coming. I still think that the black man in the South has to get a senator in every one of the six

-- seven states. We might have to be restricted to one senator. That would be justice. And I don't see any other solution. They'll never go together. Never. The white men -- they will die for the last -- white supremacy is such an item with them. It is not a question of segregation desecrated; it's white supremacy. It's the political -- they will not accept laws given by the black man in their legislature. So I think the issue is absolutely irreconcilable. I don't believe in any gradual improvement there. But you have to take other steps to restore justice. This is -- you have to go -- you see, you just have to -- to think, "What is the right of a black man in a -- in a state in which he is denied the rights of citizenship?" That's the situation. And the sooner they think about this, I think, the better it is. They will not accept the testimony of a black man against a white man in court to this day. They just won't. You know this. I mean, you think of the Mississippi case, where everything was proven, and the man was acquitted. You remember? Who was the boy?

( { } .)

Terrible case. { } murder, man is acquitted. In no other country -- is this thinkable. It's a unique American institution.

So the funny thing is that Thucydides -- you say -- speak about these speeches, you see. To Thucydides the speeches are simply a way of saying how he has understood the history and the war. What he puts in the mouth of these speakers, you see, is the -- the -- instead of the bones, it's the -- it's the blood running through the -- the -- the deeds. He wouldn't argue with you -- your --. Your question, he wouldn't und- -- you see, he would not care. You think that the speech is a fact. But I tell you: the speech is that what -- what still rings in my--the historian's--ears, of the event. It's a little different relation, you see. And believe one thing. The -- the -- today there are two worlds. The world of the scientist, who says, "Here are objects, and I speak about them. And God is an object, and I speak about God. And wars are topics, and I speak about this war. And the Athenians are a topic, you see, of conversation; I speak about the Athenians." But I have never believed this. As an historian and as a -- as a creature, I allow God to speak through me, and I allow the Athenians to speak through me. They make me speak. And the laws of this country makes me eloquent, you see. I want to protect them, and I am made to speak. And I am -- anybody who speaks about God is despicable. You cannot speak about God. And God is the power that makes you and me speak, Sir. That's a different story. We speak, because we must speak. We must testify, must we not?

And -- and all these modern definitions--for example, of God--are so ridiculous. God is not the maker of the universe. In the first place, everybody knows that there is a God, because He -- you speak to Him, and you listen to Him. And the power that makes us speak is the power that is the first in experience. And then we delve from this power that God makes us speak, that He's the spirit alive in you and me, that He also probably created the other things that do not speak. It's the other way around, you see. The -- the article of the Holy Spirit is the first article of experience. Everybody wants to speak. And a child wants to become eloquent, and he wants to convince his elders; and the historian wants to -- to make these dead sacrifices and victims speak so that they shall not have died in vain. "Lest we forget." You know the "Recessional" by Kipling, do you? Who knows the "Recessional" by Rudyard Kipling? You bring it next time. Rudyard Kipling, "Recessional."

So -- I -- I -- pardon me for becoming always so passionate about this, but I know I'm fighting a whole world of prejudice of the 19- -- of the Enlightenment. The Enlightenment has built up this wall that we speak about things. And that's true of dead things. That's true of things who cannot speak. But people who have said something! If I speak of my marriage of my parents, I can only testify to their love by having listened to what they say to each other, and what they have told their children. And then I can understand that they once bef- -- long before my own days, they made love. It's the hardest thing for a child to understand, the pre-history of their -- the parents, you see. That's -- and that's what the historian has to do. He has to penetrate before the state which he takes for granted. Into this moment, you see, at which it was -- didn't exist. The great -- if a child can understand the -- the engagement period of his parents, he is an historian. Because he speaks of something, you see, on which his own existence very much depends indeed, you see, as having once not existed. And if you would have -- two people have the power to understand what brought your two parents together, you would have no problems of psychoanalysis, because your -- the problem of the unity of these -- these people would outweigh by far all the repressions and all your mother -- Oedipus complexes and so on, all this nonsense what they tell you today.

Why is that today? Why does the -- the psychoanalyst say you have to analyze the embryo for his traumas? Because they do not understand that the historical problem before the -- child is to understand the history of his parents. So he puts it into the embryo -- nine months in the mother's womb, you see. What has to be done by deliberate spiritual effort of the child to understand how his two parents got together and to marry each other. That's the first historical

task of every human being: to penetrate before his birth. But not before his birth into the sperm, and into the material something, you see. The hormones. That's all nonsense. Perverse.

And we live in this. Now everything has been perverted into material nature. What you have to hear is the word spoken, and the letters exchanged between your parents. That's why it is -- every family is very lucky where such letters have been preserved, because when you can read about the days of your grandparents in their own letters, you see, you live a life larger than you -- if you only treat yourself as an individual whose embryonic existence as a fish in your mother's womb has to be -- has to be analyzed by a hired -- a hired psychoanalyst. It's just -- but you live in this world today. That's why I have to tell you. It seems to me -- all these people -- project, instead of dealing with the history of their parents, you see, they project themselves into -- into -- into geology, and into history of man for 500 million years backward; and they have all these fantasies.

I had to laugh. There is this boy -- this Japanese prince marrying this commoner. The pa- -- papers in Los Angeles, in a city with a university can afford to write, "The first time in 2,690 years that this happens." Now the whole Japanese empire only exists for {1500} years. The rest is all mythology. And typical of all mythological people, they always project and double the time that has elapsed. And this paper accepts on face value this Japanese myth that the -- that the history of Japan goes back to 660 B.C. There's not a word of truth in this. It's a natural projection of unpurified minds to double the time that has elapsed, you see, to make it more interesting. And it is much more difficult, you see, to read the history of the -- Peloponnesian War, of the Civil -- of the World War, too, at this moment, than to deal with -- with these geological times. If you read the read the history of -- World War II, you are shocked by the omissions. What we have not done, you see. And we are shocked by the bombs on Hiroshima, et cetera. But if you read the history of mankind, you see, of ape man in 400 million years before, you have no responsibility. You are {in nature}.

And this is what goes on, on this campus all the time, I feel, that the -- the -- the difficulty is to get the unfinished business before you. That's history. Yes. Can you understand it? The unfinished, the still-reverberating thing, that the harmony of which has not been yet caught by your ear. There are so many disharmonies still hanging, suspended over you, as you see, in the clouds, over this country, that have not been harmonized. Unsolved, unconcluded peaces.

So the historian is the -- is the doctor, is the med- -- the healer of society, I assure you. He heals the conflicts by hearing them so ineradicably; still, you see, reverberating, that he has to speak of them. And by -- by speaking of them in such a way that -- that the whole makes itself heard, he -- he -- he makes the peace in his own day possible.

And then you understand then that for ancient historians, the speeches were his hearing device. By the speeches, he simply identified himself with the people who spoke at the time. Perhaps this -- this answers your question { }.

Does it? Ja?

(Hm.)

There is not this division of: here is a man making a speech, and here is the historian. But in the speech, the historian tries to express what he has heard these men saying. And so he -- it's his own reverence for history that is expressed. He is not the master of his -- of his task there, you see. But he is submitting to this tremendous burden of the historical facts, that he can only solve -- relieve -- get relief if he makes these people speak through him. In this sense, it's -- you may say it's dramatic history, because he is the dramatist whose persons, you see, walk up to you and speak in their own tongue what they have to say.

This is -- now there are some elements about Thucydides. He -- how does he write this history? We talked about this. I mean, the -- the -- the funny fact distinguishing him from -- of course from modern historians is that he's a contemporary. Our friend -- my friend Page Smith, here, Professor Smith, is now publishing an article in which he proves that the best -- history of the colon- -- of the Revolution War was written by a contemporary. You have s- -- wie?

(He talked about it.)

Ja. Very exciting, you see, that even this law of Thucydidean history -- writing of history is true today. And -- there is no science of history, because there is no accumulation. Every -- generation has to be brought into this same commotion, and emotion, you see, and interest by a different means, because the more you are removed from a -- from an event, the difficult it is, of course, to prepare the ground in you, that you still see that it is vital, that you may have to go to war for it. Ja?

(Is it perhaps possible then that such a history as that of Winston Churchill would -- would stand as the contemporary history -- of World War II?)



Ja, you know, I'm an admirer of Winston Churchill as a statesman. I'm not an admirer of him as this -- having written this last history. If you want to know what Churchill can do in history, read his Marlborough. That's a great book, the history of the Duke of Marlborough. And that's of course -- there is -- his whole heart is there. He is, as you know, the younger son of the famous Churchill family, and this Duke of Marlborough was the target of much abuse by the -- by the Whig history -- -torians in Great Britain, Macaulay hated -- hated Marlborough. And Churchill simply obviously was intrigued by the task of rescuing this really very wicked ancestor. And I feel that's a great book, that he has written a very beautiful book about his own youth, A Roving Commission. Has somebody read this book? He wrote it in a chasm of deep despair when there seemed to be absolutely no future for himself in 1931. A Roving Commission. That's an autobiography.

Now I invite you to read these books to show what a -- what refinement and subtlety he had at that time. I mean, simply -- English writing and in -- in -- in humanity. These are like murals, you know, frescoes, these new books. And -- I -- I think his -- his -- his shortcoming is his lack of identity of the -- with the rest of the human race outside the British empire is -- is most galling. And -- he -- the man is absolutely divided, you see. He's the -- on the one-hand side, he's -- he's really down on everybody who is not an Englishman. And the other hand, he's enough of an American--after all, he's half-American, you see--to -- to know better. And he has this other, this all-human ring. But I think in these last books, the -- the recon- -- the peace is not established between his two natures. And this is -- frankly to say that I'm -- I'm -- I -- I have not -- I feel that he has done better -- better history writing. In his great moments of defeat in his life, he has reconquered himself by saying, "Well, if I cannot make people listen to me, I'll make them listen to the great voice of history." And -- and he has. (Well, I was just grasping for some instance to illustrate the principle that perhaps the best history writing is by contemporaries.)

Ja. Well --.

(But if not Churchill, whom might we look to for the history of World W-- of the world wars, or at least of World War II?)

Well, I highly recommend the first volume of de Gaulle. Is -- has that been translated into English? Of course, I read it in French, but it -- I think it has come

out in English. That's a -- it's a won- -- it's very fascinating, de Gaulle's memoirs of war.

(Yes, they're in English.)

(When was Crusade in Europe written?)

(1948.)

Wie?

(Crusade in Europe, he said.)

Ja. It's not a bad book. But it's not a good book, either. I'm told that he didn't write it. And I hate ghostwritten books { }. I mean, if somebody else writes it, his -- this name should appear in it, you see. It just isn't right. It's all -- have you read it?

(No. I haven't. I was just wondering if it was written during the war or after it?)

Oh, after. There are very nice pieces in it.

(He has the feeling of the Russians' side { }.)

Oh ja. Oh ja. Oh ja. No. He's at his best in the book. I -- have to admit that.

No. All I want to say is that it's a very -- a story of Mr. Eisenhower's role in the war, but it isn't really the story of the World War. He -- he doesn't have...

(Doesn't he try to justify a lot of the things he had done { }?)

Ja, quite. So it isn't Crusade in Europe, it -- is Mr. Eisenhower's part in the crusade in Europe. That's really -- it's a -- it's a modest book, an agreeable book. But it hasn't this reconciliatory effect that after you have read it, you are glad the thing was done, and -- and has come to an end. I mean, it isn't this -- has nothing of the -- of the fate knocking at the door, of -- you know. No -- you don't feel that--despite of -- the title--you are not taken into the confidence of the great powers of darkness and light who are fighting in this -- in this incredible confla-

gration. You -- you don't understand anything about the issues. The -- the future -- is nothing.

(Well, in any case, there are -- there are still many contemporaries who are at work writing history. So that perhaps we may see yet a contemporary history produced.)

Ja, but -- oh, not "but" -- only let me add this one thing. We mustn't be impatient. I think it wouldn't be surprising if it would take two generations before the ma- -- this one song of humanity can be sung, because the task is so new that the whole world has gone to war. And suddenly we had to go twice, because people didn't even understand what had happened then the first time. Certainly this country hadn't understood it; the Germans hadn't understood it; the British, you see. Everybody was still thinking that it was the -- the continuation of their own national destiny. Now we know -- or I think some people know that it was the end of all independence, you see. And that this interdependence is -- is really with us.

Therefore, you cannot wonder that it will take a singer who is already wakening up with this lightning, you see, inside of the interdependency, who has not gradually to be convinced of this, as all these people have. And Churchill hasn't. Churchill has been backsliding, I think, be- -- before, in his writing, before the war. He's a -- he is -- and I do think the man had to do so much to -- to digest his American mother, and to become purely Eng- -- well, as you understand, the problem being, after all, for the leading Amer- -- English statesman to make the people feel that he was not American, you see, was -- and -- that I think the -- he had always to narrow his comprehensiveness into the English pattern, by an effort. You see, he had to remain British when, perhaps by his background, he had already the wider conception of a -- you see, of an intercontinental missile -- mission.

And -- and therefore, we need a man who comes, quite the contrary, from {this} { } -- you see, limited --. And unfolds, without this fear of -- after all, from 18- --when was he born? 1880 is it? 1878--in the times of the darkest nationalism, he goes to the Indian service. He goes to Egypt. Everywhere it's the British empire in which he wants to prove himself. His father was Randolph Churchill, as you know, one of the most unhappy, and most ingenious statesmen of Great Britain. And he has Miss Jerome for his mother. And his mother, as you know, behaved really very much like an American. As soon as the father died, she married a young journalist, 10 years her younger--which -- typically of an American lady--and -- and disappears from the scene. And he's without any

family background. And poor -- they're -- also are the Churchills, you see, this branch. They have nothing to do with the Duke of Marlborough family, and their fortunes. And was -- he was very lucky. He married this wonderful person. This -- his wife of course was his great bliss. But he must make the Amer- -- English public always forget his mother, and that he may have some loyalties with this country, you see.

So he can't be jingoistic enough, you see. That's why Indian service, you see. And Sou- -- he goes to the South African war, as a war correspondent; he's nearly shot dead there. Every scene of a -- Great Brit- -- the British empire, you see, is for him, because he must, so to speak, stake out his claim to be contained within the British empire. Can you see this? This is his -- driving force of his life. Ja.

Would somebody -- in the college library, there is a book by Polybius, that's the -- the second historian of rank in antiquity. He lived from 201 B.C. to 120--this is estimated; we don't know for sure, but it must be about right--201 B.C. to 120 B.C. And in his 30 -- let me give you the exact place--is the college library a standing library or is -- a lending library? What is Col- -- in the catalog it says "College Library."

(That's the undergraduate library.)

(You can borrow from --.)

Wie?

(One week only.)

Well, so you won't take it out. But -- is it available? I mean, can you go and -- to the stack -- shelves?

(Yes.)

Well, there is this man, Polybius. Loeb edition. In six volumes. As you know, there is the Greek and the English text. And I want you to read up the fragments of the -- 39th book. There are only a few fragments left. And the last is -- the whole history in 40 volumes. And this fragment of the 39th volume I want you to read. Then you will see what speeches have to do with history, because it's a great -- it is the strange thing. And in my own life, it has played quite a role

in this country. So you -- I think it makes it even more interesting. It's called -- "Fragment on Scipio When He Conquers" -- can -- you can't miss it: "Fragment on Scipio When He Conquers Carthage in 146." The 39th book deals with this. It's a very short paragraph, but every one of you kindly will read this. And you will find it in Loeb -- in the sixth volume, I suppose. This is the little -- these little Bänd- -- volumes, and -- and it's in -- I think in the last volume. And don't take it out, but allow every one -- member here of the seminar to read it on the -- on the spot, there. It's so short. It's one page. But I think this -- I even recommend highly that you copy it, verbatim. Every one of you. It deserves it. Then I'll tell you the story which has played in this country after the Second World War.

So I'll make a real effort not to talk so much next time.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...storytelling, so to speak. Now that would be the first thing that the histori- -- philosopher is the judge of the historian. And I think you first -- what I read --.

(You yourself are a philosopher of history, aren't you?)

-- Well, I'm very willing to tell you this, yes. This is very {astute.}

(Hegel and Spengler are {the others}.)

I hope I'm not. I hope I'm just telling -- trying to tell history. And I'm tell- -- trying to tell you what historians do. It's not the same, you see, as judging the -- the histories told, you see, for the systematic meaning and the order of things. Well, we'll come to this. Ja, I'm glad you asked this question, { }. \$64,000 ques- tion; only nobody pays me the \$64,000.

Here, we have to read { }. Here. Perhaps you begin to read this. This is Mr. Collingwood who is dead by now. Was an English philosopher. And never dawned on him that he was involved in history himself, that he was a part of the history. He's a true philosopher of history. There's no doubt about it, that he tries to judge what his- -- what historians do. And -- and from what he--well, I sup- pose--called a "philosophical point of view"--whatever that may be--outside the -- not only the history, but even in the business of history writing. He's neither in the field of historians, nor is he engagé, as people today say in existential philos- ophy, himself as the victim, or object, or member of the -- of the stor- -- story that's going on.

Ja.

("Greek Conception of History's Nature and Value.

"The ardor [ar-DOR] with which the Greeks..."

Ardor [AR-dor]. Not ar-DOR.

"...ardor with which the Greeks pursued the ideal of an unchanging and eternal object of knowledge might easily mislead us as to their historical interests. It might, if we read them care- --

carelessly, make us think them uninterested in history, somewhat as Plato's attack on the poets might make an unintelligent reader fancy that Plato cared little for poetry. In order to interpret such things correctly, we must remember that no competent thinker or writer wastes his time attacking a man of straw. An intense polemic -- polemic against a certain doctrine is an infallible sign that the doctrine in question figures largely in the writer's environment, and even has a strong attraction for himself.

("The Greek pursuit of the eternal was as eager as it was, precisely because the Greeks themselves had an unusually vivid sense of the temporal. They lived in a time when history was moving with extraordinary rapidity, and in a country where earthquake and erosion changed the face of the land with a violence hardly to be seen elsewhere. They saw all nature as a spectacle of incessant change, and human life as changing more violently than anything else. Unlike the Chinese, or the medieval civilization of Europe, whose conception of human society was anchored in the hope of retaining the chief features of a structure unchanged, they made it their first aim to base and reconcile themselves to the fact that such permanence is impossible.

("This recognition of the necessity of change in human affairs gave to the Greeks a peculiar sensitiveness to history. Knowing that nothing in life can persist unchanged, they came habitually to ask themselves what exactly the changes had been which they knew must have come about in order to bring the present into existence. Their historical consciousness was thus not a consciousness of age-long tradition molding the life of one generation after another into a uniform pattern. It was a consciousness of violent, catastrophic changes from one state of things to its opposite: from smallness to greatness, from pride to abasement, from happiness to misery.

("This was how they interpreted the general character of human life in their dramas. And this was how they narrated the particular parts of it in their {history}. The only thing that a shrewd and critical Greek like Herodotus would say about the divine power that ordains the course of history is that it is --." { }. It is envious, and it is mischief-making, noise-making, or { } -- confusion-making.

(The Greek is --.)

{ }, wie?

{{ } Greek words?)

Greek words. { }. { } is the -- important word, it's the envy of the gods, that the gods cannot see perfect happiness among mortals without disturbing it. Probably you know the story that Herodotus tells on this account; it's an important one, and always quoted { }. Polycrates of Samos, was in perfect bliss, and he received the visit of the Egyptian king. And the king said to him, "My dear Polycrates, the gods have done too much for you. They will be envious. Do something to reconcile them to your bliss."

And Polycrates was quite willing to listen to reason. And so he took his -- the ring on his finger, which he prized very highly, and which the -- was the symbol of his statescraft--I mean, he sealed his laws with this ring--and threw it into the sea.

And while the king of Egypt was still with him, the next day, a fisherman brought a fish, and the fish had in his -- had in his mouth this ring, and so the -- king recovered the precious ring. Whereupon the king of Egypt took his departure in great haste and said -- "The -- the gods had not received your sacrifice, and therefore you are doomed. I will have nothing to do with you."

And a few -- short time later Polycrates was besieged, and deposed, and died in misery.

So this -- this is the envy of the gods. And it goes through all Greek tragedy, and is quite serious, I mean. There is a castle on the Mosel River in Germany, built by a very rich banker. He had a wonderful wife; and he was very wealthy; and was healthy, and everything went well. And one day, his Dutch friend, friend of the firm, eloped with this wife. And so this man had the great courage, the -- the -- the bereaved one, the one's -- whose wife had gone away from him. And you can read to this day, on the -- above the entrance to the castle of Cochem, on the Mosel River--it's one of the most beautiful places in Ger- -- in Ber- -- Europe--{"Begehre nie"} -- who know- -- does anybody know German? No, it makes no sense then to quote it in German first--"Never ask for too great a fortune or for too beautiful a wife, because the heavens might concede you your wish for your punishment."

So you should never ask, you see, too great a bliss, because in their wrath, they might -- they might concede it to you and then you lose it.

So that's quite bold. Certainly it doesn't go with the modern American tycoon's idea of -- of tumbling from one place in Reno into another place in



Mexico City. But this country, of course, doesn't know what tragedy is. It's not admitted in America that there is real tragedy. But this man, this Herr vom Rath in -- in -- in Germany, had the -- had the courage to -- like Polycrates, to know that if you come under God's judgment, it is -- without remission. It is -- there is no remission, easily. So that's the envy of the gods. Go on.

("He was only repeating what every Greek knew: that the power of Zeus was manifested in the thunderbolt, that of Poseidon in the earthquake, that of Apollo in the pestilence, and that of -- and that of Aphro- -- Aphrodite in the passion that destroyed at once the pride of Phaedra and the chastity of Hippo- -- Hippolytus.

"It is true that these catastrophic changes...")

These are all, of course, dramas, I mean, Hippolytus and {Phaedra} { }.

Who has read Phèdre, at least, by Racine?

("It is true that these catastrophic changes in the condition of human life, which to the Greeks were the proper theme of history, were unintel- -- -telligible. There could be no --.")

Knowledge. Knowledge. { } "knowledge."

("There could be no knowledge of them, no demonstrative, scientific knowledge. But all the same, history had for the Greeks a definite value. Plato himself played it down, that right opinion--which is a sort of pseudo-knowledge that perception gives us of what changes--was no less useful for the conduct of life than scientific knowledge, and the poets maintained their traditional place in Greek life as the teachers of sound principles, by showing that in the general pattern of these changes, certain antecedents normally led to the -- to certain consequence. Notably, an excess in any one direction led to a violent change into its own opposite. Why this was so, they could not tell. But they thought it a matter of observation that it was so, that people who became extremely rich or extremely powerful were thereby brought into special danger of being reduced to a condition of extreme poverty or weakness.

("There is here no theory of causation. The thought does not resemble that of 17th-century inductive science, with its metaphysical basis in the axiom of cause and effect. The riches of Croesus are not the cause of his downfall. They are merely a symptom to the intelligent observer that something is happening in the rhythm of his life, which is likely to lead to a downfall.

("Still less is the downfall a punishment for anything that in an intelligible, moral sense could be called wrongdoing. When Ama- -- Amasis in Herodotus broke off his allegiance...")

That is the king of Egypt.

("...broke off alliance with Poly- ...")

Polycrates.

("Polycrates, he did it...")

It was the ring, you see.

("...he did it simply on the grounds that Polycrates was too prosperous. The pendulum had swung too far one way and was -- likely to swing as far in the other.

("Such examples have their value to the person who can make use of them, for he can use his own will to arrest these rhythms in his life before they reach the danger point; and check the thirst for power and wealth, instead of allowing them to drag him to excess.

("Thus history has a value. Its teachings are useful for human life, simply because the rhythm of its changes is likely to repeat itself. Similar antecedents leading to similar consequence. The history of notable events is worth remembering in order to serve as a basis...")

Now listen well. This is all really what people today call "philosophy."

("The history...")

I'm -- I have -- to tell you the truth. I think it's all awful what this man does. Ja. Go on.

("The history of notable events is worth remembering in order to serve as a basis for prognostic judgment--not demonstrable, but probable--laying down not what will happen, but what is likely to happen, indicating the points of danger in rhythms now going on.

("This conception of history was the very opposite of deter-

ministic. But the Greeks regarded the course of history as flexible and open to salutary modification by the well- instructed human will. Nothing that happens is inevitable. The person who is -- the person who is about to be involved in a tragedy is actually overwhelmed by it, only because he is too blind to see his danger. If he saw it, he could guard against it.

("Thus the Greeks had a lively--and indeed, a naïve--sense of the power of man to control his own destiny, and thought of his power...")

The naïveté is all on the side of Mr. Collingwood, who has the idea that he can control {his story}. It's just in of -- but this is the modern stuff that you get, you see. I'm just reading a book by a lady, which is real desert: *The Martyr Complex in American History*. This lady has the effrontery to -- to look down on the martyr complex of all the people who have made this country great. And she of course, who will never be a martyr and never make a sacrifice, now writes a book, *The Martyr Complex*. And this is what happens among you people. I mean, the -- destruction of the -- of the tissue between -- the relationship between the people whom we owe our existence--the soldiers and the martyrs--and ourselves has reached the point where these people -- at their desk, who -- costs nothing to -- to sit in judgment, laugh at these martyrs and say they have a martyr complex. So they say, "Jesus committed suicide," you see, and "St. Stephen then has a martyr complex."

This is what we have reached. And this is the same superciliousness, you see. Here he says, "naïveté." What does he know what naïveté is? He is naïve in his -- in -- at his desk, thinking that he is outside of history. The intellectuals in this -- in the Anglo-Saxon world all deserve to be -- to be hanged. The most destructive class of people I know. If I had -- something to say, I would close all the universities -- at once. Because they detach man -- the human society from -- from -- their victims and -- the people who make the sacrifices. Give me any soldier or sailor, any man as compared to a Ph.D.

(You're an Anglo-Saxon intellectual.)

I'm not. I'm a German intellectual. We at least knew that we had to stand upright for what we thought, that you have -- had to fight. This at least is the -- is the -- since Luther the tradition of a Protestant, that their -- their protest engaged -- involved you, you see, that we were part and parcel of the historical spectacle in -- in putting down what we thought. That it was risky. That we were just part of the story. This is -- at least, you see, was not forgotten. This comes of course

from the fact that the professors in Germany made the Reformation, you see. Whereas in -- in England, they were cowards in Oxford and Cambridge, and did not protest. And followed Henry VIII.

(Doesn't claiming distinctness from Anglo-Saxon heritage or -- or claiming distinctness in German professorship put yourself outside the brotherhood of intellectuals -- brotherhood of --?)

I'm -- certainly do not belong -- do not want -- my -- my next door farmer certainly is closer to my heart, or a member of my congregation than the next { } professor. Should -- because I -- I -- cowards. They don't know what they do. They don't know that they are responsible for what they are saying. -- This is just -- a fact, you see. -- A missionary in -- in England has the faith of a professor in Germany, so to -- so to speak. A missionary -- is he not committed? He goes to India, I mean -- that's how the British Commonwealth has been built up, how the Pilgrim Fathers founded this country, you see. That's the spirit. With -- those people, I feel at peace. You understand?

(Yes.)

Who -- who knows? May -- we are all benighted here. Or {may be}. But at least we are willing to stand by our word and say, "I said it. Quote me on this," you see. Where I find the academic professionals here -- profession constantly telling me, "Don't quote me on this."

Pardon me for being quite frank, but you -- you -- this is a terrible situation in which I find myself, that I -- I'm find much -- myself. -- In my own town, you see, when the -- when the central school system was built, and the district schools were given up--which I think are in the -- the center of American democracy, that the children are educated not in big military institutions and { }, so to speak, you see, but in -- in -- at the place of where they -- where they live. The farmers came to me and -- and -- to defend them against this inroad of the intellectuals in our town. So I mean, I have even -- practically, you see, I was a lonely wolf on the side of the farmers to try to stave off this -- this orgy of modern education.

You see, that -- that to teach is not to be outside life, you see, looking at it, and talking about it. But it's a part of the -- of the -- of the process of letting the spirit run through the generations. This is here -- lost with this idea of objectivity, you see, that you only teach objective, let the people -- child themselves pick and choose. Whatever I bring before a child for this, I am -- remain responsible.

Nothing will -- the -- the fiction that the child then chooses and makes a decision, you see, is all ridiculous. But today the program is that you -- you choose your courses. The 12-year-old chooses h- -- his courses. The 10-year-old girl says whether she wants to take science or mathematics. How can she? You see, it's all fiction, this free-will idea, you see. Practically, by psychological tricks, they bring this -- this little donkey, so that he -- the child -- still can only choose between cabbage and asparagus, after all, I mean, and artichokes. I mean, the things that are offered in the school are very limited.

Now it appears that the child chooses this, between three items after all, which confine the selection to very definite issues. Wouldn't it be much better if the teacher would say, "This is the in- -- heritage which every child has to -- has to receive, and -- imperatively so," you see? Dictatorially so. Why don- -- why don't we protect children from -- from their own nonsense? If they -- they cannot know what it is -- it means, you see. So we allow them to drop out of any such chosen subject, as you know, after a year. So they are the most unhappy people on earth, because nothing really enters them seriously, you see. They have {lift-ed} everything -- a little bit, you see, and never learned anything really. And this is called "education" in this country.

Where is your language? What -- what -- which foreign language do you

--

?

(French.)

Do you read it?

(No.)

Now, I mean.

(Not outside the textbook, no.)

Wie?

(Not outside of the textbook.)

So it's perfectly meaningless. As long as you do not subscribe to a French journal, or read French literature, voluntarily weekly, is the whole language requirement should fall whole. It's already -- it's all fictitious. That's one great

item of waste. Meanwhile, because the teacher will not stand up and say, "This is necessary," you see. They will not take the responsibility of fighting for it.

Now, let's come on.

("Thus the Greeks had a lively and indeed a naïve sense of the power of man to control his own destiny, and thought...")

Don't you think Mr. Collingwood has the same naïveté? He is even control- -- wanting to -- control the destiny of historians. This whole naïveté, you see, which--like this lady with the martyr complex book, see--she thinks the martyr is naïve. And she -- doesn't know how naïve she is to believe that we can live without other people protecting our -- us with the investment of their lives, and this fortitude.

Whenever you read from an academic person the -- the term "naïveté," turn around and look at him, and see how naïve he or she is. Any primitive person -- people are certainly less naïve -- know more the tragedy of life--than the people I meet in -- on this campus. And we call the primitives "naïve," and they know how tragic their life is. They know that -- what blood guilt is, they know what -- what -- what warfare is, what vendetta is, you see, et cetera. So these -- the -- I've never seen a -- a chieftain of an Indian tribe, and I have seen some -- to be naïve. They are terribly -- they know exactly that every good thing costs its price. But we live in a fools' paradise -- we think we can have something for nothing, on the installment plan. And the credit card has never to be paid. The fools' paradise is with our -- is here. This is the -- naïve society.

Come on.

("Thus the Greeks had a lively, and indeed a naïve sense of the power of man to control his own destiny, and thought of this power as limited only by the limitations of his knowledge. The fate that broods over human-...")

Don't you think that's just what modern man in Hollywood thinks? Only limited by the -- limitations of his knowledge. Or don't -- don't we control nature? And don't we think that's all we have to do?

Ja.

("The fate that broods over human life is from this Greek

point of view, a destructive power only because man is blind to its workings. Granted, that he cannot understand these workings, he can yet have right opinions about them, and insofar as he acquires such opinions, he becomes able to put himself in a position where the blows of fate will miss him. On the other hand, valuable as the teachings of history are, their value is limited by the unintelligibility of its subject matter. And that is why Aristotle says that poetry is more scientific than history, for history is a mere collection of empirical facts, whereas poetry extracts from such facts a universal judgment.

("History tells us that Croesus fell, and that -- Poly- -- Polycra- --?")

No, you bring it out yourself. I want first to hear you say it.

("Polycrates.")

Yes.

("Now, poetry, according to Aristotle's idea of it, makes not a singular judgment, but the universal judgment that very rich men, as such, fall. Even this is in Aristotle's view, only a partially scientific judgment, for no one can see why rich men should fall. The universal cannot be so strictly demonstrated, but it approaches the status of a true universal, because we can use it as a major premise for a new { }, applying these generalizations to fresh cases. Thus poetry is for Aristotle the distilled essence of the teaching of history. In poetry, the lessons of history do not become any more intelligible. And they remain undemonstrated and therefore merely probable. But they become more compendious and therefore more useful. Such were...")

What is "compendious." Do you know what it means? What is a compendium?

(A collection?)

Wie?

(A gathering-together, a collection?)

Yes, but a compressed collection. "Compendium" is an abbreviated, a short, or condensed form. That's what we mean by "compendium." "Compendious" means condensed, really.

("Such was the way in which the Greeks conceived the nature and value of history. They could not, consistently with their general philosophical attitude, regard it as scientific. They had to consider it as, at bottom, not a science, but a mere aggregate of perception. What, then, was their conception of historical evidence?

("The answer is that, conformly with his view, they identified historical evidence with the reports of facts given by eyewitnesses of those facts. Evidence consists of eyewitnesses, narratives; and historical method consists of eliciting them -- these."

(You want me to go on?)

I think we -- we have -- unfortunately. I wish we did -- wouldn't have to.

But in order to do justice to this gentleman, you will have to read two more pages, yes.

("Greek Historical Method and Its Limitations.")

And I grant you, if you follow--kindly pay attention to this--I think in we penetrate really into the strange relation in the last --. Since Mr. Descartes, many unfortunate things have happened to history. And -- this is all Cartesianism, you see, run am- -- running amok. And therefore, I think you have a good example of what philosophers make of history.

("Quite clearly, it was in this way that Herodotus conceived of evidence and method. This does not mean that he uncritically believed whatever eyewitnesses told him. On the contrary, he is in practice highly critical of their narratives. And here again, he is typically Greek. The Greeks as a whole were skilled in the practice of the law courts. And a Greek would find no difficulty in applying to historical testimony the same kind of criticism, which he was accustomed to direct upon witnesses in court.

("The work of Herodotus or Thucydides depends in the main on the testimony of eyewitnesses with whom the historian had personal contact. And his skill as a researcher consisted in the fact that he must have cross-questioned an eyewitness on past events until he had called up in the informant's own mind an historical picture of those events far fuller and more coherent than any he could have volunteered for himself. The result of this process was to create in the informant's mind for the first time a genuine knowledge of the past events which he had perceived, but



which, up till then, he had...")

"Opinion only."

("...opinion only, not --.")

"Knowledge."

("...not knowledge.

("This conception of the way in which a Greek historian collected his material makes it a very different thing from the way in which a modern historian may use printed memoirs. Instead of easygoing belief on the informant's part, that his prima facie collection was adequate to the facts, there could grow up in his mind a chastened and criticized col- -- recollection which has stood the fire of such questions as, 'Are you quite sure that you remember it just like that? Have you not now contradicted what you were saying yesterday? How do you reconcile your account of that event with the very different account given by So-and-So?'

("This method of using the testimony of eyewitnesses is undoubtedly the method which underlies the extraordinary solidity and consistency of the narrative which Herodotus and Thucydides finally wrote about 5th-century Greece. No other method deserving the name 'scientific' was available to the 5th-century historian. But it had three limitations. First, it inevitably imposed on its users a shortness of historical perspective. The modern historian knows that if only he had the capacity, he could become the interpreter of the whole past of mankind. But whatever Greek historians might have thought of Plato's description of the philosopher as the spectator of all time, they would never have ventured to claim Plato's words as a description of themselves. Their method tied them on a tether whose length was the length of living memory. The only...")

Ah, here we now come to the first so {-- wealthy} word. Perhaps you take this down.

"That whatever Greek historians might have thought of Plato's description of the philosopher as a spectator as that of all time, they would never have ventured to claim Plato's words as a description of themselves. Their method tied them"--funny, again, condescendingly expressed, quite wrongly, I think--"their method tied them on a tether whose length was the length of living memory."

That's all we need. Here we can stop. This is the only word of truth in the whole -- on these whole pages.

Historians continue living memory, Number 1 -- Sentence -- Thesis -- Number 1. They continue living memory, what the -- the people at the -- after the battle of Gettysburg told what the president wrote in his dispatch, what he mentioned in his speech, is then continued by the historian who gathers together all these people's living memories and tries to -- to cure them from their contradictions. So historians are doctors of human memory. They are the -- the physicians who try to cure contradictory memories. And the highest aim of an historian, as you can see from this--as in the case of Thucydides--is to reconcile the Corinthian, and the Spartan, and the Athenian memory of the war, so that they can all recognize that he -- he is right in -- in building up, in enlarging their memory to the complete picture.

So if you will understand the writing of history as a -- the curing the conflicts of living memory, you have the function of the historian in -- for any group, and for any warring number of groups. Conflicts of memory--as we know now from psychology only too well--constitute a trauma. Therefore humanity needs an office for confu- -- procuring the traumas of conflicting memories. So when the Americans and the English go to war in 1812, it is absolutely necessary that after 20 years, people begin to cure -- to make peace. So that -- they do this by writing the history in such a way so that both sides can agree that this is the history of the War of 1812. And as soon as such a history reaches this point of agreement between the warring parties, the war is over. And not before. That is, all war -- peaces are the continuation of war, until peace is concluded. And the great act of peace is not the treaty, but the great act is a tradition which unites both people. Today the independence of America can well be understood by the English, because their whole commonwealth has been saved by this experience, as you know. And they gave dominion status to Canada, and to the -- and thereby saved their commonwealth. They would have never learned this lesson probably without the American independence.

Therefore today, after a hundred and yea- -- a hundred years, it is possible to write this history of the Revolution War in such a way that this -- Englishman and an American can agree. That takes time. And that is what historians do. And on this they are working all the time. So they are inside so- -- in a society just as much as a doctor is with a baby, you see. There is an illness, and without illness, the human mind is never going to work. We only become conscious when something is wrong. When we go happy-go-lucky, we live unconsciously. All the parts of our nature which are in order escape consciousness. The whole idea that

consciousness is a bliss is nonsense. Consciousness is a necessity. We have to focus attention on these points of life where there is a handicap, where there is a -- a frustration, where there is a block. If you want to open a door, and it doesn't open automatically by radar, you see, w- -- when you go in it--the famous eye--you -- you have to -- of course to do something to open this door, you see. So you have to become very conscious that this door doesn't open. The same is with the street light. As long as the lights are green, you just automatically drive along. You get this block of red, you have to become conscious. Now I have to stop. And if you dream, or -- listen to the radio while you are in the car and overlook this red sign, you see, then the lack of consciousness is -- is hurtful. Again, the naïveté of the modern academic mind seems to me to be -- to think that we -- are expected to be conscious, and become more conscious, so to speak, that at the -- when we die, we are all consciousness. And this is all nonsense.

Consciousness is only used -- necessary where there is conflict. We need consciousness to focus attention. That's what pain, for example, does. It makes us conscious of that part of our body for which we have to go to the doctor. You see, as long as we have no pain, {be} not conscious of your health.

Consciousness is always the compulsion to look in a specific direction, to do something to remove an obstacle. Now between peoples -- the conflict of memories are a serious {business}. As long as the South -- the Southern white and the Southern black man look at the Civil War, it -- with different eyes, they'll never agree. There can't be peace. And that's the story, of course, to this day in the South, that the history which the black man in the South and the white man, you see, can -- can, so to speak, agree upon, hasn't been written. It's -- John Brown's Body is the attempt by -- Stephen Benét to do just this. But I think he has not overcome, of course, the illiteracy of the black man in the South. That is, the black man just doesn't read -- Vincent Stephen Benét's book, you see. If it would be recited publicly, if we had such an institution, you see, where people who do not read books still listen to -- to Homer, so to speak, to our Homer, I think John Brown's Body by Vincent Stephen Benét could serve the purpose, because it was certainly written with this great devotion to curing suffering memory.

This is -- see, that's why I think that the real historian of our era in this country is -- Vincent Stephen Benét. And that it is put in poetic form, that must not faze you at all. I mean, that's all nonsense. How do we know in which form a -- a future book has to be written? The style of a book changes constantly. And

do not be betrayed because one book is prose, and you say, "That's history," and the other is in verse, and then it isn't. If you want to achieve your end, any form that will achieve this end is -- you see, is the right form. And obviously for certain, I think for history, the poetical form -- the epical form is certainly much more adequate than the prosaic form.

Again, there is -- we are full of prejudice. If since history must be made into a science today, you see, therefore even the form must be as stultifying as this ridiculous scientific prose which people write today and think is the only way in which you can express truth.

The -- the historian is then the -- the physician or a healing process in society. He himself enters the process like pus enters a wound. The -- the -- the white blood corpuscles, you see, hurry to a place where there is an infection, and where the body has to become conscious of -- something has to be done. And that's where historians should hurry, where there are conflicting memories.

They go to this place. I will not even uphold that they are doctors. I -- I don't think that I am outside society when I write the history of a conflicting -- of conflict. But I am probably one of these blood corpuscles at this moment, you see. I'm very much inclined to -- to accuse my sociological and historical confrères of megalomania when they think we -- that we are the doctors of society. I am not a doctor of society because I am inside society in the body politic, and so I cannot be the doctor who would be -- outside, you see. So -- but there are physiological processes of healing in a body, you see. And I think the historian is one of these -- these viruses or healing processes, you see, and -- and goes to the spot where the conflict is, and tries to add that amount of unity which limits the -- the conflict first, and allows the whole body to live beyond it, like a scar that is healing, you see.

And -- so Mr. Collingwood admits this, but he -- admits it as a negative thing. He says, "It {tied} them on a tether whose length was the length of living memory." Now I would say that this -- strange expression, "tied them to the tether of living memory" is just -- their honor. As a doctor is not a zoologist, but is called in because a patient cries in pain and says, "Doctor, help me," so I feel this tether of living memory is -- just the honor of the -- of the physician, you see, of the -- of -- of -- in history.

This is the first thing I -- I would like you to understand, that the relation of an historian to the society inside which he moves is one of pain and healing, of -- softening suffering. And therefore, his relation to his patient, when he

bends over the body politic of a bleeding country and tries to comfort the members of this community, or to encourage them, or to explain to them, or whatever you -- enlighten them about their own past, is a service which connects him much more closely to this body politic than to his so-called colleagues in -- in the history department. Any historian then is more closely related -- he's an excrescence, he is an organ of the body politic, and not of schools. So once you transfer the place of the historian from the schools, organized departments of knowledge, you see, to his response--as in -- in Benét's case, you see, who was not appointed for history, but became the historian of the Civil War--in this sense, we are all self-appointed when we listen to the cry of an emergency, you see, to an SOS and go there. It isn't the police who has to rescue a -- a -- a man from a burglar. It can be his neighbor. And then he -- the bur- -- neighbor is the -- is the congruous policeman, the real police at this moment. And this has been lost sight of, that history i- -- follows a vocation, a calling, an immediate emergency. There is a call. Somebody has to write this history. So when Parkman decided to go on the Oregon Trail--as you know, he was a weakling; he had poor eyesight; he couldn't -- only read a few hours a day, he had to be read to; he -- he was a physical wreck--and when he decided, "Now just the same, I'm going to write the history of the white fathers in Canada, and of the Oregon Trail," he became the appointee of fate. And he -- the -- the professors of history in the various colleges of the land had absolutely no authority, compared to his original claim to be the historian of this western -- movement. And so today, we read Parkman, and we don't read the -- the contemporary professors of history in Harvard College. And Parkman never was a professor. That has nothing to do with -- with history. Philosophers are not those people who are made professors of his- -- philosophy. And historians are not the people who are appointed to -- to teach history, you see. These are original responses, and because they have been given, because there has been a Thucydides, we think we should get acquainted in our schools with this, and so the schools are derivative, you see. The are pro- -- there are professors of philosophy who tell you that there is a Thucydides and Herodotus, just as I tell you here. As a professor, I -- I make you acquainted with historians. Just as professors of philosophy in -- in -- in -- in schools are very rarely philosophers themselves, but they report on what -- philosophers have thought, you see. Cartesius, as you know--Déscartes--never was a professor of philosophy. He never taught. But he is the greatest philosopher of the latest 3- -- 300 years, just the same.

So as long as you do not re-establish the hierarchy of values, gentlemen, then an historian is a man with an intimate and direct relation to the people whose history he writes, and feels -- himself responsible either for their rebirth, for their renaissance, or for their -- their reconciliation with their neighboring enemies, or -- whatever his -- his story is, you have no way of placing the man. You will look for a place for him as an imitator of natural history, or as a mathematician, or a logician. That's not the case. An historian emerges in any country, and where you have no writing. In Yugoslavia, you had always an old man who had to sing the story of the wars between the Bulgarians and the Serbs. And there were no schools, and there was -- they didn't put -- have to write it. This was an oral man -- achievement. And it was for many centuries and many ages. But every group has to have a treasurer of memory. Just as you have a treasurer of -- of gold and money, you see, the historian is the treasurer of living memory. And since he sees that the currencies in this treasury are contradictory, and somehow debased, he will do something about curing the conflicts in this treasure. And that's why Mr. Thucydides calls his own work "a treasure forever." He called it this. We -- read this, did we? And that's not a -- not a -- ja?

(-- I was going to say that -- that we think then Thu- -- Thucydides satisfied more or less both parties in the war, and by being -- even though he was detached, he -- he was --. )

But dramatically engaged, you see. He was --.

(He could see it, the event clearly. He -- from both -- from -- from both sides.)

Ja, and suffered, so to speak. Through him, you see, both voices became -- became sympathetically understood. I mean, it isn't enough to say that he could see both sides. But he allowed both sides to enter his own heart; they penetrated into him, you see. I give voice to opposites, don't you think?

(Speeches { }; I have noticed that.)

That is just why the speeches -- make the whole thing real.

(Wouldn't you say possibly one of the reasons for this was his banishment?)

The reason for -- we don't know.

(I mean, it might help -- it might have helped him to --.)

Well, why the banishment was the reason for his history?

(Yes.)

Well, that has been debated. Who -- with whom did I talk about him? Ja. I -- we have too little to go by. He says, after all, that he wanted to write this history long before his banishment. In 431, he set out to -- to take down, { }. And therefore, he insists that the banishment has nothing to do with history. Now you are psychologizing and say it has. But...

(Yes.)

...I won't commit myself, because we just have no material to go by. This is just all vague. The -- I think that if one of -- somebody who knows Greek well could try to see whether the speeches after his banishment are -- are more passionate, you see, a -- change in character, so to speak, than before, then I would say perhaps that in the first years, the -- his -- his blood wasn't so -- running so high than later, when, under the pressure of his banishment he himself sought salvation -- tried to be saved, after all, to be -- have a meaningful function. As long as he was rich and general, this was an avocation. Then now it had to become his vocation, because nothing else was left. And perhaps in -- inside -- I mean, a real investigator might s- -- feel that the later parts are more passionate, which would show an increase in heat, you see. And this fever curve in his writing would indicate that he later became even more upset by his task -- or more devoted to -- to his task than before.

(I might perhaps have a danger to over- -- to psychologize too much, but it seems to me that he -- since -- that he would be less identifying himself with the Athenians after the banishment, too, although identifying himself more with -- with his cause of writing the history. Because before the -- before the banishment, he had too much invested. He had to prove he -- he was -- he had to serve as an Athenian, primarily.)

Ja, -- you say this, my dear man.

(It's only -- it's only --.)

I don't know. You say this. Perhaps he was detached before. Perhaps he

had already so much interest in the harmony between -- all the Greeks living in Thrace -- there in the north that he felt it was just too bad that there was not a larger comprehensiveness, you see. So all this is --.

(It's -- it's sheer speculation. Perhaps a map for future study. But it might even be because he had this tendency before to see both sides, it might have even affected the episode during which he was involved, which led to his banishment.)

Well, I -- I -- I think the -- this is going too far. I mean, we have no -- that's pure specu- -- speculation, and I think it's an insidious one, really. You have -- the only thing you have to go by is that there are not two parties, but more than two, that the whole fate of Greece is just involved in this fact that there are the Corcyreans in the north of the isl- -- of Greece, you see, and the Spartans, and the Athenians, and the Corinthians. There are four parties, my dear man. So it is a polyphonic enterprise. It's not just dualistic. Therefore it is a high- -- much richer canvas than is usual. All -- The Trojan War by Homer has two parties, you see: the Trojans and the Greeks. But Thucydides, you -- we should over- -- is -- has become the classical -- the historian, because he has just taken on as many parties as there involved -- were involved in the war. That is, the war dictated to him his method. You see, there was a war in which there were later the Sicilians, you see, who have quite different interests again from the people in -- on the mainland of Greece, and on the islands. And I feel therefore he is -- a good man rises to the occasion, gentlemen. And it's no excuse, because of the world War, there were 25 or 49 warring nations that a man then limits himself to the German-Russian conflict, or the English-German conflict. Here -- if he is the historian of this event, he has to provide means to encompass it.

And therefore, to rise to the occasion in this case of Thucydides meant that he had to go beyond the already well-known epical tradition of reconciling two conflicting enemies; but he had to become polyphonic. It's like a step, you see, from -- from the piano into orchestra. You see, the orchestration of the histori- -- history is the great act of -- of Thucydides. That's Number 1. Let's put down what --. Only to show you that the Greeks were constantly aware of the neighborhood of history -- rhetorics, jurisprudence to life.

In my school in -- in Germany, there was written in our assembly hall in Greek letters, because we all had to know Greek -- { } {episteme} { }; { }.

And that means, "All knowledge, all kinds of knowledge, separated from engagement, from efficacious action, is scoundrel-like, is the -- the thing of the scoundrel, and no wisdom goes with it."



So the -- I have been brought up with this -- with this doctrine that knowledge is not tolerable, unless we are engaged in the health and the salvation of that part of the world for which we have knowledge. Anybody who knows something becomes responsible. A forester who knows about the forest must do something about forestry. Can't you see this? That's why he knows about the forest. And the man who is -- just knows about the forest and doesn't do anything about forestation is a scoundrel in my eyes. A scoundrel. And the mowle- -- mere knowledge without engagement is -- is -- is for scoundrels, is just robbery. You can rob money, but you can also rob knowledge.

The dilettante, I mean, for hobbies, that's all right. But I despise hobbies. We are not on this -- in this world to -- to -- to have hobbies. We are responsible. When we are -- know something, we suddenly grow -- above the normal stature of man--other peoples don't know--and knowledge is responsibility. If you know how a forest, you see, has to recover its existence, you are not Mr. {Schweighäuser}, you are not entitled to cut it all down. And Mr. {Schweighäuser}, as you know, the famous family in the north of Oregon and Washington state, they have all -- everywhere now signs that they are -- that they are responsible. In 1930, the Congress of the United States made a -- a scathing report on their vicious destruction of the forest in the north, and now they have scientific forestation, and they have schools of foresters, and -- in the hard way they learned the lesson that he who knows must -- must feel responsible for the reproduction of the forest, you see. Knowledge involves responsibility. For -- it's the same thing, I mean. We only know, because we are provoked to know. The doctor -- that's why the -- you see, research is there because we must teach. Because I must tell you history, therefore some research is necessary so that I purify what I tell you. Teaching is the -- is the master of research. Forestation is the master of the knowledge of the forest. You have to turn around everything you -- in this country, you see, at this moment, it's just an article of import -- is a complete misunderstanding--knowledge is separated from responsibility, and teaching, even. That's why teaching seems to me so very inadequate. But the teaching must go on. Living memory must go on. You have no living memory. I have to put it in to you.

So teaching is a subtle thing. In any moment, the older people must teach the young, is that not? Therefore histor- -- history -- scientific research comes in, because of course I want to give you the best, you see, of the living memory I can come to. And therefore, although I am -- have to tell you something about the history of the United States, I may improve, I may tell the story a little bit better. But there is no science of history. But there is a necessity of teaching the living

memory to people who are not alive, as you. You live in apartment houses, or in barracks, or in -- what do you know? You only know that an -- an -- when an automobile runs. But what has gone on before, nobody told you so. So you live in stone -- in a stone desert of memory, and therefore, we make a special effort to reach you. And you have to be concentrated in big schools in order to replace what otherwise your father, and your mother, and your grandparents could have done to you.

And so research, gentlemen--as the word says, you see, re-search--is the honor of a teacher who wants to do the best of teaching. But the dogmatic precedence is with teaching. In -- in a living society, teaching is necessary, you see. Man must teach. If -- therefore they can improve on this teaching, by channels of research, because we don't want to teach you -- clog -- to clog your memory, you see, with -- with falsities. But as soon as you turn it around and say, "Not what we have researched is taught, but that which has to be taught must be searched for," you suddenly discover that to tell the story is the a priori, precedes the necessity of teaching history, you see, precedes all the tools and instruments of a little better research. The history of the Declaration of Independence has to be told long before the details are known of who had a cough, and who had -- had diarrhea on the day in which it was signed. These little items which the people now try to bring out. That's all right if they bring it out. But I have to teach you this even before this doctor thesis has been written, you see. So history has to be told long before it can -- has been analyzed, and -- and researched scientifically. All the time it has to be told. It cannot for one moment stop from being told. You cannot wait and say, "Fifty years from now we will know." If this dawns on you that history is a necessity of a society for its survival, you suddenly give the historian back his real rank as a functionary of society. He's just as important and as necessary as the postmaster in Chicago. I mean, even more so. The postmaster exchanges the letters of the contemporaries, you see. But we exchange the letters of the dead, bring them to you. I'm the postman of the past. I deliver the letters which your -- which your ancestors are writing to you, and admonishing you not to forget them. That's, I think, a full expression, postmaster of the -- of the past, for an historian.

Now let's look at the -- at the philosopher of history. Here we have, I would say, the -- the -- before the historian, there are the events, and there are the -- perhaps we should call it the "reports." The great example is the Battle of Waterloo, because the great French writer, Henri Stendhal, Henri Beyle. Have you heard of his name, Stendhal? Who has read the name Sten- -- Stendhal? Stendhal? No?

(The novelist?)

Ja, the novelist.

(The Red and the Black.)

Wie? The Red and the Black. He has a famous description of the Battle of Waterloo. No? It's the other way around. Stendhal. He -- his real name was Beyle. Now Stendhal has given a description of the Battle of Waterloo, and it's a stroke of genius, because he says -- shows that nobody who fought in the Battle of Waterloo, where Napoleon was defeated by the English and the Prussians, that in this Battle of Waterloo, nobody knew quite what was going on. There was a -- a horse was shot, and a -- a mill began -- caught fire, and the cavalry rode. And -- any number of things happened, but nobody knew -- knew quite clearly what was happening, certainly not Napoleon on that day. And it was fought over several village -- through several villages, and it had not even a name. So the event, the conflict, the more it is a conflicting event, is nameless. And the victor has the privilege of giving the name to the battle.

So the first historian is the general. That is, that this is the battle to be called "of Gettysburg," is already a part of the event, or is -- because before, it has not -- he hasn't gotten the name "Battle of Gettysburg," it is just three days of fighting. And a witty, anti-Lincoln man has said that if -- if they had called the battle not "Gettysburg," but "Cassville," the Gettysburg Address could never have made this impression, because "Cassville" is just such an impossible name for -- for such a heroic battle, you see.

Well, they -- have a point. The Germans and the -- and the continental troops at the Battle of Waterloo tried to call it "Belle Alliance," because there was a farm called Belle Alliance, which means "beautiful alliance." And they said, "Since this was a coalition which happily, you see, united, and we hope it will go on, this union between the Prussians, the Germans, the -- English, the Austrians, et cetera, and the Bavarians, We let -- let us call this Belle Alliance," you see. And in German textbooks, the battle is called not "Waterloo," but "Belle Alliance." But the -- the -- the French -- when the English won out, and Wellington, because he held at -- at Waterloo, you see, call it "Waterloo." But there are still -- is still a conflict even in this tradition, that the name of the battle is not identical in the continental textbooks and in the western textbooks.

Now, when Mr. -- when the historian then takes over, he has events which he can test by counting the number of -- of -- of ammunition sold, of the cannons used. These are objective statements for which he doesn't have to even have eyewitnesses. He can just go to the reports, you see: how many cannons entered the -- this battlefield? And then he has the reports of the generals, what this man here calls constantly the "eyewitness report." And the -- this is not true that they are the eyewitness, but they are participants. The complete -- wrong idea that this is an eye- -- a general is not a witness, you see. He's done it. It's his own story. So he already is filled with the story. If you tell what you have done, that's not -- you cannot call yourself a witness, you see. But just you tell the story, you see. You narrate it. "You see, and then I fell into the water, and somebody drew me out." The -- I wouldn't call this a witness, really, you see. To -- to narrate what has happened to my- -- oneself, or one's country, or one's hometown, or one's family -- that's not a -- a witness. So Mr. Collingwood, I think, makes this mistake, you see, that he only knows from the judiciary that we are witnesses. But when I remember something, and I have to tell it somebody else, I'm not the witness, you see. I'm the reporter, or I'm the teller. I -- to tell a tale is something quite different from being a witness in court.

There has -- therefore, in -- in the Battle of Waterloo, there is Blücher, there is -- Wellington, there is Napoleon, there are Napoleon's generals, there are the soldiers wounded, there are the letters they wrote home from the hospital. And these are not eyewitnesses. I think that cools again us into the scientific realm, into the refrigerator of zoological facts, observed by some onlooker. I am in it. I haven't looked at the battle. I have fought it. To tell me a wit- -- say I'm a witness is just ridiculous. I wanted to win. I'm a partisan. A witness is, after all, usually somebody who -- who ob- -- try -- can -- is able to be objective. But I do not demand from a man who has been defeated in battle that he should be objective. He should cry. He should weep. He should say, "I'm the" -- you see, "I'm the most unhappy, unfortunate -- I'm miserable." That's what I want to hear from him. Then I can write the -- later the history, because he has made me feel how he felt.

But this omission of feelings, it's a funny thing about historians. I'm only interested in -- if I want to write the history of a battle, of course -- what people felt at this moment. They felt that the -- the Heaven was -- was falling upon the earth, that the -- it was a catastrophe. It was the end of their world. If you cannot see that Appomattox was the end of Robert Lee's life, he's not a witness of what went on in Appomattox, you see.

But every -- why doesn't -- they say this? Because in court, we are sup-

posed to -- you see, to be detached. And the whole idea of Mr. {Hollingwood} is to try to save history and to give it that little of scientific character which makes it then -- stand in line with the mathematical, and -- chemical, and physical sciences. If this is the honor of philoso- -- history, to become a science, then I'd try to get witnesses, because they objectify this, you see. And -- but I need people who tell the tale, with all their ludicrous involvement, pathetically weeping, laughing, sobbing, hysteric.

Then comes then the historian as the reconciliator, as I told you, of conflicting evidence. And he's only interesting in -- because -- more necessary, the more conflicting the evidence is. So that the historian's role, so to speak, is aggrandized, is -- is increasing in stature, the more conflict there is, you see. The simple story of the -- therefore, it is not great honor to tell us the history of Santa Monica. There have been no civil war, as far as I know, before the oil well was begun in Santa Monica. Now there may become -- be a civil war if they build -- to -- dig this oil well. And then it would be necessary to get a real historian to write the story of Santa Monica. Today a chronicler is enough. The less conflict, you see, the less you need a specific -- the specific role of the -- of the historian. Also, you take a -- you take a -- it's the -- same with a doctor, I mean. You can get along with -- on Christian Science and on a midwife, as long as everything goes normally, you see. And only when the thing is very serious, it's a conflict between mother and baby, it's very serious; you have to go to the hospital and have -- get an operation.

And -- so I would say the -- between the chronicler, who is a midwife of past memory, and the doctor, there is this difference, that with the doctor, the conflict is -- is so serious, that he has to know more than the usual thing to understand the conflict, and to -- and to -- to compose it.

Now comes my philosopher. And gentlemen, what -- how would you define a philosopher? I would say, what is your first degree of what that is, a philosopher? What's the difference between a theologian and a philosopher? Then that's perhaps the { }.

(Well, a definition of a philosopher, a good one, would be: one who seeks the truth.)

Of what -- what is the tr- -- I mean? It must have some content.

(Nature.)

Good, ja, ja. That is, the philosopher tries to treat everything outside himself, including his neighbors, his family, as a part of the world. It's the wisdom of this world. That is, it's a tendency to say that everything outside my own brain is world, and is the con- -- has to be -- fall into a system of -- cause and effect, or of connections, which I carry and balance on my head.

So a philosopher is like the stag who tries to have -- the whole world as his antlers.

Now this is the -- an act, because a philosopher of course cannot treat his own wife and his children--if he happens to be married--or his parents as part of the world. They are part of himself. And an historian is on the opposite pole from a philosopher. A philosopher tries to transform everythi- -- even his own body, perhaps, into a part of the world. He tries to explain that -- why his body also must die.

(The -- "I think, therefore I am"?)

Wie?

("I think, therefore I am"?)

Ja. Quite.

So if you think of reality in which we are immersed, here standing here, sitting here in this room--here is around us -- walls, there is a building, there is the campus, there is Los Angeles, there is the globe--the -- the tendency of philosophy would be to dissolve this square of obscurity and -- confusion in such a way that on one side there is human reason. Even patriotism is just a part of the worldly process. Every group has patriotism, for example, he'll say, you see. And -- now Mr. Collingwood tries to ascribe, assign to historians the idea of useful knowledge, that it can be used. And this is the first here- -- error, I think. I have tried to show you that a doctor, after all, is called in by the patient because the patient is in pain. And therefore he wants to get rid of his pain. And in the sense, peoples are in pain, because they cannot -- they have hereditary enmities. And they have -- call in the historian, or the historians -- feels called up -- to be called up to cure this disease. And that's all he does. And with the achievement, he goes out of business. So history is always dependent on customers. And it is rooted in pain, rooted in -- in experience, rooted in demand. Rooted in emergency.

All this is for the philosopher quite un-understandable. And so what we read here about Mr. Colli- -- from Mr. Collingwood's pen is an attempt to save history in the realm of technology, so to speak. He wants to know how we could use the product of history in the future. And of course he -- it is the same problem.

You know what the technologically minded man asked the -- the mother -- no, the -- the story is a little different. A man made a discovery, and the practical man said, "What's the use of your great discovery?"

And the man was very angry, and he s- -- you know the answer. You know what's the answer?

"Sir, what's the use of a newborn child?"

That's the only answer you can give to these practical men, you see, about any -- any group-like spiritual action. A sermon is of no use. It's an expression of a liturgy of the Church. Nothing has use in the sense of the practical man. If I discover that the -- that the -- earth retreats around the sun, the only answer is that's as beautiful as that's the -- there is a new -- new baby. A baby has no use for anybody, you see. It's just a burden. And yet it is the most wonderful thing in the world. It has its own justification. God obviously created the world and put as its climax the baby. That's -- you -- that's why we have Christianity worshipping the baby in the cradle.

Therefore there is no -- the -- all the other things can be used by the baby, but the baby cannot be used by anybody for any other purpose, but its own happiness and bliss. And all the attempts you make to find how useful you are in society will all you -- drive you into the arms of illness and mental -- decrepitude, because there is no use for you. You are an end in yourself, and you are not a means. The -- mankind is -- is God's playmate, but He is -- God had -- didn't -- doesn't use us. But this is the -- again the heresy of the philosopher, who must find for anything in the world, you see, some practical application. Flowers have no -- they are just beautiful. And -- the girls are just pretty. And that's perfectly sufficient.

There you have to make up your mind. If you go with a philosopher, you allow yourself to -- to be made a part of a -- of a system in which you function. And this is true that to a part, in order to be supported by society, you must work. But that's not myself. That's only -- the earthly part of mine. With our

body, and our earth, where we must eat, we must also give some work, and some sweat, and some toil, in order to make a living. But you can never define my whole existence by saying, "I'm a -- a worker in the -- in the Socony Vacuum filling station," you see. That's not myself. Because I'm just there employed for the time being, you see. Tomorrow I do something else.

The -- the temporary, in other words, the passing things, the techno- -- are the technical things which I have to perform. But they never -- can encompass me. And so the historian's task is something much more modest. It is not on the -- on the playing of usefulness. Here is the world of things. And here is the society of man. And here is the process of creation. And you may -- ambivalent between creator and nature.

Now, you all know the baby that is created belongs, it is -- it is true, to society. It's a child of the family. And it belongs to the world of things because, when you put it on the scale, it weighs so much -- many pounds. And therefore it's a part of this earthly system of gravity. And -- and -- and diver- -- and expanse. But this doesn't exhaust the smile of the baby. The baby is the end of creation. It's the most beautiful, you see -- destiny of all things on this earth, that such a beautiful baby should be born. All these things have to serve him, and society has to serve him. And woe to the parents who enclose this child and say, "We own it." You are just part and parcel of society. This baby has a right to its own name. It has a right to speak out against the society. It can criticize society. It can leave the society. It can reform the society. In other words, this baby is a child of God. That is, it has an immediate rank, and it is irreducible. You can never explain this baby -- newborn baby by anything that has gone on before. Woe to you if you try. And it can never be explained by anything for whose use it can be used. That's why slavery is really impossible, why a newborn child cannot be enslaved just to serve the -- on a plantation. You cannot enshrine a human being, you see, in known purposes, or in known groups. Because it may be his -- his destination, to bring up this group -- this society as it exists, to be a rebel, be a reformer.

George Washington never thought of himself as anything but a British gentleman. And there he was thrown upon, you see -- it was thrown upon himself to become an American. You -- you mustn't think that he liked the idea. He -- he was forced into this, gradually. And his enemies forged letters in his name -- the famous Randolph letters, published in 1778, in which they make him complain that he doesn't want to be -- to cease to be a Britisher, that he was a British gentleman, and that was all he wanted to do. And you do not see what an agony it was for the man, you see, to have to cease to be a member of the existing



society and order of things, and no longer be a subject of King George III. You -- naïvely assume that it was very agreeable to him. But it wasn't. It was most disagreeable. He hated all -- the whole business. But as a baby of God, he had to listen, to obey orders that came to him, you see, outside this society of his, and outside, certainly, the w- -- the world of things, of dead things which -- which declared that Virginia after all was Elizabethan colony, and that everything there had to remain in -- within the British realm.

You can hardly imagine how difficult it was for a man like Washington to outgrow his society and to outgre- -- the nature of his environment. And his greatness is that he did. He became, out of a son of the British commonwealth, the father of this country. And why is he called the father of this country, you see? Because when he grew up, as a son, there was no such country. You can only become the father of this country if you are the first, you see, in whom this country takes shape.

This newness of the historical -- is our belief in history in our era, of which Mr. Collingwood doesn't take any cognizance.

So history has to do with the newness of {unwhole} events. That's the second thing. The historian deals with conflicts, but he will only remember those conflicts which have brought into being a new kind of man, or in which man has asserted his right to re-create society, and to re-create nature. This is the second element. Now comes the third.

Mr. Thucydides, I told you, has immortalized the period, and he has insisted that the Peloponnesian War lasted from 431 to 403 or -4. And we all, ever since 1900 -- 2,300 years now, speak of the Peloponnesian War, on- -- although our only authority for this is Mr. Thucydides. And he has to fight the idea that this is not one war. And I tried to tell you that he has the same problem today, that as long as the two world wars are not considered one catastrophe, we will not be able to agree on its solution, you see. As long as you think that Hitler was a wicked man, or Roosevelt was a politician, and do not see that the emperor and -- and Mr. Wilson were engaged in exactly the same conflict, I think we -- you will not understand--neither the Russian problem, by the way, with their rejection of czarism--and -- nor the American problem.

So the third thing then is: that historians, in order to solve conflicts, must del- -- delineate epochs, events of a certain length of time. We owe to the historian the recognition of epochs. That is, in the atomized time, where every second is different from every other second, the historian gives us the insight into continu-

ity. But he does this from concrete epochs. He doesn't side with the philosophy of history, and -- say that all times are always changing, as Mr. Collingwood there says. But he's quite satisfied, Mr. Thucydides, to create this one unity, 431 to 404. And around this you can append other facts, perhaps.

Well, all we owe to Thucydides is nothing that went on in history before, or after, and -- the philosopher despises concrete times. He wants to abstract from time and space. He wants to have a system that is valid for all...

[tape interruption]

...and misled. That there has been this tremendous calling-back of the nations of the western world into one order. And with the great sacrifice of the war, you will understand first that wars call the human race to order when any individual generation has gone astray. That's the first thing. Wars are visitations. And they are -- world wars are phyllogenetic. You know, we dis- -- distinguish in zoology between ontogenetic, which is a -- a problem ending my own nature, and phyllogenetic, which is a problem of the -- of the constancy of the human race, through many generations. "Phyllon" may -- being the -- the stem, or the tribe, or the -- or the unity through generations.

Now wars are phyllogenetic, and they prove it by demanding the sacrifice of life of one generation in order to intertwine and connect the preceding and the later generations. And in any war, the people who die on the battlefield make the sacrifice so that their parents and their grandchildren may still see eye to eye. If they fail, the community is destroyed, as Troy. Their eyes -- you see, they are defeated. Victory means that this continuity, this unity between grandparents and grandchildren is re-established at the price of the physical life, the carnal existence of the middle generation. And whether there -- everybody is slain among the -- on the battlefield, or only one, makes no difference. Anybody's death in battle, which is the -- essence of war--that somebody is killed--means that there is one man willing to connect the phyllogenetic unity of an empire, a realm, a United States against the -- on -- ontogenetic madness of pleasure-seeking society, as of the day, where people forget the unity and -- don't want to pay the penalty of this -- for this unity.

Therefore, ja?

(-- Just on this topic, I was looking--you asked me { } Rudyard Kipling's "Recessional," on the next page. It deals with just what you're saying. I'd like to read it.)

Glad to, wonderful. Of course, he knows this.

("The Question, 1916"

("Brethren, how shall it fare with me,  
when a war is laid aside,  
if it is -- if it be proven that I am he  
for whom the world has died?

("If it be proven that all my good,  
and the greater good that I will make  
were purchased me by a multitude  
who suffered for my sake?

("That I was delivered by mere mankind,  
vowed to one sacrifice, and not,  
as I hold them, battle-blind,  
but dying with open eyes?

("That they did not ask me  
to draw the sword, when they --  
when they stood to endure their lot,  
that they only looked to me for a word,  
and I answered them, `I knew not' -- `I knew them not.'")

"And I answered, `I knew them not.'" Ja.

("If it be found, when the battle clears,  
their death has set me free,  
then how shall I live with myself through the years  
which they have bought for me?

("Brethren, how must it fare with me,  
or how am I justified,  
if it be proven that I am he  
for whom mankind has died?

("If it be proven that I am he,  
who, being questioned, deny -- deny.")

And it's an accusation of the United States. It's written in 1916, when the United States dis- -- you see, didn't want to enter the war. So this poet is very poignant. Kipling of course had this in his heart all the time, because he was married to an American, as you know, and so he -- he was deeply involved in this. It's really an incredible poem.

{ } to the United States of America { }.)

Well, I feel of course, you see, when I read in the papers today--and I may mention this, because I want you to say what you feel about it--I can re- -- off and on read about the Amer- -- English debt to America, in the {secu-} -- or financial debt, I mean. Now it is obvious that Mr. Roosevelt knew that this country should go to war right away in 1939, and was only restrained by political -- reasons of the domestic policy not to do this. It is also clear that if he had done so, the war -- Europe would have -- not have been destroyed first. And it's certainly true that England bled white, to death, so that the Americans might come out of this war as the victor over all other countries; whereas the British lost India, and practically New Zealand, and Australia, and -- and Canada to the United States.

Now I can hardly contain myself when I read then about these \$4 billion of a debt, when the United States, like a Shylock, waited till -- England had bled white, and then entered the war. And -- let the whole burden in -- of the first three years be borne by the British. This is never mentioned here. But it was obvious to every statesman in the United States, that it was only the resistance of the British that has saved the United States. In 1939, gentlemen, in 1940, at the Stock Exchange in Wall Street, lectures were given -- about the fact that Hitler would now be in the United States six weeks later, and what would the Jewish bankers then in New York have to do? This is all forgotten today.

But the shabbiness of this country, that allows newspaper writers today to speak of these few billion dollars in 1940, you see, when the -- the -- the -- the whole British Isles, so to speak, were pawned for the -- for the victory of the United States later, that's { }. And that's how we to this day treat our -- our so-called -- the foreign aid, I mean, as though these people were outside our responsibility. I mean, that's why this poem, you see, is exactly the -- right, because every Englishman died -- who died then, died for the greater glory of America. (Well, that's not -- a lot of people think about the -- the Treaty of Versailles, that the biggest blunder of the Treaty of Versailles was the reparation payment that Germany had to make.)

That was acknowledged finally.

(And -- { } caused them to think that { }.)

But now it is even, you see, held -- held against the British, which I think

is -- is more awful, because the solidarity of the British, the -- their resistance was only meaningful if there was a United States who finally would come forward, you see. The British would never win this war. Their resistance then in the Blitz, you see, was simply a delaying action. Don't you see this?

So they already anticipated that the United States at one time would -- would turn the scales.

So you only see, we -- we are in the same boat as Thucydides. If it can be done, that the people of the United States can be sold to the idea that they were in the war really in 1939, or in the days of Bill Mitchell already, you see, and not just in 1941 after Pearl Harbor, history would -- would -- would be the World War history, you see, and it would not just be the private history of how to convince you -- the people of the United States that they should enter the war. But the -- the fictions in this country about the war are -- are quite remarkable. (Well, in 1936, it wasn't -- Hitler wasn't sure that France and Germany would even go to war with him. That's why, when he moved into the Rhineland...)

Oh, he trembled. He thought they might --.

(...He told his tank commander that if he met any resistance, to move back.

And the same with Czechoslovakia.)

Ja.

(He wasn't sure whether he'd meet any resistance.)

Ja.

(So when he didn't meet any, I guess he knew that he had a free hand.

And he knew America wasn't going to enter, either.)

Well, Mr. Borah, who -- had then passed this terrible neutrality legislation, you see, in this country, who -- who -- was pa- -- in German pay. The senator, the chairman of the foreign policy committee.

(What was his name?)

Oh -- Louis Borah, Senator Borah. Wie?

(Voted against -- the treaty. Voted -- one of the senators who voted against Wilson's {treaty}.)

(What was wrong with the law in Germany? To conquer all of Europe and unify it. Keep it --.)

Because they tried to colonialize it. You see, this would -- this would be debatable if you had -- know -- understood, if you had assumed -- could assume that he would give the others equality. He never meant to. He -- I -- I tell you, this is a very good question. In 19- -- on the 13th of January of this year, I -- I told you perhaps already, I was in Frankfurt attending a big meeting of 1500 people in the so-called Paulskirche. That is the center of democratic tradition in Am- -- in Germany, because the first German parliament met in this building. So it was quite a meeting.

And I defended my -- my theses -- several theses there about the peace -- future of a peacetime society of worldwide character. And there was much give-and-take and discussion. And finally the -- the--how would I say?--the -- president, or I mean the -- the Eric Johnston of the enterprise, I mean the -- the -- the --how do you call it?--the manager, yes -- got up and said, "Gentlemen, here this man from America talks to you about a worldwide society. Be a little careful to -- and don't turn your -- turn your -- your back on this because after all we owe the world very much, because" -- and I heard -- this went out -- from his mouth, you see, for the first time -- "we have -- the -- Germans -- the Germans have tried to introduce --" oh, the -- my sermon had been on -- about the underdeveloped countries, the colonials, you see, the Africans, and so on, the { }. And he said, "Don't forget, ladies and gentlemen, that Germany from 1933 to 1945, has tried to treat its European nat- -- neighbors once more as though they were colonies." And that's why this was not a question of the unification of Europe, you see, but it was really the brutal treatment of this -- Poles, you see, and Czechs, and so, as though they were -- African Negroes, you see, as though they were colonies to be exploited.

And so, you see, it was impossible to accept, for any -- for any human being, this solution. Hitler, in his -- in his very strange hatred and -- of -- of probably his own ancestry, because I suppose that he is a Czech by -- was a Czech by -- by birth; well, however that may be, he hated, from his Austrian-Hungarian tradition--he was an Austrian-Hungarian, you see, and there the nationalities were all at war with each other. And so, feeling that he was on the

German side, he simply wanted to put his foot on the -- on the Czech --.

[tape interruption]

(...{ } had Europe been united in this federation, then it -- would've -- have been permanent beyond Hitler's regime, or would have dissolved back into France, and Germany, and Italy, and Czechoslovakia and Austria. Because --.) Assuming that he would have had greater wisdom, but then he would never have come to power, because the revenge of the German nationalism was after all the platform on which he was allowed to take over. And therefore -- since he wanted to revenge the defeat of Germany in 1918, and promised this, you see --. I don't think that anybody who promised the unification of Europe--reconciliation of France, and everybody--would ever have been allowed to -- to get into the Ger- -- government. And the French, of course, didn't want to -- know anything of the Germans, and the Italians, you see, were very -- megalomaniacs at that time. So -- and the British were islanders.

So I think if you -- if you take away Hitler, you don't find a possibility after this Peace Treaty of Versailles, of any man coming forward with authority, and uniting these -- reconciling these enemies of the First World War in -- a nice confederacy. The only people who could do this were the Americans. That's why there is no -- no future for any confederacy of Europe, if you omit the -- United States. The United States are the only country in which there live of -- descendants from all of these countries, Number 1, you see. That makes America more akin to any one of these countries than there is France to Germany, or England to Germany, or Holland to Belgium, or Belgium to Czechoslovakia. You see, among themselves, the Europeans are more divided than they are with relation to America. The bonds between any one country in Europe and America are much stronger than the bonds between, let us say, Italy and France. Very simply, because 6 million Italians emigrated to America, but no 6 million -- Italians, you see, made good in -- in France. A very simple reason. There are 40 million Germans who came to this country, you see. So it is very easy still to find -- you see, unity or reconciliatory tones between Germans and Americans, obviously. (There are more Norwegians in the United States than there are in Norway.)

(Forty million Germans; I think, the population is France only.)

Fourteen, 14 million Germans.

(I'm just curious about one fact that might be off the subject. And that is, why the so-called democracies did not go to the Munich Pact with Hitler with clean hands, why they went there with dirty hands, and came back with dirty hands? By that I mean, the democracies, for their own safety, Britain and France, sold Czechoslovakia down the river, to stay in and buy time --.)

Well, my dear man. I still am not sure that the intellectuals of this country are not going to sell the -- 2 million people of Berlin down the river. They would like...

(That's the same uh- -- )

...exactly the same. We haven't seen the end of it.

(That will be coming up here on April 29th.)

The lackadasiacal attitude here of the educated people is, "Okay." What do they care? I'm very doubtful}.

(It's something to think about.)

Well, one point then, let us settle for today. The problem of the philosopher is that he wants to -- to generalize all times and all spaces. And the topic of the philo- -- of the historian is to save one period, one certain time, and one certain area from oblivion, and he creates epoch as a creature. Can you s- -- begin to think that perhaps 70 years or 30 years are just as much a reality which has to be sa- -- given its proper character, its uniqueness, you see, as if I -- you consider -- a person. The Thirty Years' War, or the War of Independence, or the Civil War cannot be reduced to four years in the abstract; but these five years from Fort Sumter to Appomattox are an event, one event. And just as you would admit that the redwood, and the rose, and the tulip are different creatures, and that we should honor them for being distinct creatures, I invite you to -- to consider that man must save the times, the high times of history from being just dismissed as physical -- having the physical character of four times 365 days, you see. The Civil War is not just any four times 365 days, but four times 365 days strung together in a unique pattern. And it is this uniqueness which the historian creates, or supports, or pronounces, or proclaims, or whatever word you want to say for this. He stands for the unique character of the event which he re-creates, or which he reports, or which he -- makes into a treasure of mankind, in living memory.



Thucydides says, "I make this war," you see, "a gold mine for all times."  
That is, you can no longer say, "These are just 27 years of the past. What do I care for the past? All the past is dead," you see. And I just count it in the counting-house, and say, "So many -- so many seconds, so many minutes, so many days, so many years." This is how the physicist creates time. The historian assigns to every time a unique character. And he says the Thirty Years' War, or the Hundred Years' War of the Roses -- you see, in England, or the Hundred Years' War between France and England, these are events--like the Trojan War, too, I mean, or like the Revolution War. Valley Forge is not explained by saying it consisted of 60 years of suffering. It's "Valley Forge." And the name "Valley Forge" is the seal upon the fact that it can never be confused or mistaken for any other -- period in the history of mankind.

Therefore, you must -- will now understand why I feel that the historian is threatened by the philosopher. Here. Here is the historian. And in front of him of course are just atoms of time. But he suddenly realizes, in sympathy with the suffering of the human race, that during 1860 and 1865, something was solved, something was done which made all these people move together so that -- and -- if he puts the seal under this event, this Civil War, or John Brown's Body, or whatever he does it, man will not have to repeat the performance. Out of the travesty of disorder and anarchy, of chaotic time, of just living day by day, there emerges at one time this pyre, you see. And the flames of this conflagration enlighten this historian. He's inflamed. He's really shot through with the meaning of this event. He says, "Don't forget the Civil War."

Perhaps now you'll read now "The Recessional." Would you?

("Recessional--1897

("God of our fathers, known of old,  
Lord of our far-flung battle line,  
Beneath whose awful Hand we hold  
Dominion over palm and pine--  
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,  
Lest we forget -- lest we forget!

("The tumult and the shouting dies;  
The captains and the kings depart:  
Still stands Thine ancient sacrifice,  
An humble and a contrite heart.  
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,  
Lest we forget -- lest we forget!

("Far called, our navies melt away,  
 On dune and headland sinks the fire;  
 Lo, all our pomp of yesterday  
 Is one with Nineveh and Tyre!  
 Judge of the nations, spare us yet,  
 Lest we forget -- lest we forget!  
 ("Yet {drunk with} sight of power  
 We loose wild tongues that have not thee in awe  
 Such boastings the Gentiles use  
 Or lesser breeds without the Law.  
 Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,  
 Lest we forget -- Lest we forget!  
 ("For heathen heart -- for heathen heart that puts her trust  
 In reeking tube and iron shard,  
 All valiant dust that builds on dust,  
 And guarding, calls not Thee to guard,  
 For frantic boast and foolish word --  
 Thy mercy on Thy People, Lord!")  
 {Ja.} That is really -- I -- he rises here to real -- to real responsibility, this --  
 this very -- this very neurologic man.  
 So -- the modesty of the historian is that he's perfectly satisfied of saving  
 one little part of time from oblivion by giving it -- its unique name: "Civil War,"  
 "Battle of Waterloo," you see, or whatever it is. Once he has saved this one little  
 color spot from the drabness of nothingness, of annihilation, there is hope that  
 others -- the whole history will {begin} to become transparent as the creation of  
 very beautiful flowers of -- of civilization, or -- or whatever you call this.  
 And therefore, the historian is perfectly satisfied if he can give to one  
 event this lasting character. If he is able to write a world history, or a whole  
 century, all the better. But that's so much gravy. The historian has already fully  
 served the community if he makes them put their foot down at one event and  
 say, "We won't forget that." Then they're already emerging from the fog, and the  
 mist, you see, of day-by-day living. They already get a memory. And as soon as  
 they have got -- memory in one spot, then they can enlarge on this. But you have  
 first to hold onto one point, where you could emerge from casual, you see, acci-  
 dental living and say, "This is -- was not an accident, that we occupy -- the Gold  
 Rush of California, and the building of the railroad, and the statehood of Cali-  
 fornia, we'll stand by that. California is a state and must remain a state."  
 Any one such memory saves us from this daydreaming in which most

people indulge. I mean, if you -- I go in to Los Angeles, I feel most people are daydreaming. They don't know at what time of history, in what hour of -- of history they live. They live -- try to live in a -- in a timeless disorder. They wouldn't know whether they live 1912, or 1959. They say, "What does it matter? I look up the calendar; the calendar tells me 1959." That has no meaning, I mean. That it means after the two world wars, they wouldn't admit for a moment. They just live and have their -- their appointment calendar, and it's just within the year that they get around. But 1959 is not different to them from 1940 or -- if you tell them tomorrow it's already 1975, they say, "All the better," you see. "Then we have saved a lot of time, and --." I mean, you can -- they play around with time. Because no year has its unique character. A nation has very great difficulties, you know.

I told you the tragedy of this country is that we have now Veteran's Day, which is a completely mythical day, which applies to any war, and has absolutely nothing to do with the achievements of the two world wars. When we had Armistice Day, it was at least a memory of the First World War. Now we are so modest, that since we have no peaces after two world wars, and just armistices, we call the 11th of November "Veterans' Day." Now Veterans' Day can apply to the year of the -- of -- against Great Britain in 1812, you know. And it can apply to the Mexican War. It makes -- it is just mythical war and peace rotating, you see. But the Mexican War is not the World War; and the World War, you see, is not the Spanish-American War.

And this is the creation of the historian, to make them incomparable, and in-confusable. The creation of uniqueness of time is as important as the creation of God when He created animals and trees. You take this for granted that the word "tree" is not all you have to say about a palm tree and an oak tree. And you leave to the oak and the palm their honor of being specific.

Now historians are specific. They create, you see, this great secret of creation is -- is: be specific. Creation is not a generalization. The philosopher, however, withdraws this seal of a -- special creature from the specific period, he wants to generalize. He wants to submer- -- emerge all times into some -- what he calls "time and space abstraction." And therefore philosophers destroy history. They destroy history. They must dissolve the achievements of the philosopher. If the philosopher, to put it -- I mean, I have -- I'm not a painter -- but if a philosopher is making knots, and he adds that 1812 and 1941 are unique events, but the philosopher comes and dissolves these knots -- unties these knots and say, "Oh well, this is a war, and this is a war, many wars," you see. Therefore, I abstract from -- from the -- all your work you have done was to make 1912 unique. I, the

philosopher say, "What does it matter? This was a war, { } war. People are always foolish. They always seem to go to war," you see. And so the philosopher will untie this knot and again, time will then just look, you see, platt -- as a platitude, as a flat, platt plain.

And therefore, philosophers and historians are enemies. They do the opposite thing. And therefore, I think a philosophy of history is impossible. (Could you speak about the relation between this tendency to abstract and be objective and the ever-in- -- what seems to be an ever-increasing tendency toward conformity?)

Has to do, of course with -- wherever you philosophize, you create for the mind a unified universe, and you dis- -- you abstract from all different -- differences, as you possibly can, I mean. One mind, everybody has a mind, so you have to agree to my system of thinking.

I start as an historian, of course, with the fact that there are children, and grownups, and old people, and silly people, and -- and educated people. I say, my problem is: how could they keep the peace despite the fact that they all have think differently? I'm not interested in the unity of reason, you see. I'm interested in the colorfulness of people at different times, and in different places, and different races, you see. And I wonder why God created so many different people. But philosophers wonder that all men can be substituted for every- -- -body else. This is to me, you see, the -- the boredom of philosophy, that it has to annih- -- annihilate the colors of men. The salvation is of course, you can always beat a philosopher finally with his own arms.

Mankind, you see, is a species out of species. If you live right, at the end of your life you have to become -- have to be- -- have become your own species. Any great man in history, or any great woman--what we call a saint or a -- or a genius--is a species which can never be repeated. Saint Francis can never live again, you see.

And so if you want to save yourself from philosophy, keep in mind that man was created by God as a species out of species. That would be the Latin version of this, you see. Man is that strange being that -- whereas all the wolves belong to one species, in the human family, you see, every one of us is specific by his own name. And we are a family, a species, that consists of Lincolns, and George Washingtons, and Walt Whitmans, and -- and -- and -- and therefore, every one of us is specific. And your own task in life is to keep the solidarity with

the human race, yes; but in it, become a species.

And that's what your tombstone must say. If the tombstone says, "Here lies a good man," it is meant that here lies an irreplaceable item, somebody who is unique, who can never be replaced, because he has left a good odor, and his aroma, and what here -- his attitude to the -- world of the -- li- -- as a newborn baby is an end in itself.

("Now he belongs to the ages.")

Exactly. Exactly.

So the creation of uniqueness, gentlemen, is the task of history. The historian tries to save this uniqueness. He doesn't pretend that he makes the World War out of whole clothes, you see. He says, "There it is." He believes it. He accepts, acknowledges, recognizes, and makes recognizable God's creation inside history. The philosopher, however, tries to dissolve this pattern and start from scratch, because he was -- will -- always wants to go to the moment at which history begins. He wants to see the elements out of which this world is woven. Now you can dissolve any tapestry, and can say, "Well what is it? It's just -- on this loom." There -- how do you call the two things? The warf -- the war- --? (It's warp and woof.)

Yes, you see.

And so you can dissolve any pattern of history, but -- dare you? May you? Can you dissolve the pattern of the United States and say, "We go back and start from scratch. And next time we go to the Antarctic and we don't go into the United States." You can, if this is at an end. But then you condemn the United States to be a worthless something that is decadent and must die.

So philosophers always are grave diggers. The philosophy of history can always say, "Dismiss a number of events that seem unforgettable and unique and say it isn't worth it." So Mr. Spengler writes *The Decline of the West*. Mr. Toynbee says, "23 civilizations have passed away." That is, he takes stock of -- you see, of things that have ceased to be. Whereas the historian tries to save what has happened from oblivion so that it can still function.

Grave digger, after all, and doctor are not quite the same. It may often -- one lead to the other, but then he's a poor doctor.

So there is enmity between the historian and the philosopher of history. The philosopher of history tries to bring out the elements out of which history started and to which it can be reduced. And the historian tries to save the creations out of these elements. The configurations, you may say--that's perhaps the most realistic expression, you see, or the constellations--to which these elements have been brought.

An Englishman, Mr. Sansome, has explained this -- this hostility between historian and philosopher in an interesting way in 1935. He is a chemist and you wouldn't expect -- a biologist, pardon me, a biologist, and he is a -- he is a member of the -- great English society of--how is it called? It is not called Society of Sciences --?

(Academy of Sciences.)

Academy of Science. Mr. Sansome -- N -- S-a-n-s-o-m-e. I wonder how you pronounce his name correctly. San-some or San-sum-ee? And he says, "For so long, we have wondered what -- about the problem -- what brings about change. Now, we have proven that change is going on all the time, perpetually, and therefore we begin to wonder what makes anything permanent. And so we have to change our whole system of questions." When philosophers would try to begin to understand how miraculous this is, that such a unique creation as the United States of America came into being, they will then join the historian in asking not the abstract question, you see, "What dissolves 23 civilizations?" you see, but "How do these support this civilization?" what the historian tries to do. In -- in making it so valuable, so unique, that we'll stand by it, and say, "It still -- be given a chance." It's -- if we only enter deep enough into the meaning of this body politic, you see, we will find a new lease of life for this.

At this moment obviously the United States are faced with this very question: What is the future of the United States? Then you have to dig deep into its continental mission among -- as a new world to get your courage up and say that we will live longer than the Russian system. That takes an act of faith. And for this, we need to re-create the uniqueness of the -- of the achievement and understand it as deep as -- -ly as possible in order to -- to have our faith reinforced. Now philosophers then, gentlemen, dismiss faith, and historians build it up. -- History is always an article of faith. Because whenever you call your -- any out of the millions of women your bride, that's an act of faith, that she should be the one and only one. And this -- what the historians -- does. He clings to an

event and says, "This is unique." And thereby -- God wanted -- has not created abstractions. Do not believe that God is not the most colorful. He created the sun, and the moon, and the constellations in Heaven, and every constellation is different. { }. God is the enemy of abstractions. And that's -- where you have abstraction dominant, as you have in this country at this moment, there's of course no vitality.

And now you understand why I -- I think I have understood very well what the philosophers try to do, and have followed the -- as far as dead things are concerned, philosophers are very necessary. I have to dismiss for -- even from the construction of the United States those elements that are irrelevant, you see. And -- for example, I -- always very angry when you -- I hear you say that Americans are a capitalistic country. That's accidental. Obviously the United States are quite indifferent to any social system. This is a free country. And we can -- we can do -- one way or the other. The building -- railroads were built obviously in a social- -- as a socialistic enterprise, because the states gave the -- the capital to build them. Now do you call this a capitalistic country when the government pays for the building of a private enterprise? That's all right, but it makes no sense to me. I call this a colonial system.

In colonies, you see, the -- the -- the -- there are many economic systems. And I -- I think any country must be able to buil- -- contain, use, employ any number of economic means, or systems, or -- forms of organization. As soon as you -- as you say, "America is a capitalistic country," I call the philosopher in and use him, so to speak, to dissolve these -- ele- -- elements and say that this wouldn't make the United States, you see, then -- then unique creation. That's a passing thing, and accidental.

Only to show you that I have some use for philosophers, because the ingredients of American history should be -- should be sifted for what is the real contribution of the United States, you see, and what is purely veneer, or cloak, or I mean, of passing, and has nothing to do --.

Give you -- an example. Mr. Morison, Mr. Samuel Eliot Morison, is a great historian in this country. And -- who has read a book of his?

(I'm reading his { }.)

Well, we are personal friends. And so he one day confessed to me that he had to use a certain philosophy in order to free himself from all his Bostonian

environment as a -- as a blue-blood Bostonian.

And he's -- I -- I, being very anti-Socialist indeed, understood that this man used philosophy in order to find the pertinent things in his history, you see. Being an historian, he wanted to rise above the accidental. He didn't want to -- to identify the Lowells and the Cabots of Boston, you see, with American history. And feeling that he was so -- dyed-in-the-wool Bostonian, he looked for some critical, philosophical approach which would take down certain things that seem to -- you see, seem to the native identical with the -- with the meaning of history, you see, that God created Boston, the hub of the universe. And I admired him for this honesty with which he used, you see, a radical system of philosophy -- -phizing, you see, in order to learn to be a better historian.

So in this sense, philosophy is the critical faculty of warning us against arbitrary -- fanaticism, so to speak, you see, or devotion, you see. And in -- in this negative sense, I think historians can use and will always use philosophy as a sifting process, so that they are warned against falling in love with -- with accident, with -- with things that have not brought about the results they want to celebrate, or they want to stabilize, you see. Sometimes the -- the man who wore a blue cap is the leader, then everybody says a blue cap saved the country, you see. This -- a philosopher then can cure us by -- generalizing and saying, "Caps have nothing to do with patriotism." Can you understand my point?

(Then the proper use of philosophy is meaningful to the historian.)

Ja. Ja.

Because we all inspire and expire. We all inhale and exhale. And the negative attitude: "Oh no, that's not very much," is just as necessary as the other: "That's terrific." Obviously we have to move in both directions, and we have always to dismiss that -- that which doesn't deserve our admiration, or our allegiance, or our loyalty. And that it means to philosophize. And philosophizing is like exhaling, I think. But history is inhaling. Historians must inspire their readers. And -- and philosophers must detach their readers. And so you can also play -- make this pun, but puns are a little dangerous, I mean. Historians attach us to life. And philosophers detach us from life.

(The attempt of thinking -- their objectivity is -- is okay, as long as we have the historians to balance -- to balance it.)

Quite. But they are elsewhere. You see, you must not say that the philos-



opher of history makes history superfluous. You understand? The philosopher and the historian are just doing something quite different. The philosopher tries to submerge the individual times, and places, and people into some general system; submerge, you see. And the historian tries to make emerge the really created mountains and plains, you see, of real people into consistent survival. "Emersion" and "submersion" may be -- is quite a good word, you see. If I read a philosophy, everything is submerged under generalities, you see. Nothing -- any longer is important.

(Well, wouldn't the philos- -- the philosopher would probably say, "I see, therefore I believe." And the -- the hor- -- historian does not necessarily have to see to believe; he has the faith, without having to see to believe. Did you mention that a couple of lectures -- back?)

Ja. Perhaps we have still 10 minutes for Mr. Polybius, because that's just an anecdote, it seems, but it shows you that this -- very sober--and -- people have s- -- even held of him, a very poor--writer -- as a writer, has real greatness as -- regard to the -- to the emergence of uniqueness. What's the story? Did you read this? Why didn't you?

(I couldn't find it in the library.)

Who has read it? Well, you're a good girl. -- Now will you give { }, will you? Read it out loud.

(Twenty-two, or a little bit of 21 which sort of introduces it more, which is down a little bit of that, prior to the part that you -- you wanted us to emphasize?

(The lead-in.)

(Yeah.)

Oh, yes, very necessary, very neces- -- now the situation is -- 146 B.C.

Rome has conquered Greece. Rome has conquered Carthage, the great enemy. And the queen of Carthage and the commanding general are surrendering and approaching Scipio while the city down -- is ablaze. And so it's a great scene. And next to him is situated Polybius, his teacher and friend, who has accompanied him to headquarters. And here he receives the surrender, Scipio. Now go on.

("Turning around to me at once, and grasping my hand,

Scipio said, 'A glorious moment, Polybius. But I have a dread foreboding that some day the same doom will be pronounced upon my own country.'

("It would be difficult to mention an utterance more statesmanlike and more profound, for at the moment of our greatest triumph and of disaster to our enemies, to reflect on our own situation, and the possible reversal of circumstances and generally to bear in mind at the season of success the mutability of fortune, is like a great and perfect man. A man, in short, worthy to be remembered.

("Scipio, when he looked upon the city as it was utterly perishing, and in the last throes of its complete destruction, is said to have shed tears and wept openly for his enemies. After being wrapped in thought for long, and realizing that all cities, nations, and authorities must, like men, meet their doom, that this happened to Ilium, once a prosperous city...")

That's Troy. Ilium.

("...to the empires of Assyria, {Medea}, and Persia, the greatest of their time, and to Macedonia itself, the brilliance of which was so recent, either deliberately or the verse escaping him, he said, 'A day will come when sacred Troy shall perish, and Priam and his people shall be slain.' And when Polybius, speaking with freedom to him-- for he was his teacher--asked him what he meant by his words, they say that without any attempt at concealment, he named his -- he named his own country for which he feared when he reflected on the fate of all things human. Polybius actually heard him, and recalled { }.")

Gentlemen, in 1945, this country was very much enraged, because the Germans had dared to offer resistance at -- in the Battle of the Bulge, and at Christmas at Bastogne, and it was in -- you can hardly -- remember this. But while the Ger- -- Americans were really quite happy-go-lucky all the time before, this last moment of resistance seemed to spoil everything, and poison, so to speak, the mood. And people got -- became more anti-German than they had ever been before. And so in 19- -- in the middle of '45, the -- as you know, there was the Potsdam conference, and the -- the soldiers were forbidden to -- to speak to the Germans -- not only the German soldiers, but to the population, you see, and they were ostracized as {brutes}. And it was obvious that the Americans were so engaged in fighting the war after it was over, that the new enemy, the Russians, bec- -- remained invisible. And the Germans couldn't understand this. They -- all -- every German told at that time, the Americans, "Why don't you turn around and fight the Russians with us?"

Well, the Americans, of course, were stultified. They still had to live for another five years in the hatred of the Germans, because the hatred against Germany, as I told you, did not develop in 1939. It didn't develop in 1941, but it did develop at the end of the war in 1945. And so this -- the soul of man is not contemporary of the events very often, you see. You can bring about a -- quite a distemporanity, quite a discrepancy in the timing of human feelings, and in the timing of events.

So I invited Dorothy Thompson, who is -- was at that time a very famous columnist in this country, and myself, and a man who -- in the college who had been the chaplain and the founder of a new department there. So we three invited 35 colleagues of mine in the -- Dartmouth College to a meeting at my house, because I had the largest rooms. And Dorothy Thompson came, as a politician, and the old man came as a clergyman, and I came -- spoke as a former German, and an historian. And I simply read to them this -- this anecdote of Scipio, that this man had the na- -- at the moment of greatest triumph of Rome considered the inevitable onetime decline of Rome. And I went so far to say, "Now if you consider this, his tears obviously have made it possible that the Roman Empire went on for another 500 years. Because the sobriety of a victor who can identify, you see, the vanquished with his own later fate, is of course much greater than that of the triumphant victor who only thinks that he, you see, cannot be reached, cannot be attained."

And therefore I think the Roman dignity -- the Roman -- what is -- has been called "pietas," piety of Rome, shows in this fear of the envy of the gods, you see. This is a through-going, ancient notion. And we talked about it in the beginning, that the gods who give such a complete victory will only tolerate it if the victors remain very sober, very, you see, debonair, very relaxed, and do not stiffen and say, "Now we can do as we please."

And -- so I tried to convey to them the fact that the future of Rome was created by this insight of the victor into its relative character -- the relative character of the victory. What happened was that these 35 gentlemen laughed. Laughed. They laughed. And so of course the Americans dismissed the army. They -- had to go through this terrible Korean injustice, where people were called up again to the colors, who had fought for four years in the World War, you see, and -- whose family life was destroyed, because nobody had served in the meantime and been prepared. I have seen this. I have three marriages that have been broken up, in my own friendship, because young -- these young naval -- fliers were completely overtaxed in their strength, and they had -- just a

nervous -- nervous wrecks when they came back from Korea. One of the greatest injustices in this country, that people had to go to war twice, you see, because there was -- had been no substitution, you see.

And so I think the -- the -- that these people, who were all educated people, were all teachers, could laugh at this representation floored me. I have never been the same with these people, to tell you the truth. I was through with them. The cynicism, or the indifference, or the -- the flatness of their souls in such a situation -- it was -- after all, it was September '45, four weeks after the Japanese surrender; so, I mean, everybody was still living high, so to speak. But they only thought that we were pleading, you see, and that they were after all the victors, and they felt very good, and they could do as they pleased, and nobody had to tell them anything.

And -- ja?

(When they heard the -- these words of Polybius, I thought immediately of the 24th book of The Iliad, where Achilles can shed tears for Priam.)  
Tears for Priam.

So -- I only think -- Polybius is rated even much more prosaic than Thucydides, but in -- in saving this story, I think, he has shown that he feels, you see, that he creates the future by fully depicting the -- the -- the -- this moment, I mean. This story is written of -- obviously with great emphasis at the end. It's the end of the story. It's not the very last book. It's lost, unfortunately, the 40th book. It's a 40-book -- this is the 38th or the 39th book?

(Thirty-eighth book.)

Thirty-eighth book. And I think every one of you should take it into your notes. It's a unique thing. And I think it still should be repeated and repeated again to the United States' people, that the victor is only saved if he can see his own fate in the s- -- in the light of the vanquished.

But then you will understand that history is -- are not philosophizing. But that they put us in your place. They -- they -- you see, the same as prayer does. People always ask me, "Why do we pray, what -- does it make sense?" Because I only know from prayer who -- I am. In the addressing of the creator, I know that I am a miserable creature, a passing thing. And I have to pray, because you can't tell me who I am, and you can't tell me who I am, because all we are -- all labor

under misunderstanding. Nobody knows the other fellow, you see. Only my maker can tell me who I am.

And so we -- we only know in dialogue who we are. And in the same sense, here, the historian, in the dialogue between past and future, makes us see the future -- makes it transparent, because we can see it in moderation, I mean, in measure. And just as people today dismiss prayer as ridiculous, when it's the only cure for a sick soul, so it is with history. If you philosophize on history, you -- it's -- one drabness. Everything -- all cats are gray at night, as you know, or black at night. But cats aren't black in reality. They have all kind -- different colors.

And so the -- the -- man lives in very beautiful gardens of his own creation. And I would think that any country should be treated as such a garden of Eden, which we will lose as soon as we do not pay the price for supporting it, and you no longer honor the -- the victims, the sacrifices that are made for us.

Let me end with a -- with a -- with a good anecdote, because I think it should be told. It has to do with this -- you may not see it right away.

-- Mr. -- Mr. Eliot was the great president of Harvard University. And he made it a great university. And he had come to be 90. So really, of course, retired already. But there was a meeting in 1919 in Boston about who had done more for the war effort, had made -- greater sacrifices: capital or labor? And the tycoons of -- Boston business and the trade union men got together in a town hall of Boston and discussed a whole evening: Who had made greater sacrifices for the victory, capital or labor? And at the end, the chairman of this boastful meeting--of course labor, you can imagine it; they just -- none of them would of course -- could have done less but save the country.

And so the chairman said, "Now we have the great privilege that Mr. Eliot -- President Eliot has come over from Cambridge to talk -- to be present. And since we have this privilege, I think I should now ask him, if he has a word to say to us."

It was 10 o'clock in the evening. It was very stuffy in this whole room.

And the man -- the witness who has told me the story said it was like opening a window. Because there stood this very old man, 90--you know, that's --erect, and only said, "I don't care for the sacrifices made by labor. I don't care for the sacrifices made by capital. I only care for the real sacrifices made by the brides, and mothers, and sisters of the men who have died."

That settled the whole question, you see. The whole evening, you see, was -- was {over}. Wie? And that's a similar story, I think, as Polybius, don't you think? They could be put together.

So -- now we go into the abstract time.

And what did we -- what did we agree upon? What happens next time?

{{ }.)

{ } do you think so? What -- did you speak of Caesar, or did we not speak of Caesar. Wie?

(We started Thucydides a couple of weeks ago.)

Who is studying American history? Well, shouldn't you bring an American historian? Should we now go into this, and look at an American historian? I don't care who. But it -- can be Bancroft, or it can be {Brown}. Or whatever you have.

{{Mallory?}}

Wie? Who?

(Do you know Dr. {Mallory}? {George Mallory}?)

What has he written? I don't know his book.

(He's written American Democracy. I guess it's just a textbook, actually.)

{ }. I {have a} textbook at this moment unfortunately myself. So I want to do something -- want something higher.

(Couldn't -- couldn't we study one of your books? Aren't you an American historian? An historian of American history?)

{ }. This library doesn't recognize my existence.

{{ } library.)

How many copies of the -- of the Driving Power of Western Civilization is there -- are there? Do you have any idea? Do you know?

(I think there -- there were six copies.)

Oh, that's really too -- too few.

(How about Sandburg?)

What?

(Sandburg.)

You know, this -- may sound prejudiced, but I think biographies are at this moment tending to dissolve the reverence for history. It's a long story, and I -- you don't have to follow the whole argument, but I think that it is today an escape into biography, prevalent. And -- and history is not biography simply. And I am -- you might discuss this. Who has -- I'm -- willing, this is perhaps our good topic: biography and history. How would this be? Would you care --? When we -- I'm willing to start with -- with Sandburg, with Lincoln. Who has read Sandburg's Lincoln? The only man? Wie? Who has read Sandburg? Now, what Amer- -- biography of any American have you read? just let us ask around. Well, only if you remember it, is it important. Because it's living memory, you see; not dead memory. What have you read?

(Thoreau.)

His own life? Autobiography?

(Oh, autobiography.)

No, any biography.

(No, I read several biographies of Henry David Thoreau.)

By who- -- by whom?

(One was by J. B. Krutch, I think -- he I don't know if he was at Harvard -- Joseph -- Joseph Krutch, and --.)

Who has written a bio- -- read a biography? Yes, you, Sir. Have you read a

biography?

(Of any great American, Jefferson? Hamilton?)

Yes. It could even be Jefferson Davis.

(I was thinking of Thomas Jefferson.)

It's just not much of a life. The man is not very -- what -- what's is the book you have read?

(Titled Thomas Jefferson.)

By?

(I don't remember.)

Then you haven't read it. No, I deny it. I deny it. If you don't know the author. Who -- after all, gentlemen, this is really a test of your living memory.

You have read a book and you don't know the author. { } seem to you --.

(Why is the -- the author important?)

Your -- affection for the author is important, nothing else. He is not important. But we are made important by other people's love of us, you see. Nobody is important, but your affection might save this man from the grave, you see. But it hasn't. Therefore, you -- you didn't -- don't -- didn't grant him resurrection. That's why. You only live by the -- in the hearts of other -- our countrymen, my dear man, or other men { }. You see, a question is illegitimate, why should you remember the man's name? You see, because that means that this book has begun -- begun to be important in your life. If it hasn't -- it -- you dismiss it, and it's just as though you didn't read it.

(It's abstract. It's just another book on Jefferson.)

What?

(Just another book on Jefferson.)

Ja.



(Philosophy.)

Your contribution is your affection for the author. That's -- you see, if you have teacher and student, the teacher must have faith that you will remember something in the future. I have -- can bring no compulsion on you. So I act on faith. You act on hope that something I have known already may be worth your receiving, you see. You act on hope. We are -- however bound together by that much of -- affection which it is necessary that the hopeful and faithful can get together. My faith that this is necessary for you to know--because otherwise this country will perish and you are -- hope, that you may receive something which -- of which you are ignorant, which may be worthwhile--is tied together by the patience and forbearance we have for each other, you see. I call this "affection" with too emphatic a name, but it is, you see. It is a certain degree of mutual forbearance, and -- and you cannot listen to me if you are only hostile, you see. Then you will not understand what I say.

Therefore, really, I mean it. The -- the hope, faith, and love are elements of the problem of knowl- -- of -- process of knowl- -- knowing anything, my dear man. And the first thing, if you look -- like -- feel affection is that you ask for the name of the person who has given you pleasure. And if you say, "I -- he remains incognito," he -- you have philosophized him away into the elements of life, but he -- he hasn't reached you as a -- as an occasion to -- to come to life yourself. Just as you want to be introduced to an interesting person.

Now, who else can -- can testify? You want Sandburg, or what else?

(-- Also -- Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin, and {Benjamin Thomas} Lincoln, and so forth.)

And you, Lady?

(Also Benjamin Franklin, and Jonathan Edwards by Perry Miller and Grif- -- {McGiffert}? { } {McGiffert}? And Lincoln by { }.)

No wrinkles in your face!

(And { }.)

{ }, ja.

(Federalist Papers.)

(Channing.)

Wie?

(Channing, a biography on him.)

On Ellery Channing? The historian or the Unitarian?

(The Unitarian.)

The Unitarian. Well, what have you read, here?

(Well, as I said, you know, the same with Sandburg, and -- something { }.)

Well, I -- { } constantly, so you must know what you're reading. No?

Well, have you read a life of Henry James, or William James? Or any such thing? No. Roosevelt? Of Theodore -- have you read a life of Theodore Roosevelt?

(No.)

Now what's the cherry tree? It's -- I'm interested, really -- because if we want to have -- we have five more meetings, and the topic, biography in history, is -- is an important topic, and I think a fruitful topic. But then -- let -- allow me--do we have another five minutes, perhaps?--

(Yes.)

--to go into this. And that's why -- some background is -- I'm not asking you to ridicule this, but I'm really trying to find out what we can do. And if you -- there is no basis for discussion, we have to create it. Therefore I have to impose on you reading something. And so would you kindly go to the library and read for the next week, The Life of Pericles by Plutarchus? That has some connection, after all, with our friend -- with our friend Thucydides. The Life of Pericles by Plutarch. In many editions available, probably also -- available here in the paper binding. You have the -- look at it here, you may -- we may even find it here. Isn't it in here?

(There is a paperbound edition of Plutarch's Lives, but there's -- yes, Pericles is among them.)

Well, I'm sure it is among them. But we'll go on and you read Pericles and {Cinna}. I think there are even -- no, there are -- who is {Cinna}? They -- always -- is one Roman and one Greek together, you see. I don't know who the Roman is. But you take Caesar and --.

(Alexander and Caesar are contrasted, as I --.)

No, I don't want Alexander. It's too complicated at this moment to make.

But we -- be prepared. We have to have -- know -- need something. Now Plutarch's biographies are not what you would call biographies in the modern sense by a long shot. You may -- we may have to -- to analyze this -- to -- not to confuse the word "biography" in the ancient, pagan sense with what you call a life today. But on the other hand, I would like every one of you to pick out an American biography which he would -- wants to read within the next fortnight. And so that will be my assignment. Every one of -- I don't care that it has to be identical. I don't think that's necessary. But I want every one of you to -- to read fresh a new biography of an American person of the last 200 years.

(What do you mean...?)

250 years.

(What do you mean a new biography?)

Well, a book you haven't read yet. You have not -- that's all. You -- with regard to yourself. One can be as old -- as old as Methuselah.

(When did Plutarch live?)

He lived around the year 120 of our era. He was a Greek living in Boeotia, in Chaeronea, and -- being very prolific writer, and we owe him all kind of ethical investigations. And he had this bright idea of confronting always one Roman and one Greek statesman, philosopher, or person. And write therefore parallel biographies, pointing out, according to a -- that's just what distinguishes him from a modern biographer. He had a standard of biography, certain points: descent, family, wealth, education had to be mentioned, you see. And he had to go by this very elaborate scheme, and fill it out, so to speak, as you have first a scheme, and then put the things in.

Now what we call a biography is genetic. Christianity has brought in -- everywhere the element of time. We even call nature now, "natural history." That's a Christian expression, you see. The ancients didn't know anything of natural history. They couldn't, because to them nature consisted of things as they are. And that's all forgotten today. "Na-" -- "Natural history" is -- simply a Christian term, because Christ, you see, is not in space, but in time. He's the morning star that rises, you see, over history. But He's not the morning star that rises in the horizon as the star Venus. And this transformation of space -- things in space in -- in processes in time, that's the whole story of the Holy Cr- -- Ghost, you see. Now the Greeks were static. They looked at things. They wanted to -- to -- they believed in -- in -- in -- in -- in -- the Greeks were autonomous -- there was no world history. And everything was cyclical for this reason. And therefore, Plutarch is a pagan biographer. And everybody falls under the same pattern. It is not how this man became to be -- as we would, you see, are interested in -- came to be something, but who he was, a descriptive thing.

And all this is forgotten today, because this, of course -- the boast in -- of Americans is that they are purely Greek. They are. Nobody can. You couldn't be a Greek if you -- even if you wanted to.

So that's why Plutarch has to be read -- read by -- with a grain of salt, because you couldn't approve, so to speak, of such a biography, you see, today. And if you read this, you will find out about this.

And if you compared then what -- the story of Samuel, you will see how -- how much the Jewish history is one of becoming, and the Greek story is one of being.

Now I wonder -- Plutarch -- I -- I recommend then to you that you buy this. This is not very expensive. It's \$1.50, I suppose.

(Thirty-five cents.)

Wie?

(Thirty-five or 50 cents. Maybe it went up.)

(Mentor Pocket Book. You can get it in the bookstore.)

So everybody goes and buys it. All right. Wonderful. And please come on with your perfect knowledge of the life of Pericles and Caesar.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...teaching and experimentation. Because if you would learn in a laboratory to set up an experiment, so you learn here how to set up a -- the problem of a -- a source. It has -- is a masterpiece, I think. It has never been done, to my knowledge, in such a masterful way, well, because the man preferred to show the secrets of knowledge and methodology instead of -- of method, instead of coming forth with his own solution. This doesn't exist. Otherwise a peop- -- person -- you may learn something from a brilliant historian, but he always -- has an axe to grind. He wa- -- has a thesis.

Now Mr. {Momigliano} has no thesis. And therefore as an educational experi- -- you see, experience, this is unique. And therefore, I want you to follow this man's arguments, and to weigh them, and -- and say what -- your decision after this. You have to make up your mind. He hasn- -- not to.

So this is the -- the problem, you see. He puts all the evidence before you, weighs the evidence, shows you how to weigh evidence. You have never done this. And you are children in this respect. I mean, this country is the most gullible nation in the world. I mean, you are taken in all by the latest news. Somebody -- and the later news--it may as -- be as wrong as possible--you still believe it, because it's the latest. That's the worst thing an historiographer can do, you see. You leave something -- it -- we have this every day. You find a papyrus. Now these Dead Sea Scrolls, you see. -- Worthless stuff. Well, what -- what -- what literature { }? You see, Jesus -- teacher of righteousness and so. You mean -- here is a monastery, you see, you can call it a printing -- the printing press of Jerusalem, you see. That's the whole story of the Dead Sea Scrolls. But what you read in the last years is just all humbug, because it's new. And since we all do newspaper writing, and even the historians of this country try to be -- have smart -- like smart alecks, have catching titles. So you see, they write books, you see, to catch your imagination. It has nothing to do with history, has nothing to do with truth.

And so Mr. {Momigliano} is -- is -- deserves very well of us, because he brings us back to our senses. Here is the last century before pagan Rome becomes Christian. It's the last century when the -- Roman emperors reside in Rome. Take this all down. It's all important for you. It's the last century in which the Christians are in the catacombs. And -- are persecuted. And -- the only -- or nearly the only history of radical source of this whole century are -- is this strange book, the -- the writers on -- on the history of the {Augusti}. {Rer- --

Rerum, you see, *Scriptorius Rerum Augusti*). Now that's a -- that makes the book simply incred- -- it's the last pagan history, of the last century of paganism in Rome.

Every history written later falls into the hands of Christians, and becomes Church history. This is the last attempt of having a secular history. And to tell you the truth -- you will -- I hope you will all go to the library and take out the Loeb edition -- or even s- -- buy it. I would advise you, it's worth your while to buy this volume, with the Latin text on one side, and the English text on the other. The only edition with an English version that exists. There is no special edition of an English text { }, per se.

And -- Constantine then leads the children of Israel out of Egypt. He's celebrated as the new Moses. And that's to be taken quite literally. If you look at this book, this collection of imperial biographies of the third century, you begin to understand the necessity of Christianity, the necessity for Constantine to leave the old gods of Rome, who are completely impotent, and to leave the city to the pope. You see, the pope gets this -- got his power from the -- from the voluntary renunciation of the emperor, to part with the gods from the Capitoline Hill, and to -- with whom he couldn't compete, and who were destroying his empire. This is very -- the whole thing is much more serious. For the last hundred years, in your school tradition, the coming of Christianity is either mechanized, as in -- in- -- inevitable evolutionary process--and so it has no value in it--or it is always treated as the downfall of Christianity, because the Church became imperial and secular. That's the Protestant tradition, you see. So for the Roman Catholics today, it is just, so to speak, the invincible march, and costs nothing. And for the -- and they all think that he came, so to speak, by -- under his own steam. The Church conquered. But Constantine made her conquer by ceding Rome to it -- to it.

And we will -- today take a very different view from the last century -- whose tradition has of course tainted and painted your mind--because you are very obsolete, gentlemen. With all you have learned, you are 200 years behind the truth. As it always is in high schools and schools of a country, I mean. They're always lagging in -- what the real research today is interested in is, you see, the -- the battle royal between paganism and Christianity, what a miracle it was that -- it did conquer.

Now if you want to understand therefore -- the exciting problem is: these -- history of the third century, of the century of the disintegration of the Roman Empire as a pagan empire is -- has come to us in a book, which was obviously --

written in the Christian age, and which shows no vestiges of Christianity, but which seems to have been published either under Constantine or one of his successors. Or much later. That's a great debate. Now it is nearly all we have in an historical form of this whole -- whole -- third -- third century on a -- from a pagan -- from pagan writers, from non-Christian writers. And the Christian writers of course are not dealing with the -- with the government of Rome at all. They are dealing with their own church problems, you see, squabbles between heretics and so on, and the Orthodox Church.

So here is the complete shift of allegiance. The book is written in an -- in a time, or composed, or published--we don't know; you will see all these --. Who has read this paper already? Well, you know, it's all open to doubt. But it is not simply, as if we would say, a book composed on the years 1750 to 1850, you see. We ask whether it's written -- 1900 or 1950. You -- it is much -- infinitely more important and decisive, because it is the last pagan century, you see, written in a Christian era -- the first Christian time. By pagans --. That's how it looks, you see. So it is -- it is fascinating, because one of the disturbing facts about antiquity is, you see, that there was absolutely no progress. The -- your whole dogma of progress, you see, which is very childish, is -- assumes that progress is in evolution. Regress is just as much in evolution. This country is re- -- retrograde at this moment. It's not progressing at all. And why should it? The South retrograded, since -- from 1830 to 1860 slavery was getting worse and worse, and not better and better. And that's why the Civil War was inevitable. It wasn't inevitable 1827, because at that time, slavery was perfectly -- I e mean, mild, so to speak, you see. But 30 years later, it was not mild. It was cruel. It became worse. Now this is the one thing your mind cannot catch: that things, before they can get better, must get worse. And therefore, Marcus Aurelius and Antoninus Pius, the caesars of the second century, were much better emperors than the emperors of the third century. And the emperors of the third century were just beasts. All warriors, soldiers, I mean. Constantly at war. And becau- -- ja? (How can you say slavery was not bad in 1820?)

Because at that time, the people in South Carolina, the gentlemen of -- South -- Carolina were concerned with dissolving it. So it wasn't so bad. If there was an {outlook} since, Mr. Hayne, the great -- the great opponent of Webster, in 1837 said, "We will abolish slavery." But nobody said this in 1854. There appeared a book, Sociology for the South, by Mr. {Fitzhugh}, one of the greatest -- most scandalous documents of the human mind ever published, in which he



wrote a sociology based on slavery, you see. So that society could not exist without slavery. I recommend this book highly.

It's not in the library. Shows you what a miserable library we have. We have no Plutarch -- and -- to speak of. We have no -- all the important books are not in this library. All my books are not in this library. But I went down to get you some books on Plutarch. There's nothing there. It's a miserable library. And this book by Fitzhugh, one of the most important human documents, if for nothing else, Sociology for the South is not here. I c- -- you see. It's one of the great scandals of the century. And it must be here, you see, because this is the book in which the South took position and said, you see, "That's the only way of life that is reasonable," slavery. That's quite an achievement, you see. It appeared -- of course, inspired by the Count de Gobineau, who two years before published his famous book on the inequality of the human race. And it's all in one -- in one moment.

You see, after 1850, when -- when -- when Melville goes from Moby-Dick to Pierre, that's a complete break in the spirit of the times. Deepest optimism up to 1850 -- Millerites, you see, the -- the -- "the millennium is -- is with us." Everybody is optimistic. And after 1850, black pessimism. And again, that shows you how history really works. History is, you see -- there was a desperate mood after 1850. And one of these desperate -- expressions of desperation of this profound pessimism is -- is the -- this book by {Fitzhugh}, Sociology of -- for the South. And of course Henry Adams is the last of these pessimists, and Brooks Adams, with the degradation of the democratic dogma, and The -- The Law of Decline and -- how is it called?

(Civilization and Decay.)

Wie? and Decay, ja. And that begins all, you see, in 1850 and ends in the two world wars, because people -- began -- it's -- began to smell.

But -- the average American, of course, since he -- since he boycotted the mo- -- mo- -- the movements of the educated class in this country, wasn't touched by this. Now you are driven by this, I think. Yours -- don't think that what your mood -- the official mood of this lost generation, or angry generation is anything but the catching-up of the mass of the people with what the educated people believed since 1850, that man was -- was hopeless, wicked, you see, mass, mob, perverse, you see, homosexual, murderer of his -- of his father, incestuous with his mother. I mean, all the modern tenets, so to speak, they were all developed in 1850. But in this country, with the stream of immigrants, you see, this -- the --

upper classes could live their own mind -- mental life, and the -- the masses of the newcomers, you see, didn't -- were never interested. Now you're just catching up with this.

And therefore in this sense you are obsolete, because you are -- in this coun- -- college, I find the official attitude is that of 1850, of Pierre, of Melville's Pierre. And Pierre -- I assure you, a man like Mer- -- Herman Melville wouldn't write such a book today. He would try to get us out of Pierre, I mean, and the Ambiguities, if you know the book. Who knows Pierre, or the Ambiguities? It's the American classic. Nobody reads it? Who has read Pierre? Nobody? Well, who has read Freud?

(Excerpts. Excerpts.)

Well, what have you read in psychoanalysis? You have heard it all, have you? Where do you get your information?

(Lectures.)

Wie?

(Lectures. Lectures.)

No -- probably by going to the analyst yourself.

Now really it is very strange how the -- sources of information of the most important issues of the time are of the most casual sort. Every one of you thinks he knows what -- what psychoanalysis is, don't you? Don't you know -- think you know?

I -- I -- I talked to a very serious psychoanalyst in this city on Sunday, and the man said that it is "just too bad that I have become popular. Nobody understands what we are doing, but everybody thinks he -- they know what we are doing. And also dogmatically then pa- -- you see, says that things are as such as they have misunderstood us." Was a -- quite a -- quaint complaint of this man. Well, I want to say -- gentlemen, the -- the -- the -- the people who get their information in this callow way, as you do--on the most important issues--religion, politics, ethics, sex, family, just very casual what you pick up in the newspaper, the radio, and television--you can always be sure that you are a hundred years behind the times. And if you would begin to -- to believe me this,

you see, you would be -- come -- be able to educate yourself. But -- in the -- since you believe that what's in the papers is newer than what's in the books, you see, I cannot help you. You really think because this book was printed -- when was it written? Who has a textbook? -- 1948 -- so you think this is, so to speak, older than what's today in the Examiner, you see. That's not true. Because the way the man looks at things in the paper has to have the -- the -- lowest common denominator. Otherwise he wouldn't sell. And the lowest common denominator is always a hundred years, at least, behind the times.

I have -- investigate this on a large scale, and that's -- has to do with this historic problem, you see, of Mr. {Momigliano}. The -- the reactionary character -- if these people wrote pagan -- were pagans who wrote this history of the third century, you see, we cannot be surprised that they moved in categories, you see, which were already superseded in the time in which they -- at which they wrote. And that is a part of the trouble of Mr. {Momigliano}, you see, that the dating of a pagan writer is much more difficult than the dating of -- Christian writer of that time, of Christianity marching. Because the reactionary of course -- you can read today, a -- a book by a Mormon, you see, and he still believes in the authenticity of the Book of Mormons, you see. God help him, I mean. I mean, there's nothing to be said. He's not of 1959, certainly. Because Mr. -- Mr. Joseph Smith couldn't { } the two plates today, you see. So anybody who believes in the authenticity of the Book of Mormons belongs to this strange era in American history where something was better than nothing. And -- and so when he -- he had this vision of -- in 1829, and he found gullible people to -- to believe this. And I think even -- there's a famous chemist in this country, Professor Eyring, who's an elder of the -- Church of the Latter-Day Saints, and -- you know it? Wie?

(His name sounded familiar to me.)

Eyring, yes. Famous man -- family. Three brothers born all in Mexico, who came to this country. From American parents, and were naturalized only when they were grownups, and have all played a great part in this country. One became a college president, and the other a university president, and the third, the leading chemist of this country. Eyring: E-y-r-i-n-g. Now, of course, for a chemist, the Mormons may be good enough. And -- I mean, they have no brains. And -- I think all scientists are drawn to superstition. And so he's a Latter-Day Saint.

He was asked, of course, about the Book of Mormons, by a friend of mine.

And -- well, he smiled it away. He said that was not to the point, you see, you see. To him, church was a social agency, and truth had nothing to do with it. As you find many people today, who think the Church is a social agency, you see, and -- and what is nice in this group. So the background of the church doesn't matter.

But seriously speaking, I think the -- the -- Mr. Eyring is a good test case to say today that the Book of Mormons -- you couldn't found this -- a church today on the Book of Mormons. So a man who believes really in the authenticity of the Book of Mormon only can be explained from the set- -- immigration -- immigrant situation of 1829, you see. And -- so it's -- in this sense, it's dated. There are no Mormons as of today.

All professions, gentlemen, have such a date. I mean, a doctor belongs to the 1600s, when anatomy was introduced in the modern style of medicine, you see. The psychoanalyst tries to remedy this, and they take a new beginning with Freud. But -- I mean, all the physical doctors of course are against these psychosomatic people, because they are based on -- on the body. And this isolation of the body, as being something in itself, which is -- ridiculous, is Cartesian, and came into being in 1600. And medicine, as it is today in America, at least, treated, is -- be- -- is -- belongs to the 16th century. It's an enlargement of the ideas of 1600. And there's a battle royal now--beginning with Christian Science, and now in psychoanalysis, and psychosomatosi, and what have you--to get out of this, you --.

You see it in the crisis of -- about cancer, you see. Cancer is not in the -- old sense a physical disease. It's -- a disease in which the -- the soul loses its power over the body. And the body goes wild. It's a luxurious growth, as -- as everybody knows, you see. The physical doctors look into the body and try to explain the phy- -- the luxurious growth, you see, from the luxurious growth. So they spend hundreds of millions of dollars in -- in looking at the luxurious growth and -- and saying, "Yes, it's --."

So, I mean, a hundred years from now this will look very stupid indeed.

But -- explicable, because all medicine, as officially treated in this country, goes back to the -- to the -- year 1600, and the principles, the main ideas then held.

To give you another example of historical fa- -- lag -- among the writers of texts, or -- or science. In -- in 1100, the great University of Paris began to -- to coalesce, and began to function, under Abélard. You may have heard of Abélard and Héloïse, the great pair of lovers. And -- Abélard is the founder of scholasti-

cism. And -- then came Thomas Aquinas, and that -- were the great people, and -- and straight thinkers.

At the same time, when Abélard was making his revolution and was excommunicated in the process--all decent people have to be excommunicated before they are recognized--so St. Thomas only escaped, you see, by one decade, his being excommunicated, because in 1230, the pope forbade the study of Aristotle officially to the University of Paris. And in 1250, St. Thomas founded his -- his whole book on the study of Aristotle. Twenty years had sufficient -- be -- sufficed at that time, you see, to move the papacy to -- to lift the ban. So if he had lived 20 years earlier, you see, he would just have incurred the -- excommunication.

You must always know that those sayings that are worthwhile are only by a hair's breadth away from hell. Otherwise, they wouldn't be interesting. And it wouldn't be very risky to become a saint, you see. It's always just by a hair's breadth that they don't -- that they are not excommunicated and condemned. Now this is what I've tried to tell you about history, that it is such a risky affair, the -- human spirit. And -- well, to tell you this lag of the -- of these writers, of whom Mr. {Momigliano} is writing, is -- it's -- it's one of the exciting problems. And if you think in these terms, you will even get some help in -- in explaining why these people, who wrote before {Momigliano} on that topic, have found no solution, because they hadn't looked into this situation, you see, of the lag. What it means that a pagan writer in the Christian era has to write on the last pagan century, knowing that they -- came to an end, that it was all over. You will not find in this -- in this -- detailed discussion that this viewpoint of mine has -- has find -- found adequate treatment. So that's my -- I would enlarge on Mr. {Momigliano's} paper in this -- this respect.

You always have in mind that the book couldn't have been written probably before--Constantine at least granted tolerance -- -eration to the Christians--probably after he moved to Constantinople, out of Rome. Perhaps after he even was baptized on his deathbed. Then we -- you see how exciting it is to know how we see these emperors, you see, who preceded him, in which light. But let me finish my medieval story. In -- while Abélard was founding the moder- -- most modern school in the world at that time, the University of Paris, you see, which was the great sanctification of controversialism, you see, and based on -- on the free, you see, opposition of opposite minds, of contrary minds. That's why it's so very funny -- it proves that there is no university in

America--except by name--shows you that today it has become here a word of vituperation to say somebody is controversial, you see. In -- in Paris, you couldn't become a professor ex- -- unless you were controversial. That was the basis of being a professor, you see. -- He had to profess something. If you profess something, there's somebody else who professes the opposite. Can't be helped. And to be a professor means to be -- to enter the -- the -- the battle royal, you see, of controversies. That's the university.

And that's -- is Abélard's invention. He invented the idea that a student should listen on the same topic to opposite opinions while he's studying, should be exposed to opposite view. That's the university. That's why the Academy of Plato is not a university. The university is a medieval invention. And all our literature is bunk here in this country, bec- -- of this popular brand. The -- they s- -- tell you that Plato founded a university. He never -- he would have -- fought it. His opinion was law, and nobody had to say anything different from him. That wasn't permitted. You had to emigrate. Aristotle had to establish immediately his own school, because he -- he didn't share all the opinions of the master. That was enough to excommunicate him.

Now the great liberality of the Catholic era, on the -- Christianity is the Augustinian dogma, you see, that we must have different minds, and the same faith. That's -- is the idea of the university. At the same time, however, while this great step was taken into -- into liberalism: different opinions, but one heart and one soul, the -- appeared a book, The -- The -- The Mirror of the Educated -- for the edu- -- for the education, so to speak, of the people. This became the most popular encyclopedia through 400 years. And while the -- the Aristotelians in the Middle Ages made all kind of scientific discoveries, this book went from one edition to the next, {through vier hundred years}. And until the Reformation, it was always the bestseller.

And so we know simply that this -- underneath, you see, the -- the educated, or the progressive group, there is always this backdrop of -- of -- of a conservative -- mass instruction which doesn't move. And I think that's the case in this country very much, where people still believe in Darwinism as -- as something sci- -- you see, that everybody -- evolution, I mean. All the data which get into your head today just as indisputable truth, you see, are given up at the center of these special sciences where they generate it, you see. And you still believe them for the next 200 years. Because our superintendents of schools have learned nothing, have been physical ath- -- athletes, you see, and don't care for the content of what they teach, anyway, you see. They want to have registrations, and class. And how can you expect that your school system functions when you have

people who hate knowledge, as administrators?

So this is the strange situation with the Scri- -- you have in the {Scriptores Rerum Historia Augusti} in the -- something that is eternal. -- The remnants of an older world, which seemed, at least, and to have already cracked open -- cracked up on the top, but -- well, you may say it's a nostalgic memory, or it is a farewell address to the past, or it is accidental. But however you see it, it is in a new world, you see, the old world. And that is always a -- a great spectacle. I mean, it's -- it would be, as -- you see, if -- if in 1850, Massachusetts, people would read Mr. Burnet's -- the famous Bishop Burnet's history of the Glorious Revolution, you see, of the British, you see, which included still the American colonies, you see, and which made for the unity of the English-speaking nations. So this is -- I mean, this -- one example, something of the mood, you see. In 1850, this would be a textbook in the American schools, you see. -- Then -- then this would of course create something, do something, you see. It would make it -- you see, it would emphasize, you see, the -- the past in -- and would, so to speak, hold people, you see, onto this unity of spirit.

And we have this in American tradition, of course, with the trip to Europe.

I mean, all educated Americans did go through the 19th century, you see, to Rome and Europe in order heal the breach of the Declaration of Independence. And your tourists -- tourism today is the last wave of this -- of this attempt to get in touch with the pre-independent world, you see. Now to be introduced to the Court of St. James, as the -- as the -- here, the ladies, you see, of the swanky Americans wanted to be. You have heard of it. So they were so flooded in -- at the Court of St. James that they had to give it up last year, you see. You have -- may have heard that the queen of England was fed up in serving as a target for the American society. It was only given up because of the Americans. Because every -- Mr. Woodridge, or Mr. Aldrich, or Mr. Baldrige, you see, had -- his daughter. If he was the president of the Bank of New York, or City Bank, and he had of course to get an introduction to the Court of St. James, because there he -- he touched ground, the pre-independence, you see, the -- the ground of colonial days, the -- the European ground, you see, of what had been. That's like reading, you see, Burnet's history of the Glorious Revolution.

All books that you read, gentlemen, take you into a certain moment of time. You cannot escape from this. Your novels, too. And -- you see, literature has always either a reactionary or a prophetic character. I think today -- at this moment fiction is reactionary, all fiction. Whether it's Lolita by Mr. Nabokov, or whether it is Proust. Pro- -- the prophetic character -- today is -- more readily found in fields of science -- or soci- -- social writings, you see, than it -- or -- than

it is in -- in the -- novel. Literature belongs to a past era. Since the Russian Revolution, literature no longer has the same role of taking you into the future. So beware.

A man in 19 -- in the 19th century, if he read War and Peace by Tolstoy, or The -- Brothers Karamazov by Dostoevsky, was taken -- ahead. And if you read these men, you still are taken ahead of time. But if you read today's literature, it has lost this character of pro- -- prophecy. Hemingway is a case in point. No future in him. Absolutely no future. Not prophetic.

There is -- many reasons. But you see, God goes from one form of writing to another in order to reach us. And once a form has been used for a hundred years, it grows stale. You couldn't go on writing gospels, after the ones -- the first four had been written. They tried it. Gospel has been written after -- well, there must have been perhaps 52 gospels written, you see, all told. And the spirit didn't move in them. So the Church said, "Only the -- these four are genuine. All the rest is deteriorated," you see, is obsolete, is -- is imitation.

And again, I think, in -- all your touching of historical books, you should -- ask yourself whether in that time, it was still the receptacle of the spirit. And again, this book of the -- on the third century is such a perversion, and such -- such a terrible book that it shows that by pagan history, you see, man could no longer be led, or worked, or directed, or -- or see anything with any meaning in history.

The forms then of literature, gentlemen, cannot be relied on, on always presenting the same values. The spirit exactly--how does it go?--blows as it listeth? or?

(Bloweth as it listeth.)

Ja, ja. And -- you see, and you never are sure that because a book has a tempting title of a -- of a drama, that it is a drama in the sense of Shakespeare's dramas, you see. It doesn't. It's -- the form is over. At this moment, the same result, you see, of Anthony and Cleopatra, or Hamlet, cannot be certainly attained by a play. It would have to have a different literary form. Just because in 1959, we already have Hamlet, you see, and therefore, that which must play the role of Hamlet today, must -- cannot be a second Hamlet. It cannot be a tragedy of the -- you see, the same style.

A composer -- a great Italian composer once was asked what he knew



about the history of the spirit.

And he said, "I only know one thing: that the next step always is unpredictable, and incalculable, that it never looks like the previous one, that it always comes as a surprise from a corner in which -- into which we -- to which -- towards which we have not looked."

And so I only want to tell you, your -- if -- if your ancestors read Hawthorne and Melville, they did something quite different than when you read Hemingway and -- and Faulkner. And once this begins to dawn on you, you cease to be dogmatic about your -- about your little boxes, you see, of your definitions: history is that, and literature is that. It is not that, you see. It is -- at all times, you must be aware that the -- same label covers a different content. And that's why I think your English departments are -- such seats of devastation, because they cling to this conviction that what is called a novel is a novel at anytime, you see. And has the same function in the economy of your mental life, at any time. It doesn't.

All this I think is not wanton, because -- it may -- whet your appetite for this strange, last century. It is as exciting as if you look into the Dead Sea Scrolls and see the decay of Judaism in the last century before Christ, I mean. Here is the same problem. It's the last century before our own era, you see, before our -- you don't know how much we are in our era. If you -- I wished you would -- I could provide a text of these writers, at least of one or the other biography. Has anybody taken out the volume from the library?

(What volume?)

You have?

(No. I say, "What volume?" The --?)

With the text of the {Scriptore}. I might have -- it's so expensive only to have it -- to have it copied and distributed among you. When I came here, of course I was naïve enough to think that this library had everything. Nobody has taken out a text? The -- the -- the book itself. Well, it shows your profound interest. { }? From now on, you have to do the work, and I won't.

Who -- who is the -- well, you are all familiar with the library. Under -- under PA, in classics, you see, in the -- on the third floor, you will find this. So in the recess now, you kindly will go there and try to get this volume, you see, of

the -- of the Loeb edition. Look in the catalog: {Scriptores Rerum}--that's the title--and bring what you find. Or the Greek and Latin texts. I may still decide to have at least one -- one biography mimeographed, so at least you -- you can smell the thing.

You see, at this moment, the emigration of -- of the pag- -- last pagan emperor, Constantine, to Constantinople, is suddenly in the blaze of light of research, that people have suddenly realized that the history of our own life today was -- is much more dependent on the fact of 325, you see, of the Council of Nicaea and the emperor becoming Christian, than on the life of these fishermen in Galilee 300 years before. That you and I only are really immersed into the tradition of free men, and of all the things you take for granted--that all men are equal, for example--that all this has reached you only through this eye of the needle, when the Roman emperor, you see, turned Christian. And that was only the point at which it -- Christianity was able to educate you and me, and the teachers, and the students, you see, of the world over the century.

And -- so all of a sudden, the -- the flash- -- the floodlight, so to speak, is shifting from the year 33 of our era to the year 3300 -- 333. -- And that's a complete change of interest, because if you read Gibbon, or if you read any history, you see, the -- this 3- -- 300 that was just an -- as I said, an evolutionary stage. But it isn't. It is a break. And -- hardly credible, when you go into this. And this -- why I thought it was worth your while, even with all your language handicaps to hear one time about this greatest of historical breaks in our own tradition. You can only compare it to the Declaration of Independence, and the development -- of -- American character after -- after the Declaration, you see. There were no Americans before, you see. And then there suddenly, 70 years later, the Americans have a -- definite character, and there they are.

So you will -- you will kindly run over.

Now have you read -- who has -- has a Pericles? Is a Pericles in this? In your volume? And with whom is he coupled?

(Alexander?)

Wie?

(Isn't it Alexander?)

How could it? As a Greek, too. It's always a Roman and a Greek. Oh,

Kind- -- children, children, children. Ignorance.

(Fabius.)

Wie?

(Fabius.)

Who is Mr. Fabius? Who is Fabius, Sir?

(I don't know.)

Who is Fabius? Ja?

(He was in charge of the Roman armies against Hannibal, { } had the delaying tactics { } place to place { }.)

And so he got the nickname --?

(The Delayer.)

Cunctator. Yes, that's Fabius Cunctator. Now it is a very strange idea that -- for -- of Plutarch, and it must have been quite despondent to find anything reasonable to put together: Pericles and -- and Fabius. They have really absolutely nothing to do with each other. Because one dies in the moment where his country goes to ruin, and the other saves his country, you see. So it's just -- point in exactly the opposite directions. It's -- it's a des- -- I mean, it just shows that there -- Plutarch is a very superficial gentleman. Terribly superficial. That's a -- the -- the terrible thing about his biographies. They are very superficial. How -- did you read it? The life. Did you read it? What -- how about the famous -- the famous eulogy of Pericles at the grave of the Athenians? What does Mr. Plutarch say about that? Wie?

Does he say anything? Ah. Does he mention? Have you the book in an English edition? Can you show me the place where he does it?

(I think he -- he just said a little -- one sentence about it or something.)

Find it? Find it, please. He who finds it first gets an A? I'm not going to find it. But you have to find it now. Right away.

It will take a long time. You can stop the machine. They have now to read the whole thing for the first time.

(Didn't the --.)

(Didn't the Pelop- -- Didn't the Peloponnesian Wars begin around the -- the time of the Battle at Samos? Is that one of the early battles?)

What do you mean by that? Why do you ask?

(Well, because the only reference I found that I thought alluded to the -- the speech that Thucydides mentions was on page -- well, it says that in -- in {Comnium}, Pericles spoke of -- of the immortal soldier -- the -- the life that soldiers gained was comparable to the gods. That -- but Phil says that's not relevant.)

Well, no. You -- just give me the -- the pla- -- the -- the chapter.

(My -- my book doesn't -- doesn't have chapters in it. I don't know how to direct you, Sir. Yeah, the paragraph begins, "He has left nothing in writing behind him, except some -- decrees," and "There are but very few of his sayings recorded." And then Plutarch records some of the few sayings.)

Now you are quite right. It's in connection with the end of the Samian War. And what is the -- what is the sentence?

("For, said he, we do not see them themselves, but only by the { } we pay them, and by benefits they do us. Attribute to them immortality; and the alike attributes belong also to those that die in the service of their country.")

Well, I don't think that's the -- there is this quotation, just this quotation.

But where is it said that he gave this harangue?

(It doesn't say that.)

Yes, in the ninth one, the Samians surrendering themselves { } up the town. Don't you have it?

(Yes. Yes.)

And then go on and { }.

(The next paragraph says, "Since Thucydides..."--and I didn't know if this was Thucydides of Thrace.)

Yes, that's the historian.

(The same one. "...described the rule of Pericles in a -- as an aristocratical government." So I just connected those two paragraphs, and thought that --.)

Well, you are right, but I am right, too. You had a quotation, didn't you?

(Yeah.)

A literary quotation. But that's at a different place, isn't it? What I have is this: "Pericles, however, after the reduction of Samos, returning back to Athens, took care that those who died in the war should be honorably buried, and made a funeral harangue, as the custom is, in their commendation at their grave, for which he gained great admiration." Ja?

(What translation do you have?)

What?

(What translation do you have?)

The oldest one.

(North?)

That's --

(Thomas North.)

Right. Right.

(I looked it up in another book. It said that in the golden age of translation--that was the 16th century--they said Plutarch was translated by Thomas North.)

Oh yes. That's a contemporary of Shakespeare, you see. A little older. And Shakespeare read it -- read Plutarch, in the -- North translation. That's why it's

very precious for us. Because Shakespeare got all his incidents, of course, in -- from this -- from the Plutarch's Lives. That's why it is so very important. But this then in the -- a hundred years later, Dryden was the head of a commiss- -- committee, you see, and they -- several translators got together and he wrote the introduction. That's probably his only contribution. And this is what I have here. And then it has been re- -- re-translated several times, of course. And -- I don't -- I don't think this is very excellent. But they had to pay no royalties when they publish it. That's the only reason an American publisher -- for an American publisher to publish it.

Now -- but the sentence is -- is to be underlined. "Made a funeral harangue, as the custom is, in their commendation at their grave for which he gained great admir- -- admiration."

(What's the opening se- --?)

Has anybody Thucydides -- here? Probably no one.

(Yes, I have it.)

Now let's -- let's look up. At what occasion did Pericles make the speech according to Thucydides? Will you kindly look it up?

(Could you tell us the first sentence of that paragraph in which the quotation is used?)

Well, I can't { } Thucydides.

(No, I mean in the -- in the Plutarch, for which the --.)

Well, they -- "the ninth months the Samians surrendering themselves and delivering up the town, Pericles pulled down their walls, seized their shipping --." As you said, then comes Thucydides. What -- you have the pla- -- here. You had it.

(Yes, I have it, but it doesn't say that.)

And before, it's Ephorus, the historian, the paragraph before, tells us.

Have you no index of names?

(Oh yes, I have the list of names.)

Well, then let's look up Ephorus.

(E-p-h?)

Or {Elpinike} is even simpler. {Elpinike}, if she is in the index, because she comes on the stage right in the next sentence. {Elpinike}. Wie? You don't have her?

(No. Oh yes, yes.)

Well, let's look her up.

(Well, what page is { }. You mentioned --.)

(89.)

(...the last one.)

German History, very famous, by Mr. von Treitschke, it was five volumes, 600 pages, by and large, each. And I was so disgusted that it had no index that I sat down and made the index myself. And -- offered it to the publisher. And he said they could do well, but without the index. But I felt that already at 16 that a book without an index was just a scandalous affair. Was not a book at all.

Well, prove to me in the Thucydides that -- that the -- the Samian War hasn't gone on before this funeral speech. I don't find it. That's quite strange. -- In Thucydides, there is no connection between the Samian War and the funeral speech. And in the -- in the biography, there is. That's after all, very -- very strange.

Do you find anything about the Samian War in Thucydides? That's -- we must look for. Look up "Samos."

(It was -- I don't have the book, but I -- I remember that there is { }.)

Is there?

(In the campaign.)

(Because that's where he mentions that Thucydides was -- went over

there, into the Samian War. He was one of the generals. Wasn't it? I'm not sure.) Well, I would like you to find the place. Because, you see, Mr. Plutarch quotes Thucydides for this. He says, "Thucydides speaks of -- not of the cruelty of Pericles towards the Samians." In other words, Thucydides mentions the Samian War. So I -- before -- { } to identify one funeral speech as given by Thucydides, and the funeral speech as mentioned by Plutarch, we have to be careful. There could be two. There have been many occasions of burying people. And we have to find out: is there only one speech?

This is a simple, historic expression. Did -- Pericles -- he might have given the annual speech, I mean. You see, the convocation address, as the president does, you see. Would be something -- or several -- inauguration addresses, as Lincoln. There's a first and a second. And before you say that one funeral speech, you see, meant -- the one mentioned by Plutarch is identical with the one given in Thucydides, in full text, you have to watch out. We don't know. And I don't know. I haven't gone into this specifically.

(Well, undoubtedly he gave more than one { } speech { } quoted himself.)

Wie?

(He quoted himself that -- "Pericles, however, after the reduction of Samos, returning back to Athens, took care that those who died in war should be honorably buried, and made a funeral harangue, as the custom is.")

Ja, certainly they -- every { }.

(So it ought to { }.)

Well -- wheth- -- whether he was speaker more than once, that's not settled in your way. If it has a custom, there can be a different speaker each time.

(-- Didn't they give Pericles the first opportunity during the war to give the speech?)

Well, that's what we are asking. You have to try to find --.

(Well, I don't have my book, but I -- I think I remember they gave him the first -- the honor of making the first oration { }.)



(Well, here, at the same place, that -- says, "Are these actions then, Pericles, worthy of crowns and garlands, which have deprived us of many brave citizens, not in a war with the Phoenicians and Medes, such as my brother {Simon made}, but in destroying a city united to us, both in blood and friendship." That's { } Plutarch { }.)

(This translation has "allied" and "kindred" said.)

[overlapping conversations among the students]

Well, Plutarch follows this up after he has mentioned this famous speech with the strange line: "Sometime after this, when the Peloponnesian War was about to break out --." In other words, he places the funeral oration before the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War. Now, anybody who reads Thucydides would be inclined to say it was inside the Peloponnesian War -- therefore Plutarch -- wie? (That translation must be wrong, because according to this, it was after the -- the -- Samos was -- was destroyed.)

What? Well, exactly. Exactly. We are -- you misunderstand.

(Oh, that's right.)

This is really an interesting question. I don't know the answer. "Pericles, on his return"--listen to this--"Pericles, on his return to Athens after the reduction of Samos, celebrated in a splendid manner the obsequies of the -- his countrymen who fell in that war and pronounced himself the funeral oration, usual on such occasions. This gave him great applause."

Now in my translation of the older style, it doesn't say it "gave him great applause," interestingly enough. But "It great him -- gained him great admiration." So that's typical, you see, of the modern style. "Applause" and "admiration." Admiration is a -- is an inner attitude, you see; and applause is the noise you hear. Or whatever it is. Ja, it's very interesting. The word is not "applause." It's of course "admiration." But for a modern American, it has to be noisy. Very -- applause.

So he got in. Here is then -- and then comes the next paragraph, "Some times after this, when the Peloponnesian War was about to break out --." There is no doubt that the funeral oration happens before. Now if -- will you go back to

Thucydides now and try to find a dating of the funeral oration, because it would give -- shed some light on our friend Thucydides, on his power of even engulfing a thing of a different date, you see, into his canvas, because he wants to get it in, in order to be picked -- Pericles, you see, no holds barred. Simply the funeral oration, Mr. Thucydides thinks, must be in. So if it isn't the Peloponnesian War, it makes no difference. Ja?

(Maybe Plutarch here is -- is a hundred years behind Thucydides in breaking up the Peloponnesian War into different -- maybe he means by the "Peloponnesian War" something different from { }.)

(Samos is not in the translation).

We have to find what Thucydides -- when he mentions Samos. So you kindly will -- is this -- is this Thucydides, Sir? Is this Thucydides?

(This is -- no. This is Plutarch, but it's a different translation. And according to this, you get a different idea. "After this war was over"--talking about the Samian War--"the Peloponnesian War beginning to break out in full tide." From this, I infer that Samos was considered the -- an initial stage of the Peloponnesian War.)

Exactly. It's all very exciting. Mine is quite different, you see.

(No, this is right.)

I mean, my translation is quite different here. I read to you my translation.

I said -- my translation says the Peloponnesian War had not yet started. And you say it's only full tide, which is quite right. Then it would be the beginning. Now where is the word "Samian" in your index? You must find "Samos" in the -- Thucydides. You -- one -- one of you had the Thucydides.

(I gave it to you. You still have it.)

And that's the only text on Thucydides we have here?

(The -- the Modern Library Edition --.)

Yes, the Chapter 8 of the First Book has the -- the break between Samos.

"In the sixth year of the truce, war broke out between Samos

and Miletus over the question of { }. Now the Milesians came to Athens and lodged violence -- protest against the Samians. There, { } was supported by various private individuals from Samos itself, who wished to set up there a different form of government. So the Athenians sailed to Samos with 40 ships, and established a democracy there."

But that's -- "When the Athenians heard of this" -- also, the counter-revolution in Samos against the Athenians--"they sailed against the -- Samos with a fleet of 60 ships, under the command of Pericles and nine other commanders. The result was a victory for the Athenians."

Ja, that's -- so in this Chapter 8 of Book I of Thucydides, the Samian War is very briefly given. And then, when we come to the funeral oration, that's just a little later. And it is perfectly possible to reconcile. "First year of the war." This -- it is, you see. In the second book only, of Thucydides, the first year of the war is described. So that the Samian War is not made a part of -- that's our question, you see: Is the Samian War a part of the Peloponnesian War? According to Thucydides, it is not. But according to your translation, it is, "in full tide."

(No, no. "It was beginning to break out in full tide." Yes { }.)

The -- his t- -- well, what does --?

(Yeah, { } is.)

(No, because this translation says, "After this war was over"--referring to the Samian War--"the Peloponnesian War, beginning to break out in full tide --" and so forth.)

There's no doubt that he makes a difference. Chapter 8, I have given you the story shortly of the Samian War. Now it come -- goes on to Chapter 9 of the first book in Thucydides. "It was only a few years later that there took place the -- events already described." So there is a break of several years. And he doesn't make any attempt to attach the Samian War to the -- Peloponnesian War, so it -- I cannot help feeling that the first year of the war, where the funeral oration is placed, cannot include the -- the Samians. But that's very contradictory.

So will you kindly go -- for the nec- -- and come back for the next time with information? You can read up a life of Pluta- -- of Pericles. In the various {source- }. There is -- Cambridge History of Antiquity, and so they -- must settle the question. Because we really are at sea, because the funeral oration only

occurs in the second book of Thucydides, which is quite impossible if it would have anything to do with the Samians. On the other hand, it is true that Plutarch's -- praises the speech of Pericles as though it was given right after the Samian War, outside. It would -- {deal} something for our -- judgment on Thucydides, if for rhetorical reasons, just to get this wonderful piece of eloquence into his canvas, you see, he would have transposed the thing. I think that's -- important, really, for our -- our whole judgment, how much he was an artist, you see, and a Shakespearean writer, just having his canvas, you see, of Anthony and Cleopatra drawn according to aesthetic standards, or whether he was an historian trying to report chronologically the events as they happened. (Is he have -- in the first year { }?)

Wie?

(I would say that would be foolish of him, if he did anything like that.

There would undoubtedly be people living in his time who would be able to detect the error.)

Well, I'm -- I'm completely ignorant of the facts in this matter, you see.

And therefore I have no judgment. But you will admit that before saying anything, we would have just to try to find out. So you -- I charge you to read the life of Pericles by Plutarch once more, and to find if there is another such speech mentioned. Is there a second or- -- funeral oration mentioned, as -- as -- written by Thucydides, perhaps?

(Thucydides says here { } oration mentioned in the first year of the Peloponnesian War?)

Who?

(In the first year of the Peloponnesian War, that's when the --.)

Of course. Of course, there's no { }, you see. Because he says here, look here. Look. "It was only a few years that there took place the events already described" -- you see, later. So this is a break. Then comes the funeral oration in the first year of the war. There's no doubt that for Pericles, the funeral oration was given in the first -- after the first year of the Peloponnesian War. And there is no doubt that in Plutarch, the oration was given at the end of the Samian War. And that's not the same time -- date.

(-- We haven't { } Thucydides, what he said? { } Thucydides made the date as, or when it occurred?)

Well, here, look here. He -- I -- just talked about the Samian War, that Pericles goes there by ship and to -- pulls down the walls, establishes a new government. And the -- Plutarch then says about -- of this that he was supposedly very cruel. And -- however, Plutarch goes on to say that Thucydides is silent about the special cruelty of Pericles, that this has been held against -- against Pericles by -- by dramatists, by Douris. But that one doesn't have to trust a man like Douris, because they exaggerate.

(Yes. I -- I have that in mine, too. But I'm -- I wondered, if Thucydides mentioned the actual time of the oration.)

Now -- yes. Now I have come to this. After the Samian War has ended, and it is reduced--Samos--to obedience, we get in the first book -- and books after all are -- mean something, because they mean breaks in continuity. At the end of the first book then, in Chapter 9, it says as follows:

"It was only a few years later"--after the Samian reduction--"that there took place the events already described here: affair of Corcyra, the affair of Potidaea, and the other occurrences, which served as causes for the war between Athens and Sparta."

So there is no doubt that there are several years between the reduction of Samos and the affairs that led to the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War. That's what Thucydides literally states. And he also says in Book II --.

(I was going -- it's not in -- in this biography of Pericles. "After the -- after this war -- the Peloponnesian War began to break out in full tide," the next paragraph down, he mentioned where Pericles sends ships to Corcyra, and they arrive too late, because the war there was over. So maybe Plutarch is considering the causes as part of the war. He took what Thucydides has said and -- and considers the causes and -- the beginning?)

Oh no, no, no. The -- we are just asking when the funeral speech was made. And Mr. -- our friend Plutarch says, literally -- you -- don't you have the place? You can't get out of this, that he --. "Pericles, however, after the reduction of Samos, returning back to Athens -- Athens, took care that those who died in the war should be honorably buried, and made a funeral harangue, as the custom is, in their commendation at their grave, for which he gained great

admiration."

There is no doubt that these are the people killed in the Samian War.

(This is -- the question is now: this is the funeral oration that is the famous one -- of the later -- the one subsequent to the Corcyran or the Corinthian campaign. This just -- simply says, "...pronounced himself the funeral oration, usual on such occasions." This may just be another funeral oration which isn't the funeral oration, which we were referring to earlier.)

Ja, but -- since Plutarchus says, "...for which he gained great admiration," there is the one -- of course, one speech that made him famous, you see. You aren't -- if you have a customary address every year, the -- all these addresses are not of the same { }. Obviously Thucydides meant to bring to us the great oration of {Thucydides}. And Plutarch says, "The great oration, which -- who gained him this admiration -- "was given in -- after the end of the Samian War." And Thucydides said, "No. It was given in the first war -- year of the war." Peloponnesian. You can't get out of that.

(Well, Plutarch doesn't say that was the great one. He says the { }.)

Well -- well, that's just a question of your translating. You see, that's a adj- -- a participle in Greek. "They -- in their commendation -- he made a funeral harangue, as the custom is, in their commendation at their graves, for which he gained great admiration." "For which he gained great admiration," you see, would be in Greek, you see, "This oration producing great admiration." Therefore, it is the oration for which he is quoted. There's no doubt about it. Ja?

(Well, the reason I came up with that thought is because I read in this paragraph that the -- beginning of Plutarch -- Plutarch's analysis. It says, "Pericles, however, took care not to make his person cheap among the people, and appeared among them only at interval. Nor did he speak on all points that were debated before them, but reserved himself--like the {Salominian} galley, as {Critolaus} says--for greater occasions.")

You are quite right. I -- I know this -- this paragraph very well, because it -- he shows his way of government. But that has nothing to do with -- with his being the annual speaker, and having a -- {rich pay} for more than one of these funeral orations. That's highly improbable. You see, if -- if -- if the -- then Plutarch would say, you see, "It was one of the -- the few orations which gained him great admiration," because he has read Thucydides, always think that he --

the man writes after Thucydides has established his reputation. In the same paragraph, he quotes Thucydides.

So -- all you could do is only to try something about the Peloponnesian War in a later -- part of the -- biography of Plutarch, and tell me if you can find anything there.

Where is the -- this -- on the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War?

(It's --.)

It comes later. That's the -- the pestilence.

("He neither wept nor { }." Is that { }?)

Very tragic, you see.

("He neither wept nor attended any funeral { }.")

Quite. Individual funeral. That means individual, private funeral. And then he breaks down because his son -- because, as so many things, you see. It's quite misleading. Biography in antiquity has nothing to do with -- what is called a "biography" today. And that's the first law. All pagan things -- pre-Christian things--Plato included--are quite different from what the name, the identical name, covers. That's why today a university is not a platonic academy, because we invite controversies, and Plato excludes controversy. That's a very simple example of -- that we cannot -- transpose our Christian tradition, you see, of a university, in which people live in one -- as one heart and soul, although they are quite different in opinion, you see, that we cannot -- must not carry this back into the ancient world.

Because if we -- we are today -- we have used Greek words for everything.

We use "psychology," "politics"--these are all Greek terms. Now you know that we translate, for example, Plato's book, The State, "politeia." That's a great misfortune. And in the last 30 years, the -- the great- -- the best classical scholars have tried to remedy this by showing that of course for Plato, Athens was his church, as well. And since we have the div- -- separation of Church and state, when you read Plato, The State, you instinctively think that this is a book on a secular state. It isn't at all. It's a religious book on the di- -- on the religion of the city. And therefore it shouldn't -- can just as well be -- translate "The Church." It would be wrong, too, because it would be { }. You see, the ancient city was a

church-state, or a state-church, or whatever you call it. But it certainly was not what we call a "state."

And Mr. Werner Jaeger, who is the man in classics at Harvard, has now devoted a whole book to the theology of Plato, you see, in --. Because he says, "But in antiquity, Plato was called The Theologian." That was his great honorary name. Plato "Theologus" was his nickname, you see. And -- in your schools, since you are so completely secularized, you only pick up what you are interested in--the forms of government, or what-not. But in Plato, the many forms--aristocracy, monarchy--are only explicable if the same gods ruled the city, you see, regardless of who governs. In this country, if you would abolish democracy, there would be nothing left, because America has as its only religion, democracy, you see.

Therefore you cannot -- you are -- absolutely static, you are fixed; you are petrified. I mean, you have a rigid system of democracy, because the only tie that -- that ties Americans together is democracy. You see, there's no state religion. But the -- Greeks could very well go from -- from tyrants to democracy, to monarchy, because their religion remained unchanged. They were all in the same church.

So you see, the -- only to give you an example how this little word "state" simply doesn't mean the same in antiquity as it means today--or "politics," you see. "Politics" includes worship of the gods, and -- today it doesn't. When you say, "It's just politics," you mean it is nothing religious, you see. Very typical. When you said in Greek, "This is politics," this {meaned} that you kneeled at the altar and slaughtered your daughter, you see, Iphigenia, as Agamemnon did when he went to Troy. That's politics. You can see the difference.

And so I warn you that "biography" is not biography. And if you -- if we should be able to establish today and the next time why it isn't biography in our sense, you would also be able to -- finally understand that the Gospels never intended to be biographies of Christ, of Jesus. The whole hunt, the whole goose chase for the life of Jesus in the last 150 years is just a hoax. It is now dissolving at the center of theological study. People know by now that -- that Jesus didn't want to have a biography. And that is His great merit, that He knew He couldn't have a biography. That's why He went to the Cross instead. And the life of Jesus doesn't exist. It just doesn't exist, because He tried to get out of His time and not into His time. And a biography is how a man appears in his own time.

And we wouldn't care for Jesus if He had been a contemporary of -- of



Herod. He -- we don't -- you are not interested in Pontius Pilate, or in Herod; forgotten men. And the only reason why we think of Jesus was that He managed to have no biography in the usual sense of the Encyclopaedia Britannica. And so the word "biography" has been so abused in the last 150 years that you have to -- know that as little as politics in Plato has anything to do with politics today, so the word "biographia" in Plutarch -- this has nothing to do with what you mean, when you -- read now the new, wonderful biography of Theodore Roosevelt by Mr. {Putnam}. Has anybody seen this book? You should read it. Very great book. Good book. Wie?

(I -- I didn't hear { }.)

{Putnam. Putnam}. The newest, I mean, just the first volume has appeared. But for a student of history, I think, that you must know what important books come out.

(Is it Samuel {Putnam}?)

I don't know his initials.

So -- when I was a boy, your age, and finished -- the Gymnasium, I was a good student, so I received the book by Friedrich Leo on the style of ancient biography. And this was my bonus. This was my premium at the school, and so I know a little bit about Plutarch. From this day on, I had written myself a biography of an ancient {writer} -- told -- we dedicated this to our school. That was the habit. And for this I -- was very fitting that my class teacher thought that the premium I should receive as a bo- -- as a good student, should be on the -- on biography.

Now Mr. Leo was a professor in Göttingen at that time, and he has a very neat {proof}. I wanted to bring the book to class. But unfortunately it is not in the library. That's why I was very angry when I came here, about this library, you see. He made this point that the ancients are completely geometrical, space-thinkers. All pagans are, you see. They try to arrange things in space, just as geometers today, I mean. Mr. Einstein says that time is the fourth dimension of space, you see. That means that time, you see, is subdued to space. First is space, and then we put time into it, so to speak. And that's of course against your and my living experience of life. And since they think in these terms, they first have the man; and then they have a list of qualities, which they distribute. One, birth; second, nobility; third, wealth; fourth, virtue; fifth, you see, acts; si- -- seventh,

pronouncement. And therefore, since this is classified by one, two, three, four, that's not a biography in your and my sense of the word. Your biography begins with what?

{{ }.)

With birth, you see. And it doesn't in -- in Plutarch. It's not the important thing that a man has a process, you see, through which he grows and changes. The -- what -- what the man wants to show through -- the ancients want to show the constancy of a man's character. They characterize him. A good biography in our sense of the word tries to show the transformation the man goes through, you see. And the constancy is the problem of ancient biography, and for us the change. We are interested in the -- in the change that comes over Lincoln when he becomes president, or in the -- Douglas, you see, just -- famous -- how do you call it?

(Debates.)

Wie?

(Debates.)

Debate. That he wasn't before, and now -- what he -- was -- after, you see. In this, the ancients simply didn't believe, because they had not conversion, metanoia, growth, transformation. All these terms which you now take for granted, like "evolution," you see, are quite foreign to an ancient mind. They are all of Christian origin. Mr. Darwin is unthinkable unless he's a Christian. He has inherited from Christianity the idea that interesting in you and me is our change: of heart, of mind, of appearance, of opinion, you see. That's the important thing in life in -- for you and me, you see. For an ancient, the important thing in life is what he is always, what he is -- you see, as rich he was created. The constancy, not the transformation, not the education -- of Henry Adams, or s- -- any such things. These are all Christian themes. They are quite unknown in antiquity. And they are hated. And a Greek would tremble and -- if you told him this; this was for a slave. He could -- have to transfer his loyalties from one city to another. That's why an ancient man, when he couldn't be a -- a member of his city, he committed suicide, like Themistocles. And when a man -- a man in a -- Europe didn't know how to live any longer, he came to America. That is, we are allowed to live into another loyalty; and in antiquity, you couldn't.

[tape interruption]

...and -- he was as schizophrenic as only I think educated people in this country can be. And when he founded these -- departments of biography, he tried to forget that he had been a Christian minister--and a very good one, by the way, a very good preacher. And he took Plutarch as his model, for his department of biography. And to this day, they are giving courses, as you know, in Dartmouth, on 12 famous men, you see, or 12 -- eight famous men in one course, and jumble them -- I mean, jumble them around. And since he wanted to keep in watertight compartments Plutarch and the Gospels, he wrote down, exactly in the Plutarchean sense for every of his heroes, these characters--as I told you--birth, genealogy, temperament, behavior towards women--he was a -- very much haunted by sex, this gentleman, and he was a widower; and he forbade himself to marry again, so all his -- all {his} thinking was about -- on sex, so it interested him terribly whether these people behaved, you see, or married a second time, or so, or { }. His best sentence, very anti- -- ancient, very pagan, you see, as though you could say of anything -- man, you see, what's his best utterance. All these classifications are childish, because this means that you can know what a man says outside the temporal, the -- the moment, you see. But the hour decides on the value. There are many hours and you can then many -- make the best utterances, if you have presence of mind. And they are just incomparable.

And you can never say of -- of Lincoln that the Second Inaugural is better than the Gettysburg Address, you see. They both fit the occasion. That's all you can say of a human word.

And all these -- whenever you have this terrible idea of "better," you see, you know that you have a pagan. If you write -- receive a letter, it says -- the man says that you are one his best friends, tear it up, send it back, and say, "So I'm not your friend, am I?" All these qualifications, you see, "one of your best friends," is Greek. Perfectly valueless, because -- you have lost -- the -- impotent, because you are classified. "One of my best friends" means that I am nobody, you see, for whom you express your -- your real, personal relationship, you see, which always would be Christian. I mean, the -- the Lord could not say to John, "I like you better than Peter," you see. -- They are Apostles. There the story ends. And then there -- are individual relations which are absolutely untransferrable, you see.

This is one of the most offensive utterances I always receive in America -- where the -- just this pagan influence of the liberal arts college has, I think,

allowed even women to s- -- to write such { } as "You are one of my best friends," or "It's one of the nicest things I have ever seen in -- in my life," you see, or "I have experienced in my life." That's quite -- as you know, it's just style. I mean, everybody writes these letters. I don't think that a -- that a simple person, a folksy person would -- would say such a thing. It's -- it's not -- it's hypocritical. Just hypocritical. Commits you to absolutely nothing, you see. You do not coin your phrase for the occasion. It's a ready-made phrase; you cannot be caught. You haven't said it's the best, you see; but you haven't said it's the worst, you see. You've just said, "One of the best." Absolutely noncommittal. It's a classification. And personal relations die -- are dying from classification. If you hear that somebody says, "He's one of my best friends," mistrust the man. Then you are just an acquaintance. Ja?

(Would Heraclitus be an exception to this?)

Ja. The one -- one -- that's -- I've a whole -- written a whole book on this, for this reason, on Heraclitus. Heraclitus has the great word, you see. Whenever you meet Plato, you have this classification. "The divine." Many things can be divine. This is divine, this is divine. Then there's no God. And Heraclitus was so angry with -- on -- with this whole dilution of "one of my best gods," that he said, "I will never say 'the divine.' But I will say 'Zeus.'" That's one of his -- of his -- I mean, phrases which has come -- haven't come to us -- frag- -- one of the fragments. I think it's a very great saying, you see. He wanted to have the unique name, you see. Zeus is "Zeus," and he's not -- "one of my best gods." And you see how funny that is, as soon as you transfer it to "one of my best gods." For a set of china, of course, where 12 cups -- teacups are all the same, you see, you can say, "This is one of the 12 teacups of my best service." But then this is the best china, as a whole. And of course the members of this set, they are all the -- the same.

But whenever you classify, you are Greek; and whenever you name, you are Jewish or -- or Christian. And you cannot get out of this. We are all Greeks and Jews at the same time. And if you could only learn that Christianity is the -- is the -- is the holding onto this fact, that whenever we have to -- classify, we are deadening a relation. You see, this is a table, because this table is dead. And for my satisfaction, when I go home, you are "one of my students." But you will admit that then I have not yet known you. You -- just beginning to come to life, you see. That's a preparation of a relation that is so definite that I know who you are. And -- as long as you are just "one of my students," you are in the -- in the antechamber of human relations, you see, and it doesn't say much. And it's

noncommittal, I mean, and you pass out again of the picture, you see, when the term is over.

But yesterday, I suddenly was stopped on campus by a car. Out jumps a man, and he says, "Min- -- Mintz."

And Margrit sa- -- says to me, "Who is this man?"

And I said, "Oh, that's Mr. Mintz. He graduated in 1937. He helped me to get my friend Riel out of Germany by his affidavit."

Well, he beamed all over the face. You see, he hadn't expected me to know after 22 years--we hadn't seen each other for 22 years--his one action by which we became personal friends. I had asked him for -- his father, you see, wrote the affidavit for this friend of mine who was persecuted by the Nazis. And for his father--was a great thing. It was an Orthodox Jew, and he had -- was asked to do this for a Gentile. And he said -- that much at that time, that he had never done such a thing before, and it was pretty much a shame that he should suddenly -- he hadn't cared for the Gentiles. But he did.

And so I only -- want to say: this man Mintz, you see, when I quoted him for the one immortal deed, you see, by which he has stuck in my mind, beamed, of course, radiant, you see, because I did not classify him as "one of my students." I did not introduce him to my -- my wife as, "Oh, that's one of my students at Dartmouth." But I said, "That's the man who rescued our friend Riel, you see, in Germany." So -- we -- we were real friends at that moment. And I hadn't seen the man for 22 years. And I -- I was surprised that he had recognized me, and I was very proud that I recognized him! Because he certainly had changed. He's a professor here now at -- at -- at the university.

Only to show you what it means to personi- -- personalize, you see. If I had only said, "He -- oh, he must be a student of mine," you see, it would have been a let-down. You understand?

But I warn you against this -- this -- this is -- epidemics in this country, now. "It's one of the finest books I've ever read." Throw it in the wastepaper basket, if it's only one the finest books. It has to be the book that you had to read at that moment. Then it's a good book. It just came when I needed this book. That's a description, perhaps, I mean, it's only a formal description. But it -- it at least gives the -- the book the character, you see, of -- of hitting you at the time when you were ready to be hit by this book, and by no -- none other. And you --

most of you live, of course, in this -- in this sepulcher described by Plato, you see, the cave. That's it, you see. The cave is the world of classes, and definitions, and concepts. And when I read a man describing -- saying that the word -- word pictures, that's not a -- you see, "word pictures," the man is not -- has no speech. If he can -- word pictures are of -- you see, all general concepts. The uniqueness of a poem cannot be -- ever be called a "word picture," because a word picture consists then of a number of words set together, but a -- an impression gained by you, made on by you--or anything living--on me, you see, creates a new speech. All these words get in -- take on new meanings by my -- trying to articulate an impression that is unique. That's what a poem is. Not the word picture putting together green, and red, and blue, you see, but from a new light, creating a new rainbow -- a new rainbow. Out of the whole, you see, the parts--I explained--are not out of the parts, the whole is composed. And you all try to compose your human relations out of these generalities, "one of my best friends," "one of the nicest persons I ever met." Mistrust yourself. It's impotent. You cannot make love that way. You can't tell your -- your girl that she's one of the nicest girls you have ever slept with. As soon as you classify, she will -- I hope, she'll say, "Thank you." I hope I'm right, ladies. Wie? I mean, if a girl is not unique, then -- well. You see, the -- my Dartmouth boys, they are all athletes; and they have no brain, and they have no -- and they have no speech. But at least they have one sentence by which they admit that they should have speech. And -- you know the phrase, too. They say, "You are so unusual," you see. Now "unusual" is the minimum, you see, of personal speech, because classifying speech is usual. And so, as -- when you begin, that's the basic, there's a threshold of events, between persons that you say, "This is unusual," because at that poi- -- moment, you begin to speak to a person. You should always speak in an unusual fashion to any hu- -- living being, you see, because it's the first and only time that you and she meets, or --. That's a new situation. So the word "unusual" in -- Dartmouth is the saving grace, you see. -- These athletes don't say much, but at least they say sighingly, "You are so unusual." And -- these poor girls, of course, have to put up with this scarcity of spiritual means. You should ask {for more}. So will you kindly now go to the library. We -- we meet again at quarter { }.

[tape interruption]

...nobody will throw any dirt there, you see.

Now, that's a purely physical reaction, you see. You don't -- people won't throw things, like dogs, into a radiantly white corner. So this man is not treating his -- his labor force as people, but he's treating them as dogs. Which is all right, because as far as we are in this -- in this physical, you see, atmosphere, I think we should be treated behavioristically as people who can be influenced by light, by shade, and so on. There's no harm done. And so in a -- in an -- in a -- employment office, people are handed around as -- more or less as things. I mean, because one knows their characteristics, that they can be classified. You have classified ads, which is the same thing, of course. And part of us, you and I -- as far as we are finally to be laid -- into the coffin, we are things. We are physical entities. We weigh 155 pounds, and we are 5 feet 5 high, and so on and so forth. And therefore, all these -- newspaper reports on you and me, you see--blue eyes and green hair--they are -- they are that part of our anatomy which can be classified. And there is a lot of us -- in us of course which is classified.

Now comes, however, "when we see eye to eye," as we say. I must name you. I must give you a name. I must say, "Mister," and other -- or I must say, "John," and tap you on the shoulder. That is, equals. See -- must see eye to eye. That's not trying to handle you, not trying to manage you. But we grow into each other by seeing eye to eye. We form a -- a dual or a trilog. You see, "where two or three are gathered in His name," there -- he is amidst it, there is a common spirit, here in this classroom. I must see -- look at you. I must not only treat you, you will understand, you see. But I must entreat you. And I can only entreat you to do something by looking at you and by making our eyes correspond. And that's a new layer of language, be- -- as soon as we speak man to man, I treat you as my equal. I treat you as alive, you see, and that's why they put the names in the -- behind the -- behind the--how do you call it, the -- in the banking, the Post Office, behind the --? and say, "Mr. Smith, clerk," you see, so that you treat him as a person, and are not tempted to treat him as an automat. You understand.

So this whole language -- there's a whole language which our dictionaries omit; it's a language of proper names. And it is degraded today, because people at this -- in this country, as you know, only feel at ease -- when they can call a 70-year-old lady "Sweetheart," tap her on the shoulder--or "Girl." And this seeing eye to eye is with us such a natural that it has a -- no degrees. But I think if you -- if you -- it's a problem when -- when living eye to eye is to see degrees of authority, and of dignity, and to call your mother "Mother," and not just "Sweetheart." -- In my own family, there -- was a tremendous rift -- my -- when my sisters decided to call their parents with their first names. And I decided that they

were -- had to remain my father and mother, and I have never called my father and mother till my dying -- their dying day with anything else but with the -- their title. And I would have felt falling from grace if I just suddenly began to call them by their first name. And I think you are -- you have an under-developed speech here already when -- between people, because you have to call everybody "Johnny," and "Helen," and -- and "Billy." And that's a very one-sided -- it's a -- it's a nursery, speech. And you never grow up in your relations to -- other human beings, because it only begins to be difficult when you speak to the prime minister or the president of the United States, and tell him the truth. Although you call him "The Pres-" -- "Mr. President," you see.

I -- always have the hunch that in a -- an American feels that anybody who tells -- whom he calls "Mr." he can lie to. He is only cordial with a man whom he calls by his first name, you see. Then he is at ease. And then the man has, so to speak, the moral requirement of a -- of a partner. But as soon as a man is -- is a foreigner, he cannot make any demands on your morality.

This is very strange, but you -- once you estab- -- I mean, you behave differently, and with regard to your frankness to people whom you call by your first name, and -- those who -- do you not call by a first name. And in society, of course, the greatest achievement would be, you see, if you would tell the pope the truth, in an audience. That's not so simple. { } somebody like him, you see. (But at the same time, you don't call him by his first name.)

That's what I mean, because it is much more diff- -- don't you understand what I'm trying --? I'm just saying this. It's no merit if you can tell -- tall -- tell the truth to Johnny. But it is highly difficult to tell the truth to somebody whom you call, you see, "Mr. Archbishop," or "Your Grace," you see, or "Your Highness." Then you begin to lie. Because you feel -- you see, you do not see eye to eye. I only want to bring out then that there is a tremendous wealth of speech, you see. Take the -- hospital. I have seen people--or the dentist chair, I mean--the authority of the dentist, I mean, or of the doctor is very often such that the people take lying down all their prescriptions, never daring to say, "But that's not for me," you see. "You -- you mistake me. I mean, I cannot stand this operation." I have seen a friend who knew that he couldn't be chloroformed, that he couldn't be anes- -- you see, was too old for this. And he didn't dare to say anything. The doctors decided -- had to be operated upon, you see; and of course, he went -- he lost his mind by this anesthet- -- by the anesthesia operation, you see.



It wasn't for him to undergo such a treatment. And -- it took him months and months to recover, because he just had not dared to say anything to these great professors, you see.

So I feel that people who -- who do tell the truth to Johnny and Billy will hesitate to tell the truth to Professor Such-and-Such, and Doctor Such-and-Such. I wonder if Mr. Eisenhower tells the truth to Dr. {White}. The great man who saved his life, you know, the heart specialist. It's very difficult. You do -- watch your step, I mean. Ask yourself to whom you tell the truth, what you really think. And -- and blush, because all your examination papers are pious lies. As far -- I can determine, I mean. This country, it is not {reckoned} disgraceful to make confession of -- of opinions in your examination paper, which you only write because you think I want {that} to hear -- or to read. And that didn't exist in any other country. It can only come from your moral weakness that I -- you do not owe me the truth.

(-- How do you know that that's the case?)

I have found out, I mean.

(How?)

Not with you, personally, but I have found out with students, that they will tell me that they'll write down anything they think the man wants to read. And they'll think that is not personal. They are not attached to what they're writing. They're -- that's an examination paper. "I -- write exactly what this man hopes to read."

So there is no -- your relation between professor and student in this country are completely corrupt, because you don't owe your professor the truth. And you don't think you do, because of this stupid examination pa- -- this -- that's why the examinations have to be destroyed in this country, because they are making for hypocrisy. You are all mendacious, Sir.

(Don't you know such people?)

(Well, sure, I do. I -- I said, no, not in this case. I think I can write anything.

I think it depends on the professor.)

How do you know? That's a -- poor professor. He's { }.

(Well, as far as I know, you do not think I -- I -- I could write almost anything. But --.)

It is a scandal, you see. The -- when teaching is demoralized, when the devil has entered the relation between student and teacher, then there is nothing to be hoped for in a community. And this is rampant in this country. And nobody mentions it, even.

(In many ways, don't you think it's the professors who are destroyed by this system as well, I mean? They --.)

Of course they are.

(It -- it encourages them to hear themselves --.)

Repeated. -- Well, then there is a third thing, you see. -- When you and I { } --.

(No, I wanted to ask a question. Where do -- where could you -- I -- where -- show me a teacher that you could express your opinions, and he'll grade you on your opinion and not parroting back what he has given you?)

Oh, I know three in this college alone. And I know very few -- I mean. I know perhaps a dozen men. Of the others, I wouldn't even say "yes" or "no." I mean, I don't know how they work. But I know of three for certain that they would be delighted to "A" you just for a contradiction.

(Well, I -- I'll give you an example. I have a course right now. The first test, I put my opinion down. I got a D. The second test, I gave what the teacher said; I got a B.)

Well, what's the third paper, you see?

(Well, we have the final coming up. What are you going to do? You -- have to graduate.)

Pardon me. The D may just be as well deserved by -- when you just contradict without giving any material, and any -- knowing nothing, I mean. Just spitting out an opinion of course is not a paper. So I -- I will not follow your suggestion right away, because I don't know what the paper -- it can be D, just the same, although you did contradict the man. It's not meritorious just to contradict.

(Well, I read a -- I read a book on the subject by a man that he disagrees with. And I followed the other man's argument. And I thought the other man's argument was good, because he is always contradicting the man in class, and so that interested me to read the other man's argument. And I liked the other man's argument.)

Well, did you know at least his own argument?

(Well, I thought I did. I --.)

Well, did you -- did he, I mean -- I think that any teacher, when you weigh argument, and -- and show that you know both sides of the case, will -- will not ever -- ever penalize you for not taking his side.

(Well.)

But of course -- { } the other argument, he says, "Well, you are ignorant of my own. That's -- and I have taught you, after all, so please, you didn't come to class."

(Yeah, I think everyone is responsible at least to show the professor that he understands what's being dispensed { }.)

I mean, that's the minimum. So I -- I cannot -- you see, your -- what you bring up is inconclusive, because I haven't seen your paper -- how much it did -- comprehended the -- the -- the teacher's view.

He has a perfect right to -- to -- to ask that you first state what is to be said on his side. We are all --.

(Well, in the -- in an hour, in answering two questions, you don't have time to express his viewpoint, when he asks you a question. You just don't have the time. I mean, you can't --.)

{ } {amphetamines?} Just take {amphetamines}.

(Well, it sounds easy when you're sitting there, and --.)

Well, I -- I have -- I allow -- I have my -- I've always allowed my students to bring all their notes to class -- books to class. I have never cared, I mean,

because I have wanted them to show judgment. And I'm afraid, { }, there is plenty of time. I mean, I don't believe you that two hour -- two questions cannot be answered in an hour to satisfaction. I don't know your questions, of course. But in general, I feel that our examinations would be liberal in time -- in the time span given. And if the student really would -- would know { }. But since he is only out -- "What do I have to say in order to satisfy him?" he never enjoys the exam. I try to make my exams -- you may recall this, I mean, an occasion in which -- that you { }.

({ }.)

What?

(That's true. I can vouch -- I found suffering, a great deal of suffering in the first -- first, I think, one or two exams. But then it became more enjoyable. But I find that the better I know the subject, the less time it takes to -- to answer it than --. If you know it well, then you { } -- you { } compress. Say -- you can say it in very few words, and then go on, spend the -- enjoy the rest of paper and -- in -- po- -- posing alternatives, or -- elaborating some thoughts you've had yourself.)

You see, the -- the thing is so dangerous, today, the { } of the campus; and { } look so very innocent. And this inner break between the loyalty to the teacher and the loyalty to the truth is -- is -- is not an issue. That's why I feel this -- you -- must become aware that we always speak on three levels. We speak of things; then the -- we classify. And as far as the world goes by, you have to classify. You say, "A thousand cars just went by." You don't care who is in this car, you see. It's a thousand car. These are motor- -- motorists. And in this sense, you -- you treat them at this moment what we call "world." This is a speech -- the man of the world will always say, "He's one of my best friends." That's noncommittal, you see. Then you find out he has no best friends. I mean, he has no friends. He is just a man of the world.

As soon as you begin to -- to define and use definitions, you deal with the world, the outside world. You are here, and objectively -- you objectify. You can also -- whether you say "objectify" or "classify," that doesn't make any difference. Now I want to bring -- wake you up to the fact that you do something when you speak, that you decide that this is the part of your out- -- the outer world, and you have the right to speak of me as a short fellow, you see. I'm short. That's my physical quality. Therefore, you qualify me, there -- I mean, you classi-

fy me under the -- the small people, and not the tall ones. That's all right. I mean, I have no objection to this. But it is -- it is -- it makes me a part of the outer world of appearances, of phenomena. And as long as you -- you think you have -- you have -- this is all, you are in world, a child of the world. Then you are a child of socie- -- member of society. And here we identify. As soon as we see eye to eye--you find me in mourning, or you find me sick--you must express what we call "sympathy." Now "sympathy" means to -- to be a colleague, to be a comrade, to be on the same level--companionship, partnership--whatever you have, you see, the group. That is, identify. That is, you and I stand on the same level, and here we are in society, of men. And here we are in the world of things. And here, you see, we are in the world of authority, of the gods. So we meet here in the name of history. You cannot help that the -- admitting that the only point of conduct we have at first is that you want to study history. So you take 198, section 3. And therefore, in the -- we meet -- the basis of our agreement is that there is above our crown of our heads an admission that history has the power to draw us together. And therefore this is not a story of our -- identifica- tion, but of command, of authority. This authority may be science, or in the physical field, it is -- sports, and your -- your coach has authority to tell you how to play the game. And sports is the god, or the -- the -- the little Newman, the little authority at this moment. While you are on the -- out there, across the street, you are -- sport is an authority, or is the authority to which the coach refers when he gives orders. And you are very glad to comply, because there is complete agreement that for this moment you are trying to train your muscles. And since there is agreement of what should be done, I call this a "command," which you do not like. But all real importance in serious life is -- is {led} under commands. You have to do it. And you are hateful of commands and of authority. The overthrow of authority is the constant attempt of American public life to show that you have no authority. It's a child's game. You are always under authority. Then independence is your god, or self-reliance is your god. In the name of self-reliance, you are ruled. So -- nobody can open his mouth without de- -- without deciding this -- this three-partition, this three-pronged fork. You open your mouth at this moment, you say something to me. It can be done on a personal level, of sympathy with my toothache. I look pale, you say, "You don't feel well." It's -- you can do this, because we are just human beings then. You -- can meet in the name of Plutarch and -- and history. And any sentence you say is then dictated by the respect for the field for the -- activity which we both at this moment are asked to per- -- pursue. You see, that's a command: history--that directs our -- our activity here. That's why I could send this gentleman to the library; and he did go, you

see. And he didn't feel that I was abusing my authority, because he admitted that he wanted to study history. And a student of history must find the sources. And so he went.

And -- so we have three -- at any moment, you have to decide when you meet a person: do you meet under a higher authority? Soldiers in an army. Citizens of a state. A -- students of a science. Sportsmen for a game. And then there will be a tacit agreement that at this moment, this spirit should -- this authority, this god--I have called it "god"; the Greeks called it "god"--will direct you -- us, and will keep us together, and will select what we have to say to each other. In a good game of Whist, you see, the -- the god of the game, the spirit of the game directs us what to say. At bridge, you mustn't talk nonsense; otherwise you hurt the game, you see. You have to be silent, when the cards are distributed; you cannot -- talk politics. That's excluded. You see, peo- -- bridge players have nothing at that moment but the bridge. Or at chess, you mustn't talk at all. The game is simply -- cannot be played, in chess, if people begin to talk. You know how strict it is when people are allowed to look at a game -- in ch- -- of chess. The third man who looks on is not allowed to say a word. He cannot even cough, and -- and -- and -- express his -- his displeasure or his excitement, I mean. Why? Because he knows what he -- is expected he -- of him, you see, is to attend to this game. And the god of the game is in authority.

Now if you only would see that at every moment you decide which part of the environment -- of the reality here, you can treat as things, which part of the reality you can treat as companions and partners, and which part of the reality in which you stand is demanding your -- your opinions, your loyalty, your--you see, your -- your selective -- selection--you would know that to speak means to divide the reality into gods, men, and world. You can treat your dog as a -- your so- -- as your society, and -- talk to him. And many people do, the -- much better with cats and -- and dogs, as you know. All the old spinsters do this. And their dog is their brother, and a sister, and sweetheart and what-not. -- So we are completely able, or -- the -- the art collectors, they can deal with a piece of -- of canvas in this admir- -- admiring way. That it is much more than a thing, you see. It's revelation, they say. And they personify it, this piece of art.

And -- in every moment you open your mouth--you must know this, because it's -- has been completely forgotten--before you say, "Oh, this is black here," you make the decision that you want to describe this as a thing. You have

made a decision that you have the right --. If you meet a new person, and she looks very black, you cannot say, "But you look black," you see. Then she would feel insulted, because she want -- you wants -- you -- she'll -- expects you to see eye to eye to her, and to speak about something in common. And once you begin to tell her, "But you look black," she feels that this is an insult, because you are tre- -- she is treated as a piece of the world, and then you have no right to talk to her.

So it's very simple. Any -- anybody or anything you treat as belonging to the world, you have the right to speak of them. In this, here, you have to -- be -- you are allowed to speak to them. Speech of the -- of the -- we speak of things as though they were absent. And we speak to people.

And now the third thing, which is completely denied in this country, even by the ministers, is: we speak out of our gods. They dictate. Any -- what we call "divine," or "God is the power that makes you and I -- me speak," and to select the words that are fitting the occasion. So if you would see that all speech is dictated, you see, out of some decision you have made--"Now we are s- -- we are good sports," "Now we are students of history," "Now we are in the Church," "Now we are in politics"--you would know that all the time we are moving under an authority. All the time. We -- you say, "We are at home now," and you put on your slippers. And you get out of, so to speak, of the formality of the -- of the behavior on the street. You change the authority which dictates your -- your speech, your utterance, your expressions.

This is completely lost. You -- we speak always under an authority. We always try to speak to other people. You write letters to our friends. That's why people need friends. We have to speak to people who whom we can identify ourselves. And we always have to speak of things. We -- you cannot speak of God. That's already an impiety. And you cannot speak of living people in their absence differently than you talk to them to their face. That's gossip and slander, you see. You can say anything of a person after you have told them sa- -- person the same thing to her face. That's the condition, you see, of transforming gossip into -- into con- -- human conversation. There's no s- -- harm done if you say -- a person to her face, "You are a niggard," or "miser," or -- you see, or "wicked." Then you can say also to the neighbor, "She's really wicked." But you can't say it before. If you say to the -- your neighbor: the third person is wicked--you see; if you never tell the person who is wicked to her face, you begin to go schizophrenic. You -- you split. You -- you are -- your { }

So, better to say to nobody about a third person, you see, something, un-

-- unless you are -- have the courage -- the moral courage also to tell the person to her face. And as you know, our whole society is constantly disintegrating, because you -- we all take the liberty of telling other people what we think of somebody, you see, and never telling them.

And -- it's the hardest thing to tell the truth to a colleague, I mean. I can assure you. It's very difficult.

I -- I was so put out by the -- the -- the corruption of our schools, that I left the -- schools three times in my life -- four times. I { } -- just in order to get up my -- screw up my courage to tell them what I thought of them; I had to get out of this. Now I feel I -- I have the right to say it inside, too, because I said it loud enough.

So will you kindly observe this -- this strange triplicity of -- of all human utterance? When you s- -- you -- we all the time make the decision: what we think should belong to our living group; what should belong to the world of mere world, what we call "world"; and what should be our -- our -- well, I don't even dare to use the word "gods," but our commanding, directing forces, the forces under which we make this decision now to -- to divide this world of ours into dead things and living beings. Here is dead -- the dead things, you see. Here are the living, and that's the -- the gods are the power who decide between life and death.

You see, in the name of spor- -- take -- the best educator -- education, as you know, in this ca- -- on such a campus as of today is the -- is in the athletic field. There the teachers -- the coaches have the right to make you go through real sacrifices. They can -- they can really rough-handle you, and we can't. And so there is discipline. And -- why? Because they can tell you that all your superfluous fat has to go, you see, that this is dead matter. In order to come out right, I mean, you have just to do -- keep a diet, and sleep enough, you see, and do not drink before the next match, and so on. So you -- the coach is em- -- empowered to remind you what is your life of the future, and what is the dead weight which has to go, and has to be left behind.

And so any divine power, any inspiration, what we call -- makes this decision between what is life and what is death. What is dead, and it should be left behind; and what is life and could -- should be carried into the future. And as I said, in a -- you can study this best in a -- in a football coach, and what he is allowed at this campus to do with his football men, I mean. He just is allowed to -- to -- to completely -- transform them into different beings. Isn't that right? And



that explains the -- the admiration in which this guy was held, you see, this shoddy creature. Here, the las- -- the last one you had here.

-- As long as you do not know this mystery of the tri- -- of the crown of your head, which is under authority --. Wherever you enter a room, you by and large know whether you are here to a cocktail party, whether you are to enter a classroom, whether this is an examination, whether this an election booth, whether this is a courtroom, you -- this is a hospital, and you behave accordingly. That is, you say the things that belong in this -- you see. And the power to know where are you -- where you are, that's our divine -- the divine order of thi- -- of -- of our lives. And it always comes to this that part of the -- of the world is -- our -- are we ourselves, written large. America is -- you identify yourself with America's history, I hope. I mean -- to that extent that her miseries are your miseries, and her illnesses are your illnesses, and her victories are your victories, and the -- her defeats are your defeats.

Wherever you do this, where you really share the -- the sentiment and the -- the unhappiness and the happiness, you see, you see eye to eye. And where you try to manipulate -- "manipulate" comes from the word "main" -- "manus" in Latin. It means "manage" -- the same thing, you see. It comes from "handling." And only things can be handled. And as far as you try to handle men, you try to get out of them their thing-character, their character of being material parts of the world, you see, who follow certain strains of gravity, and laziness, and -- and -- and zest, and ambition, and competition; and you can handle them. Because they just respond to your little stimuli, and just -- what they try now -- in our psy- -- psychology experiments. That they try -- how fast the retina of your eye reacts, or Mr. Pavlov -- you see, sees that the spittle is gathering in your -- in your mouth when you -- when you are told that the sausage is near. And in this sense, we are things, because you can -- we are predictable.

Everything, you see, in this world of things is pre- -- is -- we -- try to make predictable. When we shoot a -- a -- shoot a satellite to the moon, it is a great victory. -- We can predict that he will reach the moon in so many seconds. Then we have managed the satellite, have we not, you see? We have handled it right. And it is a triumph of co-operation to do this, as you know, when you have five parts of such a satellite to be shot into space. Everything is full of admiration, because these things have been manipulated right. We have talked of them, in their absence, and -- to -- described them, you see, to perfection.

So everything here is predictable, which means -- when somebody- -- -thing is predictable, that you do not have to talk to the thing. Because we pre-

dict what the thing is doing. The thing is dead, and we have the life of the thing in us. We know more about its -- future behavior than the dead thing itself. So the man whom you call "predictable" is dead, for all practical purposes. As far as politicians handle us as predictable, you see, they are -- we are treated as raw material.

-- I have heard the nice story about the American stamps, you see. Jefferson was on the 3-cent stamp, so they wanted to {uppen} the -- the Democratic Party wanted to have the 4-cent stamp, for mail. So half a year before they brought this before Congress, they put Jefferson on the 4-cent stamp. Nothing said. So when then the new law went through -- the Democratic president, Jefferson, was on the -- every letter stamp, you see. Very good politics. And then -- a friend of mine wrote to them and said, "Was this done on purpose?" And they said, of course "Pure accident -- purely accidental." They had managed this, you see. If they had changed the picture of the president at the same time as they -- {uppened} the -- fare, there would have been an explosion, you see. So they -- they treated us, you see, as we deserve it, too, as -- as children. (But observe. The new 1-cent stamp has Lincoln, and you have to put the 1-cent stamp with all the old 3-cent letters to make the 4.)

Well, now he's on the 4-cent stamp. The Republicans change it again. Oh, that's very clever change. And if we say, "Just politics," we mean just this, that we are manipulated. Isn't that right?

So I -- now Mr. Plutarch and -- all the pagans do not have this tripartition of speaking. They knew nothing about it. The ideal of the Greeks was to have the divine reason of men; and all rationalists today have the same --. "My reason is God, and the re- -- the world is the world." And "You, too, are just treated as an object of my understanding," you see. They don't know of identification, and they don't know -- but they are in authority of their -- on the -- as scientists, as rationalists. Their reason is God, and all the rest is manageable. That's called "ob- -- in this country "objectivity."

But you ought to know that "world," "God," and "man" are already in existence in your own consciousness, in your -- the working of your spirit before you open your mouth, because you choose at every moment what to call "God" -- whom to call "God"; whom to call "partner," and "comrade"; and whom -- what to call "thing." And every moment you -- world and -- and God, and man are methods of approaching or dividing reality. They are not things, as you naïvely

-- God is not a thing. But God is a direction, the direction into you. What is it?

(The rearrangement?)

(Catching up.)

Ah-ha. Now come back to your -- to your book.

(Well, { } by { }.)

It's wonderful to have all this big volume. There is a second copy in the college library, I think, of this, because they have a whole collection of Loeb. You see, this is -- very nice biologist, Loeb, created this endowed fund -- endowment, you see, and -- for all -- for having this book collection. And -- what would be a way of -- you see, if I take this here to the secretariat --.

(We just got it for the day, because I told them I could bring it back today { }.)

Pardon me? You put it on reserve, you mean?

(No. We got it -- we took it out on our reg -- on our reg card, on the promise that we would return that today. But you can probably get it through the department, by just -- calling them up. Because it's "restricted use," it says.)

Where did you find it? In the college library?

(In the regular stacks.)

Well, I -- I want -- would like to put it at your disposal, in the most practical manner. And I think it is too late to have copies made of -- all the -- would only be possible of a few pages. I mean, it's too expensive. So you can read this -- and shall I put it on reserve, downstairs? It is -- there is no --. And I'll put it under 198, under my name. So you all can find it. And I advise you really -- you have, after all, fully three weeks -- a little more. So -- that at least you get an impression of what these people are saying. What?

[miscellaneous overlapping student comments]

Well -- do I have to know your name in order to make them find out about it? I suppose, because that hasn't been --.

(Otherwise they'll start charging him { }.)

(Well, I could take it back { }.)

We go together, perhaps. Do you have a moment's time? { } or are in a hurry. { } could go now. Wie? That's what I mean. We go right after class, together. Thank you very much.

Now, my ta- -- my -- this is for the paper. But the -- the second thing is -- oh yes, another. Who has { } -- learned Latin? You have?

(I had Latin three years ago. But { }.)

You don't wish to make any use of it? Of Latin?

(Oh no, I'll try and { }.)

What?

(I'll try speaking { }.)

Rationalist.

Now, would you try to find in -- between Fabius and -- and Pericles, and--this is your work for the next week, the assignment--the -- the -- the parallels in the -- in the form of the biography? I told you that this 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, -- 5, 6, was dictating Plutarch's ethical approach to biography, that the man was classified, I mean, as to his behavior and --. Ja?

(Unfortunately Fabius is not in this paperback volume which everyone has. Are there enough copies of the other?)

{ } of these editions. I mean, a man writes parallel lives, you cannot cut out the -- the one bias or the other. Is it really true?

(Yes. It's not in there. It's not in the Harvard Classics, either, he says.)

(No, it certainly isn't.)

Well -- { } what?

(It's in the Great Book.)

It is?

(Yeah. { }.)

(It's not even in the Harvard Classics.)

Now, why don't you read then Caesar in comparison. After all, that's very interesting and -- and -- in itself. And it also has -- poses exactly the same problem, the -- the division of --.

(Caesar -- Caesar isn't here, either, in this paperback version.)

(Could we take one of these --?)

(Yes, it is.)

As a model, you mean. Well, Alexander's too rich, you see; it's not so simple. Why don't you take Solon? Solon. Well, take one second. Alexander -- is too diffuse, I mean, the world conqueror, you see -- there are too many facts that obscure the -- just too many things to report that this -- this order of simple qualities -- disappears, I mean it's such an ocean of -- of facts to be reported. Hence I feel this is a little too difficult. But Solon and Caesar will do.

There's another thing about Plutarch which I -- like to mention. Plutarch read -- writes under the good emperors. But he begins already to read -- write under Nero and these be- -- and Domitian, the -- the wicked ones. So he does not mention any person later than Caesar. And the tragedy, I think, of the -- of the Roman world was that people preferred to be driven into antiquarianism, and to deal with people of former ages more than, you see, of their own age for fear to say anything of -- against -- which the powers that be would -- would dislike.

And -- that of course is the constant threat for free speech, that people in -- in Russia --. I mean, Doctor Zhivago is so outstanding, because it's the one book that is dealing, you see, of -- our own times. And that makes it a great book. I think otherwise it isn't a great book. But it has the courage to -- to speak out about the present, under a dictatorship. And the -- the temptation, you see, under any form of government, is for the literary and the intellectual to escape. And I think Mr. Hawthorne is -- is a case in point, with his Scarlet Letter, and so. That was too difficult for him to describe anything contemporary. And so -- I think he

made his reputation, really, by -- by escaping into another time in which he was very truthful. But -- it's a different thing.

And Plutarch I think is therefore, you must know, that he is already a Greek, who leisurely deals with a past that for him is safe, secure. And to find this already in antiquity can -- is a good lesson, I mean, object lesson for our own temptation, you see, to -- to --. If you want to be frank, it is of course safer to be frank about 200 years ago.

And -- so never overestimate the -- your own courage when you pass judgments on the founders, or on King George, or something. That is, if you haven't first passed judgment on the present day, I mean, and then -- you do not know if you really are, so to speak, allowed to pass judgment on the past. I think one of the necessities of the historian is to be involved in the present by some decided action or participation, because otherwise he will not be able to understand his own judgments about the past. You are all in this quandary, you see, that historians--if they want to be historians--have to participate in the future and in the present, because otherwise they will make judgments that cost them too little, about the past. -- You will -- because, you see, the degree of danger in which we make a judgment educates us to refine our judgment. And I feel that most American historians writing on European affairs are so very blasé and they know all about Louis XIV, of course. Terrible man. And -- and of course, I mean, and George -- George III. Because they never come in a position to tell anybody like Louis XIV or George III something to their face. And so they are not qualified to judge. I mean, this is -- costs nothing. That's too far away, you know. That's not refined enough. You haven't really entered into the spirit of their day. And well, I feel also, I mean, with Cas- -- Mis- -- Del -- Cas- -- Fidel Castro, now. These newspapermen say we -- have totally forgotten that their fathers once rebelled against George III. And since they do not put themselves into the shoes of a man who throws out Batista, they have no right to talk to this man: "Are you a Communist?" This is just fatal, you see. These -- these newspapermen are hiding in a great security of -- of -- of -- cold definitions of their status. And they have no right to talk to this man. Should be forbidden, I mean. I think this is abs- -- I -- there hasn't -- one -- made a terrible impression on me, the treatment of this man in this country. It is a scandal, and it has to do with history. I mean, Mr. Crane Brinton is a case in point. He's a real rascal, a real scoundrel. He's insolent about all the people outside, because he doesn't -- never -- he's quite impotent with regard to his own time. And so he passes wonderful judgments about the past. Where he -- so to speak, gives vent to his passions,

you see, because of course he wants to be courageous. And so he's courageous in a phantom fight. And -- beware of such historians.

Demand from the -- the great historian will always be engaged in his own time, and therefore have learned to weigh his words. Because he will have living opponents, and living companions, you see; and therefore he will have learned what you can say about people in the -- hot battle of life. How can you be -- just to Pericles, you see, who lived -- 400 years before Plutarchus, you see, if you don't say a word against the bloody tyrant Nero or Domitian in your own time? You don't even say of a man -- even the word "cruel," or "benign," or "ungracious," or -- or all these, you see, all the etiquettes of -- about the character of a man mean nothing to me when I only see that an historian applies them to people a thousand years back. And he'll never say a word, you see, about anybody who lives in his own time, in a responsible fashion. Can you see my point? We learn to speak among the living, and the historian must transfer the judgments passed among the living to the past, but not just -- have this liberty, so -- that's a kind -- libertinage, today, you s- --. That's why -- why -- most historians today are very different from the historians a hundred years ago. An historian a hundred years ago built up the nation. Bancroft built up the United States, you see, Cabot Lodge, or whomever you take, who wrote history of the -- American people, you see. They were involved in the story as -- as of this moment. When they said something about Benedict Arnold, they knew what treason was. But today, Benedict Arnold is just dismissed as a traitor. You think that's so simple. Benedict Arnold was not just a traitor. It was a very complex situation between Loyalists and -- and Revolutionaries, you see. And if you have seen today people trying to -- do right between the world and the United States -- between nationalism and your obligation as a citizen of the world --. If you look at Robert Oppenheim, you see, he didn't want to break with his Communist friends in France, as you know. And for this he was hounded down -- out of the Atomic Commission. Now this man has a right to write history, you see, of Galileo. He knows what the revocation of the scientific truth, you see, may mean or not mean.

But otherwise, I'm -- most -- most people are -- who write history in this country write with a complete safety, that they never have to tell this anybody who is alive. And so we get, I think, a -- a new code for the historian. The historian should not pass any judgments on dead people, on past events, unless he has learned how to make those judgments on living events, and living { }, and living people. Distrust him.

(He has to depend always for his history on the -- the -- record made by people who were themselves involved in their own time.)

True, but in order to have them -- reverberate in his inner mind, he must be able to identify themselves with experiences of his own.

(That's why I'm -- would mistrust him, if he hasn't learned from -- from his own documents, what it means to be involved in one's time.)

Ja, exactly. The documents themselves wouldn't tell him. That's what I mean. You see, the report or -- I don't think they would.

This is -- {Alcibiades} is just called a "traitor" here. No, he died from this balderdash. Alcibiades "traitor." You call this "dictator." The legislator of Sparta a dictator! That doesn't mean -- say anything. What you mean by "dictator" is something -- you see, somebody who abolishes the liberties of a people. Here, is the -- founder of a state is called a dictator. It's -- just like George Washington, a dictator. Alexander, a conqueror. Alexander carried out the dreams of -- from Homer to Aristotle, you see -- of Greece. And the -- such a man is not a conqueror. He's a disciple of Aristotle, after all.

All these terms just show you all these people are blatant -- I mean, radio broadcasters. They have no responsibility for any of the terms they use there, you see. They have never been face-to-face with the mighty of the earth today. You must come to despise these kind of -- this kind of -- of -- of journalism. That's what it is. Headline {painting}. It's an attempt to write history with -- mere headline. I wonder why they don't call Alexander "murderer," because he slew his friend.

Ja? Let's give it up, the direction. Will you kindly come { } me? So you try to have either Solon or Caesar. Or best, of course, would be Fabius, because that's the easiest, the clearest comparison. And try to find the order and the -- the list of qualities which Plutarch thinks he must give in order to write a biography. What are the things -- you will also see that he doesn't ob- -- that you will observe certainly that chronology is not his -- is not his intention. He doesn't want to write an evolutionary, educational history of the soul of the man, you see. But he wants to characterize him, and to define him, to classify him as a type.

{{ }.)



{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...to a larger unit, I mean, that's not the -- through the -- through the international languages, through first Latin and Greek, {then} French and English, and German. -- Believe me that the -- the one moderating influence on nationalism has been the fact that everybody had to talk one other language at least. And you are the -- at this moment the only really nationalistic country is America. Because it's the only country in which an educated person takes it for granted that he can stay within his own language. That's an ostrich -- that's an {ostrich}. I mean this very seriously. There is no liberal arts education in this country at this moment, because you don't learn any other language. I mean this in every -- in every respect; that's very serious, you see. The one drawback for the unity of the world is the nationalism of the United States. This is the most chauvinistic, and jingoistic, and die-hard country I know in the whole world, because you simply -- assume that everybody else has to learn your language. And since you have given up the classical tradition, you see, and you have given up the European tradition, where is the third? Now you learn perhaps Russian or Chinese. I don't know. Well, I don't see -- accept you as educated people, with all your degrees. You can be Ph.D. I -- I asked a gentleman who -- who invited me for a lecture, and said, "Do you read German?"

He said, "Oh, well, for my Ph.D., I had of course to know some German, but I forgot it all."

"Well," I said, "so you also are a barbarian."

"Yes," he said, "I am one."

This is barbarism. Absolute barbarism. And -- it is incredible that this -- you -- you aren't ashamed of yourself, to say that you go to a liberal arts college, where all the words are -- are -- are of Latin origin. -- You don't -- don't care. You don't understand these words.

Here, I have two books on Plutarch. How can I cope with them? They are -- one is written in German, and one is written in French. You can't report on them. You can't read Plutarch in Greek. You can't read the books on him in German and French. There are no books in English. It's just this -- this -- this porridge, Everyman's Library, which is no good for anything, because it's just a -- as all these translations; they're just forgeries. Popularizations for idiots.

Nobody tells you these -- words, because they are all here in the same boat. I think, I -- one person has to tell you, "You don't improve yourself," but you must then allow -- at least certain institutions to develop other standards. It's your -- and you get on the s- -- board of education, or the school board and -- for the rest of your -- and you have to do something about this. You are lost generation, beat generation, angry generation. I don't care what you are. But certainly you -- you're no use for the -- for the interna- -- for the -- for the fellowship of the human race.

You have to have one other language. This is the duty of hospitality.

Hospitality is not -- not just giving sandwiches to a beggar on the -- at the door.

But hospitality means to make room for your -- for somebody other of yourse- -- than yourself in your heart.

Formerly it was French, you see. When an American in- -- invited any European, they always could communicate through this polite language of the courts, you see. And in the 19th century, Americans sub- --take Fenimore Cooper, or take Emerson, or take any man who--they could speak -- French, you see. Of course, he couldn't decide these -- the -- they read Greek and Latin, I mean.

I just yesterday read the diary of -- of a famous -- George Templeton Strong, a lawyer in New York who kept a diary for 35 years. It's now one of the most famous sources for 19th-century American history. He lived -- in New York, a very -- was trustee of Columbia, but nothing extraordinary; just a lawyer. And his -- his diary just says that every day he reads one Greek tragedy in Greek. He just jots it down as a thing of course. I mean, it's not -- not mentioned as any thing of a specialty, you see. But that's his nourishment.

Now of course this man lives in a wider world. But you read The Examiner or The Bruin, or all this stuff. You don't know how narrow-minded you are.

This I call "narrow-minded" to expose yourself only to the things written in one language. You can't -- nobody can be educated within the circle of one language. It's not an accident that the Bible has to be translated in 1,017 different languages. That makes it -- is an important book.

Here, I brought you, you see, a German, and an English, and a French text. And I thought some one of you might be willing to -- to report it. One, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 -- here twelve -- a dozen apostate apostles.

I -- I -- I tell you, I mean: higher education stands and falls with the lan-

guage requirement. And since it has been dropped, I don't know what's going to happen. I mean, I would say the next requirement is that you have to live for a year abroad, and that nobody could be a student unless he has been to -- at least 15 months in another country. I mean, this way you may -- you may, so to speak, replace -- substitute for the language departments. But before, I wouldn't say you are educated.

I put -- give me my dear books. I have a -- so I wanted to read this with you. It's hopeless.

Here, Mr. Chamberlin has lived in Denmark at the international house.

You know very well this plight, isn't it true?

(Yes, in fact, I'm on the board of a program that takes students abroad for a year, so that they can study abroad and get credit for a year's work. And in fact the cost is less than staying here in the University of California at Los Angeles.)

(What city is that in, Phil?)

(It's in any of the Scandinavian countries, Holland, or even possibly in Germany.

(Stanford University has opened a campus in Germany for 60 students, and they're now opening another one in Italy, and another one in Spain. Whittier College over here has just opened a campus in Copenhagen.)

Ja. These may be the only way.

You see, the educational process of these United States for the first time in your generation complies with the instincts of the immigrants themselves, the immigrant -- these large groups of immigrants. The first education in Harvard, 1636, was for the top man, for the future clergy of this country, you see. So they had no fears of a -- being im- -- called "immigrant." They were the salt of the earth. They were the aristocracy -- if you use this word. I mean, the elite, the leading class. Therefore they just did what they thought was right. But everybody else in this country, being second, third generation--or first generation even more so--has to turn its back on Europe, and wants to forget his language. Because the -- less he speaks Italian, or Mex- -- Spanish, the more he becomes an American.

And I know it from my own family, when we came to this country. The

fear of being di- -- rediscovered, so to speak, as having still any tinctures hanging around them of the -- of the former language. I intervened myself in a family where the -- the parents came from Czechoslovakia, and German was their mother tongue. And they insisted that their child -- their boy should talk English at home.

And I intervened and said, "Don't make him do this. He -- he wants to speak English, because he feel -- is afraid that people hold it against him that he is -- an immigrant, you see, a newcomer. And so he wants to go native, and therefore, allow him to forget his German. He'll recover. He'll learn later a second time, you see, without this nostal- -- with this fear."

And you must understand that our school system at this moment has, for the first time, given way to this natural dread of the second-generation Americans to be rediscovered by their grandmother to have talked German, or Italian, or Polish at home. And so the masses of the people who have been reached by -- you see, by public education, have, so to speak, written the law, the ticket. But that's an -- an anti movement. It's a dread -- it's anything dictated by fear is not very -- you see, very good. It's always -- fear is of course -- anxiety is -- and anguish are narrow. "Anguish" means you -- "narrow," you see. Anx- -- Age of Anxiety means that the -- the throat is -- is choked. And it is a -- a choked education which you have in this country today. Giving in to this turning-away from any non-American factual background, which is so strong in 90 percent of the American, you see, nation. And this has written the law.

But you must conquer this. I mean, you must look -- face this in your own background, in your neighbor's background, your friends' background and say, "Yes, all right, that's the first reaction. We want to be native Americans, 110 percent." But that is not -- has nothing to do with your ambition to get an education. If you want to get the privilege of an education, fear is not a good basis. And I feel that all American education today is based on fear. Fear, not imposing on the children. Fear, not -- not making them dislike school. Fear, you see, of not reminding them of their background. Fear of reminding the Americans that they are a composite of Europeans and Asiatics. All this is fear. The whole -- American education is based on fear. The whole system. All the unpleasant things cannot be mentioned. All the difficult things cannot be men- -- the same with the desegregation issue. It's all just based--or the decision of the Supreme Court--all based on fear. We cannot admit that there are problems. That's not a way of handling all these problems. That's why the Supreme Court will never solve the desegregation problem, you see. The first thing would be to give the vote to these unfortunate people, you see, and then let them develop their own schools and invite

white people to go there. That's the -- probably -- the moral solution. Have such excellent schools, and if they gain the vote, they can have better schools than the white people. Then it will be the fashion to go to a good Negro school.

You see, you can only win by -- not by fear, but by going ahead, always beyond that which is today. And especially in education, you can --.

I have to talk to the Parents' Teacher Association next week, and I'm going to tell them that their -- their whole system is based on fear.

We have a -- I have a boy here in my friendship, in this town, who is distracted. And he's intelligent, but he cannot -- follow any train of thought at the age of 13 for more than five minutes. Then he'll forget it. And so the -- the parents very reasonably went to the teacher and said, "You have to insist. You have to trip him up. He cannot get away with this."

"Oh," the teacher said. "I can't do this. He might begin to dislike school."

This -- I mean, with dread, with the dread that is hanging over the -- our whole school system. And it's the same with this university, you see. They don't -- they dis- -- they fear that you may dislike it, so you let them -- they -- they emphasize beauty, and -- and -- and physical education, and all the requirements you should undergo { }.

What's an education based on fear?

(Dr. Huessy, you said last time that you studied under von Treitschke when you were 16. Was it von Treitschke?)

Ja.

(That -- was that Heinrich von Treitschke?)

Yes.

(I just wanted to make sure.)

Wie?

(I wanted to know if it was the same man, that was the German nationalist.)

Ja. Well, he was a tragic figure. It's a long story, if you care to -- I'm glad to talk to you about him. I mean, he went to pieces really over this issue. He had to -- but the -- the others wouldn't be interested. They haven't read --. He was much more liberal than he -- you would have -- you would think, I mean. He came from -- from a completely liberal -- and very generous man, he was, in his actions. Very tragic figure; he was deaf. That's such in- -- it hedged him in more and more as time went on. Of course, he became more secluded, and only heard himself, so to speak, shouted. And he had a -- well, it goes too far. I mean, I -- I think the others would -- would be less --. But I'm glad to talk to you about it. So let's go back to our translated biographies.

How about your -- your own findings about -- about -- Fabius? Do you find any similarity in the structure of the Fabius and the Pericles? This was my request from --.

(I -- I thought that we had a choice of -- Caesar and Solon.)

Because you didn't have the Fabius. I understand, yes. Who was the other fellow? Caesar? And -- and Solon. Yes. Well, did you read the Solon? Well, did you find any similarity between this treatment of the Solon and the Pericles?

What I'm -- inviting you is, when a man today writes a biography and when a man in Greece wrote a biography, they had two very different purposes. Because -- the prophetic element of history, you see, the -- the rapid movement through time--what you call "dynamic," it's not a very good and profound expression, but which tries to translate into secular terms the religious idea of destiny, of occasion, of calling, of being -- asked to develop what you are -- what you have been, so to speak, meant for in this world...

[tape interruption]

...but out of which we had to escape in order to become His -- His real creature. This whole notion is of course quite foreign to the Greeks, who, quite the contrary, assumed a man when he's born is what he is. So the dynamic idea is a strictly biblical idea, and is quite foreign to the Greeks. A man is what he is. And we -- Lincoln is -- when he was born, nobody could have said who he was. You see, he had to discover this, and he had to explode the shell, the inconspicuous shell. And finally the butterfly, you see, comes out of the larva. This is your idea of life, I hope. And if you trace back yourself to the qualities in a -- in a -- in

a test, then you can only be what you already are. But you can never become what you never have been.

Now all the great careers in this country of course are careers of changing. You can take George Washington. He's the most static, and most undynamic person in the world, but he came -- became from an English gentleman the first American president, and the father of this country, you see. And it cost him tremendous pains, because he -- for the first half of his life, he would have preferred to be an English gentleman, you see. This was a much more natural ambition for a man like George Washington, you see. And to be -- make himself dependent on the rabble in this country, the -- the -- was a very -- very difficult decision for him. And it came very painfully, you see. And to identify himself with the people in this -- these colonies, which in his youngest days, he looked down upon --. There was no democracy when he was born, you see. And men were not all equal -- born equal and free. It was very far from his mind, such an idea. In England, it is just -- you were either bred -- well-bred, or you weren't. And if you read any -- any novel in the 18th century of Samuel Johnson's life history or so, contemporary with George Washington, obviously the -- the thing was you distinguished, you see. It takes three generations to make a gentleman. And -- you had to wait until you could become one. You couldn't make yourself, you see. The idea of the self-made man is absolutely foreign to the English tradition. You cannot be self-made, because you -- you have just missed the first half of your life in this respect. Somebody else has to watch you -- send you to Eton and Rugby, and Oxford and Cambridge.

And it's very hard for you to understand -- this, but you must think that in 1800 and 1780, the -- people became lawyers, and ministers, and doctors on their own, without going to a university in this country. Three -- three-quarters of the people here, you see, who were even profe- -- called themselves "professionals" later at best were apprentices, you see, somewhere -- in a -- in a private relation to a -- some doctor or some lawyer. They read the law, as -- as you know -- it wasn't taught. They never saw a college. They never saw a university, because there were no universities in this country. And it was quite exceptional that a man would go across the sea and -- and study. And so even the ed- -- so-called "professional class" in this country, down to 1900, you could become a lawyer in this country and have never gone through a law school. You must think of this, let alone through a college, you see. You must know such biographies by -- in great numbers.

Therefore, for George Washington, the -- the idea of a gentleman--I only mention this to show you that even the most static, and most stable, and most

stolid, you may even say -- or solid man in this country, like George Washington, underwent a tremendous education here for sloughing off one nature and acquiring a new one. And this is all untrue -- not -- non-Plutarch -- non-ancient. And I don't think that you could find any -- any place in Plutarch where even the -- least idea of evolution is in a man's life, you see, is traceable. And evolution is a strictly Christian idea. And that's why I always have thought it's so very funny that the Darwinians think the -- this is an anti-Christian idea, anti-biblical idea, just an imitation of the biblical idea that man is in -- in becoming...

[tape interruption]

...I have -- never understood why Mr. Darwin -- Charles Darwin -- and the Bible have ever -- have ever been thought of as being in -- contradicting each other. It's exactly the same story, and it is anti-Greek; it is anti-Roman. The pagans had -- had not the idea that anybody could be anything but what -- who he was. There you are, you see--like trees, and animals--you were a Greek, you were a Roman, you were an Athenian. And if you have ceased to an Athenian, you had to commit suicide, like Emper- -- like Themistocles, you see, who -- who was exiled, you see. When it comes to the decision of a war between Persia and -- and Athens, he ends his life, you see, because this cannot be done.

To give you the comparison. I -- you know the name Moltke, perhaps, in -- in German history, the great general. Well, his descendants have been my friends and students. And when the -- Hitler came, the -- the heir of the title, the Count Moltke, had three brothers. And he said to these brothers, "Now, you go abroad. This is the end of Germany. And I have the -- inherited the title, and the estate, and therefore I cannot get out." And so he was executed by the Nazis. He accepted this as his due, so to speak, you see, because--he is the great hero of the resistance--and -- because, he said, "Since I have -- have enjoyed the good of this tradition, I also have to accept the bad of this tradition. I'm -- I'm stymied."

But his brother, who lives in Philadelphia, fought on the American side in this last war against his mother -- fatherland, you see. That's possible in a Christian era, because nationalism is -- is only second, you see, to your real loyalty. And in Greece, this would be -- have been impossible, { }. You understand, that's the whole difference between our era and -- and paganism. Yes? (Well, there was the -- the Athenian general that lost the battle at Syracuse, and was banished. And he went over to the -- the Spartan side -- I forget his name.)



(You mean Alcibiades.)

(Yeah, Alcibiades.)

Wie?

(Alcibiades. [Al-sih-BYE-a-dees])

Alcibiades. [Al-kih-BEE-a-dees] Now you read the -- the front page there?

Who has this front page? What ha- -- what is the -- what is the subscription of the -- of the { }?

(Traitor. Traitor.)

He is siding with the Greek idea, you see. But my friend Moltke is not a traitor. He's not a traitor. He has given the slip to a -- to a pagan tyranny, you see. So not -- he's not a traitor. Nobody would ever have thought of calling this -- this Mr. von Moltke in Philadelphia a traitor. It's an open story. It's nothing -- you see, treason is always underhanded. You see, is a break in character. So I think -- here -- of course, America is now back to paganism, and so { }. That's the difference. Traitors have always existed, you see. But it's a blemish on their character which cannot be wiped out, so to speak, you see. Such -- such mishaps do occur, you see. I'm { }. But as long as it is crime, you admit then it is negative, negated, you see. Whereas in George Washington's case, you can also -- from the English point of view, of course he was a traitor, was he not? But that's not his definition. You understand? It's just the digestion of the aspect of treachery, you see, then -- which is the problem of life, you see. But it is not treason, when you act, you see, in -- in -- openly, in full risk, by giving the slip to one allegiance saying, "I -- I forgo this." That's not treason.

I -- I think the study of George Washington and Alcibiades is very instructive.

(I think the study of Alcibiades and --.)

You see, Benedict Arnold is a traitor and -- and -- and -- and Washington is not. That's very interesting. Why? Why is that so? Because of the Declaration of Independence, "When in the course of events..." this is an idea, you see -- this never occurred in antiquity, that the course of events transforms men.

(Alcibiades even was treacherous while in Sparta. He -- became { }.)

Oh no, it's very serious that you should see this. Antiquity, China, Mexico -- all the -- all Gentile ord- -- civilizations. And I think that's the impoverishment of Mr. Toynbee's whole vision. He cannot distinguish the Christian era from the non-Christian era. He -- muddles this, or confuses it. There is -- some definite, you see, limit to our secular -- secular engulfment, so to speak. In Christianity there is {freedom}.

(I guess we also have to take into consideration that whose viewpoint looking at him as a traitor. Like your friend from Germany, maybe the German -- the people over there -- or his friends might consider him traitorous.)

I don't {think so}. They might -- they might not understand him. They might stand aghast that a man has this in him. This resistance. But no.

(Well, would -- what -- in the Civil War did they consider brothers that fought against each other?)

Well, Robert E. Lee was not a traitor, was he?

(No, but brothers who had fought with each other consider -- ?)

Not a traitor. They would weep. Mourn. It's not the same thing. You see, the -- all these things are very painful. Of course, in this country, life must be, so to speak, always kept -- must be "keep smiling." Life is tragic. That's something quite different. I mean, the Cross is tragic. Jesus had to die on the Cross. That's a tragedy, you see. But it is nothing of treason. He didn't betray His people, did He? I mean, from the point of view, He was co- -- He was condemned for high treason. But you don't accept that. That's the whole -- the whole problem of Christianity. Of course, He betrayed his -- the Jewish tradition, you see, of -- of the Messiah. Of course, He did. No doubt about it, that He was guilty according to the Jewish law. Have you ever considered that? He had to be condemned.

(Judas was the big traitor.)

What?

(Judas was --.)

We say Judas is the traitor. That's the difference. That's the whole reversal. You must ad- -- understand that a completely new humanity has entered the

field with Christianity. This kind of men have not existed before. It's a new creation. It is something new that the -- your whole lack of education comes from the fact that you have been -- live now in the 50 years which have tried to -- to desegregate the Christian era, and say there is no such thing as a Christian era. There are civilizations. Well, gentlemen, if you are just in an American civilization, I certainly don't wish -- to live in any one part of { }. God created me, God help me, and whether -- if there are five continents, that doesn't alter the fact that I cannot live as a -- as a member of one continent. He created Heaven and earth; that's the first sentence we learn. Doesn't this mean that we are part of His creation, that if we are parts of His creation, no one country can -- can constrain myself? Otherwise how can go -- missionaries go out into the world, you see? That's why missions today are no longer understood in this world. This country is just, as I said, if -- the isolationism has gotten the upper hand, mentally, of you. You talk big about -- or ai- -- or aiding other countries, but the whole structure of education in this country is I -- nearly making it impossible for aiming at anything more than becoming an American. That's not enough. You're going pagan at this moment. That's exactly, you see, that's why Plato and Aristotle must no longer be read on -- in colleges, and so on. They're doing harm, because it's -- it's -- it's pure-blooded paganism without this criticism, which Christianity applied to the ancients, you see, over the last hundred -- hundreds of years, knowing that people were first brought up as Christians; then in addition, they read Plato, looking back into something, you see, through a mirror, so to speak, or through glasses.

Now you read -- learn anthropology from Margaret Mead, and you learn Greek from Mr. -- Durants -- and you never hear what Christianity stands for, and so you are sunk.

Paganism is in the -- on the advance in this country. The churches invent holidays, like -- like Joseph the Worker's Day, and -- and -- and -- and -- and Mr. Eisenhower invents Law Day. That's just as in Athens. They did the same, I mean. That's mythical, has nothing anymore to do with any -- any function of the Church. It's just arbitrary.

All the institutions which try to give you the Christian era now function in a nationalistic way. Missions are giving up. They are withdrawn. In China, there are no missions anymore, you see. And as -- so as -- as long as the missions represented the American faith and the unanimity of the human race, you could still, so to speak, despite this -- the flag in the churches here--the American flag, in -- on an alt- -- over the altar, you -- or in front of the altar--you could still

believe that Christianity was preached here. But with the missions cut off, practically, and abandoned, and no longer popular in this country, there is nothing in -- in -- in the -- in American Christianity, which is really holding out against your idea that -- it's the Mormon ideal that the -- only the Americans are Christians. All others are -- are wicked. They are Communist, or nationalist. And the only dec- -- good people in the world are the Americans. Well, that's exactly what the Greeks did.

With this word "democracy," you see, you have -- you have broken faith with all the other countries who -- who believe that political forms are of second- -- are not important, that you can have a monarchy and just be as -- be as much a child of God as when you are a democrat. You have this substitute. The American democracy is the only religion that is at this moment recognized by the American people. That's pure paganism.

Christianity says all political organizations, you see, are temporary, are second-rate. They are not the real thing. They come and go.

They -- they are good in their time, for their age, and you should -- must be loyal. All the -- you see, that's why Paul says that you have to obey the powers that be. I mean, { } it just comes from God. That's historically -- but it is nothing you must put your faith in, because the political power there can be very wicked indeed, can become a despot. And you have to sacrifice your life in order to renew it.

But I think it has all to do with each other. It's this {dread}; first it was, "I must be 150 percent American," then you abolish all the means by which the schools and the education remind you that you cannot be 150 percent American in a -- in the Christian era. And after you have cut out -- cut down all the -- all the -- the measures, the guarantees, you see, which would keep this ship of state within the human race, you see, then you no longer imbibe this -- this spirit. I -- have advocated, as some of you may know, and -- that everybody ha- -- needs to spend one year abroad in order to bring -- replace this language requirement, by -- by affirming his faith, that he belongs to a wider society than just the -- the local one.

Well, let's go back to the traitor, the world of traitors. What do you -- can you give me some? What you should have done, I -- I didn't want to spell it out, because I thought you should have done it yourself. You're so lazy, you won't do it. So you should write down--point by point, chapter after chapter--the se-

quence in which Solon and -- and Pericles are treated. And you would find out an interesting scheme, you see, which Plutarch simply follows in every biography. And then you would see immediately that these are qualities -- which he dispenses. And it is not a biography in our sense of the word.

Shall -- could we do this? Let's look it up now, and go to -- to the Pericles.

Did anybody make such a scheme, perhaps? Would anybody be good enough to volunteer? Did you?

(I left it at home.)

Oh. How do you recall?

(I don't remember. His first one was a genealogy { }.)

Now you all take a sheet, and -- just like a { }, let us try to reconstrue this. This is really -- worthwhile, because it gives you a -- a foil. You will understand that really, when we go to the pagan world, they may create systems and pictures, and whenever you speak of your own language as mental pictures, you are a pagan. That's a typically pagan word today, to speak of "mental pictures," you see. And -- a man who's under the impact of the spirit would never call his language "mental pic-" -- I do not paint "mental pictures." Speech is dramatic, and commanding, and imperious. It's certainly not picturesque. That's a by-product. And certainly not painting pictures, because I want to move you. And I won't -- don't want to stabilize you. But in front of a picture, you stand, or you sit. That's I think -- ja?

(I just read a very interesting article called -- by a Herbert Palmer, in Beverly Hills. The title goes something like, "Counteracting -- The Pictorial -- Pictorial Influences in Education." It -- it shows the -- the idolatry of the picture. And it isn't only of -- of photographs and of audio-visual aids, but also of -- of the attempt, even in language, to create strong visual --.)

You see, whenever you hear a noun used instead of a verb, you are pa- -- going pagan. That's very interesting. The -- the child must be educated through verbs, because a child will only understand anything that's told to him really, existentially, when it has done or failed to do what the verb implies. You -- if you say, "Stand," or "Understand," to a child, and it has to stand for an hour until it's tired, it knows what standing means. But if you say "standpoint," and -- the child learns this word by heart, whether in English, or in -- a foreign language that he learns, it is nothing. And so it is with "Dress."

A dress is of course something for vanity. When you talk of 300 dresses in your drawer, there's one thing that's missing, usually. And if you demand from a child to dress, and follow this whole process of dressing, until the child understands what it means to dress, it will also develop the sense of necessity in dress, and what is vain. But it is only by dressing that you can draw the line between idiotic dressing and -- and -- and good dressing, and -- and right dressing, and vainglorious dressing. And so the 300 dresses can only be prevented by the imperative, "Dress," by which a child is told that our humanity, you see, gives us liberty under dress.

What is -- why do we dress, gentlemen? So that we may gain time. The physical being, you see, is just who he is. Whether you are in lust, love, hunger, illness, the dress conceals this. All these minor movements of your body are concealed so that the main stations of your life can be lived by you. The dress allows you to treat your whole life as a unity, you see. If we would go naked, we would completely be overtaken by the moment. Even a baby is dressed so that it has time to grow and become a full -- a full-fledged being. If it was just an animal, you see, it would be -- sold as the slaves were on the slave market, naked. Because they were just sold for what they were worth at this moment. Weight, and width, and so on.

And -- you -- we are -- watch out, I mean. We are moving again into -- in paganism, because in any description of a man, it is immediately said, "Five feet 7, and -- tall, and 145 pounds, and a brunette," and so on. This is -- unheard-of. Infamous. That's not the person. The person is, you see, some person who is protected against all these momentary, passing stages of his life, because the dress and the name make a unity, give him a biography to this person. She can outgrow any one of these phases. That's what the dress does. -- Distinguish between the lasting, the permanent in you, and the passing.

And therefore, a child must learn to dress. But it must not be shown, as they are in all these wicked suburbs today, all the dresses his mother has, or her mother has. Like the domestic servants, well, you know mutually boast of the many dresses the -- the lady has, the boss has, you see. They -- they take each other to each other, drawers -- and drawers and chests, and say, "Oh, my -- my lady has many corsets." That's a total misunderstanding.

But I think -- I know children who are absolutely corrupted already, because they do show each other the number of their dresses. And they have not been -- learned to concentrate on the process of dressing. That's the great honor

of humanity. Thereby you become a political being, and a pro- -- future voter, and a future president, that you dress right. But today, you all want to go naked, because dressing means nothing to you, in this naturalistic world. Jean-Jacques Rousseau has conquered your mind. You all think that to be naked would be the ideal state. It would -- you see, condemn you never to be able to slough off your present state and become somebody different.

And that's why old age has no honor. In old age, the dress, you see, is the -- the -- has found expression in the spirit of this man, you see, and his body no longer matters.

So the -- and why? Because the imperative, "Dress," would be dynamic, would teach the child how much it takes, or how little. I mean, how -- how precise dressing is. As soon as you speak of "Dress," you get the plural. And you -- the difference in education between pluralism and singleness of purpose is of course that singleness of purpose educates, and pluralism--you see, many dresses--distracts, di- -- confuses. All of you are -- are intellectual stammerers and stutterers, because you think 300 is better than one. But obviously, if you put on one dress right, it's much more important than to have 300 dresses.

(Another striking example comes to mind. A professor very recently was explaining the idea of operational definition. And he had the -- the gall to give as an example: a child always -- he said this is a very childish concept, the operational definition, because if you ask any child, "What is?" to define something, such as a spoon, he will always give you an operational definition, because he'll tell you, "Well, a spoon is for eating." And children tend to do this; they tend to -- to explain things in terms of its function, and in -- in -- and in terms of what it does. The action. So a -- a dress is for putting on. And he -- he was ridiculing this. Being a good Aristotelian, he wanted to classify in some -- either in terms --.)  
That's how you destroy mankind. The devil has gotten the upper hand in Dart- -- school. You are in hell.

If you want to understand the -- thing, cling to this expression: Children are liturgical. That is, they want to execute, enact, and they want to be allowed by this execution to participate in society.

And therefore, in the liturgy, the -- the -- the most -- the thing that the intellectual pious, or the intellectual stoic--or whatever you are--doesn't understand is for the child the most important: the fact that the priest in the Catholic Mass has to -- has to wipe off the chalice and to clean it. Water it -- and then

clean it. Use it -- the towel, you see, that everything, you see, has to be put back again strikes the modern adult as childish. And he thinks the Mass is ridiculed, so to speak, by this very prosaic act that it -- that something is dirty, and something has to be cleansed again. Dishwashing. But for a child, this is a tremendous discovery, this cycle, this rotation of actions, you see, by which an act is -- is finished. You and I, I mean, you go to the restaurant, and you make their dishes dirty. And you never think that in making it dirty, there is already, you see, stated -- included the necessity of cleaning it again. So that he who makes it dirty also must wash it up. That's what the priest is doing.

And to me, the only way in which I can ex- -- today I think build up an understanding of the meaning of Mass, is not the secrets that go on, on the altar, but the fact that in front of the audien- -- in front of the faithful, the priest has to clean up this mess, by admitting that we are earthly, by admitting that we are creatures. We are of this -- of this earth. And therefore the whole process has to be sanctified and not just the -- the one by which we enjoy ourselves, you see, eating and drinking. But the same with the dishwashing. And that's a -- just as important, and should just be honored as the taking out of the dishes, and putting on a wonderful linen, and -- and adorning the table. And in this country--I think we are quite good-natured--the guests go -- do go out and help, doing the dishes, in recognizing this liturgical circle -- cycle, you see.

And so we are much better people in fact than our mental instruction. I think the schools are lagging behind the real fact of life, because -- it's a great fact that guests in this country do -- wash the dishes. That isn't done in Europe, you see, where you have servants. Or at least allegedly servants. The poor woman has to do it afterwards, you see. Here, we go out--after all, you do, don't you?--and help them wash the dishes. Well, there you are on the right track, because the whole -- all the acts that belong to the noun, "dishes," or "food," or "meal," you see, are -- enacted by you. And as long as...

[tape fade-out]

...{observe, it takes} to act out one social action, you are on the same side, because the definition "meal," will not mean anything to you, except operational -- Phil, your wonderful, I mean, this example, you see. The meal is a -- can only be defined by operations. It should not be defined by anything else. It just is. That's why all the tribes, you see, of antiquity, are -- the pa- -- the primitives, are so superior to us, because they have more verbs than nouns.



I went into this. The Greek New Testament was translated by -- into the Gothic language by the famous {Wolffinger} Bible. And people have counted the stem-verbs used in the Greek, and the stem verbs, the original verbs like "go," "dress," I mean, "march" -- in Gothic. And there are 30 per- -- 25 percent more verbs -- original verbs in Gothic than in Greek. Now Greek is the richest language in -- we have of the -- our Indo-European languages, we thought. You see, it's very rich. But it cannot hold -- the candle to these -- this much older, and much more -- so allegedly primitive language, you see, of the Goths, who had no writing. It's the first book which was, you see, put in writing in -- in -- in -- in Gothic in 400 of our era. And they have 25 percent more verbs.

But -- just {gone}. You see, they have the word "cut." They didn't have the word "sect," "sectarianism," "sectioning," "dissecting" -- "section" -- we -- "sects."

We have now made many nouns out of this one word, "sect," I mean, which means "to cut" in -- in Latin. So we are bounding in -- in -- in -- in -- in nouns. But the -- the real -- we are -- we are -- we are -- become concrete.

The Russians have a famous novel, by { } which I recommend very much to you. It's called Concrete, and it shows how the personal life in Russia is smothered, and people become part of concrete. But I feel that's exactly what's happening in this country. The modern mass and corporation life makes man into -- into concrete. And the expression of this, that we try to tell -- to teach your children nouns. You must never do this.

We need to learn to listen, to obey, to hear--that is, to imbibe a language, which after all is the spoken word, which you can only learn as an auditor, I mean, by -- by audit--is -- takes seven years. A child can only -- has only learned to spea- -- to speak after it has obeyed sufficiently long to know what it costs to carry out one order. Because the meaning of any verb, you see, is -- you see, you say, "It rains." Now the child must have experienced all the consequences of rain: that you get wet; that the seed begins to grow, you see; that you have to close the windows; and you have to put on an over- -- a raincoat; and that you have to dry this raincoat again afterwards, you see; that the rain passes; that it comes either, you see, unannounced, or announced. This all has to do with the word "Rain -- It rains." The word "rain" is an abstraction, you see, although you think it is not, you see. The only act that the child must learn to understand is "It rains," you see. It -- it must experience that after rain, there comes sunshine before it can understand this -- this -- proverb, you see -- saying, "silver lining," et cetera. "It rains" therefore rules all the experiences connected with rain, including the noun--"rain"--as with "dress," you see.

My wife wanted to -- introduce prayer -- in -- to our boy in a -- in an understandable way. So she took him to the kitchen, and -- and prepared a very -- a special cake. And he was allowed to -- to bake it. And since this was quite extraordinary, all the -- with the raisins and the plums, and everything used, and the -- icing, he was very excited. And so in this excitement, she took the occasion, you see, and said, "Now let's thank," you see. And he -- he had never -- there was never a prayer before.

Now in this excitement, he found it only natural that something special had happened, and you had to praise the Lord. And from then on, he had experience in the act, that prayer was not in -- you see, something silly put on from the outside as a ritual. But it was liturgical in this excitement, it burst forth as the -- as the logical consequence of the acts in which he had been involved. It followed, so to speak. Like in rain, you have to put on the raincoat, you -- you make a special -- the special -- special dish, and you have to do something special about your excitement, that you have succeeded.

We are sick and dead, because every one thing is defined out of -- in Aristotelianism, by itself. That's impossible. Don't believe it for a minute. Every thing you allegedly know, you see, is -- a moment in time, experienced in a sequence of events. The very word "thing"--may I tell you this?--is originally meaning "time" and not "thing." It doesn't mean -- meant "chair," but it meant "now."

You are all killed by the word "thing." They -- you even call God a thing. You think that -- that He likes this? Bec- -- that's blasphemy. But I have seen it discussed, I mean: "What is God?" As soon as you say, "What is God?" you blaspheme. You can only ask "Who is God?" "What is man?" You can't ask this question. You can only ask "Who is man?"

It's a very interesting fact; in the Bible, there is in the New Testament somewhere the question, "Who is this man?" "Who is --." ("{} Thou" or "What is man {}".)

Oh, that's -- for -- towards God we are dust. We are "what." That's quite correct, you see. I've written a whole book on this, so--where to say "What?" and where to say "Who?" you see. No, there is in the New Testament the question "Who?" "Who is that man?" And the King James Version and Luther, both in English and German, fall from grace and translate it--although it says in Greek, "Who?"--"What is this man?" Then you get -- never get the right answer. If you

ask, you see, not "Who is this man?" but "What is this man?" you already fall into thingness, into deadness, into neutrality, into description, you see. You don't see it as a moment in history, you see, of this hour. He is now who -- the speaker of the hour, you see. "Who is the president of the United States?" means "Who is allowed to put his -- his name under the laws which are binding to you and me?" you see.

Well, the -- what I'm trying to say at this moment is that to learn a language does not consist of learning 300 words, or thousands words. Basic English is again, such an act of paganism--real paganism--because it takes years to understand the processes suggested, I may say, by the one verb, you see. The consequences of any one verb involve you in the whole process of creation, you see, where there is -- winter, there is summer, you see; where there is rain, there is sunshine. But you have to experience this by the act, by the actuality with which they follow each other and beget each other.

All the -- in politics, I mean, you will always see that rabble-rousing in the long run, you see, leads to another -- opposite rabble-rousing. I mean, you get McCarthy, and then you get the opposite swing of the pendulum. That is, anybody who is only educated by verb- -- by nouns, will always believe in what happens at this moment. And it is only experience which shows you the limitations that all these verbs, these -- are processes that exhaust themselves and beget their very opposite, that you can be taught, that you can experience anything. A child that hasn't yet learned the opposite of every word that it is told obviously has not -- is still misunderstanding obedience.

There's a tragic case of -- a neighbor of mine had a wonderful boy of 5 -- 4 or 5 years. And the child was brought up very obediently, and ran into -- against an electric wire, because the father had told him -- taught -- I mean, taught him to obey, but the child had never seen the relativity of an angry command, you see, that the ch- -- father could counteract, it was too late. The child was terribly hurt, because the father in vain tried to stop the child, running towards him, you see. The child hadn't yet experienced the limited meaning of every one command, so to speak, that you -- a command wasn't absolute. This again can only be learned by experience.

I have tried to -- to run camps -- educational camps in which work would beget discussion; discussion would beget art; art would beget eating; and eating would beget sleeping. That is, what we -- you need today is to see that there is not art by itself, and sports by themselves, and politics by themselves, you see. But when a group is together, you have to have drama in the evening, or sing-

ing, you see, because that's part that begets -- one thing begets the other. It -- as soon as we would see this again, you see, education would become a process, instead of being a thing with credits and -- and marks, and -- to be put away on your diploma. That is not the story. But it's a constant -- one thing begets the other. Because we sleep, we want to get up. Because we get up, we want to work. Because we work, we want to think. Because we me- -- think, we want to discuss. Because we discuss, we want to explain. On it goes, you see. Every one part of life -- department of life begets the other department. And that -- can only be done if you see these are verbs, you see. If you say, "Get up," you also imply, you see, that 12 hours la- -- later, you must hear in your ear the command, "Go to bed." One and the other are reciprocal. And this, I think, is destroyed in our -- in our whole system of thinking today, that one thing doesn't beget the other. But it's just a -- an enumeration of possibilities, as we call them, you see. Opportunities.

(Smorgasbord.)

Wie?

(Smorgasbord.)

Yes, exactly. Department store. In your mind, the -- life is a department store, you see, while it is a marching order.

Now -- well, I won't be- -- let's go back to Plutarch. There is much more to be said about this. But -- the Greeks moved in the direction -- from the verbs towards the nouns. And I think we are today obliged to move back from the nouns towards the verbs. That is why at this moment, the Greeks have shot their whole -- I think they -- at this moment, they don't help us. I was brought up on Greek, and I mean, saturated with it, I can -- can only tell you. But Aristotle and Plato certainly today are enemies of education.

With the -- the -- --the washing of the -- of the -- of the sacred vessels, the -- the cup -- and the plate in the church, from there -- can start it, and make the child see how -- how inescapable, inexorable, so to speak, the -- the -- the circulation, the movement is, once you enter societ- -- the social order. That's what the ch- -- you wouldn't have any juvenile delinquents if you would bring up the child -- children on -- on imperatives, and not on nouns. We produce these juvenile delinquents every day by -- in reams. I mean, the -- a teacher who -- who ridicules a child with -- by operational definitions, throws out this child out of its

own -- own -- own reality.

(Well, of course he was a bachelor.)

When you hear a man say, "Define your terms," just laugh at -- him in the face. Nobody -- we have to speak. And afterwards, somebody else can define our terms. But when a -- when a mother says to the child, "Dress," it is absolutely unnecessary that you -- she can define what -- what it means to dress, you see. She only has to insist that the child dresses. That's all there is to it. Speech is all -- first-rate, and not second-rate. I never can define my terms. I hope I cannot. Because the language, that's the -- that's the very thing. There is no other word { }. "Get up." As soon as I can synonymize it, it has no longer any unique character.

Define -- you can only define when you assume that for every word there are synonyms. And I assure you, there is no synonym for your proper name. You are just this one -- unique {sequence}. And if you allow to believe -- yourself to believe that your name can have a synonym, you cannot be loved. Because you expect that one woman will say that you are the only one. And all your -- our self-realization, all our -- our incarnation in this world depends on this fact that there are no synonyms.

I think that's the greatest heresy, you see, all this Aristotelianism, that--again, I've written a whole chapter on this--there are no synonyms. And if ever your mother, or your father, or your friend has -- has shouted at you with your -- your own and very name, especially in great danger, you know that there are no synonyms for all the important language. For -- I mean, for -- for indifferent things, where you can use a spoon as well as a fork, well, then --. The deader the things they -- are, the more synonyms. You can have a refrigerator, you can have a natural-ice plant. So -- but even there you call one thing a "refrigerator," and the other you call the "icebox."

You can -- you can -- I think you can catch every modern heresy by seeing that this man thinks that there is -- is for everything a synonym. Then -- but then language wouldn't be a creation. There are no synonyms.

An old -- an historian of art wrote a book on Italian art, and -- being an Italian himself, a famous man in Italy, he said that a Tus- -- a peasant in Tuscany didn't know what a synonym was, that every word had its unique use. And that's why he spoke such wonderful Italian, because there couldn't be -- you see, an inappropriate term -- word. That was just impossible. Every word stood for

what it said, and you could not replace it by any other word. And that's education, you see. And you are all made paralytics -- mental paralytics, because you are taught that for everything, there are many, you see, synonyms. That's sloppy. There is for every truth that is really filling you, only one way of saying it. That's -- we call eloquence. An -- an eloquent word is the one word that has to be said at this moment, and nothing else. The rest is rhetorics and oratory. That's any -- found as -- like a nightgown, you see, slovenly.

But you feel in all great poetry. I mean, if a -- if a man writes to his sweetheart a -- a poem, it -- there can only be said the -- at this moment, in this pain that they are in, you see, or in this despair, in this one way to -- to comfort the heart. And there is no other way. You cannot transcribe a poem into synonyms. It has ceased to be what it is. But you { }.

And -- in all ways of life, people know the -- I had a friend in -- in my -- I have a friend in my neighborhood. She's a lawyer, a great lawyer. And she had a will -- she -- they sent her from New York a will on the -- written by the richest woman in town, in Woodstock, Vermont. There's a town where retired people -- rich people live. And the lady was 95 of age, so it was quite an event, of course. And the estate was of \$50 or \$60 million. And so her will had to be fireproof. And -- this New York office -- by the famous firm, sent it to the local lawyer. She was, so to speak, an assistant lawyer, this woman lawyer, to -- to correct it, or to criticize it, make amendments. And she sent back that she would like to have a comma inserted in two places. That was all she had to say.

And they wrote back and said they were very interested in her remarks. But they felt that in such an important document, it should be understood without commas. And they had managed now to -- following her suggestion, to put it in -- the comma wouldn't make any difference, because it had to be -- the will had to come out, you see, in a unique and unmistakable fashion, and you couldn't depend on -- on comma -- on -- on inter- -- interpunctuation. That was too -- mediocre, you see. If you -- if the judge should then, you see, have to base his criterion on the comma, and interpreted it one way or the other. It had to be much more unambiguous than just to be decided by commas, one way or the other.

And I think that's a very wonderful story, because it shows you the power of language, even in a legal document, that this is nothing to be tampered with. You cannot replace any one term there, or any one sentence, you see, by any synonym. It has to be said in this one way in which it will make, you see, sense and law. And try to write your -- your letters this way and you will become very

eloquent indeed. You will always find that when there is no way out, man does his best. As soon as you give a man leeway and say he can do it in 10 ways, he'll never do it well. It's always for the -- excellency one way of doing it. And that makes a document an outstanding document. That makes the Gettysburg Address a real Gettysburg Address, that you feel that couldn't have been said -- in any other way than just this.

So no synonyms.

Now the Greeks were always, being Aristotelians, on the way out, tried this, but the name of the hero of course is the -- is the unique thing, I mean. Prometheus is still Prometheus. Pericles is still Pericles. They can be compared with each other, but still there is an unrelinquishable category by which the -- the name -- named characters cannot be transferred into Camillus. You just can't, I mean. Let's go now back.

You had some -- Sir. You have something?

(Well, I was thinking -- before even the genealogy, Plutarch talks about the -- of a virtue, and I can probably -- { } show us that these men -- were very concerned with reason as a --.)

Quite right. Yes. I think the introduction to the Pericles deserves your greatest care and attention. You are absolutely right, because it is an attempt to classify -- using these -- under these philosophical terms of -- of -- and categories. It's a -- it is. That's Greek. Now what -- what are these -- his -- his tenets there? This introduction is very strange.

What is his -- what is his general denominator? Isn't there a hierarchy of values in the first -- chapter? What are they? What is his hierarchy?

(Well, knowl- -- first of all, knowledge, and the virtue of -- of knowledge is -- should not be a pursuit of knowledge just for knowledge's sake, but -- but knowledge pursued as a means for some further end, perhaps happiness.)

Well, isn't there a whole hierarchy? He -- what's the first story? Here. And then comes -- it goes -- however there is a whole climax. These are the story of the apes. What does he say? There's a hierarchy for observation. The highest is not then what we -- {here}, { } children, and the next is virtues. And if you go excellently, this would have A, and this would have B, and this would have C. Isn't that right? As I read it. The whole chapter is, after all -- what is his whole

reasoning about the first chapter? What does King Phillip say? Because we have to insert here still another A-1. Isn't that very strange that his -- in -- introduction to Pericles we -- we should be warned that -- that not -- it's neither apes which we see and admire, nor children, nor just arts. There is a complete contempt of the Muses. That a -- what does King Phillip say to his son? It's a very great saying, gentlemen. For you it's very hard to understand. Wie? No! What does he say to Alexander? "Are you not ashamed to be so good at play?" Wie? What. (Just what I was saying. "I would not have changed his { } sing so {loudly}.")

I {know it as} singing. Singing is playing.

When I learned that Tallulah Bankhead was the -- daughter of the speaker of the House of -- of Congress, I pitied the father. I thought she had -- she had stepped down. In this country, now, you see, where you have movie stars setting the pace for this country, you live in an absolutely bastardized world, because the -- the imitators make law. But to be an actor is not the same as to be president. And it's very hard -- we are -- you are -- it's very hard for you to understand that even the Greeks were very religious people, very austere people, and that Pericles, as an actor, just couldn't be -- measured in the same way. This is for you very hard to understand, because all your standards come from the stage. I me -- a movie actress has today the -- the -- the -- the -- the court of the nation, so to speak. She -- she -- she is the Court of St. James.

(A courtesan.)

Of course, a courtesan -- it has been said. And you must know -- this is very charming.

It's very serious, gentlemen. Men have no standards of behavior, because the serious man -- Mr. -- Mr. Kennedy is -- is now treated as though he was a movie star. That is, the -- the people mention those features in his appearance which we -- would befit Elizabeth Taylor. And you are meant to elect him president because he looks like a good movie actor. That's a complete perversion. Everything stands on its head at this moment in this country, because they have the limelight. But you will -- still understand that a father might prefer to have a -- a daughter marry a good man and having five children than to go to Hollywood. That's -- and -- that he throws up his hands in despair as soon as she appears in Hollywood, since she's not -- hasn't disgraced herself, but she has just



made her life more miserable and more dangerous, at least.

Now we -- this is the expression, of course, in Plutarch, you see. There is then -- in play-acting is no virtue. There may be knowledge, there may be skill, there may be, of course, in this perfection of the -- of the artisan, of the craftsman in a stage play, but it's not virtue. Because to play Hamlet is less virtuous than to -- to act Hamlet out in life.

That shows you that -- an ape in naked, and is of the moment. The child is already dressed. The actor and the artisan -- the craftsman, you see, is -- is dealt with -- with the commodity, the goods he delivers, the -- furnished, you see. But the virtuous man is contained in the -- his whole life from birth to death. And there is nothing outside, no commodity he produces, you see, no dress he wears, and no natural body heat he represents in the zoological garden. And I -- I think this climax is quite instructive. I have said -- rated A-1 and A-2, because A-1 in, you see -- in humanity is concentration on single acts, on commodities, or on plays. You play, you sing; and you are -- for the song you deliver you are paid -- "gainfully employed," you say. But you are left out. But now of course he means by "virtue" the whole person is the -- is more than anything he can, you see, deliver. And the arts and the commodities, you see, we produce are of the moment. I mean, you go to a play--never forget this--the poor actor who has to deliver Hamlet within three hours in the evening, you see, is only condensing in a form of a pill, in a semblance, the real life that goes on for 50 years. Obviously the life of 50 years is more difficult to live than the -- the furni- -- you see, the -- delivering the good in one evening. That's a small edition. That's a -- or not even a small edition. It's a--how would you call it?--an abbreviation, semblance of the life. And the poor man, as you know most -- most actors are melancholic, because the -- on the stage they have to be cheerful, so they have to take it out somewhere. So they are -- they are melancholic.

And they -- and you know the story of the psychiatrist here in Hollywood, who -- when somebody came and said he was so melancholic. And the psychiatrist said, "Well, then go to the play tonight. You'll laugh your head off."

And he says, "Yes. I'm the comedian."

(A few lines later, after he mentions this comment that Phillip made to his little boy, he discusses the fact that you are being nothing but a slave to anything which is so mechanical -- employment, and therefore the sign of inattention to something which is much more noble, within your own self, rather than aiding or being assisted other things in order to be a success.)

Ja, well. The strange -- the strange, static character of the Greek comes out, that he tries to define this greatness by -- by a static concept, and not by the biography. I would think that cer- -- I would express it, saying a whole life, you see, 70 years, the phases, or the chapters of your development, or whatever you call it. The Greeks cannot say this, you see, but they try to put over the -- let's read this today. Will you read it? "If a man..." Will you read it out loud?

("If a man applies himself to servile or mechanical employment, his {empathy in noticing} the proof of his inattention to his nobler studies.")

Go on. Go ahead.

("No young man of high birth or liberal sentiment, who would, upon seeing the statue of Jupiter at { }, desire to be { }.")

Well, you see, that's the -- the Latin is Fabius and the Greek is {Faibias}, and I don't know what in -- at this moment here { }. He is so famous that you simply have to comply with what is usual. How -- how did he?

("Fabius" is the usual sound.)

Fabius, in the old Latin tradition, ja.

("Or in the sight of the Juno and oracles to be Pol- -- Polycreres -- {Polycleitus}, or wish to be Anachrion or {Themitas}, {Theimiti -- Thimitus} -- or {Archilotus} --?")

Archilochus.

("Archi- -- Archilochus, though he { } great poem. For though a work may be agreeable, { } for the authors not the necessary consequence. We may therefore conclude that things of this kind, which excite not a spirit of emulation or produce any strong impulse or desire to imitate them, are of little use to the beholders.")

That's very unsatis- -- "of little use to the beholders."

("But virtue has its peculiar properties, that at the same time as we admire her conduct, we long to copy the example. The goods

of fortune we wish to enjoy, the virtue we desire to practice. The former we are glad to receive from others; the latter we are ambitious that others should receive from us. The beauty of goodness has an attractive power. It kindles us at once an act of principle, it forms our manners and influences our desires. Not only when represented in a living example, but even in an historical description.")

I think there's a terribly important notion, which I think in our modern ethics are not even mentioned, you see. I'm --- always -- I mean, America is sick with morality and -- and ethics. I don't believe that there -- ethics is a course, or thinking. I've always all my life defied it. Christianity came into the world to show that life had to be fruitful, and not ethical. What is fruitful, what deserves to bear fruit, that's -- we shall decide. It can be inconspicuous. But if it is fruitful, you see, it's important. Fruitful mothers are inconspicuous. Movie stars are not fruitful. They have to adopt children. And -- that -- I mean this, I mean. This modern fashion that you all have to be so slim is just an attempt to make the sterile woman the -- the type, instead of the fruitful woman. And it's terrible. Women must have hips, but they are not allowed to have hips. They all have to look like boys in this country, because you have the movie star ideal. It's a wrong ideal of beauty. Because it is of the moment, and not of -- of the -- of the race, not of the continuity of humanity. And a Madonna has to -- has to give you the feeling that she may have children.

Well, this is all -- all movie-star business; and here in Los Angeles, I think you should be the first to shake yours- -- shake it off, because you are here at the source, and you can look through all this.

Now virtue in the Greek sense then means--even the word "attractive" and "imitation" is too poor--to produce sequence, to have consequences. And I think this is terribly important that Plutarch should say, you see, "At least my heroes produce offspring, spiritual offspring," you see. "They are irresistible," you see. Whereas if I look at a -- at the statue of Athene, I feel helpless. I'll never be able to make an Athene, you see, but if I read the life of a great man, I know that although I am not placed in the same position -- the decisions he has to make, the hardship, you see, the power, of courage, and -- and virtue, they are, you see, identical. Or I -- it's very hard even to find the word -- I think the word "fruitful" is still the -- or "fecund"--although even the word "fruitful" would not tell you that you are the man who bears the fruit, you see. "Fruitful" is still too -- so abstract.

But any reader of a biography is expected, you see, to get going, you see,

to be moved, as we say. Now to be moved is not se- -- sentimental. But it means literally to be moved, that is, to be transformed, to be changed into -- into somebody who hadn't been before, because he didn't even know that this existed, this type of humanity, you see.

So we learn by biography, according to Plutarch. I think that's very important. That's the best of the Greek spirit, I think. We are moved into a -- upon a highway of life, where you keep going, as on a freeway, where you have to go 30 miles an hour, and you -- you cannot just sit by and drink. Have to keep going. It is this mobilization of your energy which Plutarch here says is the meaning of his biography.

So he does admit from this point of view a concerted effort of mankind, an accumulation of effort. Although once you are set going, everything -- in the Greek mind I think is more or less then pagan. He does admit--and this is the funny thing: the -- the tremendous power of the Greeks is in education. They still think that -- that the influence of somebody else, you see--that's the one thing they will admit--that can transform you.

You see, that's why education is their obsession, you see. The beauty, the love of the -- of the master, the love of the -- of Socrates makes Plato. And -- and there you have to do them justice. This is -- their best -- the best part of them. For the rest, I -- I couldn't {agree}. But with this enthusiasm, you see, for the example for a young man, they -- went overboard, as you know. That's why the friendship between men is of course -- their -- one overbearing passion, you see, to the point of homosexuality. But it -- the first thing is emulation. Never use the word "imitation." That's aping, I mean. The translation is wrong, young -- young lady. You should understand. You cannot imitate virtue, you see. In the sense that you take something external and -- and -- and copy it. And the word "copy" that she uses, again, very misleading. "Virtue" means literally "power." You don't know this, but "virtuous" means -- is much more a process in Latin and Greek { } than it is in our -- in our language, you see. Virtue is -- you -- you are just, you see. But -- that is, if -- if you want to translate it, in -- in Greek { } is the power, you see, to act justly.

And I once was asked to write a letter -- an article on lying, on mendacity, hypocrisy. And I said it's a question of power, and not of morals. Most people lie because they are so weak to say -- tell the truth at this moment. It's not a question that they wouldn't like to tell the truth, but they don't have the power to tell the truth. It's a question of strength, you see. This was the meaning also of -- of virtue. To be veracious means to be very strong, you see, to be unafraid. Because

what does it help you? You -- you know that you should tell the truth, but you just haven't the strength in a -- party to break up there the polite form by telling an unpleasant truth. And so you -- you may not positively lie, but you allow another man's lie to stand up. And if you think how many lies are told in any -- at any cocktail party, it's just unbelievable. Or untruths, to put it mildly. Because people are drunk, and therefore they don't have the moral strength to tell the truth.

(Is this something on -- Aristotle meant when he said to act on virtue is an activity of the soul, and --?)

That our danger is, you see, that we treat ethics, the ethical qualities, as mere binding qualities, and not as processes.

(Would you -- would you explain that a little more? I'm kind of lost on this difference between ethics and virtue. I mean, I don't see a sharp distinction to make here, because of -- { }.)

Well -- today the modern ethics course. I have a -- a colleague who is -- teaches at Riverside, and he has written a book on ethics, you see. And I -- I argued the point, time and again. He used to be my colleague out -- east. And he is an Aristotelian. And he thinks that he can define justice, you see; and he can define goodness; and he can define all these things. And the American hankering for such a nice dictionary of ethics is very great. And I think it has ruined the American character. Destroyed the American character. And all, I think -- all soldiers, and adventurers, explorers, inventors, and -- and pioneers had to break away from this because action comes first. I mean, you are -- engaged in a certain network, you -- can't take out a book of -- on ethics and find out what you -- whether you should shoot a horse thief in Wyoming, you see. There is no such list of -- of -- of actions, one or the other.

(Well --.)

It's innomine. It's without name in every moment where you have to decide. You cannot act by definitions. This is my whole objection against ethics. It's a primary discovery of what you have to do -- now, and must be -- remain undefined. They can define it afterwards what you have done. But you have to do it, and not looking up in a book how this is defined.

The -- all the people -- you see, the -- my topic yesterday in class about this difference between our standing by our commitments to the destruction of

Europe in the First World War by giving up the Austrian-Hungarian empire, giving up the Ottoman empire, you see, then we had to stand by our commitment, and cannot go home and say, "We have done nothing. Good-bye," you see, as we did. Instead, we replaced it by a ethical concept of the League of Nations, which was an abstract concept taken from the book, so to speak, of good behavior, you see, and had nothing to do with our real involvement, and our actual commitment into certain -- in certain places, and in certain actions. Where we had destroyed the political structure of a whole continent, we of course had to make sure that there could be another structure. This was our commitment. But it was a definite commitment to these acts, but not a definable abstract commitment to virtue in -- as a -- as a nice behavior in -- in the -- in the vacuum.

This was yesterday's topic in my class. Was any- -- did anybody attend except you, Phil? Well, you don't -- well, it's always --. All American politics are destroyed by this ethical concept of "peace-loving" and "We'll never attack." And -- and all this.

(Lone Rangerism.)

Wie?

(Lone -- Lone Rangerism. Do a good deed and run away.)

Was an old lady in Frankfurt, in Germany. When I had a terrible fight there, she always said -- I had tried really to do something difficult, but not, I thought, not necessary.

She said, "Do no good, lest -- lest nothing bad arises from it," you see. She says the -- the do-gooders, you see, are always producing terrible results, because they intend to do good. But that's not the way to -- to act.

({ }.)

What? Would you?

(Harry Truman said a good thing the -- the other day in that speech, when he said, "If you're in church, and you hear a -- a bunch of 'Amens' coming from one of the corners, you'd better go --.")

What?

(Harry Truman said his grandfather once told him a story that when -- whenever you're in church, and you hear a whole bunch of "Amen's" coming from one of the corners, he says you'd better go home and lock your stock -- stock in. That -- that was in a speech here.)

Well, he knows it, obviously.

[tape interruption]

If the writer, the historian, does not look up to legislators, and soldiers, and explorers, and -- and creators, and priests, he is lost. But if he wants to have this -- "all men are born equal and free," but the functions in society are not all equal, and to be, you see, the leader of man in battle must be admitted by the biographer to be more honorable, more difficult than to write a book. And today, there is a complete confusion, and that's why I think the intellectual doesn't find his place in society, because we are told that the actor in -- in Hollywood, you see, is better than the composer. Or more important--you find this very often--you find Mr. -- Mr. -- in the last 30 years, at least, you had a worship of the conductor instead of the composer. Leop- -- who was this -- is this man with "Fantasia" or --?

(Shostakovich. I mean, Stokowski.)

Ja. Such a madman is -- is -- was valued higher than the compositions he -- the composers who had written the music which he produced. Oh, what is a conductor, you see? And in this country, all the -- the -- the producers, as the word says, ranking above the -- the scriptwriter, you see, he's -- the producer is the man. The conductor is the man. The actor is the man here, you see. And I don't -- I think that therefore the man who really is the creative genius, you see, always -- had -- to emigrate from this country and find this recognition in Europe.

I read you this sentence by Herman Melville. He has said we prefer now { } themes for authors, instead of promoting our authors in this country, you see. And that's probably true. But, I mean, you must understand that this again, a Barnum & Bailey is more important than Jenny Lind, so to speak. And Jenny Lind is more important than Schubert whose songs she sang in this country. You have heard of Jenny Lind, perhaps, I mean. She -- was the first artist to produce on a large scale in this country.

And -- so you have in -- in Plutarch this strange humility that he admits

that writing the life of such a man is the easier task, compared to living it. And this scale of values is, in all of us of course, today threatened.

Here's a man called Goodspeed. He's the greatest liberal theologian of the New Testament in this country. And he can't get over the fact that Jesus didn't write a book. And so he -- in his mind, John, and Luke, and so, are far superior to Jesus, who didn't write. And he goes so far to prove that He -- obviously only didn't write, because He never learned how to write and read. So he was illiterate. So that's the outcome of this -- this wonderful idea that if a man can write and read, he would of course prefer to write a book than found a religion, you see. And of course, Jesus wouldn't have been Jesus if He had cared to write a book, because it would have shown lack of faith. If you have to write a book, then you don't believe that you -- the life, as Plutarch says, will be so powerful, you see, that everybody has to imitate Christ. However, 1300 years later, there was book -- written a book, *The Imitation of Christ*, in which it was just shown that you couldn't escape the imprint of this life, you see, and you wouldn't like to follow in His footsteps -- the footsteps of the master. It's a condition, of course, that He didn't write a book. Because His real faith, of course, could only shine if He relied on this imprint of His life, you see, and didn't propagate it programatically by a theory of what you should do.

So -- this country is standing on its head today. The great -- the greatest achievement, the greatest act of faith of Jesus was that He didn't put His ideas in a book, but left it to the Apostles and the evangelists and said, "That will come later." He had only three years to live, and He couldn't spend ti- -- any moment of this in going to a desk and using ink. He had to write it in blood, soil -- sweat, and tears.

And there you have this wrong scale of values. Mr. Goodspeed poses here as the great authority in this country. And so all the Apostles, you see, are better off than Jesus in his mind, because they write books -- letters, and He doesn't. It's wonderful. It's very hard to -- in a -- in this modern world of yours, they -- and so I find that most biographers in this country think they are bigger than the life they write down. Because the intellect is today running amok. You really think that the use of ink is better than the use of blood. That's a second-rate performance, I'm sorry to say. -- I wish it wasn't. But here, I have to write a -- books. Well, that's imperfection, not a perfection.

So this scale of values, I think, is important. All antiquity has never doubted that kings, and prophets, and priests, you see, and -- are above the -- the -- the onlooker who tries to define it. And all -- they knew that definition was second to



operation, you see, that to act was more than to -- than to define the act. And this is today all so strange. The actor today is -- is the star, then comes the producer, then comes the director, then comes -- and finally there is somebody who -- poor scriptwriter who is kept a prisoner for two years. He has a little cell, and occasionally they'll ask him, "What do you think?"

Here, the scriptwriter, a lady -- quite successful in Hollywood. And she -- she was asked to write a -- a Beethoven movie. And she came, and she -- she -- I -- she told us the whole interview. There were three of these tycoons. And -- and she -- they said, about deafness, how this would be played up. And "Now, sh- -- when he became deaf," they said, "this is a great moment."

"Yes," she said. "But he was deaf 20 years earlier." And so they gave him chapter and verse. And with every one point, it was so that they were just absolutely ignorant of the true life story of Beethoven. And she knew it all. She's a very educated woman.

And so they said, "We're sorry. You know too much. You can't write the movie."

And you were -- you told me the story of Bill Mitchell, did you?

(Yeah.)

Well, Bill Mitchell, you see, took a battleship, and a -- and an airplane and -- proved that the battleship, the dreadnought was just obsolete, because it could be, you see, sunk by one bomb, as it was in World War II. And they didn't believe him, of course. The whole brass of the Navy was of course up in arms against the man who would disprove the beauty of their dreadnoughts. They lived, after all, by bigness.

So the movie had to be shot by -- here in Hollywood. And the man -- the -- the producer insisted that the -- Bill Mitchell had to intoxicate himself in -- for this experiment, because he would be so excited, and that would show his excitement that he got drunk, you see, on whisky first. And they said, "But he didn't. And that's his greatness, that he was absolutely sober," and that he exposed himself to this -- this was after all the climax of his career, you see. It was die or -- live or die, you see, do or die. And this idiot, you see, of the producer, insisted on -- on -- on this alcoholic excess, which would have weaken- -- of -- did--of course, it was inserted--did weaken the whole point. So the man left in a huff, the author. And was left aside, and -- and they took over, and -- and spoiled

the whole thing by -- by inserting this lie, you see, this -- what ever -- never had happened.

But I think this is how things are done today, that the -- the nearer you come to the public, the -- the -- the more authoritarian the -- the person becomes who -- and he -- he decides.

I -- and so we misread all -- all biography. They always tell you that Shakespeare was such an experienced stagehand and an actor, that's why his plays are so wonderful. It's obviously an absolute lie, because every one of his plays was three times too long for the time -- two hours allotted to a play in the Globe Theater in London. And so -- he was so enthusiastic, you see, and so much a poet, that he first wrote thousands of lines, you see. Then they all had to left out -- be left out. So in practice, you see, he was much more a poet than an actor. And overwhelmed by -- you see, by his creation, you see. If you take Antony and Cleopatra, it would have filled three evenings, if it had been acted out as he wrote it.

Just to show you how -- how even the past is reinterpreted from all point of view, you see. "O practical man," you see, Shakespeare knew success, you see. And so he did -- he just was so successful compared to Marlowe and Ben Jonson, because he -- he -- he knew the stage. Well, he didn't. He -- the stage was a handicap to him.

So -- even the past is misread. And I think most people think today that -- take naturally that Mr. Plutarch, writing on 50 lives would feel superior to any one of the lives lived. But he didn't. He admits here that it is better to be one Pericles than to be one Plutarch.

Shall we read on from there? Please.

What is your translation of the sentence on the -- on the "between them mo- -- most useful and serviceable to the interests of their country"? What does your text say?

("{ } for this reason { }.")

What? It's the same text, which means that most --? I'm interested in the word "useful" and "serviceable."

(No, no, no.)

They are the -- important, you see, because virtue is something we are --  
{can't help}, imitating, he says, fruitful. But he has another viewpoint, you see.  
This is the -- the use of this -- men to their countries, which is after all something  
quite different than their relation to the reader. What is it? What is the expres-  
sion? "Useful and serviceable"? You have a different translation, haven't you?  
You see, "useful" is a -- is a little bit like utilitarianism, and I'm always --.  
Human beings are, you see, they're just sum- -- summarizing their -- their role to  
"use" is always dangerous, you see. "What's the use of a newborn child?"

(How many paragraphs is that, in?)

(Is that just before the genealogy?)

It's before the genealogy.

(Just -- just before it. Well, the sentence I have before that, the immediate  
one, is: "Whether we are right in our judgment, were it not for the immediacy  
{ }".)

Then the sentence before; the one sentence before.

(Well, there's more than a sentence at the beginning -- from the beginning  
of a new paragraph. I'll start at the beginning. "For this reason, we choose to  
proceed in writing the lives of great men and have imposed this { } life of  
Pericles and of Fabius Maximus who carried on the war against Hannibal.")

That's the same translation. That's the same translation we have here. Is it  
all identical?

(No "useful" or --.)

(This is not. No. His words deviate. "Men who resemble each other in  
many virtues, particularly in justice and moderation, and who effectively serve  
their respective commonwealths, and patiently endure the injurious and capri-  
cious treatment they receive from their colleagues and their countrymen." { }.)

Well, I --.

(Well, Dr. Huessy, I have the -- {Dryden} translation has "useful and

serviceable." It goes on. The part where Hannibal, where the column breaks -- after Hannibal, says, "Men alike, as in their other virtues and { } parts, { } and demeaned. And their capacity to the cross-grain { } all through, which made both of them useful and serviceable to the interests of their countrymen.") (Well, that's Dryden's translation. Well, this isn't.)

Well, that's just what I'm trying to find out. I haven't yet found a substitute. I would like to know if no -- everybody else translated this "useful." You have the same text?

(I have nothing. It's incomplete. It's nothing.)

(They didn't have that, because they didn't treat it both -- they didn't the comparative there. They cut it out.)

Och! Oh! Isn't this forgery? You know -- and they don't even tell you. They were not even dots.

({ } in the introduction -- I just put the dots in here for him. I just put them in myself, too. { }. But in the introduction, the author says --.)

Traitor!

(He says in the introduction --.)

Traitor. Write to him a letter: "Traitor."

Now it -- is I think important for you to know: here is a virtuous man, you see; and here is the offspring. That's the reader. And there he uses very strong language. But then he suddenly has another frame of reference. And that is -- and there I would like to have the Greek expression--I for- -- unfortunately didn't bring the Greek text. We have only one Plutarch in this library. It's a very poor library. You have to insist -- tell all -- everybody that the library of the University of California is a miserable library. There should be at least 20 Plutarchs, if you want { }. There are so many editions, you see, that are pub- --. Should all be here. I couldn't bring -- the one Greek text is -- is loaned. And it's just -- and so I have none. And that's in- -- not right. A man like Plutarch is more -- one of the most popular and -- writers, you see, and in -- there should be many -- all these different editions should be there. { } commentary. It isn't. It's just an example of how haphazardous this library has been brought together. It is of course it's

very late, and so it hasn't -- hasn't been able to find many -- many different editions. But I found out the -- the most famous book on the South, by {Fitzhugh}, *Sociology for the South*, 1854, doesn't exist in this library. It's just scandalous. This is -- that's the greatest self-indictment of the South ever produced, you see. It's the great glorification of slavery. In 1854 it was produced, { }. You cannot understand the South without this apogee of its -- of its tenacity, of its stubbornness. We don't have it. When I told this to my colleagues in American history, they didn't believe me. But it of course leaked out that they never had read the book.

You see, there are obviously two quite different directions of a biography. As long as you don't have a class of writers and a literature of a nation, the memory of a great man in his own city, or in his own nation, will be cut up like Washington's Birthday. That has nothing to do with learned biographies on George Washington. A grateful country keeps his memory because of his services to his country. Now the Plutarch position, coming after a hundred years of despotism of Rome over all the cities of Greece, has a different idea. Fruitfulness, you see, is direct in the reader. He is imitating him. He is evoking virtues. And it has nothing to do with this -- with the succession within the one country, that this is Athens. You read -- as a non-Athenian now, you read Pericles, you see, with the same power of assimilation as though he was the father of the country. And here is the remnant of the pre- -- pre-Roman, Greek tradition. He says "serviceable to this country," that was of course the reason why the Athenians would worship Pericles, you see.

So there are two reasons for biographical monumentalization, so to speak. You erect a monument -- a grateful people to the man who made you, the people. But you read biography in Plutarch already, you see, on this much wider scale, that you are provoked, you see, when this man is evoked, to walk with him through life, and he paved -- he's a trailblazer of your own virtue. And I -- I think you cannot locate Plutarch in his own time--in 110 A.D., where he does write, you see--without seeing that he -- he has these two -- these two values. Inside one's own frame of reference, where one lives, the hero is "serviceable," as he calls it. I don't think the word "useful" is a Greek word. I -- I would have liked to -- that's why I -- wanted to hunt up this term, you see. Here he uses the word "serviceable." But he's serviceable, regardless of his fruitfulness. But here he has offspring, you see. He produces results in the heart of the reader, regardless of their living in the same frame of reference.

And you have to distinguish in literature these two functions, you see. The primary function of memory is to remember. You know, this is a very beautiful word. It's not a pun. The English language has changed the Latin term "re-{memore}" which is -- should be "re-memorize" into a "re-remembering," making the man a member of society in which we live again. Or that -- anything we remember. It's a very strange "re" in this, you see; that's arbitrarily put in. It has nothing to do with the Latin term "memory." And yet we use it, you see, and I think you should exalt it to its -- to its full meaning. The people who invented "remembering" didn't know what we could do with it, so to speak. And you must make George Washington again a member of the American community, by remembering him, you see. And -- as soon as he becomes a member again, he functions again, and he is the father of this country. And I think it's a very beautiful vivification, you see, of memory, you see. That "to remember" means to make that which we remember a part and parcel of the reality in which we live. You understand?

I think it is very helpful, and -- because that's why we have to remember, lest we have to -- Santayana has this great saying, you see: men who remember the past don't have to repeat it. Because this living member, you see, re-presents, keeps the present. Therefore it is still there. Otherwise, if it is forgotten, somebody -- the act has to be performed anew.

So I -- I invite you to -- to -- to change your mind about the -- the value of the word "remembrance," you see. It is a tremendous power to make, you see, a dent -- a living member of your -- inner community again.

It struck me as a very strange -- where do you look up the story of this -- of such a word? Which is the -- the book, the treasure where you find the story of the -- book -- like "remembrance" and "remember"?

(The Thesaurus?)

Where you go to? You go down to the reading room and said, "I would like to know whether this is all nonsense, what I'm hearing here about "remembering"? It's a very strange word. The "be-" is -- you see, unexplainable -- inexplainable -- inexplicable. Well, which is the book where -- the authority on all the story of the English words? Where do you look this up? You can't go to the Webster, because he doesn't give the history of the word. Which -- which book -- takes -- gives the history? Bears out what I'm saying about the "be-" and so on is -- is not all nonsense. Where do you find this? You have to work with this. And you will derive great pleasure of doing so.

Well, it's the Oxford Dictionary, the great Oxford Dictionary in -- in 10 volumes, which came out in the middle of the 19th century, and which traces all the history of all these words by giving you the -- quotations, chapter and verse, how the word was used first, and how it was used in middle, and how it was used at the end. It is of the -- unfortunately too -- too old now to serve all the good purposes. But the first vol- -- dictionary who did this was the Grimm -- Grimm of the fairy tales. The German dictionary. And then the Oxford Dictionary is an imitation of this for the English language. But it's most valuable, because the -- the -- you get the living sto- -- history of every word there, step by step, all its shades of meaning. {It can be a} deep secret, but all the poets use this dictionary, because it gives them all the suggestions, all the assonances, all the shades and variations.

{Tununcio} wrote his -- Gabriel {Tununcio} wrote his greatest poem on the way -- first from the famous diction- -- {Dictionario de la Tusca}, the great Italian dictionary, by getting all the shades of meaning there, and then following it simply in a poetical -- as poetry. Because the ramifications of a word, you see, that's what the poet is after. A -- a mathematician wants to have one sense for a word. Any poet must worship and conjure up all the different meanings of the same word. That's his suggestiveness. And you know this is -- that's why we have no poetry in America, because you think you have to define your terms. But poetry means that the word has grown through thousands of years, through -- all the shades of meaning. And the more you can evoke in your poetry, in one word, the more poetical the use of the word is, you see. If it alludes to all kinds of -- shades of meaning, then the word is used poetically. Never use a word as a def- -- defined. That's why the Oxford Dictionary should replace in your reading the Webster, because the Webster defines. That's the surface meaning. The poetical meaning is always in geological me- -- layers of thousands of years. There is no poetry, except in this belief that the poet is at the growing point of this word at this moment, and uses it in his -- in his next living avatar. The word has a story, you see, and the poet discovers the -- the last, next meaning of the word, just as the historian--as I told you--is the last chapter of the history, himself, you see. The -- in the poet, the words work; in the histori- -- -storian, the events work. And it's this -- that's -- you can compare a poet to an historian, you see. The poet is the life of the language as of this moment. And since he is the growing point, where the sap is running, he is not interested in the cross-section of the world, you see, flattening it ou- -- out, but he is interested in the -- in the stream, and in him it bubbles up. That's the poet. And the historian, in him, the history, the events themselves bubble up. And so you can com-

pare the two very well. A historian has all the better -- the more all the implications of this event, you see--the origins, the causes, the relations are there. That's what Thucydides did, you see, by going to the -- to the roots of the story. And today you are all so flat, because you have philosophical poetry, and rational history; and that is, the words and the events are -- just used in their latest surface sense, but not in their -- how -- what's the opposite of cross-section? Length-section?

{ }.)

No, no. In -- geometry, I mean. Here -- here you have a river. Now this is a cross-section. You take the -- the bed of the river. But what would be the -- you see, such a section?

(Transverse-section.)

Wie?

(Transverse?)

Well, is that the word? Transverse-section?

(We don't have a -- an opposite to "cross-section" in our { } vocabulary.)

You don't say "transsection"?

(We don't have its opposite. We don't have { } -- in things that aren't in cross-sections.)

(It's "with the grain," you might say.)

(Or "lineal.")

Well, "lineal" is very poor.

(In terms of a tree, you see.)

Yes, exactly.

(Instead of a cross-section of a tree, you could say "with the grain." This



would work with wood. But -- that's sometimes used.)

You see, our modern mind, our rational mind is just a cross-sectional mind, and thinks he can afford to cross-sect everything--language, history, and so--as of this moment. And I assure you that poets and historians are transverse-sectionists, you see. They try to restore the -- the flow. Can you see the difference?

That's quite -- you see, mathematical thinking is always cross-sectional, geometrical thinking. And historical thinking is always transverse thinking. And that's why they can't understand each other, they're just -- you see, the --. And something interesting happened two days ago. I got a large -- long review by a man; and a friend of mine sent me the publ- -- and he -- this happened in Germany, so I hadn't been aware of this -- this debate going on. My alter ego over there, a man who has always tried to -- to publicize and popularize my doctrine, saw this review, and wrote an answer. And so I got at the same time the critical review of my historical writings, and the answer of my friend objecting to this man, the review. And it was quite funny.

The issue was the following: the man who wrote the review only has the idea that you can either be objective, you see, or you can be subjective. Now all my life, I have said this is a cross-sectionists' attitude. Here is the subjective, and here is the objective attitude. But I am in the transverse attitude. I am prejected into the future, and I have already been trans- -- trajected from the past. I am my father's son, and I am my -- my children's father, and therefore I look at everything in -- in this streamlined fashion.

And so the review ran on this case, that I was the most colos- -- colossal subjectivist there had ever been, and he -- admired this, but of course, he was an objectivist.

And then my friend wrote in, as I said, "But this is impossible. You can't use the term 'subjective' for a man who has just divided reality into past and future, and says that he is -- the future compels him to look at the past in such-and-such a way and admits it. And so he -- I am divided, you see, into prejective, and trajective attitude." And this is his reply. And he used very strong language against the man.

But it is only interesting that in -- in -- in your mind, you see, you have dogmatized, coming all from Cartesius and Benjamin Franklin -- you have

dogmatized that the only two acts possible for the human mind are either subjective or objective. You really believe it, you see.

Now Plutarch and I are neither objective nor subjective, you see, but we hope that the past can come to life in the future. And that has nothing to do with objectivity and subjectivity, you see. But it has to do with past, where we have lived, trajected the abyss of time, and the preject, where we are thrown into the future and have to live. And both are imperatives, and verbs. The object and the subject are nouns for people; here they stand. And they can move and they don't move. Usually they don't move. They just sit and -- and talk, or -- or look, or sit before a mirror; or sit at a seat and listen to a lecture. And this is the academic attitude, you see. In academic -- here in this room, of course, we are either objective or subjective. But what I'm trying to talk to you about is that we are in a stream of events, you see, where it is up to you what we remember; what of the past is a part and parcel of ourselves, you see, as a living member, you see; and what we inc- -- how -- we incorporate, or what we create, or what we -- what we allow to happen, as inevitably supplementing that which is at this moment, and is not enough, it -- doesn't suffice, you see. And the lacunae have to be filled up by -- because we are thrown into the future, to be prejected into the future, and to be trajected is my attitude. And of course I can prove it to you.

All the people who are either objective or subjective -- what do they do according to psychoanalysis? They project. If you analyze what a -- what these so-called objective sciences do, they project into the past all their own passions. I mean, Mr. Charles Beard, being a Marxian, had to project his material, economic obsessions into the fathers of the revolution, so he wrote *The Economic Interpretation of History*, as you know, and -- of American history, and proved to his own satisfaction, you see, that it was all just landowners who wrote the -- the Declaration of Independence. And now then there have to be wri- -- have been written books disproving it again. You may have heard of this debate that's going on now. Mr. MacDonald wrote a very marvelous book in which he just proved that there was just no point in this. They never thought of it.

You will always find that people who do not admit their concern with the future and the past must project. Projection is the curse of the -- of the -- of the mathematicians and the subjectivists. I mean, Mr. Einstein projects, of course, a dead universe, he already knows from the beginning that the universe consists of electrons and things dead. But I don't know this. I suppose, at least, that I'm alive. And that the -- that as little as a -- as a glacier explains the one -- the one flower that you find at the foot of the glacier amidst millions of stones, just as little the -- all these mathematical laws explain my or your existence, because we

are alive, and the universe of Mr. Einstein is totally dead. And Mr. Einstein after all isn't quite so dead. He -- he creates something new. Where does this come from? He never can explain this. It's all nonsense. But he projects, projects. And the word "projection" then is, I think, an important discovery to -- to show the limitations of this, what you call "objective science," or what we -- I call "Cartesianism," you see, where it is assumed that we live in a dead universe as machines ourselves. Projection is the curse of the objectivists. They all project. I don't have to project anything. I admit my -- my place in the bill. And I say what I want. I -- I can o- -- be open about my desires, my necessities, my urges. I haven't to project anything into a dream world.

(I proposed this term "with the grain," because it -- refers to -- it -- it has reverberations, poetic overtones of the organic, the tree.)

Delighted.

("With the grain," and then you can say, "It's against the grain," this cross-section.)

Ja, then everybody wakes up to the fact that this is vio- -- you're -- there's violence, you see, because "against the grain" does violence to -- to the growth of the tree.

(Wit no sap running sideways.)

The -- physics is always cross-section. That's its meaning. The -- nature is already complete.

Now I live with the deep feeling of the incompleteness of the story. We are just in creation. We don't know yet who we are to be. Do you know who you are going to be tomorrow? I don't. Mr. Einstein didn't know when he was born that he would be the inventor of the problem of relativity. That was his discovery. That was absolutely new and he -- and --. And the physicist can never explain the physicist, you see. That's absolutely beyond himself. He cannot explain any one of the physicists, because he cannot explain that anything new can happen in the world. It's -- from his system of nature, the new is excluded. But I have no such -- no such prejudices. I can write the history of mathematics; I can write the history of physics, you see. Because I can show that the -- the man, in order to rescue himself from death and annihilation, had just to --

you see, find -- to -- to discover new, absolutely unheard-of ways of -- and attempts, and -- and risk his life for them, and -- and die in the process.

There you have sacrifice, you see. You have freedom. And where a man can sacrifice himself for a new, you see, untried thing, he is creative. He is -- he is part and parcel of the divine power that creates the universe. Every mother that gives life to a child, you see, knowingly, instead of using -- using -- using preventive measures, knows that she is able to produce a new race, a -- a better man, at the risk of her life. Sacrifice means divinity. Divinity means creation. These are just -- we use the word "divinity" in order to e- -- to express this power that the world isn't finished yet. Where you have God, you have unfinished business.

And where you have God, you have the limitation of our insight. If we try to judge the complete universe from what we -- is already there, we must misjudge it. You cannot judge a -- the full-grown man from the embryo in the mother's womb. That's what all the physicists try to do. They try to derive the complete story, you see, from the antecedents. You can only -- write the complete story from the end backward, you see. You write the biography of Lincoln, because he has proved to be a great man. But people here tell you this today that they write the biography from the beginning forward, projection. They want to forget. They repress the reason why they write this biography of Lincoln. The reason is that they are impressed by the dead. Don't you see this? The -- they are impressed by the end of the story, but they never admit it. They write the books -- Mr. Sandburg never can finish the whole thing, you see, because he gets stuck in the prairie years and so on and so forth. But why does he write it? Because he and his readers are already u- -- united in the experience of the greatness of Lincoln, from the very beginning.

Very strange. You are all hipped on this physis- -- physicists' attitude. And that's why America at this moment is -- is snowed under, and is a dead country. Physics means to deal -- treat man as dead, to be explained from the causes. And history means to treat a man from his destiny. And to find up the beginnings of the future life already in the past.

-- You see, why do we sit here, Sir? It only makes sense because you are responsible that all the future that already got started in Pericles must not be destroyed and omitted by you, you see. The future has already begun yesterday. The good future, the vital future has now of course its mainsprings already somewhere in the past. Like a tree has its roots somewhere in the pa- --. So you -- we study history lest some part of the future, you see, that already started a thousand years ago, be omitted. Why do you -- learn to write? Because writing after

all was invented 1500 years ago -- 3,500 years ago, 3,000 years ago. It's obsolete, is it not? So old! No. The -- final thing, that all men should be able to be literate, you see, was invented there. So you have to learn it, you see.

I don't understand your relation to past and -- and future at all. I'm always overcome by this -- by your -- your -- your calculating method, that you think the past is something that went before you. The past is that which makes demands on you not to obstruct its growth into the future. You are the hurdle to be taken by -- by history. Because -- since you are ignorant that the good things of life have already been planted, you see, you -- take down the redwoods that stand there, and not know that they already belong to the final creation of man. You are the hindrance of history. And as long as you think that history is talk -- taught to you, for you, so that you get something out of it, you cannot te- -- learn history. History means to get you out of the way of obstruction. Because as long as you no -- don't -- are not im- -- immersed into this stream of history, you will act as a -- as a block against it. You have to turn it all around. History is not written for you, gentlemen. But you are, so to speak, thrown into history so that you may be dissolved in your -- in your stubbornness, and -- and become a part and parcel of the stream, where you, before, have a -- have been an ice block. The -- freshet--you know what a freshet is, I mean, the -- when the ice breaks in the spring. Now you are -- have to be -- the freshet has to -- reach you. You have to be melted into the stream of history. -- There are no other ways, I think, of getting you out of your -- of your -- of your attitude of sitting on your fannies and look at history. The -- the problem of the history teaching is not the events that happened, but you are the problem. Because "problem" means, as you know, threshold, some stumbling block in the way. And the history cannot go on if all the newborn children remain ignorant of what has gone on before. You have to join the -- the procession. And history -- is told you in order to make you join the profession -- procession. Which all again means that history consists of imperatives: "Remember." Re-member. That is, allow these parts of the past to become members of the living history.

And so I -- I at least can justify myself as being consistent, since all teaching -- in my conviction consists of imperatives, and not of nouns, you see. I have to -- carried it to this length to tell you that to -- to learn history means to get oneself moving, to be moved, in the most literal sense of the word. And that's -- I'm so glad I -- this Mr. Plutarch agrees with me, because that's what he says, you see. That it is irresistible. And the historian will be judged of course by his shortcomings. If I cannot move you, I've missed my -- my profession. But history is not there to deliver facts, you see, but to make you chain the facts into fiats.

You know that "fact" is a perfect participle, and the word "fiat" is the same verb as "let it be." Fiat, God said, "Let there be -- light" and then light became a fact. That's how the Bible is written, you see. "Let there be light, and light was -- and there was light." But if you would translate it literally, it would say, "Let there be light," and the answer is, "and light became a fact," you see. "Let there be water, and water became a fact." "Let there be men, and men became a fact." That is, fiat becomes fact. That's the theory of the Bible, and that's the story of all history, turning the other way around, that we read again into the facts their fiats.

You have understood any historical event if you understand that what -- what looks at you as a fact at one time only was a fiat, and had not yet happened. The transformation of facts into fiats is the -- is the goal of history. Follow? (Looking backwards in history. Is that what we do?)

Yes, admittedly. We live in this place, 1959. Now what else could we do?

It's all nons- -- projection if you say that you begin really in the Stone Age. You don't, of course. Here we are, and we want to remember the Stone Age. That is, we want to see how much of the Stone Age facts have still to be -- to -- to reach us as -- as fiats. They spoke; well, we have to speak, too. So in this sense, we have great admiration for the Stone Age men. They sacrificed bulls. We won't. So that's, you see, a fact that we left. We try to explain, of course, but we will leave it a fact, you see.

Now D. H. Lawrence wrote a book, *The Woman That Rode Away*--who has read this novel?--in which he said we must reintroduce human sacrifice. The Stone Age must come back in full flower. And it's a very majestic novel. *The Woman That Rode Away*. I recommend it highly to you, because it shows you the future that threatens the human race. I take it very seriously. He says we are -- Americans will be the first to reintroduce human sacrifice. In 1500 they introduced slavery, because they regenerated Rome and Greece. Slavery is nothing but Renaissance, you see. Nobody in 1500 thought of slavery; but then Plato was read, and there was so much slavery taken for granted, so that they said, "Let's try slavery."

Slavery is just an accompaniment of the Renaissance of Greece and Rome. And now we have s- -- human sacrifice, because you all become anthropologists, and you all read Margaret Mead; and you read Malinowski; and you read Frazer, *The Golden Bough*; and you read *The King Must Die*. And you become very

cruel. Have you -- who has read *The King Must Die*? That's the newest novel, you see, on -- on -- on human -- sacrifice. Haven't you heard of the book? Oh, it's a best-seller. *The King Must Die*? It's on Theseus, the Athenian. Oh, it's all over the place, because it's so obscene. It's as bad as Mr. Nabokov. And it's all wicked, and very bad, infamous book, but it's accepted. -- I have been -- here, the peo- -- my friends here all talk -- talk about it in high terms. You will hear of it. Well, it's -- the great -- importance of it is that it takes human sacrifice for something very nice, and { }. It's just, you see, all the time people are sacrificed, there, in this old Athenian, you see, and Cretan day.

Well, I'm afraid Lawrence anticipated that the -- the -- bored and -- and schizophrenic American will only find his salvation in -- in human sacrifice, you see. {There will -- but -- like the Loeb brothers}, you know, just to find out how people behave when they are murdered. And -- see, cruelty and violence are -- are the essential ingredients of the American scene. When you are so bored, as 90 percent of the American people are at this moment, your -- violence is the only cure. Perversion to violence and sacrif- -- other people's death.

(Isn't that what the Greeks were supposed -- supposed to have done with their God of wine and -- Bacchus, that they would intoxicate themselves --.)

Oh yes. Ja, but you see, still, the Renaissance first only took Pericles and the Age of Pericles, then the Peloponnesian War, and the -- Homer; there is no human sacrifice. The -- the Dionysian is older, you see. And there is a layer in Greece which you wouldn't call "Greek" anymore, but just "Mediterranean," or wholesale, you see, and Assyrian, and Egyptian, where there is human sacrifice. So within "Greek" today, only those most ancient elements today become interesting--like Dionysus, you see--which, have in common this human sacrifice with all the other Asiatic, and -- and you -- you see, Thracian traditions, I mean -- . But we -- when the Renaissance came in 1500, we didn't look -- we looked away from those layers, and we were only interested, in -- in, so to speak, in the later Greeks--the philosophers, and the poets, and the artists, and the statesmen. You're quite right, the -- every -- every -- we -- we have -- in our society we have the Navajo Indians. They have their rain dances, and their snake dances, but they also have remembrance -- memory of witchcraft and human sacrifice. Of course, they have. So in 200 years, you will have human sacrifices in this country. No doubt about it. We are marching into this direction, because you are so bored. You see, boredom is -- always introducing the vices of the past. ({ } historians say we're going to sacrifice these things to, I mean?)

Vitality, your vitality. Just as you have Vitamin A today. Everything is today vitamins. You just look around. The idol of our time is vitality. This is an impotent country, so that's -- worships vitality. Where you have no creativity, and no fruitfulness, everything is sterile, and -- and -- and cellophane wraps, you see, where you have no dirt, where you have pasteurized milk, where you have no cheese, but you have Kraft processed cheese, I mean, where nothing is allowed to live. What's a cheese that doesn't crawl? You see. You buy cheese here; it's not cheese. You buy milk; and it's not milk. And you buy bread; and it's not bread. It's all phantom. And everybody reflects this sterility in his own life. And since you have -- this cellophane civilization here, you see, where -- where nothing can germinate, human sacrifice replaces it. If you aren't fruitful, you see, you try to get vitality.

Tell you a story. The king -- do you know how the Christians -- the Swedes became Christian? In 1070, the -- the Swedish nation turned Christian. That's rather late, as you can see. Not so, you see -- not so long ago. And so it took them 1,070 years before the Swedes abolished human sacrifice. And how did it look? Exactly as in the days of Noah -- in the days of Abraham.

The king, {Erik}, aged. And he had seven sons. And so he took his first son, when he felt old age coming, and sacrificed him to get vitality back into his loins. Well, he aged just the same, and got the gout; and he sacrificed his second son. And then he sacrificed his third son. And when there was only the seventh left, the -- the -- the people rebelled, killed the old man, made the seventh son king, and asked him to become a Christian, because it meant the abolition of human sacrifice. That's what Christianity meant, you see. Christianity abolishes human sacrifice. Christ is the last human victim. It should be -- any Christian tradition. There again you have a -- the break of the Christian era, you see, with the past. Human sacrifice was given up. That's -- happened in 1070; and was literally done so that the ch- -- the king might be more fruitful, you see, more vital. He dispossessed his -- the life of his son and tried to -- to -- so to speak, project, you see, this boy's energy into his own veins. You understand? This was taken quite literally.

Now D. H. Lawrence thinks the same will happen to the American businessman. He's so empty, and so sterile that he will sacrifice life to get back vitality.

Boredom and cruelty are two sides of the same thing. If you can understand this, you can solve the American riddle. Boredom and cruelty are two sides of the same thing.



An interested person can be merciful and -- and -- and forgo all cruelty, you see. But a bored person, he wants to be shot back into reality. And that has to come from the outside, because -- in him, that has been suppressed, the stream of life, you see. He is -- looks at everything objectively. It's just what I said, you see. And -- and -- and he is not propelled into any direction. He doesn't have to reach any goal. He hasn't to reach the next shore, you see. He's not {static}. Swimmers have -- know -- you cannot drown another man, even when swimming. You just have to keep afloat yourself, you see. But a -- put a man on land, looking at other people, that he tries to experiment with them, and puts the needle into their calf, and -- with -- they jump. He's experimenting {then}. Any man who experiences life, Sir, cannot experiment, you see. And every bored person tries to experiment with the frog. And pulls out its leg and sees -- you know little boys who are bored. They -- they are very cruel. They -- they -- they take out nests, and -- and -- and, you see --.

Cruelty and boredom are -- always go together. That's -- when education gets boring, watch out. Then something frightful is bound to happen. Then you get juvenile delinquency. What else can you get? You see, when the school bores the children, they must commit murder. No help. Can't be helped.

So I think this first chapter of Plutarch should remain -- stay in your minds. And I wish -- has Solon such an introduction, too?

(He mentions -- Solon makes a statement -- Solon is saying something about money.)

Well, let's then read next time. But I wish you would try--please, do this for me, and in writing--analyze the sequence of the chapters and -- with regard to their content, you may use nouns.

(On Pericles, or --?)

(How many more meetings do we have?)

Three. Isn't that right? What do you mean? You -- wish to -- go over to some other topic. What -- why do you ask?

(I wondered whether this should be considered, whether we should think

--

.)

Well, any proposition? I'm perfectly -- you see, we -- we -- we have meandered here, because I wanted to follow your suggestion that we gave up the study of the Bible and went over to this. So I'm not -- well, I think this was -- was quite useful. And serviceable. Wie? What? It wasn't? Really? (It's really funny because we were talking about those two words.)

That's why I'm using it, Lady.

(But we -- are we going to give time for the American historian, that we want to deal with? That you were going to deal with, you said, an American historian. Did you not say at the last meeting for us to think about an American historian?)

Ja. Did you?

(No.)

Well, this is an old { }.

(What did you think about?)

(Sandburg.)

Well, I had thought of Victor -- Stephen Benét. But I'm all -- see, I don't accept biography in itself as his- -- historiography. -- It's -- today everything in this country is transformed into biography, because people have no -- no categories for the real history. And I think history is destroyed in the long run by having only biography. I -- will not fail you if you say Sandburg. It's all right with me. But you ought to know what you're doing.

People who no longer have a relation to the history--that is, to the fulfillment of certain tasks of the human race in -- in coming -- in -- in building up more and more solidarity -- that's the problem of -- the task of history from the very beginning, the creation of solidarity of the human race, you see, which analysts don't have in { }. Everything goes by itself, you see; every animal dies and lives by itself. It has no consciousness of past and future for this reason. We have, because the more past and future we develop, the more we must construe a society in which we bear each other's burden. Now that's history. As soon as you isolate this by biography, you can see that it -- it particularizes so

much that the -- the flow of the centuries is -- is broken up. So that's why I'm personally not that much interested in biography. And Sandburg hasn't written a history, you see. He has only written a biography.

(Did you want to discuss these --?)

Benét has written the history, at least, of the Civil War, in John Brown's Body. And -- if you still insist that biography after all is a relevant topic--I've written biographies myself--but I have always, by the way -- did it the left hand, as -- in a rush, because I felt I was indulging in the fashion of the time, and my task should be to -- to assure the continuity, and not the -- this -- you see, this -- this particularizing. And I have a bad conscience about it, biography. That too { } everyone. Everybody tells you biography, but they're completely disconnected.

(I -- what I would personally love to hear you make some comments about Hegel.)

Ja, but these -- people cannot read it, you see. I'm perfectly willing to do this, but would -- would this -- would this be a need in their own mind? They are not burned up either by Marx or by Hegel. So if you aren't burned up by something, it's no use talking about it. By what are you burned up? I mean, what aspect of American or -- history is -- is today to you -- the stumbling block, a hardship, a difficulty? Tell me. The future of America, future in America, past of America? I don't know. You aren't -- I -- it's just -- you -- you are indifferent.

(How about the change from -- the kind of democracy -- Jeffersonian democracy to the kind of democracy -- Jeffer- -- you know, Jacksonian democracy, to what we have today.)

(The change from probably idealism to materialism.)

(The difference between Jeffersonian and Jacksonian democracy and how we are really now today { }.)

Well, I give you a -- neither { }.

(That's why I said, to compare it with those two. { }.)

Well, this is just -- you see, I said these would be my --.

(I would second this, yeah.)

{ } that's your problem, you see. But Benét stops at the Civil War, after all. And that has nothing to do with your problem of democracy, really not, because he is still describing the individual farmer and the economy is still individualistic. And so it is still a Jeffersonian democracy. Every man a -- his mule, and --.

Well, we have still five minutes for a vote. You can have a plebiscite.

{{ }.)

Wie?

{{ }.)

You see, there is only one difficulty. It isn't -- it is not in a paper { }.

Wie? { }, ja. { } In what edition did you have it?

(-- It's not in paperback. It's just in hardback -- hardcover edition. That's the only one they have in the bookstore. The only one they have here on the campus.)

Well, I'm all for it. Read it right through from beginning to end in the last four weeks, so I'm -- certainly -- you haven't done this now, have you? Who has read it { }?

(I didn't read { }.)

I think that it is a -- a real -- the way in which history should be written.

It's very conscientious. { } A re-remembering of -- of the Civil War, I mean, of the -- {as I said,} of remembering.

{{ } tell the story of the Civil War.)

What?

(You always say, to tell the story of the Civil War. But he has written the history of the Civil War. But { } don't go further { }. That's why we raise the point { }.)

Are you bringing your texts back? I will not go back on my assignment of the order of things in the Pericles. I still feel that this is -- I shall receive tomorrow from the library the volume of my German premium. I told you that I was given as a boy his book on Plutarch and his biography. And it was in the bindery, and they said I couldn't have it before August 1st. And then I raised hell, and said that you had to learn something. And so they were kind enough to send to the book binder and get it, this one book out of -- from there, you see, before August 1st. And tomorrow, they promised me, I could have it. So I want to -- not to let them down, and -- after I have made so much trouble with the library, you see, to get the book, I want to report on -- on the book's content next time. And you bring me the { }. And also bring Benét and then we'll start right in, with the second half, to -- next time with the Benét.

(I'd like to ask -- my fellow class members whether anybody else is as concerned as I am, with what I feel is the real challenge which Marx poses to us in his interpretation of history, and whether -- whether we can't find some -- I mean, at least be concerned enough to deal with it -- with him as an historiographer.)

Well, these people here, to tell you the truth, my dear Phil, they have no relation to history. It doesn't burn them up. They don't think they are led or misled by history. You all think that you are outside history. Just look at history. You don't know that you are swept away by tremendous tides of pseudo-history -- history, your little mythical existence. -- They don't know that there are such stumbling blocks to the real history of mankind. You are nice, me- -- well-meaning, nice, innocent boys. As long as you do not see your original sin, that you are stumbling blocks--that's the meaning of original sin, you see, that you have fallen by the wayside, and you are not part and parcel of the historical process at this moment.

(You say we are outside of American history, but --.)

{ } to discuss this problem? Why can't we go on to the problems of the American man, or -- how we look at our founding forefathers, and what -- they actually were in reality?)

Oh.

(I mean, why -- why go -- why go to Marx? I -- I know he's great, and you can go to Hegel, or anyone. Why don't -- we simply know so little of these men; why don't we go to somebody we think we know? { }.)

Oh, do -- as I said. I see your difficulties. You see, sometimes, my dear man, by moral mood -- { } a new beacon, so to speak, standing far out in the sea, you get more { } you see, than the { }.

( { } to go into Marxism is --.)

(Well, it's a question of past and future, too; because Marxism is an historical philosophy, which is going -- we're going to meet down the stream a little further. And I'm -- I'm quite in agreement with our fore- -- founding forefathers had something to say to meet Marx downstream, but I think that -- but the two at least --.)

( { } one integrate both of them, rather than separating them into -- antagonistic forces, rather than seeing them both { } in certain ways. I think that's a very good suggestion.)

(Maybe one period could be spared to them, for the two.)

(As well as his -- its thoughts. I mean, that's { } critical analysis of --.)

Well, then I would ask you a question. To start this -- you -- I think -- I want to respond to your question. But I would then put the question in a -- in a narrow fashion. And I would say, "What was the future promised by the founders of this country?" Because I feel that the sense of future has been lost at -- in the last 30 years in this country. The Americans no longer feel sure of their future. And -- and not as a whole. They are trembling and they think, the -- "If the Russians treat me right, if they can out-produce the Americans, that -- that would mean the end of America -- the question: Is that true? Is that the future promised in 1783 to the American people, that can be finished by the -- by the Russians?" so to speak.

You see, the -- what I really feel is the -- the fervor at this moment in this country is that -- beginning with the -- the condescension with which the Russians were treated in 1929 and 1933, a nice little brother now finally having a democracy too, and a revolution, you see; when this ended in 1945, and the Russians marched into Poland and showed that they had very different ideas indeed, there came a great disgust with the press, and -- and dismay, and finally the -- Americans { } they thought of throwing the bomb over Moscow, and finishing once for all with the terrible people. And at this moment, when the Sputnik came, people began to say, "Well, is it possible that somebody else is

carrying the ball? We don't seem to be any longer carrying the ball."

This, I think, is the deepest feeling of dismay in this country, that the time span covered by the vision of the founding fathers, you see, seems -- suddenly seems to have come to an end, that the future at this moment doesn't go on uncontestedly to this country. Whereas in 1900, there was absolutely not question that the future was in America. You see, the future of the whole world was in America. Now with the Russian -- onslaught, people -- in this country suddenly say, "Well, we never thought that we were limited; we thought we were unlimited." The whole future, the infinite future was with them. But if they were right, in 1975, we may have to acknowledge a competitor, you see, and we won't do that. We can't do that. This would mean that we are a finite nation, just one, and not the one and only. And I think that is your -- historical crisis, of the historical consciousness. Wouldn't you agree? Wie? Is there something to it? Wie? So I -- I think the thing is quite subtle. I'm all for -- the American approach. But you must allow me this -- this -- to note this break in -- in the good conscience of America. There is at this moment a faltering. The -- the question hasn't been our future, we thought so naïvely, as absolutely secured, so to speak, that we were carrying the -- the -- the torch in the { } of the nations. And now there is another man who says, "I'll take the torch from your hands." He hasn't yet done it. But since he promises to do it, there's some gnashing of teeth, and some trembling. Would you -- would you think? And that's of course -- is the Marxian "anti" vision.

The American vision, and the -- the Marxian vision -- in this certain manner, do. Look at your dollar bills. I have no dollar in my pocket. What does it say? You have a dollar bill? What does it say? What's the -- the text? No, the other side. What does it say?

{ } "In God We Trust."

(And a New Order -- something.)

Now the question is: is -- has this new order exhausted itself, or is it still new? You see, yes, you take this a little more seriously, my dear man, as you used to do. It says Novus -- wie? Annuit coeptis. God, you see, nodded at our beginnings. That's what it says. And then --? Ja, you -- you -- you don't know this?

And they allowed you to go to college? That's really {striking.}

("One out of many." I know that one.)

Done. You are all wrong. You have heard this. That's just --. Everything is hazy in this country. It's all smog, long before there was any smog. Intellectual smog has produced the other smog. Novus ordo --? Can you read this? I'm not interested in that one. I'm interested in this one. Novus ordo --?

("Seclorum.")

What is "Seclorum"?

(Is it "God"?)

No, no. It's very secular. The word has to do with secular, "saeculorum."

It's hard to believe that students of a university, at the -- of the age of 20 and more, do not know what is printed on the dollar note of their own country. It's very remarkable. Quite an achievement. You live a mythical existence. Absolutely mythical. You are in a fairy tale. Why should I teach you anything about Plutarch if you can't even read a dollar?

(Towards the sun?)

Not -- that's just -- they -- they still were Christians, so they didn't say "Society" -- a noun, a thing. But times -- saecula are the -- the "siècle" in French, you see. These are the centuries, the ages. And the question is, you see, how many of these centuries? Marx would say the bourgeois century is over. Annus -- annuit coeptis.

(What does that mean?)

I wonder. Oh, it's boring, Sir. I shall become cruel. You bore me, so I must become cruel. Here should really be the new { } the little { }, the more complete, you see. "God nodded at our beginnings, and now there begins a new order of the ages," of the century, a new chronology, a new era. That you are { }. "Era" contains many centuries, you see. Sixteenth, 17th, 18th century are all contained in one era. And the novus ordo seclorum--that's a very bold expression--time is ordered from now on, with the viewpoint that the Declaration of Independence is a decisive new start in the history of the human race, you see. Very proud, and -- and very arrogant statement, to tell you the truth. Two and-a-half million people making this after they have been chased out -- 300 Loyalists out of this country, the best citizens. There they were, this rabble in arms, saying that they started a whole new order of centuries. Quite some -- some -- some



conceit. And that's your question before the house: Is it still true? And you have to ask: What was started -- what was so new? And -- and has it any future, and does it all end in ice cream?

It -- is the question before the house: Does -- is this dollar note going to be printed tomorrow? On an inflated -- inflated dollar note, you see? Certainly if you get inflation, the novus order is a -- going under in -- in shame and -- and debasement. It's -- it's -- you see, the funny thing is that they did not say, "Novus ordo seculi," "of the age, a new century beginning." "Saeculum" you see, is "century." Siècle in French. You must have known the word. "Fin de siècle," the end of the age. And -- but that he used the plural. Now the -- the Roman tradition had it that the Etruscans, the -- the -- the educators of the old Romans, from whom they learned the calendar, and the heira- -- priesthood, and their religion, and --.

(The numerals, too.)

Wie?

(Even the numerals. They're not Roman numerals. They're Etruscan numerals.)

Ja, ja. These Etru- -- quite -- you're right; you're absolutely right. I mean, Tarquinius was an Etruscan. This -- the town Tarquinia contains the most beautiful Etruscan {tombs} and -- from which Tarquinius got his name, the last king of Rome.

Well, the -- the whole -- this idea is an Etruscan idea. The Etruscans said that their state would last ten saecula. And a saeculum was formed by the relationship of the birthday of one man, who was the oldest in the community in his own generation, and the death of the man who was born the day before this man died. So -- a very strange idea, you see. Two human beings -- let us say, one being born in 1780, going to be 90, you see; this would lead -- bring you up to 1970 -- 1870. In 1870 then, one day before his death, or on his dying day, a child is born, and--or many children are born, in fact, you see--and the one who reaches then the greatest length of age comes 90 again, and he would die in 1960. So then the Etruscans would say, "God has ordained this to be one saeculum." That's His creation. He has allowed two men to look into each other's eyes, and thereby connect the times, you see, the ancestor and the grandchild. And so from 1780 to 1960, they would have an organic saeculum, because they -- didn't think in decades, and in mechanical geometry, but life was -- was created here now. And

so the Etruscans had a -- a -- a changeable idea of a saeculum. And the Romans accepted this. And "saeculum" in their days was not our abstract reckoning: 1800 -- 1900, you see. They -- think man was not geometr- -- to be geometrized. They had to observe the facts of human life, they felt, you see. And so the measure for man had to be taken out of man's real life, and not out of this abstraction of -- of a yard, and a foot, and a -- and a -- an inch, which I think very wise. All the Greeks tried this. Heraclitus tried this, and the -- the Athenian constitution. They tried to find the measurement in men, you see. The proper measurement of time--and of space, by the way, too.

And you do not know how abstract you are when you -- when you believe in these -- in these miles, and in these centuries, you see. That's all abstraction. Why a hundred? You see, that's just a bridge, I mean. And to say "19th century" obviously is a -- a great superstition. Why should the 19th -- anybody born in 1780, you see, not have the same features of a creature born in 1920? The Etruscans said, "Of course. If they can look at each other -- one of them, at least, they impart to each other that what makes a human being, our face." When we face each other, you see, we beget each other.

Well, this is only to show you that all this is implied in this very strange idea -- that's an Etruscan idea, that 10-steps century -- or, I don't know--nine; I don't know the number, and how they reason it out--would -- would out-- would be the story of Etruria. That's the -- old Tuscany, Florence. And -- and so "Ordo saeculorum" mea- -- meant the togetherness of more than one age of man. And an order in which there would be one purpose, and one act of faith, and one devotion, you see. And this is the American claim, of whose existence you even haven't known. Very strange.

And I think this claim is more important than Abraham Lincoln. And you are quite mistaken to try to -- understand American history from Abraham Lincoln. It's impossible. That's why I'm a little hazy about Mr. Sandburg, you see. That's an exaggeration. The American experiment and the American { } obviously is -- is Christoph Columbus, and -- and -- and the Pilgrim Fathers, and the Irish immigration. And it is a much longer story than you can -- than this, you see, than Mr. Lincoln can -- can explain to you. He is one president of the United States, and a very great president. But he is not the whole destiny of the "ordo saeculorum" of America. Mr. Lincoln cannot explain to you why we are at this moment occupied in Berlin, and in -- and in Guam, and in the Philippines, you see. The -- obviously the destiny of America is a much more -- of a global character as Lincoln ever thought, who was very happy when he could neutralize the -- the South, and -- and get it back into the Union, you see. So he is after

all a -- a reactionary who -- who -- who defeats secession.

And pardon me for using this strange word for him. But I want you to -- only to understand that "ordo saeculorum" is infinitely more ambitious than what our Civil War did. The -- Civil War made it possible again to get back into these ordo saeculorum. If the secession had happened, of course, the ordo saeculorum would have been destroyed.

We have to go.

(Well, we don't have to. I don't have to.)

Well, but you have a right to claim that this is all over. All right. The ordo saeculorum is all over.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...would you have -- all have me -- what does he mean by my saying that the Greeks did not define virtues, but just -- to -- I don't recall that.

(Well, you just said they -- they just talked. They didn't define, like we do, in the dictionary.)

({ } word meant, when they defined a word, it was in terms of a verb action, and that we { } to substitute a noun as a definition of something, rather than an experience.)

You see, if you have some -- an element --. I went to the -- 39 in {Haines} Hall, where Mr. {Bryan}, or {Byron} or whatever the man -- yesterday spoke, and there was hanging this tremendous map on the chemical, you see, elements. You know the -- the list of -- {Mendeleev's} series. And where you have reduced there the element to its name and the specific weight, isn't that?--that would be the idea, the most -- the final form of a defini- -- defining, you see, because it's reduced to a common denominator, a specific weight, you see. The only difference is the fig- -- the numeral in -- in which it stands, and then the name by which we recognize it. That's reduced to a formula "C"- "E"- "U" and whatever. So that is the tendency, the trend of scientific definition: to brush aside all associations which the average layman has when he comes in touch with a rose. He -- he says it's fragrant. When a botanist comes in touch with a rose, he has classified it away, you see, and all the niceties and amenities about roses and the poetical flavor is gone.

Now this -- the -- you can however also define an element by what it does. And you can say, "Water is the most important of the elements." As Pindar's famous first ode on the Olympic Games, begins, you see: "The best is water." And then only comes gold; because water is more, you see, needed to our life, it's nearest to -- to life, really, of all the processes in nature. And so for California, I think it's a good quotation, from the -- the first line in Pindar's poetry is: "The best is water." { }. And this is anti-scientific, because it is a quality. It's a quality which is only personally to be realized. Still more, however, are you close to the -- to the process of experience if you say, "The water rushes." The water, you see --. That's -- what you perceive is the act. And you for- -- know nothing more than: "Something is moving," you see.

And so the -- the verb is the impression, and the empir- -- is empirical; and the definition is scholastic. And you are today inclined to -- to reverse the order and think that the scientific definition is -- is empirical.

And the -- all Americans, as far as I know them -- today confuse experiment and experience. And I have tried to shield you against this error, you see. Empiricism is through actions, through processes. And all science works only experimentally. That is, you cannot experiment without first having defined what you take into the experiment, you see. There is no experimentation without definition, because you say, you see, "I omit this, and I admit this into the experiment." All experiments are stage- -- staged through a theory, you see. You want to prove a theory through an experiment. And you -- all the theoretical -- practical -- so-called par- -- "experimental physics" is based on theoretical physics. You cannot have -- run an experiment as empirical, and --. All -- every American has his loose bottom in his brain, that he confuses experience and experiment. So you don't know that all you do -- live in a second-hand world of theory to which you -- think that life is the experiment.

But experience is this side of theory, before you have anything -- any time to theorize, you are engulfed with something rushing, something thundering, something raining, something loving, something hating, certainly always threatening you, or caressing you, or doing something to yourself, before you had any emergence of your reflective organs, and before the mirror of -- of consciousness, saying, "Oh, that's nothing but." You can also say that you reach still then the first sense of wonder, the { } which Gre- -- the Greek philosophers held to be the center of philosophy, to be astonished. To be so astounded, you see, that you hardly know what to say, and you have to take a deep breath before you can articulate what you experience.

Now that's not the attitude of the experimental American, who is here, detached, and says, "I -- well, don't get excited"; "I don't care"; "This -- oh -- probably that's the -- that's probably nothing but a bug," you see. It's "nothing but." And you can always divide humanity, you see. The Russians are still in the age of the Greeks, and they still have -- speak also such a Greek language of -- of seven cases, and -- and a tremendous verbal -- word wealth. Because, you see, with them, you -- they are astounded all the time. And the whole attitude -- the -- your at- -- your whole education in this country is "Never be excited." Now not to be excited means "Never be astounded." "Never be astounded" means "Unable to experience." And all girls in this country are so terribly threatened by frigidity, because they can't be astounded. They -- it's all experimental. Sex is experimental. If it's experimental, you are already outside of it, you see. Because you have

set it up, and observe it. So all -- everybody, his own observer in this country. And the -- the impotency of an American -- the American manhood is based on this: "Life is just an experiment." Gentlemen, if life is an experiment, you are outside of it.

The Quakers and the Puritans, when they came to this country, they said, "We are God's experiment." And they use the word "experiment" in a religious sense, where you were the metal in the crucible. And this has brought on the American confusion, you see. All your language is secularized Bible. And you don't know this. And therefore, the word "experiment," like "sal-" -- "happiness," you see, is a translation of "salvation," you see. Originally everybody in this country was allowed to pursue his own salvation, you see. And when the revolution came, people wanted to use a general term, so that no church would feel hurt. So they said, you see, "the pursuit of happiness." And if you do not read behind "happiness" the word "salvation," you do not understand the meaning of happiness in America. It has never had this notion in England, you see. The pursuit of happiness -- un-understandable in Europe. It's blasphemy there. We -- we in Germany, if we hear "pursuit of happiness," we think that you are lascivious epicureans, you see. Nobody can work out his happiness; can only work out your own salvation. But happiness is nothing but an American version of -- of salvation.

And -- and -- so the same is true of experiment. The Puritans in the 17th century in this country said that we were God's mighty experiment. God experimenting with us, you see, is something quite different when we -- experimenting with life. Can you see the difference?

And so we are -- you are all confused because the religious notion of experiment, and this physicist's -- chemist's notion of experiment, run into one in your mind. And most of all, you are -- you are terribly hurt, yourself, because you feel obliged to experiment with life.

If the ladies per- -- forgive me, but you remember in "History Must be Told," in -- in the "Shame" lecture, you see, the story of the American student who comes to Heidelberg, and shocks the whole town because he has -- makes love to various nice German girls, and has the effrontery, wherever the heart of heart is reached, to put on the gramophone and have all the noises recorded and then shows this later to his German friends.

And when I came to Heidelberg five years ago, they -- they said they had never seen such profligacy. They knew something about debauchees, and they

know something of insolence, and shamelessness, but this -- this deprivation of Americans was unknown in Europe. You have to know this. Just because this man took it upon himself to experiment with love, instead of experiencing it. Can't you see this?

And -- this is the reputation of Americans in the world, gentlemen, abs--of the women even more--absolute shamelessness. Because you and -- they understand that you can experiment with your own soul, life, body and -- et cetera. You cannot. And this is the story with the -- this perversion, you see, of -- that's why I tried to warn you that ex- -- an experience, you see, note -- notes, acts, processes --. Mr. Whitehead, the great English philosopher, when he came to this country--and taught still ni- -- in the last years of his life in Harvard--wrote this book, *Process and Reality*, in which he tried to -- to describe to you the cosmos in which -- inside which we move still, as an -- as a surprising experience, as something that must astound you every minute. You must be astounded that I speak to you, that you can understand it, you see. You cannot -- but most students sit in my class and -- and define me. And say, "This is an interesting man," or "He's stimulating." You see, that's already breaking the spell of the immediate encounter.

That's why the word "encounter" today has this much -- so to speak, vogue, because people try to find the way back to immediate experience, you see. "Encounter your { }." "Encounter with God," Martin Buber's saying, et cetera. Well, it's is a rather helpless re-discovery of the most original relation of -- of life, meeting life. I mean, it's nothing special, encounter. It's the first thing. But you have perverted all the sequences of -- of the processes of life. To you, the mirror of reflection is the first, and then the acts come out of this. So you are all abstract, you see. You don't treat me as me, whom you meet here. But the -- first say, "He is a human being."

Gentlemen, that's deteriorating my -- my -- my impression on you. Perhaps I am not a human being. Perhaps I'm a devilish being, or a divine human being. I { } -- I'm -- disinclined to accept your notion that I'm just a human being. I'm not just a human being. "He's nothing but a human being." You can always say, "We are all -- all -- all -- we are all but human." In this very moment, the experience of the encounter is destroyed, you see, because you say, "It's nothing but." And you all do this.

That's here the low- -- low-brow style, you see, of dismissing everything of rank, everything of importance, every -- every superior humanity must be -- "Well, he's just a human being." Well, of course, he has to eat, and to sleep, and

do all the other fun- -- func- --. But that -- does -- does this contain a man? And you are so satisfied when you -- can prove of every man his weight in the paper, and she has brown -- brown hair, and she weighs -- she's one -- five feet five. And you have the lady, you see. All these physical connotations which you add today in the papers to the description of a man, you see -- photographing Mr. Dulles' interior -- intestines. Is this Mr. Dulles?

And -- and this wouldn't be bad, gentlemen, if you would not hurt your -- your posterity, if you would be -- children that would come out of such alliances are impotent. They have no -- no power, because they haven't come from a complete -- union and fusion of two people. But they have been planned, a martin- --.

I have a friend whose -- who said me, "This -- this child we made on March 19th." Now do you think that's something? Of course, they all have to go to the psychoanalyst. What does the psychoanalyst? Talk -- talks the reflection and all these people, once more, so to speak, you see. Thinking that two minus give plus. See, the -- the reflective mind of the patient, and the over-reflection of the psychoanalyst then shall restore innocence. Really. You all live a -- minus times minus -- in the hope that this will be plus. Well, why don't you stay here, in the plus -- realm of experience, and of wonder?

So -- you understand?

(Yes.)

All you have to do with the edu- -- in the word "education," here: preserve the sense of wonder with the children. That's all that's needed. If you destroy this by telling the child, "Oh, that's easy. Can tell you all about this in 10 -- two minutes," it's murder. You have murdered the spirit. And it is committed every day in all our schools.

And it's spreading. I read The Listener this morning, the -- English BBC paper, which is after all one of the better things of the human spirit at -- still at this moment. But there was half a column on Greece. And it said in -- in half a column everything about the Greeks. "The Greeks as They Were," it was called, or something. And it was a masterpiece of condensation, but it was all tin-canned, you see. After you had read this half-column, the Greeks no longer existed, you see. You carried them -- away, you see, in a -- in a two-penny, you see, on a -- value -- two-penny stamp. And this shouldn't exist, I mean. The -- the -- one item out of Greece, you see, which makes you wonder, that's how you



have to represent the Greeks to -- to a child, or to a student, or to -- yourself. And not -- not by compressing everything, you see. But everybody here thinks to present the Greeks in two minutes is more meritorious than to present them in 10 minutes; and to present them in 10 minutes is more meritorious than to present them 60 minutes; and so -- on it goes. I mean, you think really that shorter is better. So the sense of wonder diminishes, you see, in your mental {profession}. Because the real sense of wonder is what? Infinite, has -- the quality of infinity. You see, you never come to an end with the wonderment. The very word "wonder," you see, is the English version of "miracle." And the "won-" -- you see, "to wonder" is to -- to change, to transform. And that's quite important for you -- so that you should reclaim the connection between the baton of the sorcerer, you see, the wand -- wand and the wonder. This is the same root. And in German, of course, it has a very important role of "Verwandlung," which means "metamorphosis."

Now for the Greeks, and for the Germans--and I think for the Russians the same thing--the wonder is that we change, that we must be transformed. This is our sense of wonder, you see. Man is never the same. Every day he must be transformed by the encounter. And this is your biographical problem, too, you see, this sense of -- that God's wa- -- wand -- Prospero's wand, you see, which he puts down at the end of *The Tempest*, you see, transforms, metamorphoses, you see. That's the Greek -- Latin -- "transforms." Also, I mean, the simple word "mutation" of course is the same.

Now as you know, our biologists, in their strange experimental passion, have left God one loophole. They call what they cannot explain a "mutation." And if you -- study the word "mutation," it just means these are the spots where we cannot reason, where we have no arithmetic, you see. { } mutation, you see, the points where you still have to wonder, that you didn't foresee, you see, the behavior of the genes, of -- of your genetics -- game.

I -- I have a friend who's a geneticist; well, he's simply a madman. I -- I think they are all insane, these heredity people. Because at all decisive points, they have to say, "Oh, that's a mutation," which means -- formerly they said, "That's the divine providence," you see, "That's an act of God." Now they call it "mutation." But if you study the word "mutation," it means absolutely nothing. It is no explanation whatsoever, and all decisive -- steps in the history of the -- of the -- of life on this earth, they call "mutation." Well, exactly as the Jud- -- the Bible says, "a new act of creation." And they call it "mutation"; and mutation means transformation. And it evokes a sense of wonder that we suddenly see something is no longer the same. So there was a reptile, and now there is a quad-

rupted, a mammal. "That's mutation." Laugh at these people. They're just silly asses, I mean. To hide the secret of creation under a new word which they never translate, and never tell you that "mutation" just means "a new act of creation." That's all it means.

The old thing doesn't work out mechanically anymore, so a new start.

That's called "mutation" in this country. And nobody laughs. This is so funny.

But you all sit down, and they even bind these books on heredity. I did it myself to sample it. I just -- it just -- good for the wastepaper basket, you see.

Because where we -- you and I in biography, for example, you see, want to know who made Lincoln, you see, which act of God produced out of this -- this man with the poor digestion, and a -- poor skin, and -- and ugliness, and -- and -- and illegitimate child, et cetera -- who made him into an angel of God, with a message for the whole -- for -- for -- for centuries to come? That's -- that's a question of history. And therefore, we, gentlemen, are closer to the real problem of history than all these naturalists. And you try to explain men from natural science, but I think they only tell you that the scientists, you see, are hangovers -- hang-on -- hangers-on to our problem of transformation, and try to see in nature those changes which start us thinking when we meet people.

Yesterday you met a man. Today he's blustering. Yesterday he was depressed. You wonder what did it, you see. And -- well, this man -- some people, it's money. With some people it's glory. With some people it's love. With some people it's success. You see, with some people, it's conversion.

So these great transformations of man have -- have men dis- -- may discover change. And what we do with the change in nature, you see, only was discovered in -- in parallel to your and my encounter where we discover suddenly: well, the man of -- yesterday is -- was a boy, and today that's a man. That's experience, you see.

So all real experiences are made between people, gentlemen. And all natural science, empiricism, or experimentation is applying certain notions we have of our -- experience in real life between people, and say, "Perhaps in nature, it's similar. Perhaps -- nature also undergoes shocks, and transformations, and so we boil with the water, and see it bubbling up." And this you only do after you have experienced the heartbeat of a -- of a foaming passion, of a boil- -- as we say, "boiling passion."

If you analyze all the words which we use in the -- chemistry, they all

come from human experience, from "fury," and so on. "It boils furiously," you see. I just got a recipe yesterday that I -- should take, to prepare this tea, furiously boiling water. But what fury -- is, you only know from the heart, and no -- no way in the world outside ever to define "fury." So if you have to take furiously boiling water, the -- first you have to experience great wrath and anger. There are no furies in the outer world. They are all furies of vengeance.

Once you understand the relation of empiricism, and experimentation, you become again the universal man. And you look down at your social habitat of -- of America as a -- purely passing state of your soul. Nations, you see, are -- are ways of bewitching men into a shell of accident. No German can go to Heaven if he's just a German. No Jew can go to Jew -- Heaven if he's just a Jew. It's impossible. You have -- always to be more than what you are. This is your problem of your transportation, or your transformation, or your mutation, or your -- and you get this by a sense of wonder, because every morning, a new sense of wonder gets you out of your hard shell, of -- of a "Hm, m- -- I don't care," you see. I could kill a child who says, "I don't care," because it has killed itself already. I have a right to feel that she -- I should -- could kill this brat, because this brat, by saying, "I don't care," has killed itself.

Tell you a story. The Angel of Siberia was a Swedish woman, the daughter of the Russian amba- -- Swedish ambassador to St. Petersburg in the First World War. And a very great woman she was. Elsa Brandström was her name. Many routes, many -- streets in Europe are called now after her today. Because she went out to Siberia and took care of all the prisoners of war who were located in eastern Siberia, and of course suffered very much, and --.

And -- so after the war, she married a friend of mine in Germany. And he had to leave Germany, because he was a socialist when Hitler came, and became a professor at Harvard, and he's still there. And -- of education, by the way. Yes. And Elsa Brandström so of course couldn't help being this magnanimous and generous person again. And she had -- they had a baby, a child. And this child grew up, and so they invited one day a group of American children to -- and -- for the birthday party of her -- their daughter. And of course they had ice cream. And Mrs. Brandström passed around the ice cream, and said, "Don't you like a little more?"

And the children said with this imitable American accent, "I don't care. I don't care. I don't care."

She burst into tears and said, "But you must care." You see. You -- you

have -- here, she was a woman who had seen all this misery in Siberia, but she felt even ice cream was deservedly, you see -- could only be acceptable and could only be served -- was only meaningful if people did care. Wherever you have a person who says, "I don't care," you know that she is--or he--is in trouble. They will -- he -- they will not be up to the dem- -- requirements of living. They will have to substitute for this some psychological treatment. And that's why you all run -- rush to the analyst, or to some other -- wise- -- wisecrack, who wants to -- has to restore, or to make up for your loss of vitality. And the loss of vitality, this is the spirit first, gentlemen. What you say is -- what your vitality, and not what your -- your muscles, and your blood do. You all are, you see, now -- in black sorcery, you take vitamins, and you took whole grain, and you take all these niceties, and orange juice all day long. You take far too much of these things. And you have to, because you try to build the body up without the spirit. That's impossible.

The sense of wonder is the growing point of humanity. If you wake every morning in astonishment, you will be healthy, because you can assimilate, you can change, you can be transformed, you -- you stretch out for something bigger than you have been before. The sense of wonder is the growing point of the human soul. And you think weight is it, and the waistline is it, and the diet is, and slimness, and -- ridiculous. That's why you all make -- look under a tan-sun -- sunlamp so miserable. You can have all the nice colors of the world; everybody knows that you are bored and dead inside, before age.

This then is the first experience of the real man. We are centered in our growing point; that's the sense of wonder. Because there we stretch out for change, for being ready to become somebody different.

And I -- really I recommend to you. I mean, there should be a discussion on this campus between biologists and historians, you see, on the -- ridiculous invention of the word "mutation," you see. The biologist says, "I have 80 facts that are mechanical. And then I have one fact: I call this a 'mutation.'" And there I stop, I mean. I capitulate { }," you see. We historians, we are honest. We say, "We have 80 facts of -- of transformation, of mutation, you see. There we begin, you see. The -- one word of love can change the whole world." What's -- what's the famous line, "One smile of -- " or "God makes the whole creation new" or what is it? There's an English verse to this -- in this --. No?

So we begin where they give off, you see. We begin with the miracle. And the -- a historian who does not -- is not shocked into writing history by something miraculous shouldn't write history, you see. That's our starting point, that

there is some miraculous transformation, like the Peloponnesian War. We begin with the sense of wonder, and he is the real historian who keeps his readers under the spell of this sense of wonder right through. And this is John's -- Brown's Body from -- by Vincent Stephen Benét, that you keep the sense of wonder, you see, from beginning to end. This is the whole merit of the story, that you never are -- dismiss it and say, "Oh, that's nothing but." And -- and this is unheard-of in this country, and so he had to put it into verse, you see. In other countries, this -- such a history can be written in prose, because we still allow an historian to shock you into a sense of astonish- -- astonishment.

Now it is -- this is only, you see -- in America has only occurred in the last 50 years. You live in a completely changed country. The -- in 1900, America was in no way different in its -- approach to poetry, life. If you read Emily Dickinson, she's just as astounded as any other human being every morning about every butterfly. Have you read her? Wie? Don't -- wouldn't you agree? Every qua- -- quatrain in her has the same ring, you see, of infinite surprise, infinite sense of wonder.

And -- so don't believe what you are made into today is -- is anything but the result of pragmatism, the result of the -- cutting the anchorage from -- of Europe, deliberately; since 1910 has been done by Mr. John Dewey, and the Teachers Seminar in New York -- Teachers College, New York, and all the influences you now realize, you see, come from the -- child has no right to the sense of wonder. Everything is immediately explained. "Don't -- don't be surprised," you see. Why should you? "It's nothing but."

So newspaper clippings are -- are -- are assigned, you see--puns, \$64,000 question, quiz kids--they are all giving you a superiority complex, you see. Because -- a quiz kid is ruined for life, I would say, you see. To be allowed to ask this question, you see, ask a child questions and pay it for knowing this nonsense, which they ask, you see. Give them the question --. But that's their relation to reality. The real -- relation to hu- -- of human beings to life is not question and answer. That's, you see, the curse of your misunderstanding of the -- the Socratic method. They -- the real relation is by learning by heart, the songs of the past, for example. And none -- no question and answer. Question and answer is only possible when you are stymied. When do you ask from the street, your neighbor, where the next house stands? In which case? When would you stop a passenger and have to ask him a question? Wie?

(When you're lost.)

When you're lost, when you are ignorant, you see. Life is this side of question and answer, because it's just flowing, it's functioning, you see. And you only ask when you become self-conscious and say, "Well, I may be mistaken. Is this the house?"

Any stranger must ask for the road. Any foreigner must ask for the name of a thing. The question always means that you are outside life. Anybody who asks is already flat on his fannies. He has fallen down. That's the fall of the Bible. You see, the question-and-answer situation is this, the experimental situation, the reflective. And innocence is where you do not ask the question, but where you listen. And where you believe.

Now how can you get into the swing of reality if children are allowed to ask -- they may ask, but never answer their questions. One of the curses of America is that children's questions are answered. One out of 10 questions of a child must be answered, because it's concerned. The other is just a way of -- of phra- -- way of be -- getting interested, of getting into the swing of things, you see. The child knows very well that it is not inside the process of reality, and so by the question, it wants to, like the foreigner, to find its way into this maze of life. But you do this child a much greater favor if you {commission it} at this very moment. When the child asks a question, you may sure that it has lost its way. And -- so it sits back, and instead of joining the fray, you see, it tries to take stock of it. But it is always happy if you break the spell, forget about the question, and say, "You'd better put on your hat and go out and -- for a walk in the --" or whatever you have to -- to say to the child to free it from its questioning state. I think that's one of your misunderstandings, because you think history begins with questions. History does not begin with questions, but it begins with the sense of wonder, you see, that you live inside history. That there is -- something has gone on before what? And -- you want to be told. At the very moment somebody tells you, you have no special questions -- any further to ask.

Well, how did this all come about? When you write a life of a single man, you take him already out of the context of history. Biography is late. When -- when Homer was in love with Achilles, he had to tell the whole story of the Trojan War. He couldn't write a life of Achilles, you see. Biography is taking the -- the carpet of history and dissolve it into its elements. And all biography is already second to history. You see, you first have the story of the World War, then you can write the life of Mr. Eisenhower. You see. You can never compose the -- Second World War out of the biography of {Sperts}, and Eisenhower, and Vandenberg, and Patton, and -- and, you see, Hitler. Would never lead you -- all

the lives together never would give you any picture of the Second World War. But after you know the Second World War, you can say Churchill, and you can say Roosevelt. And you can distribute the roles in the drama, you see. So if you would see this--this brings us -- me now to my proposition today--every life of a single human being is -- it is -- analysis of an historical event in which these people play roles. So -- how do you call the -- the people in a drama? Actors, or roles, or what -- what have you? persons, wie?

(Actors.)

You see. Biography is separating the individual actors of -- the drama, of history. It's an analysis of Julius Caesar, instead of seeing the play, Julius Caesar, acted in -- in which Brutus and the others, you see, counteract Caesar.

I think this may show you why the word "encounter" today is rediscovered. You see, the deep feeling that by anal- -- analysis of individuals, you never get into reality. So Mr. Buber says "Encounter," you see, "is really the creation of the agent, the various agents." And the "encounter" is today the word for "drama." Now Mr. -- in Plutarch, there is a so-called comparison between the Greek and the Roman hero of histor-- biographies, you see. And this rhetoric trick means that Plutarch replaces the dialogue of real life between Pericles and his adversaries, you see, by his mental reflection on the two, which he puts on an artificial state. And -- this is the Greek -- everywhere the Greek reflection, still is so much bound by dramatic, dialogical experience that you have in Plato, the fiction of dialogue, at least; and you have in Plutarch, this remnant of the respect for reality that the heroes have at least to be compared in his mind. But the true biography of course is that you make the -- the man himself correspond and talk with his friends and enemies who make him.

So the best biography today is not the isolated biography of one man, you see, but it would be, for example, the life of the James -- William James family. And Mr. Matthiessen in this country--William Matthiessen--has ma- -- undertaken this. It's a great step forward in the art of writing biography. He suddenly saw that Henry James and William James, and their father, you see, produced each other constantly, provoked each other, give each other. And so he tried to recapture the real drama of this story of the James family. I think he didn't succeed. I -- I always want to write the books -- myself. It's a much greater drama than even Mr. Matthiessen realized. And I've been engaged in this for -- for man- -- two decades now, feeling that we will not recapture the -- this sense of wonder in biography, you see, if we isolate the individual agent.





So that's why true history, you see, is dissolved by a too one-sided idea of biography, that this life is emanating backward into the womb of time. And so we get psychoanalysis of the embryo. The true story -- pre- -- history of mine is the marriage of my parents, you see, how they became one. And that's their history; not mine. And therefore it would transcend the limits of a pure biography, which only speaks of me, you see. I have to make other people, the -- the dramatists, the agents of the drama, you see, in order to get to my prehistory. I have been the -- the result of other people's responsible actions and experiences. And -- since people hate to admit this--you live in an era of guinea-pig thinking--you -- everybody today traces his biography to his genes, or to his physical, you see -- to the embryo in the mother. Actually they do analyze this now. It's a complete confusion, you see. It has nothing to do. We know nothing about it. We shall never know. But it's very important whether these parents ever got married, or just said so.

I mean, if there was a real fusion of two hearts, you see, if they became one body, then the -- you will not be a decadent. People who marry experimentally, you see, have children without heart, and without passion. They are very intelligent children, but usually very cruel children. Cruelty is also hereditary. It -- comes -- not by genes, but by the degree of fusion of the two beings who have produced you. If they are in love, the result is -- is -- is simplicity. And if they are not in love, you are split.

So now you see, the -- that's why biography is very late. It's always a -- a -- a warning: when biographies are written, history is usually in a mudhole. It's stuck. Because real humility is that the individual cannot be told without his prehistory, and without his posterity, and therefore it is only in -- in extraordinary cases, you see, where the -- that we have to concentrate on the individual against the -- the tapestry of -- of -- the historical life.

And as I said, the comparison in Plutarch is the last remnant of this deep feeling that you cannot tell the secret of one person without holding him up against another, that the comparison, the so-called {"syncretism"} in Plutarch is the -- is the -- redeeming grace, so to speak, by which he begs his -- your pardon for having isolated the hero. So he puts him back into some context, at least. It's an artificial context of virtues versus vices, and so on. But at least he is there with somebody else. And this comparison of the Greeks is -- the essential Greek solution, you see. We have learned from the Greeks to compare. All comparative law, comparative s- -- lang- -- -guistics, comparative -- the comparison was the highest salvation -- element of salvation in the Greek world. And it isn't very high. But

we have learned from the Greeks to compare, and to replace real life by comparison of my own mind, which is, you see, the bystander looking at two in comparison -- comparing them, although they belong one to Rome and to Greece. And if you read Homer, the comparison between Hector and Achilles, the comparison between Troy and the Greeks, you see -- that's his great invention. That's called "humanism." Humanism is not what you think, to be nice. But humanism is the power to take two people outside their environment and to compare them as to their third qualities, you see, regardless of their historical context. And in Plutarch, Homer is, so to speak, exaggerated. You see, every two--one Roman and one Greek--are shown in the same light as Achilles and -- and Hector. But you can see the limitations of -- of comparison. There the -- the contents is omitted. The contents is left aside -- outside.

So the onlooker's mind replaces -- the topsoil in which the heroes really are rooted and make -- lead their lives. And this is -- all philosophers do this, you see. What you call the Greek mind -- and you have to learn today that Gre- -- the Greek mind is only one-half of your spiritual heritage. Without a blend of the Bi- -- biblical and the Greek heritage, you are all absolutely lost, because you all end in chasing the tail of the cat, which is comparison; because you can compare forever, and never know anything absolute, you see. It's very nice to compare Alexander to Caesar, and Caesar to Alexander. But whether you want to dominate the world, that's not solved by this comparison of two people who try to dominate the world, you see. The direction of your life is not given by comparing two people who got lost in the -- woods. That -- they are lost in the woods, or they get -- didn't -- lost in the woods, you have to know from another source. The destiny of men, gentlemen, is never explained by comparison. Ja?  
(Is that what you mean, when you say that humanism -- humanists take the two individuals out of their context?)

Ja. He just -- resigns himself: this is how they were.

Now, so I would say today, you see, in all your literature on Plutarch, you will never find the {syncretism}, the comparison on your end taken seriously. And I would say that this is the umbilical cord with which -- by which Plutarch remained a devout spirit of Greek tradition. Had he not compared Camillus or--whoever it is, I mean, in this case, Fabius Maximus and Pericles, you see--he would have posed as a superball, as Emil Ludwig or some of these scoundrels of today. And -- godless people, you see, who take it upon themselves to create and dismiss theories according to their will. It's the comparison which keeps them --

the Greeks in line. That they are surrounded by -- by civilizations that -- seem to ex- -- to explain each other, to illuminate each other, and to enlighten each other. And here in this country, where you have the harbor of New York, and of San Francisco, and -- you -- you -- you nearly perish by comparison, because to compare means to sterilize the influence of somebody within your own environment.

(The lost {Puritan}.)

Wie? Ja, exactly, exactly.

Well, I tell you. You see, Germany is a very dead country at this moment. I was invited to teach there in 1950. Went to the University of Göttingen. And I had a terrible experience. I was quite famous in Germany for my work in adult education. And the professor of adult education in Göttingen was an old friend, and--I may even say, a student and disciple of mine. Not so -- he was 6 years or 7 years younger, and in our young days, we were -- that made a difference. You are 30 and the other man is 22, it makes a difference. If you are 70 and the man is 60, it makes no difference.

So he had learned a lot. { } never denied this. And so he invited me to his lecture course on adult education. He was very ambitious, and went on -- off on political campaign speeches at that time, and left to me his class. So I made a -- great point, you see, in giving the very best I had to -- to say -- in adult education in the great, you see, the disappearance of spiritual authority in Germany--with Bismarck, and Hindenburg, and Hitler. Everybody shown up as fakes. I asked the simple question, you see, in whom to put one's trust. And how could education proceed without any leading lights, without any -- having any points of reference in the past? And that's the situation in Germany at this moment. And I think I -- I had 200 people in this class, and so I got going. And I thought I was -- it was so that I felt I had given this man an opportunity to -- to work with these people, and to lead them. And so when he came back--his assistant had attended my lectures and had taken them down in shorthand--I said I -- it's very important that you should just now join, at the point, you see, at which we have -- I have be- -- I think I have moved them. They suddenly see that they themselves are in a unique position of -- you see, of -- without ancestry, without s- -- any spiritual ancestors. And this is a very dangerous position. They have no values to go by, you see. And it's only the admission of this -- this terrible vacuum which can save them, you see.

And so I was very anxious. And after all, we had been collaborators. And I said, "Now what I -- please, would you kindly step into my shoes now, and continue?"

He didn't listen to what I had to say. And he said, "Oh no, I have just thought on my journey what I would do. I would now make a speech characterizing you, giving a sketch on your character."

So I said, "Oh, my -- my obituary. This is not why I got up here, so that you can now depict me, and just take me out of commerce," you see.

What he did was, you see, to hang me up as a picture on the wall, you see, instead of entering this process of wonder which I had tried to start in them, you see. He immediately objectified me, took me out of context, you see, and -- and he thought it was a great compliment. He thought I -- he was flattering me. And of course, I preferred life to death. I -- I said to -- I'm not interested in my -- in my after-life, you see. You make me into some posthumous, you see, specter of myself. And he did -- and he's completely dead, and his -- his wife is dying from -- from this death of the man, for years, now. And she is an invalid, only because he has lost his soul.

This is always very simple. If you once have lived a little, the human tragedy is always the same. When the -- in this man, the sense of wonder, you see, have been -- has been destroyed in favor of his knowing everything. His -- and instead of meeting me in an encounter, you see, and joining me, you see, and marching forward on this -- at the head of this army of 2- -- after all, 200 listeners are not a small capital of human -- humanity. You see, he stopped them short, and said, "Oh, look at this man," you see. "He's such-and-such," you see. And as -- the funny thing is, you see, that being completely Greek, he thought he gave me a compliment, you see, by acting as my Plutarch. And this was forbidden, you see. This happened now again with my -- Soziologie, you know, the -- the big universal history. A man has now published a long article on my -- very complimentary. But I'm as dead as a dodo, because he -- compares me with a great writer of the 18th century. That's all I can get. You see, instead of saying you can learn something from me, you see, you -- act accordingly, you see, I am out of com- -- out of -- of the ocean, you see; I'm just -- you see, as low as -- I'm beneaped. Left stranded. Terrible. And you all do this.

It's -- has become a habit now, with objectifying a person instead of encountering him and -- marching along with him. The greatest favor you do a

human being is to forget who he is and to take him up on what he says. You can see this.

Well, I have a -- I think something more to say about this -- this strange Greek behavior of all of you. If you have these three generations, these three chapters in every man's life, you see, I can tell you that there are to this day three modes of treating a human life. The Greek, the Egyptian, and the ecclesiastical. I would say -- use then -- two strange expressions to shake you out of your sleepiness. What has the Church to say about a man's life? When you read -- who -- who would be the people the Church is interested in? Wie? The saints, ja. They are not very interested in the sinners, but they say so -- but the saints.

Well, what is ma- -- what gives us -- what event connects a saint with the Church, with the memory of the Church?

(Martyrdom.)

Wie?

(Martyrdom.)

Yes, martyrdom, his death. So you find that the people, the names of a saint are mentioned in the calendar of the Church by its death -- his death, and you know it's even today demanded from a saint, if he wants to be canonized, that something is proved about the time after his death. What has to be proven in the Cath- -- Roman Church? It's -- may strike you as very odd, but it's important to think about it. What has -- the saint, the advocate of the saint, in the trial in Rome, whether he should be declared a -- you see, a saint? What has to be approved? You know it? At his tomb, something has to happen.

(A miracle?)

Quite. So in a strange and estranged way, you see, the -- the Roman Church has still the idea that man is a transformer. We are transformed in our youth, prehistorically and after life. Our after-life consists in our power to transform. -- Don't be stymied by the word "miracle," you see. If I can't do miracles, I'm not an historian. You see, we all, as loving people, transform. You transform your bridegroom, if you -- you see, as a fiancée. You have to. That's your business. He must become a different human being.

And so -- but unfortunately, our modern world, miracles have been -- are

pooh-poohed, and we only har- -- have them at the grave; and therefore, you think miracles are just out. I assure you that they are not out. My whole life has been only lived on miracles, and on nothing else. Whether you care -- call them miracles or not, I don't care. But certainly they have not -- it has not been lived experimentally. I can tell you that. And that's why I still think I'm quite healthy, and quite -- quite vigorous because I've never allowed myself to stand before the mirror and take stock of my reflections and base my life on my own ideas. I've tried to li- -- to listen to the commands that come to a man when he has to obey orders. That's the only way in which you can keep sound.

So in life, you see, of course, we have the Greek problem of a man's actions. Or acts. Or -- "action" is perhaps better. And so -- not miracles, but action. And you are all action-drunk. I mean, you want to know -- I mean, do something about it, and so on, you see. So no miracles, but actions -- over-actions. Now there is an Egyptian tradition, and you can read it every day in the paper, that the life of a man hasn't to be explained by his actions, and hasn't to be explained by its after -- his after-life, but by what?

(The stars.)

Wie?

(The stars?)

Ja, the horoscope. His horoscope, you see. And -- please don't laugh. It's just as important for you to regenerate in you the sense of wonder about the stars as the sense of wonder about the miracles. The -- you have to find the new expressions for this, but it is simply true that there is a constellation when you are born. Think of Lincoln and the constellation of this country, which made him just the -- the -- the given man for the -- you see. A man not in the Church, but still imbued with the whole biblical wisdom, you see, so that he was able to -- to write the Second Inaugural. A mere barbarian couldn't do this, you see. Mr. {Knowland} couldn't have become president, you see, because he is not shot through with the language of the Bible. But you read any word of -- of -- of -- of Lincoln, and it is there. And I tried to tell you in my class, in 180, about Herman Melville, that he was the last who -- still spoke -- Bible and Shakespeare in every s- -- line he wrote, you see, so he could become Herman Melville.

So -- the horoscope. Now here you have the three elements of bi- -- of real biography. The constellation under which you are born: don't deny it. We are all

-- in this sense horoscopol, because our environment, you see, gives us certain opportunities, and others, it doesn't. There's nothing, you see -- it's just not to be changed. We are born into a world: will you deny that it -- exists, that it has already its own -- its own purposes, its own forms, its own ways of moving and -- and determining you? And so the sooner you get together the Egyptian, the Greek, and the ecclesiastical, the more you can see that the biblical approach tries to comprehend all three. That the -- the -- what I would call the "biblical." What we saw in the story of -- of Samuel and -- his -- mother. His mother is, of course, his horoscope, his constellation, you see. Can't you see this? She devotes him to the -- to the -- to the -- to the sanctuary. She goes there, you see, in her great agony, you see. And that's all done before he is -- he is the -- responsible for this. So the little story in -- that's why I feel the first book of Samuel is the key to -- our modern understanding of the Bible, more than the book of Genesis, because it is -- you can see it. You -- we can -- you can rebuild from biography, history again, you see. If you only complete the history, you see, and see that -- that the miracle of Samuel is then the production of this tension of David and Nathan, you see. That the fact that he calls him "Saul," and abdicates the thing--"Saul will now hear the commands of the Lord," you see--although this comes to nought, the fact that he, Samuel, creates Saul, enables later this dualism of Church and state in Israel, of -- of prophecy and kingship.

And this is his antecedent. This are -- is his miracle. And there is a miracle. We -- I tried to show you that the pro- -- the role of prophets in Israel is--you remember, we talked here about it, did we?--is miraculous. They have certainly -- have never existed before, because of Samuel and his mother's faith. Eli couldn't have done it, because -- he had these reprobate sons; that's -- have been completely decayed.

So please, this will be a -- lifetime job. Your generation has to reconquer the unity of the horoscope and the constellation of the time when you are born, you see, and your respect for it. You can't brush it aside and say, "environment," you see. It's -- it's more complicated. It's your mother. And you have your own actions, of course. And you have the after-effects. The productivity, the fecundity of your life in others. And this is usually beyond our own notion, as you -- it shows later, you see, beyond our -- preconceived notions of what we are doing, we do things that we do not even -- we do not know what we are doing.

(But can't you -- comment a little bit more on the difference between the kind of horoscope you first mentioned, namely the kind we see in the daily newspapers, and what you mean here. Because I think there's a difference.)

Well, isn't it too early? Mustn't I first make you wonder about the fact that we do -- are born in a constellation, you see? I mean, you want me to say now two things at once. I'm re- -- very -- I'm not superstitious. I don't believe in horoscopes. You understand that. This I haven't to tell you at this moment, isn't that right? But I have to wake you up to the fact that in the horoscope, there is left in a crude manner, you see, a separate approach to life, you see, which does not put all the emphasis on the existence between life and -- you understand, birth and death. But it warns you to say that there is an equally essential element, you see, in this. That's all I tried to say.

And so I -- I think at this moment, you have to swallow this hard word "horoscope," and -- as you have to swallow this word "miracle." Please invent better expressions in your own vocabulary for these terms. But make an effort to see yourself treated as a Trinitarian, {texture}, you see. There are -- three elements in your own -- own life. And don't be unhappy about it, because fortunately your parents and the people -- antecedents' generation loved you, and were your equals. They were your brothers, they were your sisters in time. They -- they didn't have, you see -- that's why I -- I at this moment do not shrink from the word "horoscope," because the constellation is already the product of human hearts, you see. They did marry, and they did found a -- a society, you see, and a state. And you can recognize, you see, this -- the -- the attitude toward the past is recognition.

It's the greatest thing if a -- son can understand, that his father did act just the same as he does now. That's more difficult than for a father to recognize that his son will act just the same as he does. That most fathers are quite willing to do, you know, you do -- are. But you are, you see, happy as soon as you understand that 30 years ago, you would have acted as your father has. And proud is the man who can. And you ha- -- it is very painful if you discover the weakness in your father where you say "No, I -- I'm sorry, I mean. He -- he's -- he went wrong. I have to make up for this." But this -- both do, I mean. You are -- you are your father's judge, and you are your father's brother. You are your judge in as far as you must not repeat his performance. And you are his -- his brother in as far as you rediscover his plight and your plight, regardless of the lapse of time, you see, are the same plight.

(I was already jumping forward to Hamlet: "There is a destiny that shakes { }.")

Well, I'm all for it. But you can do this, just the same. I have to -- first to --



to make you digest, you see, two things you have excluded really from your little mind. Pardon me for saying this, because it's a little mind that tries to put all -- everything on the individual. It -- it makes you small. If you try to justify your existence only in terms of your, you see, your own consciousness -- and that's the disease of -- of this country at this moment, that you -- identify your existence with your consciousness. But consciousness is only, you see, there where we have to act. Your whole existence is not based on consciousness. It's only one-third of life that is based on consciousness. Fruitfulness is destroyed by consciousness. And gratitude is destroyed by consciousness. And grat- -- or tradition--or whatever you call, I mean--representative -- your representative character, that you are a representative of this country, or of your family, or of a -- of a de- -- talent, or whatever it is, you see, is destroyed by consciousness. You are not a good Presbyterian -- representative of what a Presbyterian should be by consciousness. But you just are the good Presby- -- you are whatever you are: a Mormon, or -- or a good woman, or a student. Represent here, you see, recognition makes us representative. So there is an interaction between recognition, which is backward-looking, and representation which is--and here you have my word for the horoscope, my dear --, you see. Then we become representative, then we are doing this because we have recognized, you see. That's an interaction between gratitude, you see, and -- and character. I become representative after I have recognized what I had to inherit, and what I have to -- re- -- remake present again. Because what "represent" mean? To make present again, you see, in my own generation.

Now here of course you have the relation of seed and fruit. And -- now I don't know what -- what we can use there in a spiritual, deliberate, and explicit situation: recognition and representation.

(Pollination.)

No, no. You have only -- you can -- { } here. Your father, or your -- the founding fathers of this country you recognize, so you become a representative American, because you can hardly become an American without represented -- that -- you see, recognizing first whom you represent. I mean, that's an interaction you can see. So we now have to find terms which do not use the syllable "re," but would have to use the syllable "pre." P-r-e, you see, because obviously -- you are the precursor, the precedent, you see, and the others follow through it, you see. The syllable "pre-" -- the antedating, you must become an antecedent. Mustn't you, you see? Here, in this case, you -- you appropriate your antecedents by recognizing them. These are the antecedents.

I had this on the blackboard before. And -- and this, well, "posterity" I may say, or -- and these -- is your own life. Well, we say "life," you see, the conscious life. What the Greeks call the "ethos," our word "ethics" comes from this, you see--"ethos" means character. And Plutarch is full of ethos. He tries to give the ethos of the hero. And that's -- you can call -- is an attempt to place him in space. To -- to abstract from the chronological course of events, and to outline, as my- -- as this friend of mine, you see, who put me on the -- as a picture on the wall. This is the Greek idea, you see, that you can depict this man as a lasting character in his actions, regardless of what went on before, and regardless of what follows.

[tape interruption]

...please me -- we -- I need an expression of, well, "saintliness" has completely gone out of commerce. I mean, the -- the -- it's a useless word, but I -- if we have antecedents, you see, we could of course here use again the word "precedent." And what is a -- the -- the consequence -- who -- the people who live by precedent, how would you call them? I mean, whose life, so to speak, is formed and stylized by the fact that they can live by precedent?

(Orthodox?)

Ja, no. That's not a good term in your ears. I mean, it's not a recommendation today. Everybody today is proud of being a heretic. Well, who wants to be orthodox? I want to be orthodox, but I'm the only person I've met who thinks, when he hears the word "orthodox," of anything but the Orthodox Greek Church. I think we all have to try to be orthodox, but I don't think that you can use this term to -- does this -- ring a bell in your -- in your -- "orthodox"?

({ }.)

Wie?

(It does to me.)

It does. Good. I'm glad to hear this. Who -- who still feels that one should be orthodox? You don't.

(No, well, it depends on orthodox in -- in -- you have to select.)

Well, but give me a -- a -- word that expresses the same reverence, you see, for the -- fear to deviate from the -- from the revealed path of righteousness. I

mean, this is what -- what we are trying to -- to establish between two generations, here. You see, that's the important life. What -- whereby has George Washington's life to be told? Or even Daniel Webster's life?

I read a very beautiful justification of Webster the other day, against "Ichabod," you know. We had "Ichabod" here, hadn't we? Well, they said, "Everything can be forgiven Daniel Webster, because of his tenderness for the whole nation, for all Americans, that the South was in his heart, really." The word "tenderness" really made an impression on me, that that was his American orthodoxy, that he was tender, you see, that he cared for carrying all the others with him. You understand? There was no brutality in the man, in his spirit. He wanted to be so comprehensive, so compassionate. And this was his justification. Not that he was right, you see, not that he was orthodox. But that he was comprehensive, or how do you? -- or compassionate, or --. And that he sacrificed. I thought the word "tenderness" was -- surprised me. And I learned it, I mean. I -- I offer it to you --.

But I don't know what -- what you would say of -- of Jesus and the -- the Church. I mean, the -- the fruitfulness, as the result of a mental attitude inside the man who -- who forgoes too much consciousness, too much vanity, you see, too much purpose, too much -- deliberate, I mean -- who -- who -- who -- planning, you see, for allowing things to grow.

({Aklos} -- isn't there a Greek word "athos" mean "the spirit of the times," replace your "precedent.")

I mean, you should feel -- that would be wonderful if we could give "ethos" this meaning. It has it in Greek. "Ethos" means "kind."

(No, no, no. There was a word "athos," "a" -- not "e" -- a-t-h-o-s, I thought there was a -- a word there.)

Yes, eth- -- I understand what you're saying.

({ } spirit. I'm just -- there -- I know there's a -- I remember hearing that there was a Greek term that means the "spirit of the times.")

Kairos, you mean. Kairos.

(That may be it.)

(Athos is the -- the promontory where the monastery is located.)

Oh, Athos. That's A-t-h-o-s. You don't mean this. Athos is just --.

(No, no, no.)

No, he means ethos, e-t-h-o-s.

(I don't know the -- I'm -- I'm getting trouble here with the -- semantic difficulties. But the idea is the "spirit of the times," rather than "precedent.")

That's kairos. That's Tillich's favorite expression, kairos. It's a very important word. You see, "khronos" means just time. "Chronology" means -- just the reckoning, computation of time. "Kairos" means occasion, to -- to sense the -- the sense of the time.

(The moment.)

The moment, yes. "Kairos" is the sense of timing, I have translated it this way, the sense for timing. Is this what you mean --? Or What is yours? I would like to know.

(Well, you're -- trying to establish here three specific sections. One here is precedence.)

Well -- I only wanted to have the syllable "pre-", yes, precedent, yes. It means the full risk, you see. Any -- the precedent is undecided yet, you see. One doesn't know the outcome. You -- even at court, you see, the precedent is -- when it is established -- not yet established, while you are before the court. I -- what I -- drop the word "precedent." Go to the thing itself. You -- you try to decide in your own terms. Please do.

(Initiative?)

No, you -- you say it once more. You have a Greek word in mind, which expresses what?

(The spirit of the times.)

Well, to tell you the truth, I really think the word "kairos" is the word. Mr.

Til- -- Paul -- you have heard of Paul Tillich, perhaps. He is -- he is the theologian

now in Harvard. And 40 years ago, he -- he founded a yearbook called "Kairos," to which I have contributed, myself. So I'm quite familiar with the whole story. And he said that the -- the problem of the living -- the Holy Spirit was the problem not -- of timing, of knowing when to move, you see, and -- that every moment had its own grace. I mean, "gratia" in the Latin sense, you see. The grace of God is in -- is depending on the time, and what you -- there is in Shakespeare the famous line, what you -- you have to take the -- the moment by the forelock, you see. Otherwise it will never come back, I mean. You have -- "There is a tide in the affairs of man." That's Shakespeare, too.

(There's a time and a tide -- yeah, there's a -- tide in the affairs of -- tide.)

(Yeah, tide. Which, if taken at the flood, leads on.)

Tide, ja. Not "time." Right. That's would be your -- isn't that your problem?

(Now I'm lost.)

Well, I want to find you -- after all, it's important. Wherever you have today the term "time," you hit on the important problem of our time. Because our time has lost the sense of timing.

I'm -- Thursday evening, I am going to speak in Riverside, as you know, on history, and the sense of time in an age of technology. And I want to show why in our time -- the -- the sense for time is destroyed. So you are hitting on the most important question of our time.

(Well, I'm getting the impression, um -- from this -- that you are developing a cycle of things.)

Oh, no, but --.

(Not -- not one that's not complete in itself, but it's an evolutionary thing.)

Well, I want to say something very simple, then. When a child opens its eyes to life, it is -- it is embedded in three spirits of three ages. And we are all three-agers, and not teen-agers. The -- you can only redeem a teen-ager by educating him to the three ages. And that's why this -- this country is in a bad way, because it has concentrated on action, and on -- concentrated on consciousness, and concentrated on will, and concentrated on reason. And therefore, the

teen-ager who is yet unable to will, and unable to reason, you see, is completely lost, because he has lost the honor of being the -- the fruit of antecedents, you see; and he's never told that it isn't the -- the deficiency of his will that he has to suffer from, but the great hope that he will be fruitful. That deserves -- that all his austerity, all his shortcomings, all his -- abstemiousness--that he mustn't go to the brothel, that he mustn't use narcotic--is there, because he will have the -- the honor of being the ancestor of a great race. If you cannot make the third age, you see, and the first age potent in this boy's life--or in this girl's life, you see--if you only want to -- then he must compare himself to the willful great executive of 50, you see, with vice president or president. And he feels -- never do that; that's too far away. And therefore, you see, it's too big. And therefore he just goes to pieces. He says, "I don't care," I mean. He says -- "Then I'll have to go to prison, to a reformatory," or what-not. You see, it's too far away.

If you only compare the -- the little baby to the big shot, you see, the tycoon, the baby will remain a baby. And -- as they do now. Ninety percent of Americans want to remain babies till they are 70. They are afraid. But as soon as you see that there are three pea- -- mountain peaks in your life, that you are just as great as representative, you see, of past, as -- as a -- seed of the future, that you are in your own right on a pedestal of -- of -- of being admired by your contemporaries, you see, then this whole thing becomes a process, and it becomes possible. And I'm not then a -- a non-entity at this moment--while I'm not yet the tycoon, you see--but I'm just as important, because I have to represent, I have to recognize all the good people.

I can't tell you the expression of bliss and -- and vitality which my son had on his face when he was 10 and he was asked who his father was. And he beamed all over his face, and said, "My father is there to govern me." And you saw the -- what a burden was taken from his heart, because he didn't have to govern himself, but I had to govern him. Now this is impossible in America. A child wouldn't say that. And as long as it can't say this, this is a very unhappy creature.

(Is that not somewhat the relationship that the Puritans had to God?)

Of course, of course, of course.

So this triune business, gentlemen, don't take it as a luxury. It means that no one phase of our existence is so terribly im- -- is the whole thing. And as soon as you compare then the perfect man of one stage, with the imperfect, the imperfect will break down and just give up. And that's what you have, this -- today,

that one-half of these people just give up the race, because they are only told that their honor is in being individuals, self-conscious, willful, planning, rational, impassionate, superior, or what-not. -- But half of my life I'm a child. And I want to remain one. But only -- one-third, you see. And as soon as you say, "You must remain a child of man, and you must be a man, and you must be a father"--or a mother, I mean, for that matter. And if you distribute this, it becomes a process in which everybody at every moment has still an important role to play. He's not just an agent, you see, but he's also the -- the fruit, and he's representative in this respect. And he's just as beautiful without acting. Can you see my point?

Wie?

(It's beginning to come through a little bit.)

Not much. Please contradict me.

(I have desire -- I have no desire to contradict you. But -- but I don't understand exactly what you're driving at.)

Well, I'm driving at the fact that the Greek type of biography is -- is -- is impossible for us today. We want to have these three different elements represented in a life, you see. The life's fruitfulness, and the -- life's transform- -- and the life's activity, certainly, and the life's constellation, or -- or -- what did we have?

({ }.)

Well, its -- its being the result and its being the fruit -- the seed. And the transformation between these three, that's the achievement of any human life, and that this combination -- one man wakes up to himself at 19, and the other wakes up to himself at 45. So therefore, once you have this -- these three elements in you, you see--the child, the man, and the founder -- I like to -- call the child not the "child" but the "heir." But with the modern inheritance taxes, there is so little to inherit that you -- you don't -- respect it, you see. But you are an heir, certainly, h-e-i-r -- you see. We all are heirs and heiresses. And it's terrible that the -- that the papers only call a rich person an heiress, you see. -- If -- you discover the -- what makes an heir is the recognition, you see, of his relation to his -- to the testator. What makes a -- a man or a wife a woman, you see, their own -- taking their -- their fate into their own hands, you see, becoming self-reliant -- and what makes a -- however, a founder, you see -- doing

things because they have to be done. The acknowledgment of a -- of a -- of a -- demands, you see, that do not care in the least for your happiness, but which make you happy because you -- you are in the gap in the armor of the human race, which only you can mend, because you only understand that there is such a gap. And you do it -- let the chips fly where they may. Any -- any grownup person is only -- healthy if this is his main concern.

I -- I always tell a very simple story to this effect that the -- I went to a doctor in England and -- I was in great pain. And my doctor in Breslau had given me the address of this man--and that's in Silesia--and said, if you are -- I had to go to Oxford to lecture there--and so as you arrive, after sea-sickness, you are very -- of course low, and you have more pains than you probably have. And -- and I went to this doctor. A Dr. {Sacks} was his name. He lived in this -- doctor's quarters where there is one doctor next to the other, as the Anglo-Saxons do it, you see. All the lawyers in one street. All the doctors on one street. Very funny arrangement. And so he said, "You are a scholar, and you are -- must lecture at Oxford."

"Yes," I said. And -- "But I'm feeling { } poor."

He said, "I'll tell you. Officers in the services and scholars, my -- in my experience go nuts if they are under medical treatment for more than a fortnight. Your -- it is your business to forget yourself and to think of others. And -- that's why you are a scholar. That's why -- what a military man has to do. So if you are asked to concentrate on yourself, on my treatment too long, that will harm you. Have your pains, and lecture. And that's better than anything I can do for you." And the -- here was a man, you see, who was a founder instead of a doctor. A doctor is an active man who does what the profession demands. He was able to drop his profession, you see, and not to write a bill and not to medicate, but to think of the future, of myself, really in terms quite absent from my silly weakness, you see, of -- of trying to get -- get a cane, so to speak, to walk with, from him.

And I have never seen a -- a greater act of love. That is what love does, I mean, to -- to emancipate the person you love from your own self. And -- but I don't know if you realize that this man overstepped the boundary of his professional ethics and became a hum- -- you see, a full-fledged man, because he provided liberty for me from himself. You see, he freed me from my superstitions that it always had to be a doctor. So to speak, he became my Christian Scientist at that moment. Which is a -- a tremendous -- and every -- doctor today is asked to



do today just that. You can't -- that's why medical ethics aren't enough, you see. Somebody has to tell the doctor, "Stop with your medicine. Send the patient home and say, 'Become well on -- under your own steam,'" in cases, I mean. Not always, you { } -- you understand. This liberty today is -- is the problem of all specialists. And this -- this is always not doing one's own will, but surrendering to a higher will. Don't you see that this man surrendered to a situation in -- the -- encountering me, which had nothing to do with his shingle, "Dr. {Sacks}," you see, "Internal Medicine." Can you see this?

And this overstepping your self-consciousness is your relation to the future, is your fruitfulness. If you could formulate this, this is why I'm asking for the term, you see: what did this man do at this moment? It's very -- this is -- you can't -- this is greatness. If you can see that this is greatness, you suddenly are in the real, you see, creative history of the human race. All the acts we have to remember are those acts where a man forgot himself. Can you -- will you take this down? It's the best -- solution of history I can offer you, you see. All the acts we have to remember are those acts in which a man forgot his -- his self-interest. You don't have to remember the acts where a man looked out for himself. Heavens! That's {ceded}. You see. The Bible said they have their reward, you see. But the reward you owe the people is to recognize that they did something, you see, beyond their self-interest. And that's all fatherhood, you see. A father -- it's against his interest. He wants to sleep with every woman. But in -- in fatherhood, he forgoes this privilege, and recognizes that he has to stick to one woman, you see. And that's his dignity. The children of this woman make him stay with her. And therefore fatherhood had -- in all -- former days this tremendous important that you attribute to a father that he does not do -- act for, you see, within the realm of his self-interest.

Take a farmer who wants to give his -- his son his farm, and one day discovers he shouldn't. The son must be left free to become a minister or a poet, you see. In this very moment, the father, you see, steps outside the realm of his own interest, you see, and forgets himself, and his interest, you see, in love to his son. Isn't that right? In this -- that's a great moment. It's the greatest moment in the history of the family.

And you can see that in biography and history, there are very few such important moments. Life doesn't consist of 24 hours. The decision, you see, that he will help his son to become something that is against his own interest -- to leave his -- his farm to his heir, you see, that's the histor- -- one historical action in his whole life. All the others -- count for nothing. That he eats well, drinks

well, and so on, that's not historical. That's all just biological. The historical is always this one s- --you can take this down--the historical is always this one step where a man decides to be representative, or to be germinative, or how -- I -- I'm just looking for a word; it's not a good word, either, but I mean -- you see, instead of looking out for himself. Can you see this -- what I mean?

So that he com- -- he becomes a triune. Gentlemen, the Trinity is not written in Heaven only, that God is in three persons. It is your own experience that you are in three persons, you see. Father, Son, and Holy Spirit--that's the daily experience of every human being, because every moment you either recognize, or you decide, you see, or you sow. Or are sown. This is even better than "sow." We don't sow, but we are sown.

And that's our great honor. And that's why life is so astonishing, because the mixture, the admixture of these three elements is every day one's own free decision. That's why ev- -- no day is like the other. You never -- this doctor went -- before I came to him, had no idea that he had to become a hero in my eyes, you see. But he did. And he has forgotten it. Of course, he never thought much of it. But I -- you see, pronounce hi- -- proclaim his glory now for--how long ago is this?--1927 it had to be. Imagine! And now I'm still speaking of it. That's how -- how many years?

(Thirty-two years.)

Ja. So I -- I -- wish you would help me to find this, if you will, this interlacing, this -- of the -- of the three generations seems to me our answer to the Greek, Plutarchean biography, you see, where everything is contained within the consciousness of the man. And -- the antecedents are only given -- given to -- lead him up to it, con- -- his own consciousness. He uses it up, so to speak, you see.

You are -- you have a very -- the Greeks have this naturalistic idea. Here is the chicken, the chicken eats up the eggshells, and -- and -- and then it is sold. And we look at it, and admire it greatly, you see, and then it dies. Or is slaughtered, or what-not. That's the Plutarchean biography. And that's most unsatisfactory for you and me, I think. Or perhaps it isn't, I mean. Then you -- Plutarch to me is -- is -- is a -- is a rudiment -- rudimentary, I mean. It's one way, you see. And he saves the context, as I said, by comparisons. He has this shelf on which he compares the -- the different bottles, you see. But it is all -- at a standstill; it's all just viewed from -- you see.

All Greeks are, in this sense, voyeurs. They -- they look at things. Your world -- Look, View, See, of course are all Greek -- or the -- the preponderance of the eye sense. But with the past, we co- -- are connected by -- by obedience, and with the future, we are connected by smell, by scent, by flair, you see. You cannot reach -- this -- this man {Sacks} didn't find anything, this doctor, { } -- in his books to tell me this. He could only sense that he would do me wrong if he treated me, you see. That's flair, you see. He -- he sensed my -- my problem, or you say he had a "hunch" -- you can -- that's not quite as good, but you may -- use it. And all -- your important actions are done at the full risk that what we see tells against the decision. Here the man saw me in his office, after all. And I was the patient, and he was the doctor, and -- who didn't expect him to be anything but the doctor. And, you see, I had to be his patient.

So the sense, to have the sense to say, "This man must not become a patient," you see, is revolutionary -- you see. It takes me out of--and him, too--out of the environment, which is there to be, so to speak, in itself to operate on us. And he uproots this context, you see, and say, "I meet you in a free encounter. I'll look at you as who you should be outside this waiting room and this office." And so he saved me.

If you can learn to discern in every day, every one of us is -- is demanded to make these -- these distinctions. These -- all of you are triune. And the more you become a specialist, of course, you -- for you it is easy to grasp it. For a man who is busy, you see, in his office -- take an executive in industry. It is -- becomes more difficult, of course, to -- to -- to remain to these three worlds, you see. Much more difficult. A man of 50, you see, is usually completely afraid to miss his -- his own self-importance, so to speak, you see. And one more appendicitis to a surgeon is very easily considered a success, you see, whereas obviously the surgeon should also be like my doctor, and say, "Don't ope-" -- or "I won't operate," you see. And you should gauge the reputation of a surgeon by the question, you see: How many operations has he de- -- de- -- has he declined? You see, instead of saying, "Oh, he does 300 a y- -- a month," you see. This shouldn't be a recommendation.

So my dear -- this word "horoscope" has one great connection with your question, Sir. The -- it means the -- the -- the view of the seasons, "horos-," of the -- and of the god Horus in Egypt--that's probably where it comes from, "horoscope." So it means this -- to view the spirit of the time as it already exists at the birth. And so the word "horoscope" at least has -- is better than -- than recognition and so on, perhaps. There is some time-sense in it expressed. If you -- if you would feel in the word "recognition" the same relation to the given conditions of

history, you see, then you can drop the word "horoscope." But otherwise I would hold it up to you as a warning that it means that God has created the world before we were born, and that we can be in alignment and approval, that we don't have to be a rebel against everything that has gone on before, that we even can't, you see. This idea of rebel, you see, is purified by this idea that -- that long before we are born, history already had a direction, had a meaning, it had a -- and therefore imparts something to us, which we have to -- perhaps to single out and -- to -- but this is -- we are not this -- you see, the world doesn't begin with us.

(How about "heritage"?)

It's not -- it's not -- it has been abused. I mean it doesn't --. Yes, I --.

Now here is the -- is my -- my boys' present. Perhaps you take down this ti- -- title. I want to -- also -- to proclaim its glory forever. Friedrich Leo--L-e-o, like the lion--came out in Lip- -- Leipzig in 1901, and it is called Greek-Roman Biography in Its Literary Form. Greek-Roman -- The Greek-Roman Biography in Its Literary Form. And I think the title conveys to you a whole way of thinking which you should adopt, that biography is a great problem. It destroys history. And today I'm -- we have too much biography and too little history. People all take -- take this way out. The historians, you see, write one biography after another. Because they are all faithless, and godless. Modern agnosticism. It's much easier to describe a man just for his consciousness and for his actions, you see. And there is no miracle then performed. The entry into the stream of history is -- is omitted. The -- I think the -- the -- the saving grace from bio- -- for any mere biography comes then from three -- from three attitudes of the historian, of the biographer. One is the encounter with friends and enemies in his own life. If you print the letters, not only written by your hero, but the answers that he receives, that would be the real biography with regard to the present time, to the -- to the -- to the -- his own life, to his own presence. And so I think the modern biographies are completely -- obsolete, because they do not publish the answers to the letters the -- the author -- the man himself writes. You have life -- the letters. And very often his letters. But what do you know of the man if you do not read the answers?

Because you do not -- recognize what ma- -- who -- how these people make him, you see, how they force him, how they shape him. And so a -- a good biography would -- would be dialogical and symphonical, you see, with regard to contemporaries. You must listen to the contemporaries speaking to this man in -- before you understand his answers -- his responses, as Mr. Toynbee calls this.

(The counter-point.)

Wie?

(The counter-point.)

Ja, ja. The counter-point.

With regard to the antecedents, recognition covers, I mean, his religious heritage, as you say, I mean. His -- what he -- because that's in the deepest sense, of course, the binding {forces really do}, you see. What binds us to the whole -- stream of history, you see. So a man's religion is a -- is a very serious part of a -- his biography, not in the sense of his conscious philosophy of life, but about the things he wouldn't overstep.

Take Ruskin, and his mother complex. He was unable even to marry, because he couldn't consummate a marriage as long as his mother lived. And she lived to be 91, and -- then he was 52, and was for late -- to him for marry -- to marry. So he was married for 10 years, but his wife could claim in court that he had never had her as his wife, because his wife -- mother was still alive, and {so} he thought it was obscene {to marry}. Tragic case. {Charles} Ruskin is the greatest case in the Anglo-Saxon life.

But I can't tell you how many famous men in the 19th century have been impotent in their own marriage, consummate their marriage. For moral or -- or -- for reasons, or for mother complexes, or for what-not. That is, self-consciousness makes impotent. No -- ever forget this, you see, that this is very strange. And religious taboos, of course, too. And love is self-forgetful. And people who have been told that they always must have ethical standards, and must always know what they are doing, you see, are very lame ducks. Because self is -- is -- is made very -- is paralyzed by --by consciousness. It isolates. You cannot lose yourself if you -- if you constantly want to know what you're doing. And if you're always willful.

These are very serious questions. So the word "religion" will have to be translated, I'm sure. I've tried to represent -- to translate it into this interaction of recognition and representation. If you want to -- to do the two things together, it would be religion. But I have spared you the -- the -- the single word, so to speak, you see.

Where is my -- my chalk?

So we have here in the widest sense: recognition, representation. That's our religion. Where you are represented -- Abraham Lincoln is representative, and he recognizes. And that's his whole religion. He never belonged to a church, but you cannot deny that he is a religious, you see. And it comes out in every word he quotes, in every word he says, how -- what he recognizes is the biblical tradition, and the American tradition. He's not only the three -- scores and ten, that our forefathers did such-and-such, but he also says, "If the"--how is it in the Second Inaugural?--"If as the Bi-" -- he doesn't say, "As the Bible says." He has a grander way of quoting the Bible. But he does quote the Bible. Wie?

And that's his --. You see, I give you a better word, perhaps for "religion"; that's "authority." What are the authorities you recognize? That's your religion. And what is the authority you represent? That's your active religion, you see. When you can say in the name of a god, "Do this," you see, to your child, you are rep- -- you are in authority, representative, you see, of Him. and you yourself recognize, that's the authority again. And in authority, recognition and representation are unified. Is it understood, gentlemen?

([A] and I are wondering whether one metaphor in music wouldn't be the overture?)

For what? For the relation of this and this?

(In the first. Page 1, here. The antecedent.)

Something warns me against that. Something warns me against that.

(The combination of many --.)

Pardon me?

(It's the combination of things to come.)

-- But there is no sacrifice involved. The father sacrifices his self. He forgets himself. The doctor sacrifices his doctoring. There is nothing of the kind in overture. Quite the contrary. It's a -- it's a holding up, you see, it's -- an advertisement, or -- in the good sense, I mean, it's a program of the whole.

(Often is complete in itself, or -- it stands out, detached from { }.)

Before I -- but it has not this going underground in order that the next may come up and be visible, you see, this --.

Goethe has expressed it in a strange way, which may show you how old existentialism is. He has said, "We have to place ourselves into non-existence in order to come into existence." That is the -- the selfless -- you see, the forgetting of self. And the existentialists today are so funny, because they want to have existence without non-existence -- you see, the --. Dis- -- we can only discover our -- the miracle of our -- personal, individual existence if we know that we come into existence after we have sloughed off the accidents of our already-existence. What I -- seem to be at this moment I have to sacrifice if I want to attain that which I -- my heart is yearning to become. Yes?

(Heidegger would be an exception to that, wouldn't he? Except that he links it -- more metaphysical.)

Oh yes, yes. But the French, I mean -- Sartre, and so on. They -- they have -- they don't -- they want to have existence without non-existence. But the problem of the existentialist is, you see, the -- the sacrifice of all the accidental forms of my existence, that it would be -- to go as far as necessary to non-existence, you see. Jesus had to be -- to cease to be a Jew, which was His whole problem of His life: "How do I do this, without violating the law?" you see. So -- only by becoming its victim. And He's -- the Crucifixion is only the last step of His ceasing to be under Jewish jurisdiction. And the Christians have always held that His -- His contribution was that He spared any later this whole road, because He took it all upon Himself to live out this last phase, you see, of the law, at the ti- -- period of the temple. And by taking it all upon Himself, He freed all the others who had -- He had -- you see, not -- not to undergo the same -- the same duplicity, so to speak, of two allegiances.

It's a question of -- of all questions, you see, that you understand that self is sterile, is only contained between birth and death. Our selves are not immortal. We are mortal. "Self" is another word for being mortal. Now we are, however -- come from far away. We are the children of Adam and Eve. And we are the children of God. That means that long ago, you see, we were necessary thoughts. We had to be -- come into this world to do what is needed. That is more than self-made. By recognition and representation, we act -- under -- in auth- -- we are in authority, just as Jesus taught in the temple at 12, already, like a man who were -- was in authority. And the same is true about the future, you see. When we strip ourselves from the masks of society, for the sake of the future -- at this moment,

we are -- bear fruit, because self cannot inherit the future, I mean. Your son cannot have anything to do with your mere self. This is not the inheritance you can give to him, you see. You must not want him to inherit your wrinkles, and your manners, and your, you see, all the mortal parts, the -- the self- -- the -- your conceit, so to speak, your conception you -- what you can be defined as, you see. What you must give him is the spirit. This is only where you free yourself from self. Where you -- and -- and for this I am still looking for the expression. You see, the -- but it of course means that we ourselves become authorities. But it's -- it's not the good -- best word. But it has something --.

This is, by and large, the relation, you see, that we become authorities only after our death. Authority, self, and authority: that's I think the road we travel. But at least this is not wrong. I mean, I don't say it's the best.

(Like a sine wave in physics.)

Wie?

(It's like a sine wave in physics.)

Explain, please.

(A sine wave, it goes up and down.)

What is a sign ware?

(It's a graphic portrayal of a cycle, but I don't think it's --.)

(Yes, but it can be linear, and that's what this --.)

(Yes, but -- it's only linear in a graphic sense, but the graph represents a cycle. So that in this sense of the word --.)

(But this is definitely a cycle.)

Ja, it is, but --.

(And it's linear. So I think a sine wave would --.

(Explain it. Put it on the board.)



Ja, I wish I learn something, here please.

(I doubt if I could teach it to you.)

(Well, now this is a challenge.)

Wipe it all off.

(Be yourself, then you can be { }.)

(Well, this I remember mostly from high school physics. It's really this: now when your -- your authority may be here, and your self may be here; I mean this again become authority and then self as a cycle -- linear. Oh yes, of course.)

Would you call this "sign"? I'm just looking for the German term. Of course, I learned my physics, you see, in Germany. But I taught physics in this country for two years. And -- { }, now, now -- wait a minute. But I never ran into the expression "sign ware." I mean, I just --.)

(Wave. Sine wave.)

Oh, not wave. Wave. I -- { }. Oh yes.

(Impulse. { }.)

Wie?

(The --.)

I'm only put off by the word "sine." I mean, wave -- if you had just said "wave," I would have understood. But sine wave, I -- { }.)

[overlapping comments by students]

When I taught physics here, I didn't have to use the term.

(How would this be like in a heartbeat, the systole and {diole}.)

Ja, very good. That's { }.

But you see, the miracle of transformation, of metamorphosis, takes place

here. You who have been self become authority, you see, and -- so it -- you see, that one becomes one's own opposite number is the -- is the mystery of -- of your own existence.

(There's a -- there's an interesting supplement to this, in -- in the operation of the electric motor, because the magnet passes through the plus and negative on those corresponding waves. The -- so that the plus would be the authoritative, and the negative would be the self-forgetting.)

Would be the self- --?

(Self-forgetting.)

And where is the self?

(The self { } when you pass the line. Halfway in between, the polarity is balanced.)

(This isn't applied to everybody. I mean how --?)

Doesn't it?

(That is the line.)

(I mean, does it now, though? I mean, take a slight, a slight --.)

Take it or leave it. This is the question of your own free allegiance, I mean.

Obviously that's your relation. Everybody -- you see, you must understand that there will always, and always has been, all the religions of the world simultaneously in existence. There is no history of religion. At any one moment, people have taken this mystery in--which contains us--in part or in whole. What we -- what I would claim of my faith is only that it is the most comprehensive. But you can of course get stuck in -- in the Stoics' attitude in saying, "self," I mean. You can take -- your root in the fatal- -- fatalistic attitude, it's all constellation. It's all horoscope, you see. And you can take it in the Latter-Day Saints, and the Jehovah's Witnesses, and it's all the Last Day of Judgment. It's all just the future. Nothing what you do now is important, and nothing what has gone on before is important. That is, I must leave to you the -- the emphasis, you see, on this cycle. I can only try to be -- to feel that it's comprehensive. You have to make your choices inside of this.

All religions seem to me to be related to each other not in any evolutionary way, but in this way, like a -- you see, but the most comprehensive, and then there are these subdivisions. And some are satisfied with this little residuum, you see. There, for example, the rebel. He says, "Well, I must be myself." All right. That's part of every religion. As one -- as one faith, you see. I could show you -- I mean, I have worked on this in larger detail. It's not just meaningless. There are these shades of -- of comprehensiveness. You can say "authority"; you can say "inheritance"; you can say "seed, fruitfulness"; you can say "self-expression," you see; "genius," you see; and you -- you say something, but you say it within a context in which all these things are within one economy, one -- one -- one budget. You can use -- people will always exist who deny this budget, this economy, and say, "It's all disorder, and I'm just living out my own self. And I know nothing else." So that's why I cannot answer your question. It's your decision.

In this sense, every -- we are all free to decide how much of this mystery is -- matters to you.

(Well then, this -- this is a mystery, you would say, Paul speaking about Ephesians?)

Exactly, exactly. He's full of this. He's full of it. That's where I learned it.

(This would be the { }.)

And you may understand that while the Gospels are contemporary with the great biographies of antiquity, Plutarch, and { } the Latin, who wrote the -- the life of the Caesars, you see -- came at an end of history, for the feeling of the ancients with the Roman Empire, history had come to an end, the times. The times were fulfilled, and now everything became cyclical. So they -- they filled out biography out of the context of history as the -- the thing that's still interesting. That's still enough surprising, sensational that you -- you concentrate on the individual, you see.

And against this, the Gospel, you see, is written in Greek against pagan Greek all the time. This is this paradox of the new biblical language in the Bi- -- in Greek, you see, that elements had to be introduced, like the word "Gospel," itself, "evangel," you see, which the Greeks didn't understand. The Greeks had lived by -- by news, you see. The Gospel says, "In this sense, the news is not better than the old." You see, sensation is not any better than itself. It -- its -- if it isn't part of the economy of salvation, you see -- if you do not wish to become

authority yourself, your self is no good. You see, the measure -- yardstick of a man's self-consciousness and a self- -- a man's self-expression obviously is his fruitfulness. "By their fruits ye shall know them," the Gospel says. The Greek says, "By your showiness, by the phenomenal character of yourself, you should show it to them." Hitler is a case in point, who says, "I'm phenomenal, I'm colossal." And { } at the beginning of -- history was the man who burned the temple of Ephesus in order to become famous. And it was a short-cut. An atomic explosion is always the simplest way of becoming famous.

(But you're not supposed to mention his name.)

Well, this -- what -- the others decided, yes, yes; you are quite right. And they -- they didn't get away with it. He managed to get into the records of history.

(It reminds me of the philanthropists who -- who donate so much money, and have their names put on all those libraries, { } dedicate.)

Exactly, exactly. Well, why we have this building mania in th- -- here in this country, you see. People overbuild in order to get their name there, and then they have nothing to run -- to run the building. The -- the whole problem of our endowments today, as you know, is the -- that the percentage that goes into building is far too high. So no salaries for -- for the people who live -- there, because the people want the -- have the big building visible and showy for their posterity. And that's of course fruitless.

I'm sure all the educational reforms which are needed in this country cost very little money. But the -- the quest will be for -- for larger buildings.

({ }.)

It's fantastic.

(I noticed a headline in The Bruin yesterday pertaining to the fact that the response, the student response for living in the new, big hall over there is very s- -- very low.)

Wonderful! Wonderful. Wonderful.

(Hooray! Perhaps there's some hope, yet.)

So I -- I think we are back really to the economy of the human spirit, because -- the -- the Roman biography reached its zenith at the very moment when the -- the Greek and Roman history came to an end.

(What do you mean by, "Biography is always late"? In that sense?)

Ja, because it is unraveling, this unity. I think a -- a -- the eminent historical people have a -- are quite unconscious of their importance. They are put on the spot, and they are just forced, you see, to act. I mean, the more the -- they are -- they are put on the spot, I think -- the -- more they have to rise to the occasion. And they never knew that they could do it. Like Truman, I mean. He's an historical person. His biography is absolutely meaningless, you see. But his act as a -- presidents are not.

({ } greatness shows much later than the act itself.)

(What's -- what the difference between a -- a man that's able to mark an era, to mark the end of it, so that it doesn't have to be repeated, say, like Whit- -- Whittier; and a man who marks the era, and becomes totally involved in it, like, say, Hemingway or F. Scott Fitzgerald. Or -- in a more critical sense, like T.S. Eliot, who marks the sterility of the 20th century? How do you distinguish the validity of one? One is a -- like -- Whittier as contributing, and the other is contributing nothing, except a -- a fashionable novel, like Hemingway. How do you make the distinction? What do you look for? Both of them mark an era.)

Well, I think the quiet recognition is lacking in Hemingway. This -- this -- he is not thankful. I -- there has been a movement in -- in -- in Holland, I was told a few days ago, which has -- may help to explain to you -- the incredible situation in which we live -- where -- a great scholar brought up his children forbidding them to say "thank you," ever. Now if you don't teach a child to say "thank you," you deprive it really some of the -- it's the root word, you see, of recognition, "thank" -- to say "thank you."

And you know how he argued? He -- he said, "It spoils the giver. The giver must give it without any -- expectation of gratitude." And so he took -- instead of looking to his child, and educating his child, he was the judge of the man who gave the child a present. And he wanted to save this man, so it was his business, you see. And thinking of the giver, he abolished the relation of the child to the things he received.

So if you tell a child it has nothing to be thankful for -- you ruin this child.

You -- he took over, so to speak, the rebel thought, you see, into the youth of the child. So never was there -- should there be any experience of having received anything unasked, you see, and as a gift. As a -- being showered really, with -- with -- with gifts from the past.

I had a woman friend, the daugh- -- the mother of a great, very famous man. You also Miss {Jacobs} of whom I'm talking. And -- and she -- she was very bitter, and her son was very sick, and her husband died. And she was -- and I said to her, "You can only be saved if you are able to say still 'thank you' for what you have received. And you have received tremendous gifts. You have this famous son," you see.

And she couldn't. And she died in absolute despair, at least. The word "thank you" was not in her vocabulary in a great sense, you see, of recognizing what -- what was given her. And so this -- this Dutch scholar, I mean, just fights with the {death}. But there has been no fashion in the last 50 years, you see, that hasn't come. And so in this sense, I think Hemingway was in danger of -- of leaving the -- the sine wave, you see, of -- yes?

(Well, I was just thinking on this -- on the three different ideas here, that are all connected. The first, maybe we could say, is "thank you"; and -- and the second, as you said before, when this child said, "I don't care"; this could maybe be the second -- second phase, here. And the third -- and the third, instead of saying "Thank you," or "I don't care," you're giving the ice cream to somebody.)

Well, I have written a -- the -- the four root words of all human language, in a biographical, or existential sense, in a real sense. Every day you have to -- to appropriate or to balance "thank you," "yes," "no," and "please." {In this you're a giver}, you see. "Accept this, please," you see. There you try to be fruitful. "Thank you," you are the -- yourself the recipient. "Yes" and "no," you cut out what is dead and what is living, you see. You affirm -- you say "yes" to the laws of your country or whatever it is, you see, to your environment, or the --. And "no" you distinguish yourself by not adjusting totally to your environment.

So I think if you -- this is what I call "the cross of our real existence," you see. It consists all -- every day in "thank you," "please," "yes," and "no." "Yes" and "no" are words of space, and "please" and "thank you" are words of time. Because "thank you" puts you into a chain of events that went on, you see, before you had made a decision, comes to you. And "please" is thinking of the future. You can also say, "I am invited here," and "I invite." Isn't it, I mean? Every

father invites his children. And therefore, these four root words, I think they are the kernels of education, of the -- educational problem, ja.

(Acceptance and invitation.)

Ja.

(RSVP.)

Pardon me?

(RSVP -- {répondez} s'il vous plaît.)

Ja. And the Plutarch I would say is -- cutting out these -- these two words.

He doesn't dwell on "thank you" and -- and "please." He takes these more or less for granted. And the biography of the secular type is only affirming the -- what the man stands for and what he has op- -- has been opposed to, I mean. You see, he's partisan, he takes sides, he -- you see. So a "yes" and "no" is for myself. But with "please," I enter the future, and by "thank you" I -- I join the past.

Now we come to -- didn't we decide to devote to -- to --? Ja. And we -- I

think you -- the -- the John Brown's Body has all these four elements. In this sense, it is a -- a full, human document -- a fully human document. It has the four relations, you see. This -- every -- verse, I think, is full of acceptance, and full of -- of invitation. Just as much it is partisan, I mean--there is the South, and there is the north, and there is { } you see. The "yes" and "no" is our involvement in the tragedy of the day. But it isn't all just a daily affair. You recognize something eternal, and you recognize -- something that we must acquire forever. And of -- I still think that in this sense, Thucy- -- Thucydides is -- has this invitation, this -- this attempt to make the posterity, you see, live on behalf of this event, in -- in -- as heirs of this event. That's his great -- his great emphasis, I mean. That's why he's more, I think, than a Plutarch.

Who has read John Brown's Body already? Well, would you give me some example of a -- where you would you s- -- would -- you would say that this -- here the man is at his best? Would you -- would you be willing to pick out something?

(Where the man is at his best?)

What?

(Where the man is at his very best?)

Ja.

(Well, I think a situation where he had { } and -- I can't pronounce that fellow's name--{Ellis or Eilis}--their hope for the future, where he starts out on his -- or he says that he will start on his search for her, he's trying to regain the past after this -- after the interlude of the war is over, I think he reaches his -- his very highest there, where he has to start out on a new life.)

Can you find the place?

(Um, it's almost near the end, here. No, it's -- it's a few pages from the end.

Oh, here it is. The build-up to this, on this -- in case you haven't read it, is -- this is a young soldier, who, during the war was captured by the Confederates, and then he escaped. Was hurt, went to the -- went into the -- forest. Was discovered by this young girl. Um, he had his convalescence; they had a -- an affair--of course, they fell in love--and then he went back to the war. And in the interlude, they lost contact with each other. And now she is starting to search for him, or he is going to start and search for her. And so here, this is the last -- I don't know which it is you want me to read, but --.)

How many pages is this? I'm -- because I think they should read it, but -- but I -- wonder if we should wait for the next time, so everybody can look at it.

Perhaps this is wiser. We could stop here.)

(Well, it's -- it's about three pages long. But that -- they wouldn't get the whole picture until they -- I think until they --.)

So they would -- we should wait, I mean.

(One point we might mention at the very open -- very opening: Invocation.)

That's a tremendous {thing}.

(Even the first words, just the title "Invocation" { } to put us into the spirit.)

(Well, I don't think that's the spirit of it. I think that shows the actual



decay, I mean, as far as the { } is concerned.)

(No. The very first --.)

(Oh, you mean the -- oh, I see. I was thinking of the second part, yeah.)

You have no copy, Sir? Kindly provide { }, because you are lost if you don't. I think everybody -- you should have a text, too.

Now listen. We are running a little -- let us do this next time. And we'll read the first -- the first -- you'll read it yourself. Because you are quite right. In this Invocation, I would like you to -- to see more than -- than a formality, because the -- the modern historian and biographer had no invocation, and I think that's why we don't care. Homer has an invocation, and all the ancients had invocations. And today this is -- thought of as stilted. You have the prologue in Shakespeare sometimes, which is another form of invocation, of course.

And -- perhaps if we -- if you would study the Invocation, best thing would be to learn it by heart. I mean this. Poetry is not really read; it has to be learned by heart, and spoken. And you are very far from all poetic life, because you don't learn by heart. Poetry is just meant to be vibrating inside of us. It is not something to be read. And that's the -- the death of modern poetry. And -- so perhaps you do read it. Do me the favor, and take the Invocation very seriously. You will discover that -- that the -- the Invocation is -- well, how should I say? -- it's that moment in which authority and invitation--because "invocation" is also "invitation"--meet, where these three phases of human -- our human spirit are unified.

Well -- I don't wish to anticipate anything. Read it yourself, read the Invocation, and we'll read it together next time. And the -- the -- you see -- you see, the -- the -- respect for poetry, or the recognition that something is poetry, is that you can read it innumerable times. Never believe that poet -- a poem can be read once. Then it is a very poor poem. A poem must be quoted for the rest of your life, if it is a real poem, I mean. There are degrees, of course, of poetry. But as long as you think that a poem, after having been read, has done its duty, you have declared it is not a poem.

All poets, you see, want to illuminate permanently a situation where they have been our -- our mouthpiece, so to speak, or have been, you see, privileged to say for you and me, you see, what occurs eternally in any -- in a human heart. And -- "To be or not to be" is not something to be read, obviously, you see, but to

be quoted. And -- and modern man is -- is -- absolutely, I mean, just self, and dead, and -- and -- and sick, because he is not filled with poetry. That's why the poet's only dignity is that you quote him, that he { } in you.

And -- and you should not -- here, Sir. You -- all--here; well, he doesn't look at me--learn things by heart. It's the only way in which you can live up to the -- to the life of the country in which you live. I mean, it is -- same with singing, of course, I mean. Everybody in this country sings doggerels and hits. But they are only the -- the weekday affair compared to the solemn hymns of the -- holiday. You all live lopsided, because you will still sing all this -- this trash, which is always the reflection, or the other side, of the solemnity, you see. The solemn song and the trash -- I am not down on the hit at all. And there must be these doggerels, and there must be these -- these cheap songs, you see. But only because there are expensive songs, I mean.

So the -- the balance is completely destroyed here in this low-brow country, you see, of yours, because you -- you think it is enough to be low-brow, but low-brow is only valuable as long as there is high-brow. And the -- without the balance, the low-brow is -- is just weeds. And so your -- your -- in your memory, you have innumerable trash. But if you analyze what you have in your memory to counter-balance the trash, you -- the -- the {schools} have denied you the honor of having the real -- the real flowers of poetry. And you only have the weeds. And it is -- you have to sow into your own memory real poetry, real verse. Whether it's the Psalms, or whether it's hymns, or whether it's Shakespeare, or whether it's Keats, I don't care. But the main thing is that you learn to distinguish between flowers and weeds. And -- and it is all full of weeds in you, because nobody can live without song, or without music. Therefore, the -- you -- you do keep all the silly songs. Because it just means that your field is a plowed field and wants to be -- cultivated and planted with something. And -- and you say, "No, I'm free, independent," in come the weeds. And since nobody can -- can live without song, you all have the -- the trash songs in your -- in your mind, and the hits. That's all right, as long as they -- you know they are the -- the cheapness that goes with the expensive things. Where you have genuine things, you also have false things -- or -- or, I mean, substitute things.

So please read the Invocation, and -- and learn it by heart. Greatest success of my life in this country has been that we -- we ran a camp, and I did succeed in making 120 men of 20 to 25 learn by heart "The Ballad of the White Horse" by Chesterton. And -- and they still live by this. And that's great poetry. It's just as great as John Brown's Body. It's for English consumptions -- has the same importance as the -- as the John Brown's Body. You haven't even heard of

it, I suppose. It's the only modern English great poem, "The Ballad of the White Horse." It's the story of King Alfred. And the -- Times in -- of London printed -- the verses of this every day during the Blitz, because it was the one poem, you see, that -- aroused the -- the English to their -- to their own hour of glory. So this I feel, John Brown's Body has the same -- the same...

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

("...strong and diverse heart

So many men have tried to understand

But only made it smaller with their art,

Because you are as various as your land,

("As mountainous-deep, as flowered with blue rivers,

Thirsty with deserts, buried under snows,

As native as the shape of Navajo quivers,

And native, too, as the sea-voyaged rose.

("Swift runner, never captured or subdued,

Seven-branched elk beside the mountains -- the mountain stream,

That half a hundred hunters -- that half a hundred hunters have pursued

But never matched their bullets with the dream,

("Where the great huntsmen failed, I set my sorry

And mortal snare for your immortal quarry.

("You are the buffalo-ghost, the broncho-ghost

With dollar-silver in your saddle-horn,

The cowboys riding in from Painted Post,

The Indian arrow in the Indian corn,

("And you are the clipped velvet of the lawns

Where -- Shropshire grows from Massachusetts sods,

The grey Maine rocks--and the war-painted dawns

That break above the Garden of the Gods.

("The prairie-schooner -- schooners crawling toward the ore,

And the cheap car, parked by the station-door.

("Where the skyscrapers lift their foggy plumes

Of stranded smoke out of a stony mouth

You are that high stone, and its arrogant fumes,

And you are ruined gardens in the South

("And bleak New England farms, so winter-white

Even their roofs look lonely, and the deep

The middle grainland, where the wind of night

Is like all blind earth sighing in her sleep.

("A friend, an enemy, a sacred hag

With two tied oceans in her medicine-bag.

("They tried to fit you with an English song  
And clip your speech into the English tale.  
But even from the first, the words went wrong,  
The catbird -- the catbird plucked -- pecked away the night-  
ingale.

("The homesick men begot high-cheekboned things,  
Whose wit was whittled with a different sound  
And Thames and all the rivers of the kings  
Ran into Mississippi and were drowned.

("They planted England with a stubborn trust,  
But the cleft dust was never English dust.

("Stepchild of every exile from content  
And all the disavouched, hard-bitten pack  
Shipped overseas to steal a continent  
With neither shirts nor honor to their back.

("Pimping grandee and rump-faced regicide,  
Apple-cheeked youngers from a windmill-square,  
Puritans stubborn as the nails of Pride,  
Rakes from Versailles and thieves from County Clare,

("The black-robed priests who broke their hearts in vain  
To make you God and France, or God and Spain.

("These were your lovers in your buckskin-youth.  
And each one married with a dream so proud  
He never knew it could -- could not be the truth  
And that he coupled with a girl of cloud.

("And now to see you is more difficult yet,  
Except as an immensity of wheel  
Made up of wheels, oiled with inhuman sweat  
And glittering with the heat of ladled steel.

("And these you are, and each is partly you,  
And none is false, and none is wholly true.

("So how to see you as you really are,  
So how to suck the pure, distillate, stored  
Essence of essence from the hidden star,  
And make it pierce like a riposting sword.

("For, as we hunt you down...")

Now I wonder that there isn't an exclamation mark. Because this is what I  
feel it should be read: "So how to see you as you really are!" Isn't that right? "So

how to suck -- " isn't it despair, and I mean, exclamation? Isn't it strange that there should be a period at the end? That's why I feel, I mean, it's just --. Go on.

("For, we hunt you down, you must escape  
And we pursue a shadow of our own  
That can be caught in a magician's cape,  
But has the flatness of a painted stone.

("Never the running stag, the gull at wing,  
The pure elixir, the American thing.

("And yet, at moments when the wind was hot  
With something...")

"When the mind --."

(Oh, excuse me.)

("And yet, at moments...")

In Los Angeles, of course, the wind is hot. But other parts of the country,  
the mind.

("And yet, at moments when the mind was hot  
With something fierier than -- fierier than joy or grief,

When each known spot was an eternal spot  
And every leaf was an immortal leaf,

("I think that I have seen you, not as one,  
But clad in diverse semblances and powers,  
Always the same, as light falls from the sun,  
And always different, as the differing hours.

("Yet, though each altered garment that you wore  
The naked body, shaking the heart's core.

("All day the snow fell on that Eastern town  
With its soft, pelting, little, endless sigh  
Of infinite flakes that brought the tall sky down...")

And that again, may I remind you, this -- these two lines are very strangely built:

"I think that I have seen you not as one,  
But clad in diverse semblances and powers,  
Always the same, as light falls from the sun,

And always different, as the differing hours."

There should not be a period. "Yet, through each altered garment that you wore,/The naked body..." that means, I think, that I have seen you, you see. So I think the interpunctuation is completely wrong. You cannot -- can you -- follow here? Well. You understand? It's very unsatisfactory, this --. He died, of course, in the process. And he may not have revised this. But I think one obscene { }. But I think it's completely misleading, the interpunctuation. Can you see this? "I think that I have seen you --" now -- now the breath has to go on -- "till the heart's core." Can you understand?

(Yes.)

And that is the -- also -- also these six lines of course are built in a very artifi- -- artistic way, that the -- you see, these are six verses, and there is a solid form. And therefore, the -- the whole meaning is that the breath has -- must not fall down at -- after -- as the differing hours, you see. But then you must, you see, you must hold it -- onto it, and go to heart's core. You understand?

(Yes.)

Very strange why this interpunctuation -- is -- all this time, I wonder if he put it in, himself.

{ } somebody else did?)

Well, I mean, {indifference} -- it is certainly highly misleading. Well, we'll -- you see, all these modern deviltries of telling children only to read by eye, and not to speak, you see, of course is only one element of the complete indifference today to the fact that this is speech--poetry--and not the written word. And as long as you believe that liter- -- poetry can be printed, you see, you -- all this happens. And of course, the language dies in the process, I mean. It is -- this is just -- unbelievable. No poet who would have -- been tape-recorded, you see, could afford this, I mean. It's scandalous. Because interpunctuation, you see, is simply a marking of your breath. And therefore there is no { } interpunctua- tion, as you are taught--all this is nonsense, I mean--by grammarians. Every man has his own breath, and his interpunctuation should be--if he's a real stylist--his own. And all these -- these -- these -- these rules are of course nothing. I told you the story of the lawyer, didn't I, and his will? Well they -- he

said, "There should be no interpunctuation. A will must be read regardless of interpunctuation, and -- must force its rhythm so on you so that there can be no quibbling," you see. A wrong comma, that must not lead to a -- to a trial, to a litigation. And everywhere, I mean, here you have the law. Then you have the language of command, of course, in the army, or wherever it is. And here you have poetry. And today, it is all leaden. All lead- -- absolutely arbitrary, you see. I cannot understand how it is possible that this is printed in this way. Imagine -- to make a period after "hours," you see! When the whole sentence has the meaning that you that is the naked body, isn't it?

Or does anybody differ?

So that even today, when we buy a book of poetry, the -- the fact that it is printed and registered with literature, you see, is already -- in itself apt to destroy the -- the power of the -- of the poetry, I mean. We -- you live -- you must know that you live today in a garbage can of civilization. That's what you do. Everything that surrounds you is already deadening life. You mustn't think that you are -- this -- this -- this country of America lives on 35 degrees of Fahrenheit, suspended animation.

And this is why the Invocation of course, strikes you as most unnatural, because this has to be spoken. And it has not to be spoken about something, but to the higher powers that enable us to speak. Now go on.

So it's quite -- it has already to -- become totally -- totally a- -- un-natural.

But we'll see that it's just the other way around. This is the most natural way of speaking, and that you speak -- should speak prose, that's ridiculous.

(Isn't it possible that -- that the period loses force? I think the period has -- has lost force in writing, so that it doesn't always mean that you stop.)

Pardon me?

(I don't think the period means that you always stop. At least in current use. I think the period is a -- is -- is a weaker form of punctuation.)

In what -- what's then the strongest? After all, you have here -- the danger, you see, is -- is doubled -- duplicated, because it's not only the period, but even the verse is set off. If the two later verses, you see, were -- following directly -- but since there is this break in the print, isn't it?



(Yes, that's right.)

So it makes it even -- period, plus paragraph. That is quite hard.

(In not in all forms, though, is -- is the -- is it set up this way. I think the tampering has been with the -- let's see --.)

Who -- does anybody { }?

(There's another style of -- of writing this, so that there's not { }.

Nobody has --.)

Well, I wish to -- well, it isn't. It isn't here. Has anybody another print?

(Who doesn't have this kind, 195- --?)

But where are the six verse printed in -- in one?

(I've seen one where -- where it's -- .)

It would be much reasonable.

(-- line after line without any break between.)

Yes, I have such an edition myself. You're quite right. So you see how -- how beautification can -- can ruin anything, well --.

(It's mathematized here.)

Wie?

(Mathematized.)

No, it's just -- not { } -- money. Wealth is always a danger of taste, you see. If they have more paper, and they have more space, make a luxury edition -- sens- -- the sense is -- drop -- drops out.

But this lack of the -- of the -- of -- of respect for the poetry today is -- is what -- {quite widely traded}? I mean, look at -- how our Bibles are printed, of course. They are with this same, disgusting bad taste, gentlemen, you see. All -- as you know all the chapters and verses are late inventions. They -- they crowd

in this Bible, you see, making it quite impossible to -- to appreciate it, because it's cut up into verses in the middle of the word. I mean, we don't even resent it, because everybody goes to sleep in reading the Bible anyway. It makes no difference. You -- cannot discover that the Bible is a recent book, because it's written -- printed in this ridiculous manner. You should protest -- I mean, this { } all your Bibles, you see, are -- perfectly unreadable for a -- for a reasonable person. You just carry this on, if -- because -- makes no difference. The laity is -- goes to sleep anyway, and the man only -- the preacher only takes out six -- six verses, anyway, and can say then, "Verse 1 to 7," you see. And so to him it's just picking the -- you see, pecking like a -- like a chicken, her feed. -- You live in such an unreal world. This world of literature, if I could only smash it, all the courses you have to take in English and so on! They destroy absolutely your sense of -- of life. It's all on a -- in a -- on a -- on a bush, a sheet of paper. Now go on. Where are we? Ja.

("All day the snow fell --.")

Would you take over?

("All day the snow fell on that Eastern town  
With its soft, pelting, little, endless sigh,  
Of infinite flakes that brought the tall sky down  
Till I could put my hands in the white sky

("And taste cold scraps of Heaven on my tongue  
And walk in such a changed and luminous light  
As gods inhabit when the gods are young.

All day it fell. And when the gathered night

("Was a blue shadow cast by a pale glow  
I saw you then, snow-image, bird of the snow.

("And I have seen and heard you in the dry  
Close- huddled furnace of the city street  
When the parched moon was planted in the sky

And the limp air hung dead against the heat.

("I saw you rise, red as that rusty plant,  
Dizzied with lights, half- mad with senseless sound,  
Enormous metal, shaking to the chant  
Of a triphammer shaking iron ground -- striking iron  
ground.

("Enormous power, ugly to the fool,

And beautiful as a well- handled tool.

("These and --.")

Now, careful. Don't give the -- waste this so completely. "Enormous power, ugly to the fool,/And beautiful" -- then you must read the "as," you see, as an "if," you see. Isn't it?

("As beautiful as a well-handled tool.")

You see -- isn't this the condition, you see, of its improvement? It's either for the fool, you see, as I read it, "ugly," or it's beautiful as a well- handled tool. So you have to bring this out a little bit.

("These, and the memory of that...")

Again, I mean, I -- I feel that the comma is misleading, you see. "Enormous power, ugly" -- there should be a halting of the breath, you see. There should be the period. I would print it: "Enormous power, ugly" -- comma, you see. Or some- -- hy- -- hyphens. You see how interpunctuation is really wanting in delicacy. The -- the -- the comma before is too -- too strong, "And beautiful as a well- handled tool." Ja?

("These, and the memory of that windy day

On the bare hills, beyond the last barbed wire,

When all the orange poppies bloomed one way

As if a breath would blow them into fire,

("I keep forever, like the sea-lion's tusk

The broken sailor brings away to land,

But when he touches it, he smells the musk,

And the whole sea lies hollow in his hand.

("So, from a hundred visions, I make one,

And out of darkness build my mocking sun.

("And should that task seem fruitless in the eyes

Of those a different magic sets apart --")

(I don't understand that.)

("And should that task seem fruitless in the eyes

Of those a different magic sets apart

To see through the ice-crystal of the wise

No nation but the nations that is Art,  
("Their words are just. But when the birchbark-call  
Is shaken with the sound that hunters make  
The moose comes plunging through the forest-wall  
Although the rifle waits beside the lake.  
("Art has no nations--but the mortal sky  
Lingers like gold in immortality.  
("This flesh was seeded from no...")  
You see, this is his decisive -- very, very difficult, but very important. We  
have to read it -- will you go on and read again?  
(These last two sentences?)  
No, no. "Art has no nation." But so -- this is all very -- difficulty to read,  
really, because "no nation but the nation that is Art,/Their words are just." And  
then he recalls it, "Art has no nations--but the mortal sky/Lingers like gold in  
immortality. This flesh," and there should begin, you see, this -- who did this?  
You? You see, this should go this way: "immortality" leads immediately on, in  
one breath, to "This flesh," you see, because the break is in "Art has no nations."  
Can you see it? And here begins, however, his apology, "but the mortal sky  
lingers like gold in immortality. This flesh was seeded..." Ja?  
("This flesh was seeded from no foreign grain  
But Pennsylvania and Kentucky wheat,  
And it has soaked in California rain  
And five years' tempered in New England sleet  
("To strive at last, against an alien proof  
And by the changes of an alien moon,  
To build again that blue, American roof  
Over a half- forgotten battle tune  
("And call unsurely, from a haunted ground,  
Armies of shadows and the shadow-sound.  
("In your Long House there is an attic-place  
Full of dead epics and machines that rust,  
And there, occasionally, with casual face,  
You come awhile to stir the sleepy dust;  
("Neither in pride nor mercy, but in vast  
Indifference at so many gifts unsought,

The yellowed satins, smelling of the past,  
And all the loot the lucky pirates brought.  
("I only bring a cup of silver air,  
Yet, in your casualness, receive it there.  
("Receive the dream too haughty for the breast,  
Receive the words that should have walked as bold  
As the storm walks along the mountain-crest  
And are like beggars whining in the cold.  
("The maimed presumption, the unskillful skill,  
The patchwork colors, fading from the first,  
And all the fire that fretted at the will  
With such a barren ecstasy of thirst.  
("Receive them all--and should you choose to touch them  
With one slant ray of quick, American light,  
Even the dust will have no power to smutch them,  
Even the worst will glitter in the night.  
("If not--the dry bones littered by the way  
May still point giants toward their golden prey.  
("He closed...")

No, no. No, { }. But I -- . Do you -- do you understand what it means --  
what he means by "To strive at last, against an alien proof/And by the changes of  
an alien moon,/To build again..."? Do- -- what does he mean with these two  
lines? Does anybody know? Very important, very American. Whole tragedy of  
the American intelligentsia.

(Yes.)

{ } about the break from England { }.)

What?

(The break from England { }.)

Who is meant by these two lines?

(Europe.)

What?

(The tendency of the American intellectuals...)

But the fact about the --.

(...educated in Europe. I was struck by the -- fact that all the intellectuals are educa- -- I think it was 10,000 Americans got their doctorate in Europe in -- in the 19th century, at -- at the same time Wagner was proposing to come to the United States to write the American -- the great American opera based out of the ethnic materials here, and --.)

You are absolutely right, but this is much more concrete than you realize.

It's very hard to read poetry, gentlemen, and to understand it. So you don't, obviously.

This has nothing to do with 10,000 {deaths}. It -- only to do with Vincent Stephen Benét.

(Well, isn't he saying that he's -- he's -- attempting to write this poem without regard to the forms --.)

No. In France! He's living in France while he writes it. This is the tragedy of American in- -- poets. He's -- living in Neuilly-sur-Seine. Isn't this preface signed "Neuilly-sur-Seine"? It used to be. Again, these editions are all -- you see, all falsified, because nobody of course is publisher, and -- his decision -- do not assume that anybody reads anymore. I mean, it's just --. Can't you see it? Then you shouldn't be here, you see. It's all -- of course, all nonsense { } the introduction, you see...

(It is signed.)

...between -- between, you see. This is killed. "Neuilly-sur-Seine." Now these are the two lines by which he sees the irony of his own fate, you see, that he -- while he's writing the -- the American epic, he's writing this against an "alien proof by the changes of an alien moon." Can't you see this? This is Neuilly-sur-Seine. But you can't read. He excuses himself. He says, "I'm Pennsylvania, I'm Kentucky." It's all Mr. -- the poet, you see. And has "soaked in California's rain/and five years tempered in -- sleet/To strive at last," and as though he suddenly wants to say, "I admit. I have to -- I'm writing this against the alien proof that is against the test of a French or European poetry," you see. And "by

the changes of an alien moon." This is --.

(Well, it's just what I said.)

No, you spoke of 10,000 intellectuals, but you didn't say this is "I, Vincent Stephen Benét, am writing the American epics on French soil."

(Well, I didn't say that.)

This is not education. But that's the act of writing this poem. It's much more special -- particular, you see. This is the particular situation of this verse, written at this moment.

(But he's not -- he's not writing it from the point of view of a Frenchman.)

He doesn't say so. But "alien" he calls it. Who says "from the point of view of a Frenchman?" I haven't said one word --.

(No, my point -- my point really was that it was the -- the fashion to go abroad.)

Ja, but this doesn't help you -- us in -- in settling --. I mean, of course, this was the problem of Henry James -- William James always, when he was in America, had to go to Europe; when he was in Europe, he had to go to America. He always took a return -- he's just barely landing there, back he went, I mean. They were all, you see, recoiling, constantly, like -- on a pool table.

But I think it's terribly important. That -- this I think is the greatest American poem in existence about American history. It's the epic of America. And it had to be written in Neuilly-sur-Seine. And that's part of America. And that's why at this moment Mr. Herter is in Geneva negotiating about Berlin. You must understand that this is all one and the same thing. First it is in the mind, and then it -- now it's in the political body and the geography of America, you see. Now this -- this homeland has to be defended for -- geographically. First, it was only in the mind of the people.

Well, the same of course is true of the first American poet with which I want you to become acquainted. And I'll -- I get -- go over in the recess and get you this. Has anybody heard of Joel Barlow? Wie? Have you? I { } mentioned -- to you in class.

(Yeah, we were -- discussed him in { }.)

Ja, well. Perhaps you put down his dates: 1754 to 1812. And it's a -- quite useful to compare him, because his first poem is "The Vision of Columbus." He later enlarged this into The Columbiad, 20 years later. But the first was better, as it is with the poem. Usually the first is -- { } is the best. He was in Yale, and later he became expatriate in France. He was 10 years our diplomatic agent in -- and he freed the -- the -- the Americans held by the Bay of Tripolis. And that is his great merit. And he died very honorably on the expedition of Napoleon from Russia, on the retreat; perished from the exposure there, and the cold, the famous {Eresina}.

(I don't think I understand really, now, what you did mean, when you said it had to be written in -- in France. "The poem had to be written in France." Why did it have to be written in France?)

I didn't say -- it was written in France. It had been written. Not "had to be written." I didn't say "had to be." It's just -- a fact that --.

Now the important thing is, if you -- that Barlow and this Benét deserve to be opposed to each other, because, as you now may realize, the greatness of the Vincent Benét poem is that he begins in the West. He begins with Navajo, and -- and the { }, and he comes to New England in reverse. And therefore, there is a completely new -- new tone. The -- the tiresome attitude of all American -- literature in America, and -- and ways of thinking, is that they first begin in New England or Boston, and New York, and then they count up the 48 states until they arrive, you see, in Alaska. And I can't hear all this. I mean, it's an attempt -- you see -- you find innumerable, well-meaning, unpoetical things of enumeration. It's one of the tragedies of America, you see, that quantity has invaded poetry through this enumeration of the -- the plains, and the mountains, and the R- -- then we come to the Rockies, you see, and finally we come to Sacramento. And I would just then say "sacrament." I mean, "sacré" it is just -- this is destructive of all American thinking. The enumeration, because that's quantity, that's -- you see, the supermarket, the catalog. And the catalog is destroying poetry in -- more in this country, because of its bigness and its size.

Now Benét very ar- -- very artistically, you see -- we -- we read this; you go back. In the second -- in the second quatrain, you see, he already has the opposite, you see. "...buried under snows,/As native as the shape of Navajo quivers." And though he begins with the Rockies, and then with the buffalo-ghost, and the broncho-ghost, you see, the Indian arrows, the Indian {corn}, and



then he only goes back, you see. And that's the whole -- the whole revolution, I think, for which you aren't even yet prepared. You still think of yourself as the West. And -- as coming later. Now of course, Benét feels that America will not be independent as long as it counts its fate only from the east towards the west, you see. It is -- has not this -- this center of gravity in its own, final organization. And therefore, I feel the poetry is revolutionary, so to speak. You have heard of Turner's "frontier thesis." Now this steps far over this. This is a new period. Poetry is always prophetic, and the historians -- of course it will take them 30 or 40 years, before you can become a professor with such heretic views, that you begin the story in California and say, "That's what it was all coming to. All the rest is preparation," you see.

So whereas Turner only sees the moving frontier, you see, Benét already sees after this event, you see, what's America. And therefore it is -- begins in the West. You cannot understand when you start in Los Angeles, and not -- not over there.

I felt the same when I made my -- my mountain climb in -- in British Columbia, that now I finally arrived in America, and -- because this is virgin territory. And I was very -- this is my last act of immigration, so to speak, when I did some first ascents in -- in British Columbia. Then one is really chest-to-chest with the -- with the secret of this independent continent. It perhaps should never have been discovered any- -- and -- which certainly is -- is a -- is difficult and inhospitable really. { }. It is -- it is a second; it was -- is not an accident. It has been most retarded, I mean. If you think of America, it has been more retarded than Africa, less populated. I mean, there is much -- has much more life going on in Africa over the last -- down to 1800 than in this country. The numbers of people living here, you see. If you read the description of the misery of the Indians here in California, a few hundred -- a few thousand at best, living over this vast stretch of land in the most miserable and -- and unambitious conditions, you -- you feel that America in itself was a neglected, and a second thought of our creator, you see. Breaking loose from the land mass of the rest of the world, and swimming somewhere, you see, into the unknown.

Therefore, it is a -- is a great event in the history of America that Vincent Stephen Benét begins in the West and puts all the influences from Europe, you see, in the second place. And I think he will be -- this will be -- this will make itself felt as years go on. I think he will be remembered as a turning point. "Vision of Columbus" is the first American poem, you see. And Stephen Vincent Benét, I take it, you see, is the first response from the other side, you see, so to

speaking. Walking from California, yes, and finally writing in a deep immersion, but taking with him the -- the complete vision of -- of Amer- -- America.

And you see, it's very important: the Civil War, with its bleeding wounds, after all, in the -- the South and North, of the eastern part of the states, he -- the old -- by centering in the West, in California and in the Rockies, in the -- with his first lines, he has the Archimedean point to pull us out of the tragedy, because this is, you see, what survives. North and South is -- doesn't exist here -- they don't exist here, so to speak, as a memory.

And so everything -- in order to write the -- the epic of the Civil War, you could all -- either go back to this "art, poor art," as he says, you see, have a general idea that art is supernational, or as he answers this, "No, I will not do this." We are -- I mean, he is in France, after all: the dogma of the "'l'art pour l'art's sake" was created. And he fights it in a very -- in a very -- or he doesn't fight it, but he lets it stand and say, "It's not my way."

Now we -- that's why I s- -- told you, we have to read this again. It's a very, very complicated and difficult -- difficult vision. Here. You have it? Read this again, will you? "I saw it rise." Here. Read this once more, and very carefully. And now you must see this is a tremendous breakthrough. It's an event in American history. And as I said, poetry is far in advance of the prose, in all -- if it is real poetry. And therefore it will take probably 50 years before the people in the English course in literature discover this. Ja?

("I saw you rise, red as that rusty -- as that rusty plant,  
Dizzied with lights, half-mad with senseless sound,  
Enormous metal, shaking to the chant  
Of the traphammer -- triphammer striking iron ground.

("Enormous power, ugly to the fool,  
And beautiful as well -- as a well-handled -- and beautiful as  
a well- handled tool.

("Tho- -- these, and the memory of that windy day,  
On the bare hills, beyond the last barbed wire,  
When all the orange poppies bloomed one way  
As if a breath would blow them into fire,

("I kept forever like a sea- --.")

"I keep --."

(Oh. "I keep forever, like a sea lion's tusk  
The broken sailor brings away to land,  
And when he touches it, he smells the musk,  
And the whole sea lies hollow in his hand.  
("So from a hundred visions, I make one,  
And out of darkness build my mocking sun.")  
Again, may I say, you see: America for the -- I think for any vision that has  
future is itself a ship; and all its gigantic situation between the two oceans, you  
do not live on -- on a firm land, on a terra firma--as the old people, the old na-  
tions. Since you are moving constantly--you are always rocking the boat, so to  
speak--it is much more correct to call America itself a "vast, gigantic ship, sailing."  
And your des- -- the destiny of America, you see, in this new world is one of  
movement. I told you this about the slang, you see, that was a movement  
through time of the language, and not through space. It was not dialect in val-  
leys and mountains, but the whole world -- the whole pop- -- people moving,  
you see, peo- -- every year a different word.  
And the same is -- of course true about the stream of immigrants: first  
generation, thir- -- second generation, third generation, fourth generation means  
that everything here is stag- -- staggered in time. Now you only move in time as  
long as space is a con- -- is a projection of -- of the time element. And America is  
nothing but a projection of a migration of peoples, of -- of the experience of  
generations in movement.  
And this is the -- this is here caught be- -- and so he has the -- the boldness  
to say, "America is -- like the sea." And so he gets out of the earth, the continent,  
the -- the -- the digging- in into some area, you see, with walls, and trenches, and  
-- and pieces of land, as we -- as the old people who entrenched themselves in --  
after all, in castles, you see, for example, in walls. And he says -- like a sea, "I have  
the sea in the palm of my hand." The metaphor itself is incredibly bold.  
Who has read Homer? You see, the -- the imagination of Homer is in his  
metaphors, in his parables, in his comparisons, you see.  
And so you must take comparisons with a -- { } of -- of rank terribly  
seriously. You only think that's a little beautifying. Quite the contrary. The  
deepest word of a poem is simply, instead of saying, "as," or if he has to say it  
somewhat longer to express what he really means. And so these four -- this  
quatrain, you see, re- -- read this again. "I keep forever..." It's a very strange  
metaphor.

("I keep forever, like the sea-lion's tusk  
The broken sailor brings away to land,  
But when he touches it, he smells the musk  
And the whole sea lies hollow in his hand.")

See, so he has the courage to say that the whole sea is in his hand--this is really something--so out of hundred visions, I make one.

(Is this the -- this his realism, or naturalism, or --.)

Oh -- be ashamed, in this context or -- to ask for stupidities.

(Or is that romanticism { }?)

I could shoot you! Breaking up our understanding at this moment with these abstractions. What -- I don't know what romanticism is. And naturalism. I have never met these ladies. What has this to do with your experience of this poem, Sir? You -- nobody in this country can -- read directly. Everybody has these little labels: 25 cents, romanticism; 50 cents, realism. Isn't this is sad? How old are you, Sir? Aren't you young? Can you not -- no -- can these words no longer reach you without these slogans, which kill all -- all your feeling and all your interest in this? Don't you see that by saying "realism," you have destroyed the -- the -- even the possibility of your understanding this poem?

What is realism? The invention of some professor for an examination! Has Mr. Benét anything to do with this? Every decent breath of life cut through all these cobwebs of these notions. Do you think they exist, realism and naturalism? But that's -- every American, you think that the abstractions are more real than this line of poetry, and I assure you, the opposite is true. This line is real, and the word "realism" is not real. This has been written with blood. And the other is just a notion which you carry around. Dear me -- what is more real? The -- the fruit juice which is there on the bottle, or the -- the sign, "fruit juices" in the supermarket? There is perhaps something that is between juices, and -- and -- fruit, and -- and -- and -- and water, and so.

Every -- every real thing oversteps the mark of your generalization. No generalization is correct. It always is -- is overlapping. But -- you can't -- cannot be helped. This whole nation is abstract. And that's why it's so boring, you see. Why everybody in this country is bored. Abstractions bore, you see. You can only go on fire if you forget all your abstractions and get deep in with this. As

soon as you first think, "Well, is this romanticism?" you have lost every right to say that you have ever read this poem. You lie if you say you have read it. You can't read it, because it's always through the spectacles of these general notions. And they kill the spirit.

Sing it, Sir. Would you ever ask of a song -- it's romantic or realistic? You sing it! That's the only relation you have to poetry. There is no other relations. All the rest are crutches. Have nothing to do with the truth. But instead of saying that you eat meat, you say you take vitamins, so you can never taste the good meat. The same thing. You and you believe it, too, that's -- that there are so many calories. I assure you, if you eat caviar, you eat caviar. If you eat lobster, you eat lobster. It does you a lot of good, because lobster and caviar are real things. But vitamins and calories are absolutely nonsense. They're good for doctors, and for nurses, but not for a healthy man who wants to eat something good which God has created. Vitamins! And you are allowed to eat venison. And the same with this poetry. "Keep this forever." You say, "Is this realism, or is this romanticism?"

This makes -- well, I shall never teach again American students, I can assure you. This is my last term in my life. I'm very glad I won't repeat it. This is only damaging. We -- any illiterate American is better off than you poor students, who are filled with this -- with this chaff. This nation is absolutely destroyed--whether it's psychology or English literature--by all this nonsense. You can no longer read poetry, and that's a very serious situation.

Now do you read this once more?

("I keep forever, like the sea-lion's tusk  
The broken sailor brings away to land,  
But when he touches it, he smells the musk,  
And the whole sea lies hollow in his hand.

("So from a hundred visions, I make one,  
And out of darkness build my mocking sun.")

Ja. Because now comes this -- you see, this attempt, you see. It's a sea, and this is the sun. That is, we are outside the -- the traditional sights of the land, you see, of these borders of firmness. And he -- we are really -- out in the -- out in universe. "I build my mocking sun," you see, "hundred visions" and he has the sea and the sun. Ja. And now comes his -- his apology.

("And should that task seem fruitless in the eyes

Of those a different magic sets apart  
To see through the ice-crystal of the wise  
No nation but that nation that is Art,  
("Their words are just.")

Now let's analyze this. Here -- we point here. What does he say with these four lines? It's very difficult to understand. To whom does he speak? Or of whom? Of course, he says very clearly that he doesn't address these -- these people, but he says, "Their words are just." So he is in { }, you see. And he is in -- in this French prison cell of the American mind, and -- where it all comes from, this borrowed -- these borrowed heads, these -- these borrowed reasons, where you say "romantic," and "realistic," and all these schools of poetry. And here, he says, "Well, they say nation -- art for art's sake." Then you can classify, so to speak. And he says, "They are, just" -- I know -- I mean, "I don't want to -- I do not want to refute them," you see. "Only art in general. And therefore my task seems fruitless in the eyes of those a different magic sets apart." Now will you explain to me whether these thirds -- line means them or means him.

(I assume it would mean them, not him.)

Ja, it is -- this is very doubtful English, isn't it? "Those a different magic sets apart/To see." And obviously the "to see" then means they are set apart, so that they see -- wouldn't you say?

(Well, I -- I -- my interpretation of this quatrain here is: he is doing something more humanistic; whereas the -- these other individuals of whom he is speaking -- who look --.)

Now just construe first the third line. Who is he { }?

(Well, it's definitely not him. { } --.)

Who is ruling the sea? This is -- it is very difficult, you see, really to interpret it.

("Those a different magic sets apart.")

(But it's --.)

Those. Those see -- would you say? That's my interpretation, too. "And

should that task seem fruitless in the eyes/Of those which" -- and for "whom a different magic sets apart/So that those" -- or "they" -- I'm only transcribing it.

You agree?

(Yeah, I agree.)

No. Why don't you see it? It's -- it's better we -- we take the trouble just to understand each other. This is all I want, to force everybody to follow our interpretation. So that they who -- who are set apart by a different magic, "through -- through the ice-crystal of the wise/No nation but the nation that is Art." That is, who can -- kept lo- -- loose from their national ties, and therefore see in their vision, you see, nothing but this airy art. Then I say you're right. "But --."

("But when the birchbark-call

Is shaken with the sound that hunters make

The moose comes plunging through the forest-wall

Although the rifle waits beside the lake."

Now -- now, please. This is all very difficult. You know what he says of himself in this line?

(Of himself?)

Ja. "Their words are just." And -- but now he says that I -- he's plunging through the forest-wall, although the rifle waits beside the lake. That is, what's going to happen to Mr. Vincent Stephen Benét?

He -- he'll be shot dead. "I'll be killed," he says. "Never mind. I'll be the victim of my enterprise. I am going on a dangerous path not only, but on a path that will kill me in the eyes of these -- of those," you see. And this is -- this is the -- very intricate. "Art has no nations," he says. He bows to the -- to the hunter who is going to rifle him down. That is, the professor of romantics and realism, you see, and who says, "This is an impossible undertaking," and "You can't do this," you see, because you are still connected with your nation, you see. "I am a nationalist," he says. That's what he says. You see, "I'm still rooted, and I'm not an artist to be classified with romantic and realistic art, because I'm just an American who has to sing the story of his nation."

That's -- that's why it is so dangerous if you try to classify him, because he says, "I'm breaking away from these classifications," you see. Art would have your classification. But this is not art. Art has no nations. But the mortal -- and

this means the -- the boy who is to be shot dead, you see; "mortal" here meaning, you see, "I'm a very limited man," you see. He's still a human -- you see, a normal, living being. He's not an artist. He "lingers like gold in immortality." "This flesh," and there he's in mortality. { }. -- If this -- the people in the Civil War were shot dead, well, you ar- -- art critics shoot me, too. I'm very ready for the kill. You see, the rifle is already w- -- awaiting me. I -- I won't -- I don't -- I accept your verdict, that I'm not a poet. In your sense, I'm not. Fortunately isn't -- he is a real { }.

And so this whole century of art for art, and your whole century of thinking is over. The poet is the voice of his nation, and he's not there for literary courses, to be dealt with, with Cs and Bs. If you don't need Vincent Stephen Benét out your -- outside your English courses, he has never existed for you. If you don't sing him to your children, and if you don't give him to your bride, but if you think that you take a course in it and then get -- an equivalent, you see, of a C-point or an E, you don't understand where literature is in -- in the life of a nation.

This is the necessary event in the history of America. And it is not -- quite unnecessary that any professor of English would take notice of him. But it is very important that the man at the filling station should quo- -- quote it. That's the use of poetry. And that's what he says. And he says it in such a sophisticated, difficult manner that it is very hard to get, because he -- he is speaking of course to people who have given up--like most students at this university--the idea that literature is for anybody else but the professors and their students. Because in this country, of course, it's a barbaric country. The people who don't go to college don't read literature. It's quite true. There are no bookstores. There is no poetry read.

So it -- I mean, I have heard -- Stephen Spencer come to our college and say, "It is in this -- in America, the critic of literature ranks higher than the poet." And that's the end of the world. It is more as -- the poet is only there to feed these courses on literature so that the professor has something to tell to the students. And he says, that's of course hell. Everything is -- stands on its head.

This man is more important than all the courses in literature chained together, because he is an event in American history. And I have tried to show you that the historian, the genuine historian--like this poet--has an immediate position in the life of a nation, and is not a scientist.

Worked in vain. You cannot understand him. You see, here you have



speech. And you have a speech department. It would be better to center the whole university, or the whole social sciences and humanities, around the speech department. You could do a very good job. Then you would see, you see, that the historian has the problem of narration to solve, to keep the -- to keep the past alive, as an influence as today. And that the -- that the prophets, you see, have to promise the future, and that the states -- the politicians have to fight for the present. And these are the three languages--the rhetorics, narration, and prophecy--that are the original languages of the human race. And all three are dying out in this country. Perhaps this is still in -- existence. This is dying out, and this is dying out. Because you have re- -- replaced it with the language for dead things, which you call "science." And science says, "2 and 2 is 4." And that's about the dead. And these three languages are about the living, you see. The -- the living that have not died yet, although physically they are absent, have to be told. That's what Vincent Stephen Benét says, you see. They ke- -- he keeps them alive. And so he apologizes. "This is my mortality," he says. And the prophet, you see, pulls the future into our lives, so that we are not bereaved of direction and future. As the politician fights for the present.

There are then three -- four laws of speech. History, you see. History sings, and that's why this is the more normal form of an historic book, you see--and Homer is--than the prose. History sings into our memory, the living -- that only -- that only apparently on the surface of things have died. Prophecy promises, and -- makes us yearn for better things, stretch out for -- into the future. "The promise of America," therefore is necessary for ma- -- making meaningful the life on this -- of this generation. If you have no promises, as the country at this moment have, it has lost its faith in the future. And that's why { } at this moment, it is flat. It has no direction. It's floundering. And it has also no past for this reason. Everything is just the car. And in the middle, there is fight. The --. So will you take down these -- three rules? The past is sung; the future is prophesied; the present is fought for.

The present is a conflict. You cannot -- establish any present without parties. Without saying one "yes," and one "no." Because that's a duel, that's competition. It's like -- wi- -- husband and wife, both going to their utmost to emphasize their opposite view of reality. And that's the reality of the present. The past is sung, because the fight is over. But the meaning of the fight has to be sung into our memories. Like the 4th of July celebration or the Gettysburg Address; that's song, because you better -- memorize it.

And prophecy, of course, is -- is prayer. You can also put here "prayer," anything that you can expect from the future. Supplication. Praise.

And then there is a fourth language, of knowledge. Knowledge is about dead things. We are allowed to know dead things so that at the given moment, you can use this -- these dead things and bring them back into the crux of life. You study -- geology after a hundred years; we drill oil wells, you see. And so the oil -- the geologists for a while seem to deal only with dead things, useless things; and then finally we discover how we can lead the oil back into the main-stream of life, our own life, you see. And all science, you see, prepares dead things for being u- -- and for re-entering the -- li- -- stream of life again.

Once you see the position of science, you -- you see its full meaning, and yet its very great limitations. Science is going out into the dead universe, preparing dead things to be resurrected, to be -- to join you and me. We eat -- now on a deeper level, you see, of -- of these -- topsoil was the first nourishing -- man. And now we go down 6,000 feet and get the oil. Which only means that we have enlarged the reservoir of dead matter which serves us and which is rejoined -- its -- you see, joins the life-stream of -- of humanity. So -- what must happen if, you see, notions like realism and romanticism that are good for dead notions of classifications of dead books, if this enters the -- your bloodstream and poisons your relation to song, and to prophecy, and to politics, you see, you can never apply these notions to your relation to a real poem. Because this poem has an immediate -- effect on you. It's part of you. You only live by knowing poetry.

A child that hasn't been sung to, you see, is a barbarian not only, but it's a heartless juvenile delinquent. And -- what -- why do we have juvenile delinquency? Because these children are confined to doggerels instead of to the Psalms. They have never been allowed to sing themselves into life for the -- during the first 15 years of their existence. They are not allowed to -- hits -- is the only thing that hits them. Slogans are the only things that they hear. Nothing is sacred. How could they reverberate the -- the word of God? The life of the race? The -- the -- the memories of mankind? You don't sing them into them. You deprive them. Our children are starved for the spiritual love, because is love is song; and song is love. There is no -- you cannot love without song. In a brothel, you don't sing. Or except a juke box makes a loud noise to make sure -- that this -- these harlots and these people who go there have some semblance of music, and song. But it's an artificial song. The nightclub song -- music is -- is -- is -- is deviltry, diabolical. It's -- it has to be music, because one cannot make love without song. But it's second-rate music. It's artificial. It's -- the same like lipstick, instead of your natural color.

And in this country, the harlot rules. Hollywood rules. And you think that lipstick is normal, and the normal colors are abnormal. So you say that the hit is the normal food of a child, and the puns, and the quiz, and the doggerels, instead of the highest songs of the human race. And so they don't learn to sing the Psalms, and they don't learn to sing hymns. But they do sing all this poisonous gas. And so it is with everything.

And so you think that a -- that a -- that a narrative, the short story that is read by recipe, in a writer's school, you see, fulfills all the requirement of real poetry and real art, which is an existential undertaking, where a man has to spend his whole life before he dares to say something. Here -- he is not here today, but I have a young friend who -- who wants to become a writer. I can only hope that he will not follow this dream at the age of 19, because you cannot become a writer. It's a curse that you -- to be a writer. It's -- it's an obligation, perhaps, a compulsion. But it is not agreeable to be a real writer, because you have to break -- to become the mouthpiece of -- of -- of a nation. And you have to prostrate yourself, you see, like the angels fall before the -- the face of God, it's a blessing and a curse to be -- to have to write, my dear children. I know what I'm talking about. And anybody in this country who says, "I'm going to be a writer," has no idea what he's saying. He thinks that he can learn how to write short stories and make money. He may, but this has nothing to do with -- with literature, or poetry, or service to the nation, or to the peoples of this earth. That's making money out of their skin. This is -- there is no profession of writers. Cannot be. Either people are -- like musicians, they are born. But you cannot say, "I -- I want to be a writer."

Every day this is in jeopardy. Rossini stopped composing operas--he certainly was a genius--at the age of 48, and said, "I -- this is over now." May -- he became a cook.

That's the re- -- normal relation to your own genius, you see. You never know how long it -- lasts. And why shouldn't a man stop writing -- after he has read -- written this? It -- he died, feeling that this was the end. A -- a poet -- a real poet, or a real singer is the singer of one song. Like -- Julia Ward Ho- -- Howe. When she had written the "Battle Hymn of the Republic," that was it.

Now, would you kindly -- this is -- has been the aim of my whole seminar, { } -- and I'm quite serious now, you see. The -- the -- this -- to tell a story is usually the imperfect of -- of grammar. That is, simply building on this one form, we all have -- we all can say, "I did love," "I went." This is a miracle that our

language tries to embrace the past. And then we can say, "This shall be." And that's all prophetic, and all promising language, or programmatic language, and all prayer.

And I also can say, "2 and 2: 4." There is not a verb in it, you see. Science is verbless language; it's an attempt to eliminate time. And dead things have no time element. The stone is supposedly there the same way, you see, after -- when I come back tomorrow. And so you can say, "All scientific language eliminates the process and thinks that it can deal with matter, or atoms and electrons forever." It -- neglects the time element. Scientific language neglects the time element. Epic language stresses that it has gone before us. Prophetic language stresses that it must come to us. And political language stresses that it is in conflict, that it is in jeopardy, that it is in danger, that it is not yet decided which way the cat will jump--that is, conflicting language.

Now our grammar, you see, was formed out of the -- out of the material of verbs. That we can say "I go," "I went," "I shall go -- come" to you is no miracle. And you think, if you analyze language as these positive semanticists do, these -- these scoundrels, they -- see, you see, say, "The sky is blue," and then they analyze such a -- such a sentence. That's not a sentence of original language: "The sky is blue," you see. The original outcry of the -- of the creator of language, of the poet, is, you see: "As blue as the sky, this was -- this battle day was," you see, or "The -- the future is going to be" or "You, my sweetheart, look." The -- the -- that is, the "is" is not a normal statement of language. It is always -- means that when you say something is, that you step outside the living process of time, and try to put it into a museum. Where -- anybody says, "This is," you see, is already a Greek mind who has catalogued away life.

Why do we speak, gentlemen? It's very important -- pardon me for bothering you with this. But it's -- I have to save my soul. Otherwise I would fail you. The -- to speak means to be able to testify and verify an event before it has happened, while it is happening, and after it has happened. All language is built on a grammar--you see, all articulate language--which enables us to call the same event as it looks before, while it's happening, and after. That is, the original language is not the language that you can say, "The sky is blue." But people speak so that they be able to say "was," "is," "shall be." They -- all the three forms are like a -- like a fork, like a trident, you see. We speak in order to march through time, so that this point here can be looked upon before it has happened, and after it has happened, and while it is happening. This is the history of the speech -- speech department. This is speech.

So all your analysis, all these logical semanticists--Mr. Wittgenstein and Mr. Reichenbach -- and I don't know -- what is dominating here, this school of philosophy--it's just so absolutely silly, because they take any one sentence and try to analyze. But to speak means, you see, to be so much alive that you know that you will survive -- you pass through the horizon of the event. You I- -- you -- the event is prophesied. It happens. You look back on it.

And therefore all our linguistic mysteries in -- in any language consists of this power to say, "I loved," "I shall love," or "Love," as command, you see. God says, "Love the Lord," as you say. You try to love, and of course you get very bleeding fists and lips in the process, and then you look back and said, "I have loved." Or "I have not loved," you see, "I have not been loved," which is more important to most people.

And this is life. This is history. This is experience. And this is why we speak. We do not speak to make single statements. For this, we wouldn't need speech. You see, we -- sign language would be enough. For -- for the -- for the sign on the -- on the road, you see, for all these technicalities, between mother and child, for example, which is -- sucking her breast, no language necessary. Mother and child would never have invented language. Language has -- is necessary because man dies. And he has -- and man is not yet born. And we are temporary beings. So you and I, in order to conjure up the times before and after us, you see, were gifted with language. And that's why we are not beasts. The animal is confined to its own day and place. And you and I are constantly immersed into the tension from the end of time, and the beginning of time. And that's why we speak -- so that we can get orientation, what has gone on before, and what's going to come. This is to speak. That's why I said, to teach means to groom successors, Sir, you see. Because to speak in such a language which will still be, you see, translatable into -- into words, when -- a hundred years from now. "Successors" means, "I'm no longer there."

When I teach you here, I identify yourse- -- myself with you. And I hope a hundred years from now, somebody will say these things to somebody, you see. And that's why teaching is neces- -- teaching is the -- is one form of eloquence, because it means that I take you into my confidence, and I -- un- -- -bosom myself, and I say what I think, so that you may later, you see, inherit this, and be able to tell your grandchildren. So I'm teaching you for the sake of the year 2000. And on the other hand, gentlemen, you listen to me for the sake of the year 900 or 1100, because you hope through me to get in touch with this past, as far as it is still living. What I'm telling you is St. Augustine and the New Testament. They -- they said this. And I am trying to tell you this, so that you may see that it is still

true.

All teaching is -- a model case of all these three styles of speech, you see, in -- in a teacher and in a student. There is -- are, after all, alive -- in you some expectation that at some time what I say will be of some use to you, you see. So the future is present in this room. And in -- on the other hand, what I mention is not of my invention, you see. It has come to me from thousands of years back. And in this very moment then, narrative and conflict, your resistance and my eagerness, for example--or your eagerness and my resistance; it works both ways--are in conflict. That's the present. Any -- any hour is cla- -- where there are -- there are two minds clashing, two times clashing. But on the other hand, if I do not select that of the past which has a future, which promises you a better life, you will not listen to me.

Therefore, in a -- in a -- this is the -- that is the -- the -- the claim of every good classroom meeting, that the original situation of speech is present, that I'm invoking--now I come to the -- my point today--invoking a spirit that will triumph over the past, over the present, and over the future. "Invocation" means this. And that's the meaning of Vincent Stephen Benét's Invocation. To invoke means to believe in the three times in one. You cannot only invoke a god, because he survives death, and he is not split in past, present, and future. If you invoke the Fifth Amendment, what do you do? Would you kindly explain to me: what do you do when you invoke the Fifth Amendment? What does it say, the Fifth Amendment?

(Don't have to answer { } incriminate yourself.)

Ja, now please, now analyze this. This is a very strange -- invocation. It's an invocation, but what does it invoke? Have you ever thought that "invocation" and "invoke" means -- is the same word? So the Muse and -- and -- and the Fifth Amendment must be -- have something to do with each other, which is very strange to you.

What do we mean by invoking the Fifth Amendment? What shall it do for the -- at this moment? If you think in terms of time, if you would only give up your -- your damned logic, by which you think that speech has to do with dead things. What is a man is allowed to hope for, when he invokes the Fifth Amendment?

(Protection.)

Ja, but use -- don't -- use this { } -- of course, true protection. To get by. He's allowed to hope that he can get through this dangerous moment unscathed. That is, he can live it down. He can still be the same man tomorrow, this -- because he has invoked the Fifth Amendment, there is an--as you say, protection--an umbrella over his head for the rainy day. This is the rainy day, his day in court; the day -- court cannot do anything, and he is tomorrow the same he was yesterday. That's invocation: to make all times one. Or more than one time, one. And the invocation means that there is molded, you see, a pathway from yesterday into tomorrow, and today he cannot get stuck; he cannot be shot dead; he cannot be killed in this. It's an arcade of time that any invocation molds. (If -- if that's all it meant, then they would change it and throw it out. But if it meant only something that you could use for the very moment --.) But you can use it at any moment.

(Yes. But I say, if that's all it meant, { }.)

I haven't said that it was all it meant. But that's the one thing you never think of. So that's why I had to stress this first.

(It's what everyone thinks of whenever they invoke it. That it will -- it will take them over that moment of danger. I would -- I would --.)

What's your objection?

(I would suggest that more fundamental than this, it invokes your immediate protection, but that it -- it draws on the -- the mistakes of the past that required that the Fifth Amendment be written into the Constitution for the protection of -- of future rights. So that when you invoke the Fifth Amendment, there is --.)

Oh, but I'm perfectly willing. Why -- why -- why is there any conflict in my statement and yours? You see, you say, "Here is -- here is a man's life. Here comes the Fifth Amendment and he walks under this protection into this future." You say yourself "future rights," my dear man. You have the time element in your thinking. You only -- you -- all this -- you -- you all think in terms of things. You see, you -- you -- you -- every American thinks in terms of space. You do not even feel that "future rights" means exactly what I have tried to tell you. That tomorrow you are still in the possession of the same rights as you were yester-

day. That's what I say.

(That's what I say.)

But you resent that I said it.

This is not one day, I mean, -- this is -- your lifetime. You are protected by this Fifth Amendment, you see, to lead your life, you see, under its protection, because you cannot be nailed down for something in the past, you see. You are not -- you are not your own accuser. Is it -- is this -- aren't we identical twins?

(Yes.)

So invocation, which is not seen by you--and that's why I had to say it--puts a higher authority above the conflicting parties of the Senate Committee on Un-American Activities and you. And there is suddenly a sky--what the Bible calls the "heaven," you see, the heavenly powers--higher powers than the living. Wherever you have the power to build an archway through past, present, and future, this has in -- all nations and all peoples call "divine." You don't have to call it, you see. One god, but it is -- has divinity, I mean. It is one god. God is the power to unite the times. Or who denies it -- divides it. And we only can unite the times in the name of God. Nobody can speak if he does not believe that what he says today can be under- -- could be understood yesterday, and can be understood tomorrow, despite the fact that you are dead.

[tape interruption]]

...it's a restoration of art to the life of the community, you see, around which this invocation is written. That's why it is a serious invocation.

It is -- I have, as a boy, as a student in -- of your age, I have written a paper on the invocation in classical literature, Homer and Virgil, and so. And this was my thesis for being allowed to enter the seminar there, in the classics in Berlin University. And so I know a little bit of invocation in antiquity. And -- see, today, I mean on the surface of things, you think it's indulgent, you think in- -- invocation is a luxury; it's just a fashion--or not even--it has gone out of fashion. Certainly you think it is old-fashioned. Now it -- it -- therefore I think it is terribly important that I think you should invoke the Fifth Amendment, and know that invocation is the -- the way of -- of gaining a public. God is the power that makes you speak. You cannot speak and think that the truth -- there is truth in what you say, if you don't believe in God. There are no atheists. The atheist says,



"Believe me that there is no God." And in this, he invokes your and my belief in the power to speak the truth. And therefore, atheism is contradic- -- self-contradictory, because to speak means to believe in God, be -- to say something that has validity before and after my physical existence. Formerly this was called "the Holy Spirit." Everybody who speaks makes this claim. You couldn't pass an examination if you didn't believe in God. It has nothing to do with your going to church. To speak means to believe. That is, to have the power to take part in a process that is -- has gone on before your birth and will go on after your death. That's called "the belief in God."

A perfectly godless person is -- is he who takes everything down into his grave, who says, "Really, after me, the --" you see, who abuses every law, every truth, you see, by the big lie, because he says, "I don't care what goes after me." There are very few such people. They are the really godless people, but they usually go to church, you see, and pay the tithe. Because they want -- they want to play safe. But the so-called atheists, of course, are always the religious people of their time, who find fault with the expression of faith -- of the time, and want to say it a little better.

To be- -- speak means to believe. This you must understand, because to speak means to unfold into these three times. And while I'm saying this, I -- I cannot give up this hope that you will leave this seminar with the understanding that history is not a part of science, but is as original as any scientific statement. But if I say, "I was once young," I say something as independent from science, you see, as ob- -- obviously science is independent from history when it says that the water is H<sub>2</sub>O, you see. These are two sentences that are completely heading in different directions of -- of reality, that water and H<sub>2</sub>O makes water at this moment not a vital and living force, but a dead thing, which I can use and store away. But the Colorado River is already more alive than just the wa- -- H<sub>2</sub>O, you see; and the Grand Canyon is, you see; and the lake is; and the ocean is. So that is the deadest form -- is to say, you see, that H<sub>2</sub>O. And that's science. The scientific style.

And that's when you say the poem is realistic, or it's romantic. Then you are trying to make this -- this poem a -- a part of the library of dead things. But if you say, "I sang this morning" from enthusiasm about the good morning, you see, you have evoked. You see, that's how we proceed. And here in the middle is our vocation. All this is lost on you. I know you hate even to be pinned down to words. But I cannot -- help -- tell you that these words have a very honorable family, you see. Your vocation is what you are trying to -- have to fight for in your whole life. And the spirits of the past have to be evoked, and the future has

to be provoked, and the powers that regulate this process have to be invoked. And many things, I mean. And the -- the people whom you help, need for your help -- they are con- -- there is the convocation, which of course means "to convene," originally, you see. But convocation are the people who will listen to the same invocation, you see. Mis- -- the convocation, the public is convened by this invocation. Vincent Benét tries to find his true public, you see, among the Americans themselves, instead of the professors of lit- -- American literature, by his Invocation. You can put it down as a rule: where you invoke, you see, you also convene, you also convoke. Because those same people who believe in the same gods as you, will congregate under this invocation. To invoke means to draw into the people, you see, to -- to throw that net, which will catch the fish. Because who feels the same invocation, you see, will come.

(Going the same way, would you say that the language of science "unvokes," or makes speechless?)

Ja. It speaks of things, you see. It doesn't -- it doesn't invoke any- -- anybody, you see. It speaks of, and about. It -- it says there is a dead world, you see, which has not to -- should not be conjured up, but should be toned down. That's why every scientific language says, "This is the style of language -- of science." "This is nothing but." And every -- all other three -- {character} of the historian, and of the prayer -- priest, and of -- prophet and of the politician says, "Imagine! This is really water! This is really a man! This is really a child!" That is, this is all talked down, and this is all talked up, you see. And the word "vox," voice, is of course always intonation. And all science whispers. That is why all science ends in mathematics, because the figure, the number, you see, is speechless. If you express yourself in numbers, you have lost your speech, you see. To tone down is the essence of science, and to tone up, to tune in--as you say these days, you see--to intone--you can also call this "intonation." And science, as you see now from the atom bomb, is a detonation. That's a good joke, you see. But it means in every sense "de-tone," you see, to tone down.

Anything that can be spoken of as a formula, you see--like the -- logical positivists think everything should be so { }--is dead. It's dismissed into the realm of the dead. It is not important for history; it is not important for the future; and it is not important for making love or hate at this moment. It is useful, or useless. That is, it comes under the category of use or non-use. Now you and me, we are perfectly useless and we are perfectly -- we are not useful. We are outside the realm of use -- we are the ends, you see.

I just read in { }, a novel--who gave it to me? You did--a wonderful thing. The -- you see, America is -- as you know, the man in the foun- -- of the foundation says, "We are abundant in means, but absolutely no ends." You see. Absolutely no ends. We have 8,000 foundations in which every administrator, you see, gets three times as much as any of the men they try to -- they try to help. And -- and that's the meaning of these foundations. Because the means are abundant, but they don't know for what purpose. But man is his own purpose, you see. What's the use of a newborn child? None whatsoever, you see. Don't try to define man in any terms of use.

Well, I have told you my story of the -- of the education officers of the CCC. That they defined a citizen as a man who's profitably employed. And I got up -- and we had a violent argument. That's 20 years ago. And I said -- they said, "Well then, how do you define a citizen?"

And I said, "Well, that's very simple. A citizen is a man who, when the city is destroyed, can refund it," you see. But has a higher power of not just being individual, but who carries in his loins the community. It can create it out of his -- his loins again, a founding father. That's a citizen.

And these are the two worlds in which you live. And more -- every day I see American, good boys and girls sink into this morass of being told that they have to be profitably employed, that they have to be useful, and that -- that they have to be instrumental in -- and all such nonsense! You cannot be instrumental. You cannot be useful. You cannot be profitable. Nothing. We are perfectly useless. As useless as God Himself and His angels. God is useless. And He is not profitably employed. This is only for dead things. All this employment business treats a man as -- in the service of -- somebody else. He signs away his living time. Mr. Riesman calls it, "He's -- he's alien-directed," you see, or "outside-directed."

("Other-directed.")

Wie? What?

("Other-directed.")

Oh, "other-directed," yes. It just means that it is nothing in his life. You see, it means nothing in his life, and it is a dead -- dead -- dead power in his life. He cannot invoke any spirit -- any divine in his -- in these eight hours in the factory. It's somebody else's life, which he is leading. And you -- you are all

acquiescing in this.

Now I tell you, I mean, every one of us is an earthen- -- -worm, and -- as far as our mortality is concerned, certainly we have to strip down, and -- and serve. That's the meaning of "service," that we do give part of our existence, and -- and -- and lower ourselves to becoming means to ends -- to other men's ends. But that's not me. That's a voluntary humiliation. That's humility. The -- the ordinary -- level of man is that he can be loved, and can be desired, and can be yearned for, and can be expected. And the highest degree of man is that he can found communities for other people. A family, and a city, and a country, and a -- and a university, and -- and in this he -- even shoots higher than just being his own life, you see, because he finds forms in which people are hanging together. So this is not only a figure of speech, this -- my Cross of Reality, but there are these three levels, you see, for things, for men, and for gods. And Mr. Stephen Vincent Benét is not simply writing an ancient invocation in imitation of some classical doctrine, but he's restoring the arts to their divinity, by making himself serviceable to his brother-man instead of writing to literary critics; because he invokes, you see, the god of America, as against the Muse of art. (This term, the "ice-crystal" --.)

Will you kindly keep in mind these three levels -- every speech is divided -- every sentence, you see, has three levels. The things of which you speak, the person to whom you speak, and the power in whose name you do speak. If you say, as a chemist- -- professor, you stand on your -- in your chair. And you -- say to the class, "Water is H<sub>2</sub>O," you invoke the god of science, truth. And you are -- invoke him so that the children may believe you. So above your head, here is the -- god of science. Then you speak to your students, so that they may know this, as your successors. That's teaching, so that you may create this avenue of time in which somebody will know after you have been dead. That's why I'm talking to you at this moment. But -- and then there is a third level in which "of water" it is said that there is H<sub>2</sub>O. So this one-and-the-same sentence contains three levels of -- of language. And as long as people do not see this, they do not know what they do when they are speaking. And at this moment, I think most people do not -- have no idea that they always invoke when they say the simplest truth. Because the say, "Believe me that I do not lie." That's prayer. That's a impli- -- a supplication. All language is prayer. All language is -- is address, introduction, embrace, I mean, declaration of love or -- or war. I mean, we speak to each other, don't we? And then we speak of something. And the something of which we speak doesn't listen in. It doesn't have to understand, you see. And you only see

today in your analysis of -- of language always this fact that you speak of. And you have to admit that you also have to speak to, and that the other person only listens to you, because he expects you to be obliged to speak the truth, to be compelled to say what he otherwise would have to say, that you speak as much for him as you speak for you.

I have read a -- a very great story of a -- of a dialogue. And you know the platonic dialogues are bandied around as the normal dialogues in this country. Of course, they are highly stilted and artificial, and I think, excepting two or three dialogues as the Symposium, there are no dialogues at all. The poor interlocutor is just always to be made to say "yes," and "no," as you know. And it's -- but there is an American dialogue which is -- written under compulsion, and is not a leisurely talk of two gentlemen having nothing better to do. It's the -- dialogue with -- published in a 50-cents booklet, "The Columbian Orator," in 1837. And you would think that this can be much less important than the Platonic dialogue. But I -- just sent it to a man who's working -- writing a book on dialogue--Harold Stahmer, you know--and telling him that this was a much more beautiful dialogue than any Platonic dialogue on which he is writing his dissertation. Why? Very simple. You can then study these -- these -- this story of the power of speech. It's a dialogue between a slave and his master, in the days of the beginning of Abolition. And it's -- it is handed over to us by the greatest American Negro, Frederick Douglass. I don't know if you have heard of him. Frederick Douglass. I recommend his -- his autobiography very much. And he reports that he was -- that he was quite overcome when he read this "Columbian Orator" dialogue. And -- what is its -- why is it so great? When they begin, the slave is made to say, "I submit to my fate." That is, they are in agreement at the beginning of the dialogue. "I submit to my fate." Incredible word, too, I mean.

Then the master is so touched by the harmony, or the win- -- submissiveness of the slave that he says, "So, make your point."

And so -- then only, after they have, you see, first found their unity, they find their dissent, and finally the -- dialogue ends very beautifully that the master emancipates the slave.

Now the greatness of the dialogue is, I feel, in this simple fact that we cannot speak to each other before we have not found our common god. You have to invoke one spirit before you can even begin to speak. And that's completely lacking in the Platonic dialogue. There are two individuals. And that's

why I do not think they are real dialogue. But this is an incredible story. It's like a husband and wife, talking in the night, over their sorrow, where also the wife will say, "Well, if you want me to do it, I will do it, and invite this beast. But I won't invite her if you -- if I can have my way." And then she'll begin talking. But since the husband has first been told that she is willing to invite him, if he insists, she can cure him from this insistence, you see, by giving her reasons later. And that's what any good woman will do. She will not say first, "I'll never do that." But she will say, "I'll do it, but let me tell you," you see. That's human speech, because it means that without having first in -- having been in agreement, there can be no agreement in the end.

And this is completely over- -- people think they can talk themselves into agreement. That's impossible. You have already to prefer the peace between you and the other man, you see, first. Then you can go to all the arrays of your ammunition and your guns, you see, in the process. And then the other can surrender and come around to your point of view.

But -- it's very -- you see, all logic in our -- this country is taught in this idiotic way, as though reason was vested in you and in me. To speak means to be of one spirit. You couldn't listen to me here if you hadn't the good faith that it was worthwhile to take this seminar. You see, that's the first degree. And therefore, we always have already invoked a higher spirit when we enter a room and sit down to talk to each other. That's called "peace," and that's called "understanding," and that's called "good will," and that's -- called "joy." I mean, all the nine gifts of the Holy Spirit are involved in this. You couldn't come here, and bear with all my -- my disagree- -- our disagreements, if there has -- hasn't first already been the invocation, you see, of a command, "Listen," "Wait," "See," you see. It may in the end turn out to be, you see -- to have been worthwhile.

So all speech is a -- is a movement inside one spirit. And all speech is a movement in constellating--as in the square dance, the partners--constantly taking turns. The real talk is not argument. The real speech is between two friends, or between a teacher and a student, that one comes to the viewpoint of the other, and the other comes to the viewpoint of the one. You see, they change their roles. It is never that you convince the other person. But if there is any real speech, at the end, you see, both see each other and this very often -- so that then the wife begins to defend her husband's position, and the husband begins to defend his wife's position. You will find this very often in your married life. That at the end, it's just the -- in reverse, because both love each other, are in one spirit, you see, and suddenly see that the other have an -- has an important point to make, and to defend. And since they both see this, you see, at the end, it is very

strange; there are still two points of view, but now they are represented by the opposite number. And don't be ashamed of this. This is how it is.

Of course, this happens in politics all the time, you know. You remember Disraeli putting the bigger franchise in than Gladstone in 1867. Have you heard of this in English history? So there was -- Gladstone asked for an enlargement of the franchise { }. And there are such things in American history by the way, too, I mean, of course. At this moment, the Republicans of course are doing more for the farmers and burning more crops than -- than 20 years ago, the -- the New Deal ever did, you see. They have seen the light, and now they have seen a tremendous light.

This changing of the roles is the true essence of speech. That's why there's drama. That's why it's worthwhile to play on the stage something in which people change their places, you see, at the end. All your logic and -- however, is based on the old Greek, pagan idea that man is impenetrable: that one man is here, and the other is there, and now they club each other down with argument. Gentlemen, that isn't worth mentioning, I mean. Such a -- has absolutely -- you see, that's in court, still, a remnant of paganism. And even there, it is -- it is quite nonsense. I mean, the famous Darrow in the {Loeb} case, he never did this, you see. Said the man is guilty. Of course, he's guilty, you see. But what do we do with such a man? You see, that's a Greek -- that's a Christian defense. Because speech means interlacing of souls. It means -- it means opening up. And that's why all speech is disarmament. That's why Moral Re-Armament is such a silly heresy today in the -- in the world of religion. You know -- have heard of Moral Re-Armament movement, because all real life is the disarmament of the spirit, you see, and not the armament.

If I -- we must disarm to understand each other. It's a condition of understanding each other. You can only understand each other--and if you are not on speaking terms, you have to fight. To speak means to disarm. And we disarm in the name of the truth, or in the name of charity, or in the name of the future, or the name of our children, you see. When Romeo and Juliet's parents get reconciled, you see, they invoke the spirit of their children.

If you only could see "disarmament" as the essence of speech, I think it would help you greatly. And you would also see how little peace there is in this world of ours, in so-called "peacetime," because every shyster -- and every merchant there tries to arm. "Advertising" means to arm, not to disarm. And so you wouldn't become pacifists. You would see that war is going on all over the place, you see. Peace is where we disarm. And you disarm when you speak. And

when you shout and have neon lights, you lie. All the streets in Los Angeles to me are -- are all harlots, you see, because they are all makeup -- have all makeup. The -- it seems that not one of these stores ever tells the truth. It's all exaggerated. Can you understand why I get excited over this? This would be my minimum { }. I always feel the world goes -- goes to pieces, because nobody wants to -- to know that history is a way of keeping the dead alive, you see. It's evocation.

({ } remarked on this sentence that he follows through a little bit later.

Isn't he trying to call us back again to the past, that the Civil War -- so that we can recognize our debt, so to speak, over a half-forgotten { }.)

Sure, sure. Well, you can even say that he has exactly the same picture as I had with Invocation. He says, "Let's build a roof over this Civil War." And I think this means that it is -- will not be bracketed, and omitted from our memory, you see, but we can march through these -- blood-stained battlefields, South and North, an invocation of the Muse. That's his poem. He says exactly what I have tried to say: like invoking the Fifth Amendment, a poet invokes, you see, this amendment of his history. So that the ghosts of the past can march through this, as in Macbeth, I mean, without hurting you. You are -- have the power now to accept them as their -- and that's -- look at the last page of the poem. What is the last verse? { }.

"Say neither, in their way,

'It is a deadly magic and accursed,'

Nor 'It is blest,' but only 'It is here.'"

Which -- by which he has said, you see, that he has evoked the past; now it's here, present. And you -- you live with this, without -- under the protection of this poem, you see, without being shot at, without being wounded, without being -- you see, feeling that you are hurt. It is this -- that the -- if the past doesn't hurt, then the power of the poet has succeeded.

So I insist that the word "invocation" has to be taken very seriously by you. At this moment, if you read a literary -- history of literature, Sir, you will find that invocations are brushed aside as an old-fashioned cobweb; I mean, just a habit, or a routine, you see, and cannot be taken seriously. Mr. Pope or Mr. Dryden uses these artifices, you see, invocation. And so we don't believe in Muses, and therefore, it should be -- be dropped, you see.



Now I do. I'm so enthusiastic about Benét because he has rediscovered the original power of the invocation. And he says, "Without this invocation, you readers of mine will think that I am a partisan, that you have to --." And so he says, "It is just here. You have walked with me, you see, under this invocation of the Muse, unscathed, unharmed, unwounded. Nobody has to feel that his heart is pierced, and that he is, so to speak, attacked. The past is reconciled." And you see, all speech is -- is -- when it belongs to the past, healing the wounds of the past. The historian tri- -- we talked -- said this about Thucydides, you see. It's always the same story. This problem of the history is to make both parties read one and the same story. Then it is over. Then it can be -- made a part of our memory. Before, the memory, as you know all from psychology, has traumas. We don't wish to remember certain -- certain humiliations, certain acts of shame, certain acts of -- of impossible behavior of our own, usually. And so we repress half of the past. Our memory is always incomplete. The poet makes it complete, and therefore allows it to be part of reality, to be the -- the -- the frontier between past and present is broken through, you see. And the present--that is still conflict--gets tremendous resources, because here is a unified past, which has not this conflict. And you can see that even Republicans and Democrats belong to the same nation.

I once had a dinner at the Somerset Club in Boston. That's the snootiest club -- club they have. And I -- of course, I was only a very modest guest. But there were high judges, and it was in the days of the New Deal, in 1935, it must have been, or '36. And I have never heard human beings speak of the president of their country -- the head of their country in such disrespectable terms. "Him, Roosevelt was only a paralytic," you see. Imagine, a man with the polio, you see. He was of course a paralytic who had syphilis. And since he had syphilis, of course, he was out of his mind. And since he was out of his mind, he was ruining the country. And that a syphilitic should run the United States, that was just too bad. And -- and every bite of the venison we were eating, and of the good food, you see, was -- was spiced with such and other poetical excursions.

And -- and then I finally said to them, "Now, gentlemen, I understand that the president went to Harvard, like you." And -- I taught at Harvard, I mean. And they were furious. Absolutely furious. That {set them flat}, you see; had nothing to say {anymore}. Because they had, of course, as alumni of Harvard, to admit that it did something to you, you see. "Once a Harvard man, always a Harvard man."

Which means, you see, that the past does reconcile. Well, gentlemen, of

course, very soon they went on: "Traitor," you see, "to his class," and so on. But perhaps you understand why I'm in love with Vincent Stephen Benét, because he, at the growing point of -- of the word, of the living speech, has discovered that beyond art for art, there is still a future for poetry again, you see. And because he has shared the superstition, so to speak, of the 19th century, he was tempted, you see, to think that art was a -- something quite by itself, and had not this normal relation between humanity, you see, of either past, or future, or present, or you see, this decision. And he -- he is a convert. And -- and he is not treated as this, in this country. The people haven't even noticed that there is this distinction between the poem -- the poet who is really against the -- serving his nation and the people of this earth, you see, and the poet who writes for his own satisfaction, or from getting a reputation, you see, of being called "a poet." You see, any man who performs a service in his community must perform it even at the risk that he is denied the {title}. That is, you have to risk your -- your label as a poet in order to write the good poem. You understand? And you have to risk your label as a scientist in order to -- to be the poet.

When Mr. -- when -- Mr. Planck said that there was quanta theory--that there was not graduate -- graduation, you see, or gradation in nature, that nature did make jumps, you see--he risked all his reputation. They might have called him a fantas- -- a phan- -- phantasm you see, fantastic quack. This you have to do with any new creation. When you want to renew the function of any important branch of human -- the human spirit, you have to be willing to be denied the title which was given today for this performance under other conditions. That's -- that's the -- the -- the danger spot, so to speak. That's real greatness. When you perform the act, although the people say, you see, that you aren't doing it, because they are accustomed to have -- done, you see, in routine ways that in your mind are now poisonous at this moment, and -- and dangerous.

And I think therefore the -- the modern artist is in the -- exactly this way. The painter is. The musician is. You see it from the crisis of the arts, that they -- the -- any real person has at one moment in his life -- ri- -- the risk to be called "a quack" or "a fool," not because he -- I mean, this is one thing you can fall down and just be a quack and a fool. But I assure you, there comes in every function of life the moment where the doing the thing itself is more important than being called it, honorably, you see.

I always tell the story of John Quincy Adams, who had been president of the United States of America, and then stepped down and became a simple

member of Congress. And from 1831 to 1848, he was in the Congress. And -- and one time -- what?

(You said 1831.)

Oh, I'm sorry. 1831 --. And in -- I think it was in 1839, the House was in such a partisan mood that they couldn't elect the speaker. And the -- the clerk who was instructed by one party, by the Democrats as against the Whigs, declined to call the -- the members from New Jersey. Their election was contested. And the number -- the partisans were so evenly matched that if he had seated them, by simply calling the roll, they would have elected a different speaker. And that was a partisan issue.

And so the clerk for three days always read the roll. When he came to New Jersey, one party shouted it down, and said, "Call the name," and he declined; and on it went again. And the whole -- House was in a uproar, and being the sovereign power of the United States, it seemed that the United States had no government. And after three days, they had exhausted their -- their ammunition. And John Quincy Adams, you must know, was hated by the whole South, as the Abolition man, and as a man who already presented the petitions from the North against slavery, and had been already threatened by -- from -- with being unseated, and being excluded from the House, so he was far from popular. And -- just the same, when storm raged for three days, people grew tired. And everyone turned to John Quincy Adams and acknowledged that he was the only authority who could replace this -- this corrupted clerk and bring the House to order.

And so they turned to him -- and the Democrats from the South -- from South Carolina, marched up to him, and seated him in the -- in the speaker's chair--pro- -- I mean, provisionally--and he called the House to order and ruled it with an iron hand for 24 hours, until the speaker was elected. And everybody agreed, this was the highest moment of his life, in which he was the acknowledged leader of his country, without having the name of it. That is, he performed this one act, you see, by which the House could organize itself, and for which there was no provision in any -- in any order, law, prescription, you see. And if you have such a man, a country can be saved, because he does the act without the title, you see. Doing is more, you see, than being called -- with a name. And -- and the greatness of John Quincy Adams' life to me is -- is -- expressed that you have to be a very good -- live a very good life indeed, you see, in order to rise -- rise to this height, to do justice.

And the same, I told you, about Myron C. Teelor -- Taylor, who just died,

you see, that he had once performed a function for which was there no name in this country. And thereby, he is the great pacifier of American industry. And when he died, the people don't even know it. You remember?

And so this is greatness, you see, to do -- to evoke, to invoke the spirit of peace, you see, when you -- only can do it without the title, because the title has been abused by people who have fallen down on the job. Here, as in this case, the clerk. And in the -- Myron Taylor's case, the president of the United States even had to prevail, and the oth- -- industry, you see. You had to do it just on your own good will -- tour of good will. This of course, is the greatest thing in lif  
e.

And this I feel Ben- -- Benét is doing. He says, "I'm risking my reputation." And therefore he -- very -- of course, turns away the wrath of the critics by saying--how does he say it? It's a very beautiful--"Their words are just," you see. So he steps outside this whole magic circle of literature, you see, and said -- this is what he really says. "Their words are just. But when the --" you see, you see, "killed. But I have to say it."

And his tone -- I mean, he's deprecating of course his -- you see, his impotency, his -- that's his modesty, you see. "But," he says -- now it's a very beautiful -- you see, the other side of speech. The invocation, and the evocation of the poet or the historian: to what should they be? How does he get his -- his certainty that it doesn't depend on him alone? If you read these last -- these last verses. He says who de- -- who heals this incongruity?

(Is he { }?)

Ja. "My maimed presumption, my unskillful skill/My patchwork colors, fading from the first,/And all my fire that fretted at the will/With such a barren ecstasy of thirst," you see, "Receive you all" -- "them all," and now -- who is invoked now? Who is provoked? Who is -- in whom does he put his hope? (The reader.)

Yes, in the reader. And there you have real dialogue, you see. The reader has to -- to complete the task, you see. "You and -- and -- and -- me," the -- the poet says, "together can only form the success of this. I cannot write, if you do not respond." And so the response of the reader is not just reading, you see, as in art for art's sake, where you have a -- observ- -- contemplation, you see, and lookers-on, but you have, you see, "Should you choose to touch them," you see,

"With one slant ray of..." So the light comes from the reader. This is what he says.  
{ }.

And then he -- the last line is: perhaps another giant must come after me.  
This is what it means, you see, the last two lines: if not -- if I find no readers--"the  
dry bones littered by the way/May still point -- giants toward their golden prey."  
It's still the greatest theme of history, you see, he says. Do you see? But -- it's  
hard. It's all very concealed. Very tactful. And so in this life -- let's now read the  
-- the end.

Let's go, here. Three hundred thirty-three in this -- most editions. John  
Brown's Body. We have to read this {more or less} -- could even begin before,  
because all this is already epilogue. John Brown's Body. You have it? Ja. Would  
you read this?

(I -- I guess it's page 333 on most of them.)

(Yes, 333.)

("John Brown's body lies a- mouldering in the grave.  
Spread over it the bloodstained flag of his song,  
For the sun to bleach, the winds and the birds to tear,  
The snow to cover over with a pure fleece  
And the New England cloud to work upon  
With grey absorption of its snow -- of its slow, most lilac-  
smelling rain,  
Until there is nothing there  
That ever knew a master or a slave  
Or, brooding on the symbol of a wrong,  
They threw down the irons in a field of peace.  
John Brown is dead, he will not come again,  
A stray ghost-walker with a ghostly gun.  
Let the strong metal rust  
In the enclosing dust  
And the consuming coal  
That is the furious soul  
And still like iron groans,  
Anointed with the earth,  
Grow colder with -- grow -- grow colder than the stones  
While the white roots of grass and little weeds  
Suck the last hollow wildfire from the singing bones.  
("Bury the South together with this man,  
Bury the bygone South.  
Bury the minstrel with the honey-mouth,  
Bury the broadsword virtues of the clan,

Bury the unmechanized, the planters' pride,  
The courtesy and the bitter arrogance,  
The pistol-hearted horsemen who could ride  
Like jolly centaurs under the hot stars.  
Bury the whip, bury the branding-bars,  
Bury the unjust thing  
That some tamed into mercy, being wise,  
But could not starve the tiger from its eyes  
Or make it feed the beasts of mercy feed.  
Bury the fiddle- music and the dance,  
The sick magnolias of the false romance  
And all the chivalry that went to seed  
Before its ripening.

("And with these things, bury the purple dream  
Of the America we have not been,  
The tropic empire, seeking the warm sea,  
The last foray of aristocracy  
Based not on dollars or initiative  
Or any blood for what that blood was worth  
But on a certain code, a manner of birth,  
A certain manner of knowing how to live,  
The pastoral rebellion of the earth  
Against...")

Pastoral.

("...the pastoral rebellion of the earth  
Against machines, against the Age of Steam,  
The Hamiltonian extremes against the Franklin mean,  
The genius of the land  
Against the metal hand,  
The great, slave-driven bark,  
Full-oared upon the dark,  
With gilded figurehead,  
With fetters for the crew  
And spices for the few,  
The passion that is dead,  
The pomp we never knew,  
Bury this, too.

("Bury this destiny unmanifest,  
This system broken underneath the test,  
Beside John Brown and though he knows his enemy is there  
He is too full of sleep at last to care.

("He was a stone, this man who lies so still,  
A stone flung from a sling against a wall,

A sacrificial instrument of kill,

A cold prayer hardened to the -- to a musket-ball:  
And yet, he knew the uses of a hill,  
And he must have his justice, after all.")  
Would you go on?  
("He was a lover of certain pastoral things,  
He had the shepherd's gift.  
When he walked at peace, when he drank from the water-  
springs,  
His eyes would lift  
To see God, -- robed in a glory, but sometimes, too,  
Merely the sky,  
Untroubled by wrath or angels, vacant and blue,  
Vacant and high.  
("He knew not only doom but the shape of the land,  
Reaping and sowing.  
He could take a lump of any earth in his hand  
And feel the growing.  
("He was a farmer, he didn't think much of towns,  
The wheels, the vastness.  
He liked the wild fields, the yellows, the lonely browns,  
The black ewe's fastness.  
("Out of his body...")

You may -- stop one moment. As you know, the old distinction between the Christian era and all other civilizations has always been the idea of incarnation. That is, what the future has { }, the future then comes true and takes shape. It's all lost -- the word has no meaning for you, and you don't think that -- that the spirit gains body, and the whole process of creation is that the word comes first, "Let there be light, and then there is light." Here is prayer, and then it hardens to a musket-ball. It is the shortest formula I've ever heard of -- of -- for incarnation. Here, I put you -- you see, prayer, or the future; and the musket-ball of course, is of the conflicting moment, you see. And he is now -- John Brown, he is now looking back, and the historian--the epic, because that's what an epic is, history. "A cold prayer hardened to a musket-ball." I -- I thought this was exceedingly beautiful, and exceedingly precise. And you can't find it in -- in any -- in any other poetry, this -- this recognition of our orthodoxy.

And I still think that you will discover, if you just base yourself on this, that the tradition of the Christian era, that we are there to incarnate, is the only -- way of -- of coming to agreement with our fellow man. And with -- all problems

of education. Our poor educational misery, you see, comes from this very fact, that -- that your educators do not know what "incarnation" means. They don't know what it is. They have no idea that this exists. And here it's very simply said as the his- -- "the fate of America, here is this --.

I just read Victor Hugo's intervention with the -- Virginia, not to -- not to execute John Brown. And the spirit, you see, is extra-space. It's super-mundane. The word flies. It has no fron- -- natural frontiers. And therefore, incarnation always resets the boundaries of the world. That's why you are frightened now by the Russian Revolution. How could it? There are no Communists in this country. But the word knows no frontiers. Whether you have a Communist enlisted in a party or not, you see, the words called "Communism," or "industrial -- I mean -- sharing," or whatever you call it, they are over our heads, you see. And they press. And people in their nationalism today think that frontiers are real.

For the process of incarnation is always that a cold prayer is of -- a universal. There enters -- with any word that provokes the future, there enters something that is -- defies all walls of houses, all private-property fences, you see--anything that is earth-made--prayer is always in Heaven. Then it comes to earth in a conflict. That's -- that's what he means by the musket-ball, you see. And now he -- Benét leaves it to us, as a -- as a procession forever, as Thucydides said, you see, -- the -- the process is then at an end, when you can see what it did. And -- so "A cold prayer hardened to a musket-ball" is great Christian theology. And I feel that this is the way today theology alone can be probably told -- taught effectively. Not in theological terms, but it's exactly the story. And it is always simply -- and that's why we all have to be--pardon me for saying this to you, who don't believe it--of one faith in the -- in the next 50 years. The process of incarnation is the only process by which people can understand how we have to live. Whether in education or politics. And if -- if then the prayer will always -- if it is resistant--turn into a musket-ball, you see, there will always be terrible wounds and terrible war. And the poet will always have to come and try to make peace in the end. This is our eternal destiny. There is not -- no getting out of this. Either the prayer is understood and shared, or it is -- will lead to this. Or it isn't prayer. It isn't -- when man is serious, his spirit always will beget conflict.

And since you are all evading this, and want security, gentlemen, I have to tell you that you want to stop the process of creation. And you will not be able to. Any country that -- that cries for security will perish. You will -- you will just



all perish. You will be counted out of history. It's -- you are just like weeds. We root ourselves not on this earth by building houses, or digging -- digging down, but by taking upon ourselves this process of future, present, past. Pray- -- promise and prayer, you see; conflict and song. You have to be- -- try to become a song in the -- in the mouth of the people who -- have lov- -- whom you have loved, who have loved you, but you cannot begin this way. Today everybody wants to be liked. That's not a way of entering life, you see. This is not the way. You can only invoke the gods and ask what your vocation is. A song you become, after you have struggled, and after you have been hated. And since people do not take it upon himself to be hated, they cannot be {loved} { }. They can only be liked. And that's not important.

So, the -- pardon me for dwelling on this. That's why you -- perhaps you understand why I am -- think that this is a very great event in America. That here the right faith has been restored. If you take it seriously. "A cold prayer hardened to a musket-ball:/And yet he knew the uses" -- we go on, please?

("Out of his body grows re- -- revolving steel,

Out of his body grows the spinning wheel

Made up of wheels, the new, mechanic birth,

No longer bound by toil

To the unsparing soil

Or the old furrow- line,

The great, metallic beast

Expanding West and East,

His heart a spinning coil,

His juices burning oil,

His body serpentine.

Out of John Brown's strong sinews the tall skyscrapers  
grow,

Out of his heart the chanting buildings rise,

Rivet and girder, motor and dynamo,

Pillar of smoke by day and fire by night,

The steel...")

Now where -- what's -- is this quotation? "Pillar of smoke by day and fire  
by night"?

({ } going in the wilderness.)

Wie?

(What it means?)

Well, it's a quotation.

(From the Bible.)

Yes, quite. I only wanted to find out if somebody still knows. Ja?

("The steel- faced cities reaching at the skies,

The whole enormous and rotating cage

Hung with hard jewels of electric light,

Smoky with sorrow, black with splendor, dyed

Whiter than damask for a crystal bride

With metal suns, the engine-handed Age,

The genie we have raised to rule the earth,

Obsequious to our will

But servant- master still,

The tireless serf already half a god--..."

One moment, one moment. You know what this is? And it is very biblical.

You know what from the "steel-faced cities" to the "half a god," what this really reminds -- should -- tries to remind us of? Where is the -- the final, electric, and crystal ci- -- and jewel city described? Where -- well, it's the golden Jerusalem, you see, of the Revelation, in the last two chapters on Revelation. "And I saw the city of Jerusalem," you see. And it's all building, jewelry, and -- very similar, I mean. I only want to tell you that this is the kind of vision, which -- as -- as much as this is from the Old Testament, "Pillar of smoke by day, and fire by night," you see, so this -- this -- from now the "steel-faced cities reaching at the sky," this whole -- this is "hung with hard jewels of electric lights," that is, you see, is the attempt to replace the vision of Revelation by the vision of our -- of our per- -- perfect cities. Ja?

("Touch the familiar sod

Once, then gaze at the air

And see the portent there,

With eyes for once washed clear

Of worship and of fear:...")

Ja, here you have: worship, the future; fear, the present conflict, you see;

and "We -- I have made you wal- -- march through this with wise -- I have washed your eyes clear," you see. That's what he really said, the poet, you see.

("There is its hunger, there is its living thirst,

There is the beating of the tremendous heart

You cannot read for omens.

Stand apart...")

What does this mean? I cannot quite follow. "There is the beating of the tremendous heart/You cannot read for omens." What does this {thing}? Does it mean "for omens" because there are so many omens? Or you cannot read it and ask it to give you omen? I mean, the f-o-r, the "for" --.

(I think he says, "No omens.")

They must not try to read an omen. Is that the -- no knowledge of the future { }. That's what it means, ja. Ja?

("Stand apart

From the loud crowd and look upon the flame

Alone and steadfast, without praise or blame.

This is the monster and the sleeping queen

And both have roots struck deep in your mind...")

"In your own mind."

("...in your own mind.

This is reality that you have seen,

This is reality that made you blind.

("So, when the crowd gives tongue

And prophets, old or young,

Bawl out their strange despair

Or fall in worship there,

Let them applaud the image or condemn

But keep your distance and your soul from them.

And, if the heart within your breast must burst

Like a cracked crucible and pour its steel

White-hot before the white heat of the wheel,

Strive to recast once more

That attar of the ore...")

What's attar?

(Essence.)

Wie?

(The pure -- the pure part of the ore.)

Ja. You mustn't read anything you don't understand. Ja?

("In the strong mold of pain

Till it is whole again,

And while the prophets shudder or adore

Before the flame, hoping it will give ear,

If you at last must have a word to say,

Say neither, in their way,

'It is a deadly magic and accursed,'

Nor 'It is blest,' but only 'It is here.'"

So -- ja, if you want --. This is a real philosophy of history. That's what historians do. I mean, that's what he has done. And he's aware of it. You see, that he -- he makes -- what we call the past, you see, is beyond conflict; it has been healed. That's what he tries to say. As long as this war is still making parties, it has not been lived down. It is not { }. And history means this power to make us keep the -- you see, the -- the event, but no longer engaging us in -- in fighting the Civil War.

And he has laid down in a very -- in a very -- extremely -- decisive way the conditions. He has said to the South: "Slavery is over." And he says then -- and that's -- I think is the great mastery: "Obsequious to our will/But servant-master still,/The tireless serf already half a god." That is, the slave on -- whom you despise, is al- -- also half of God. If you read this very carefully, you understand that he cures the South from its -- from its {superior} -- from its arrogance by saying, "These people whom you treat as slaves, you see, are in fact, you see, half gods, because even your machine, you see, is more dominating you than you dominate it." It's a very subtle way, you see, of deciding the issue between slavery and South. Not saying, "Emancipation; free him, this -- the slave," but seeing that all serfdom, you see, is divine. And that if you ha- -- could have seen in the slave the divinity, you see, that you -- that you really make yourself after all dependent on his faithfulness and his { }.

It's a very complicated religion here. He -- he declines to take sides simply, you see, between the working man and the aristocrat, you see. But he says, "The genie we have raised to rule the earth,/Obsequious to our will/But servant-master still." Don't be betrayed, see. The -- the servant will always master the -- the master. "The tireless serf already half a god."

So I -- you see, this comes full cycle, you see. The -- the servant of the South -- the slave of the South is now replaced with the -- you see, the -- the great monster of the machine, you see. But don't think, he says, that you are now

therefore able, so to speak, to forget his service, or to -- to walk on his services. You are dependent on them in the sense that you must -- you must associate, and -- and--how would you say? --democratize them.

Has anybody any idea if this book is read in the South?

(That's what I was just thinking.)

Wie?

(I was just thinking that.)

(It's not read in the North.)

Well, can you say that? I think it is suffering simply from the anemia of reading today. You see, this can only work by being -- by being learned by heart. And all poetry must be learned by heart.

And I -- I -- I once established a camp for -- Camp William James for leadership training for CCC. Did I tell you my story?

(Yes.)

Of the "Ballad of the White Horse"? And the people did learn it by heart, and they still recognize each other by quoting this line. And there is no other way of -- for -- as a test of poetry {than it be learned}, that it -- people know that it has to be -- reverberate in their own self. So what can you do in a world in which nobody learns anything by heart?

(The brother of Benjamin Spock, the author of this book on baby care, is a teacher, was a former colleague of mine, and teaches American history. And he uses this book as the center of his course. And it's -- it's always the -- the high point. The -- I -- I don't think he requires that it be memorized, but the -- they spend a great deal of time on it.)

Well, I only can say that anybody who would take it upon himself to memorize the Invocation, will have a panacea of all the heresies of to- -- of our day, because he will get into his system all the -- all the eloquence of a real -- of a real, living soul, as against all your temptations of looking down on reality by -- by your little brain and -- and staying outside of it. I think that -- this is -- .

I assure you, any good historian has ever tried to do this. I think it is nothing, you see -- but today the functions -- there is one thing, you see, that today the arts and the sciences have grown so apart, that the reconciliation or the renewal will only come when the scientist becomes poetical, and the poet becomes scientific. That is, he admits real historical source research. I mean, that's not { }, you see. This is solid work which he has done. And you demand this today. Take the historical novel, where you also prefer a novel that is really saturated with -- with good historical knowledge, you see, to a -- to a poor novel. And why is this so? Because they -- we have so specialized art and science to such an extent, you see--they have gone to such extremes--that I think today the reconciliation is that the -- this man is an historian and he calls him still, you see -- calls himself a poet. And -- but in his lines, he has made this transition, you see, that -- by saying, you see, that--how did he?--with the nations, you see, the --. This is really -- "I'm going to be a historian." He doesn't -- cannot say it, because the secret of course of a new deed that's done for the first time is always, you see -- Jesus said, "I'm the son of man," and only when He went to the Cross did -- He allow to -- Pontius Pilate to say, "You are the son of God," you see. He was not allowed to say it during His own lifetime.

Now anybody -- you may know somebody -- something of Mr. Kierkegaard, of the incognito that is required from any man who { }. The best, you must not blackguard yourself. Who you are, your -- your -- the others must say -- must find out. And anybody who has a vocation in life, is not allowed to label himself. The -- only the quack does this, I mean. And you can distinguish the quack, you see, who -- who claims that he is somebody extraordinary -- that's never true, you see. To be extraordinary, part of it is that you do not claim to be extraordinary. And that's a con- -- contradiction, of course, in terms. Very difficult. But he does it.

And I therefore feel that poor Vincent Stephen Benét will only come -- into his own if the historians of today do repentance and say, "We are not scientists," you see, "But are very glad to walk in the footsteps of -- of this man," you see, who has set an example of true history writing. And this is hard -- hard -- a hard lesson for you. But this is what we are living in, that all the functions, so-called, are no longer to be found under their labels. You write -- read a book -- you buy a book, you say -- and you think you get what it is called. But all these things have to- -- have today been -- been ruined, overdone. And all free, creative life is today incognito, and must even prefer a different title, you see, in order to be -- to allow the public to find out what it really is. Because that's part of the reader. That's part of the reader's contribution: that he must wake up to the greatness of the thing, and by his own. He cannot be told by the publisher that

this is the greatest book of -- of all times, you see. And he won't believe it, anyway. Because the advertising has reached now such proportions that Dante is always -- not Dante, because he wrote The Divine Comedy, but because he comes out with Scribner's. I mean, the publisher takes it upon himself to distribute the crowns and garlands of life, of course, not one word of truth in this. And since we have this system, you see, of self-blackguardizing, and -- and -- and -- and the situation is such that you must learn to discern the spirits.

This is the latest issue, I -- I want to -- to talk about perhaps next time. I think it's enough for today. But I do feel that history today is not simply what is labeled in a catalog of the college, "History." Poetry is not what is labeled "Poetry" in the catalog, you see, of the bookseller. If you do not know this, you will not find out the genuine fruits today that are produced, you see, the good -- green flowers -- the -- green grass, and the real flowers, the real fruits of life.

The -- the genuine today has to hide, because as soon as it calls itself with one of these names, it's commercialized, it's cursed, you see. Prophets cannot call themselves prophets. If they call themselves prophets, they come out as Bill Graham. Twenty-four hours' prophets. That's not prophecy. Prophecy means to -- to direct this nation back into the path of mankind for the next thousand years. It doesn't mean -- to -- to -- to cure pickpockets, and such things. It's a complete mis- -- misnomer. This has nothing to do with religion, what this man Bill Graham does. It's not a priv- -- religion is not a private affair. It's the -- it's the tie-up of man with the -- with his -- with his destiny, you see, from being created to reaching his destiny in -- in 5,000 years' march.

So the prophet today must not call himself a prophet. The historian must not call himself a historian. And the poet must not call himself the poet. And on it goes. And you are in a terrible confusion for this reason, that you think you go and buy this label, you see. But go -- go to the -- buy bread, and you get bread. You get some substitute for bread. It's nothing of bread in the bread. And on -- with all the vegetables, and all -- with all -- all the things you buy. You nowhere get the real thing today. Is this -- in food, in -- in mental things, you see, and -- and you are so accustomed to take these -- these pseudo-things for the real thing, of course, that -- that you live in a -- in a second-hand world.

So -- first of all, sing. And write your own songs; that's the very {least}. It is worth it.

So, will somebody take it upon himself? Would you do me the favor and bring Joel Barlow's poems or works. He has written other poems, too. And I

think, to show you the -- the -- the distance America has traveled, I think it's -- it's interesting just to look into it.

You {bring it} here. You have it? Joel Barlow. And if there are several cop- -- take one -- perhaps you go with him, and you -- there may be several editions, you see. There is one Collected Works, and then there is probably an edition just of the poem, "The Vision of Columbus," and then there is the -- his later rewording of it, The -- The -- The Columbiad. And then he has a -- The King's Man, and then he has the famous -- famous poem, Hasty Puddings. And could we -- could somebody -- would you prepare something, you two together, about the life of Vincent Stephen Benét, and what else he has written? And perhaps you can get his books to us, please.

And our -- our topic then is the function of the poet, next time. Or the function of the word, I mean, or function of { } see it's -- as you see, it's -- it's just in between. The -- Benét today I think is ruined by being treated as a poet. And that's why he can be forgotten. There's still danger; you have to do something about it. I mean, you say your friend has taken it upon himself to save him, you see, in American history. Is it? The brother --?

(No, it's American history. I -- I don't know how widespread this is.)

No, but I mean, there he is -- he's just -- do the same thing, he and I, trying to put -- put him in -- at -- in -- in his real place. But I -- Ja?

(I was going to say, the treatment is such, they spend enough time on the book so that -- that these boys never forget it. They're -- they're -- they're quite taken up by the spirit of the book.)

You see, the -- the exciting question of course is: anybody who does renew such a path of mankind, like narrating the past and evoking it, renews the office, the function of the historian. Of course, Benét is not simply an historian in the eyes of the American Historical Association. But at the same time, he's more of an historian, of course, you see. He covers a wider ground, you see. He plays on deeper chords of the human soul, and much more comprehensive. In this sense, then, the office of the historian is renewed. It isn't the same office after Benét has sung his song.

So that in every moment, of course, take a surgeon and take any doctor, I mean--any great surgeon renews his -- his function, I mean. Since we operate now heart and brain, surgeon is not surgeon. Formerly it was a barber, who



would only cure limbs, you see, arms and legs. Today they go into the thorax, and they go into the skull. This man is not the same. The -- the office of the surgeon simply doesn't mean any longer what it meant a hundred years ago. You must not forget this, you see. It's simply something quite different -- capacity and faculty today, because you have just to have a quite a different imagination, you see. You are not dealing with -- with the -- with the same -- with the same part of the human body.

So any greatness stakes out a new claim, and revamps the relations of the various fields of human endeavor. You are in this great danger to have this fixation to believe, for example, that this division: social sciences, humanities, and science--is based on any real separation. Whereas every creative effort, of course--like psychoanalysis, for example--moves these spheres, you see, into new order. Is it scientific? Is it humanity? Is it social, I mean? That's open to doubt. And -- and this is, I think, the great merit of any great feat of -- of human expression, that it forces us to admit that these -- these boundary stones and these fenceposts between the departments are all preliminary, that any creative action laughs at them, ridicules them, overthrows them. They are only for children. And today, the -- the grownups believe in them. That's so terrible.

What? Anything? Would you -- would like -- we have only one more meeting, I'm sorry to say. You will, of course, rejoice. And now do I get my papers? Will you kindly furnish them tomorrow, into Mrs. -- Miss {Braun's} sanctuary? Wie? Or they are already here? Who has theirs to give me? Well. Will you kindly put them -- I have there a box in the -- in the history department.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...not one of you has read over his manuscript, his typewritten manuscript and corrected the misprints. I've never seen such a treatment. This is just -- I mean, a pig wouldn't be treated this way. And I can prove it, because not one has any emendation on his typewritten errors. There is not -- never a pencil or a -- even bit of ink on any one of your papers, where you have been good enough to correct your own nonsense. Why should I read such stuff? It's really -- it took me quite -- I was very reluctant not to throw these papers into your faces. I'm not your wet-nurse. And you are so -- you have never grown up beyond the age of 2. You go to the toilet -- you are not toilet-broken. That's how I call this. This is what you are. I -- I really had to -- to use very much restraint to read these papers.

And the second thing: -- do you think I'm so stupid that I do not see that you copy literatim from another text? I've even mentioned it. It's despicable. You just have copied pages and pages from printed books. Do you think I'm such -- such an idiot? Num-- -- that's Number 2. What shall I do with you? I don't care. My -- I'm an old man, and I thought it was a privilege for you, that I -- well, that you could hear these things. You haven't treated me this way. You have made me understand that I'm just a fool.

These two external things are just incredible. I haven't even noted down when I knew that you were just copying pages from printed books. -- It's so stupid, even the -- quite out of the -- of place, I mean. Here, there -- {Histor- -- *Scriptores Rerum Historia Augusta*}, you come with Herodotus, and Thucydides, as though -- that was -- had anything to do with it, because the introduction to this -- in Loeb, probably, contains the such a -- such a retrospect of rhetorics and what-not. Nothing to the point.

There are s- -- of course some decent papers. You -- you know your own exceptions quite well. And I -- I'm quite satisfied. But most of you could do much better work than the -- you condescended to -- to do.

But these two points, gentlemen, that even the best of you do not read over their paper. I don't know why -- any -- you know very well that you make slips. This is a -- very strange. All of you have to learn to be clerks and secretaries for the end -- rest of your life, so teachers will all have to make reports, that it is obvious that you will never allow yourself to hand this into a principal without having read it over. But why not to me? And some of these misprints are just

indescribable.

Now we come to the content. And there of course it's very hard to find any standard of behavior. One of you performs the -- a remarkable feat: he derives the Jews from Cain. Obviously not known who Cain was, and said that the story of the Jews was short, because it began with Cain. Now Cain is the son of Adam, so it's quite a long story, of course. And I thought -- that even you would know that the story of the Jews begins with -- with Abraham. And that's pretty late in the game. How -- anybody can offer me a paper -- with -- with such a sentence, I mean. This is not even in grammar school, because they wouldn't mention something they wouldn't understand. Can somebody explain to me how a man can begin the history of the -- Jews with Cain? He must be a dyed-in-the-wool anti-Semite, because -- Cain is the first murderer.

Who has written this? Confess. It's on the front page of my -- of my criticism. Here is -- must be the --. Then I give -- I mean, what's the use of teaching anything if this can happen? Mr. { } is not here. Wise. {Kranz}? Here. It's really in print here. "The Jews don't claim eternity, but begin their history with Cain." Quite some achievement. You do -- where is this man? Has he ever appeared here?

(Yes. He's here most every time.)

(Who?)

{Norman Kranz}.

(He's Jewish, also.)

(I was going to say, he probably's Jewish.)

(He is Jewish.)

He is Jewish? Well, that's a {specialist}. Well, I mean, he says it himself, so it must be true. You know him?

(I know him, yeah.)

Will you tell him? We accuse him of anti-Semitism. He's {ruinous}. I mean, this {record in Cain}?

(It's obvious he hasn't read Out of Revolution.)

What?

(It's obvious that he hasn't read Out of Revolution.)

Well, he hasn't to read Out of Revolution for the -- just to go to the encyclopedia, or something of this kind.

So I wanted to -- to read Barlow today, just to show you the -- the transformation of -- of an imitation of European models into a genuine American creation, as in Benét. This is -- step is very great from Barlow's "Columbus"--which is still a vision from Europe, so to speak, of America--and this first poem, which takes explicitly its stand, so to speak, in the Rockies, and -- and does not start from the Eastern seaboard. But we don't have a copy on the shelves, strangely enough. It's either/or { } the one copy that isn't there. So this library of course is a very shoddy one. And you -- if you can do anything to spread the -- the word that this library has to get a shot in the arm. I mean, some million dollars have -- to be put into this library to make it into something, not just current expenses. It hasn't been done. And the -- the staff is always defeated. Whenever there are -- there were \$2 million, you see, set aside for filling the gaps. And I'm told that \$1 million immediately went into buildings, as they always do, you see. This country is intoxicated with brick. And -- and everything is overbuilt, you see -- in -- externally, and nothing is there to run the show, to put something inside. This {really} -- o- -- all over the country, I mean. Every donor, you see, gives \$10 million, and \$9 million have to be put into the building. Then there's too little left to fill it with anything that's going on inside, because it has to be showy.

Well, I haven't to tell you here this. Everywhere it's overbuilding, you see. You can run a good university without buildings, you see. But they think you can only -- you -- have a greater university by -- through buildings. This isn't true.

And the first thing, here, this library is not comparable to even -- to Berkeley, which isn't such an {extraordinary} library, either. And you can't get anything.

(Well, the downtown library is a pretty good supplementary -- institution. It has practically any book that I've ever tried to find. But even to get the books in our library at UCLA, you have to go through hell and high water. It's just

discouraging.)

Well, that's of course, with such a { }. This cannot be helped. But -- there are just incredible gaps. And -- here, why didn't you go to the downtown library?

(Well, I got -- I have -- listened to the "Hasty Pudding" poem.)

It doesn't have it. But you could have gotten a copy of Mr. Barlow, I'm quite sure.

(At the downtown library.)

Well, this is our last meeting, so now I have a -- { } up { }. So let's forget about all this.

I would like you to -- to ask you -- do you feel capable now--and that should be one of the fruits, after all, of our gatherings--to define the difference of historical time and scientific time -- physicists' -- physical time? This -- at least -- I think would be some achievement or some understanding which should stay with you, { } other -- other things. That's the main problem, you see. Do you understand why historical time and physical time are not the same? Does anybody care to try to express this? We have talked about this time and again, last time again. But I would like you to -- to be able to articulate this yourself. Does anybody feel up to this? Wouldn't you try?

(Me? I could try.)

You can go to the blackboard if you want to. It may help.

(I'm going to sound like a machine, because I -- I feel so hesitant to try to

--

.)

Oh, Sir. Well then, never mind, I mean. I -- nobody will poke fun at you.

(First of all, the time of science examines things as -- as -- it just didn't -- in one area of time, they examine them in the present. It -- it -- it -- ex- -- science examines things and objects, and doesn't --.)

Well now you can even say it neglects time. I would even go so far. You say "present," but it isn't a true present, because it says, "This thing is," isn't it?

That -- the expression for all science is "is," you see. And here is your mind, and here are--as you rightly say--the objects, you see. "This is": that's after all the formula of science.

(Whereas...)

In history, we don't speak this way.

(The language of an historian must look at the three elements of -- of time.)

Good. Now you come nearer to the truth. You can put these in opposition on the other side. No, put the future first, because they two --. You see, past and future he has on top, and underneath, as a result, the present. That's the story of the historian. In other words, the -- the historian, you see, here stands between mi- -- his mind and things. That's you -- what you always think you do, what you call "objective," you see. And then you have only as opposite "subjective." And I have tried to tell you that the historian has neither to do with sub- -- the mind's subjectivity, nor with the thing's objectivity. We don't know anything, except that at this moment, I'm talking to you. And yesterday I was not talking to you. Today I'm talking. Tomorrow I have talked. And this is history, that we can say of an event, you see, "I shall be talking," "I am talking," "I have been talking." That is, that we have landmarks to say whether we live before an event, in the event, or after an event. That's all what history is, but it's magnificent. And you want to magnify it into something quite different, you see. The great thing of -- of history is that -- that we can announce, prophesy, suffer, undergo, submit, and report, and praise, and remember. This is our movement through time. And by this, anything that has happened stays with us. You ha- -- if you want to -- take the story of the Jews, then you cannot begin with Cain, you see, bec- -- no, no, you stay.

(You told me to sit down.)

No, I'll { }. I yield. I yield to the gentleman, yes, { } {Arizona.} Come on.

(Because I -- when you -- I realize how hard it is to -- to explain these things when we just start with ourselves up here, all alone without any notes, because as we're going -- reading our notes and seeing all the things that you -- that you said, and we -- it just feels like -- it seems like we understand it, until when I meet someone who doesn't even know you, and they -- and I want to say

that I met an instructor that I think has made some difference in my life, and he asks the question, "Why?" and I try to explain --.)

Kill him.

(I just say, "You have to meet him.")

Well, that's very good of you. But here, let's state what we have. I do feel that it is possible to formulate this in such a way that even the -- the cynic is put in his place. And I -- I want you to get that far tonight -- -day. So let's work on this. It's really not so impossible as it -- as you --. Must -- don't give up, you see. Once you break the spell of these people's naïve faith, the past, you see, is what they have, what they own, so to speak, you see, that causes then the present, and then the past and present together, cause the future. That's all their superstition they have, you see, that the past is theirs, because they have totally forgotten that it isn't theirs, you see. It's just down in oblivion, it's in the abyss, most -- even all this -- really analyze what these people call the past, they think it's there, that nothing can happen to the past, you see. It is -- it is imperishable, so to speak. Now in -- history, that isn't true. Ja?

(I think that 1984 by -- Orwell...)

Orwell.

(...by Orwell -- Orwell does a very fine job of alerting us to this problem and possible defeat of all our past by showing that it can be very -- and we can lose ourselves.)

-- It has helped some people when they think of themselves as sitting on a raft on a river, and this raft is longer than they themselves, that it expands backward up the river and down the river to a certain extent. This raft is our memory and is our historical sense. And we move on this raft backward and forward with a certain liberty. We can go up and down. Any tribal organization, any family organization through the grandfather and the grandchild has a raft that goes through five generations. The whole river of time is inaccessible to us. But the whole experience of backward and forward is already on this raft, you see. You go back, you see, to the Heck and you go forward--how do you call the -- the forward end of a boat?

(Bow. Prow.)

A bow. And -- and although you are very definitely aware that this is very limited, it gives you still a -- a feeling of expanse. Now the -- what all me- -- human beings, from -- since they buried their ancestors, have tried to do -- to remain, to expand the time after their death and before their birth. And the analysts have also made us aware of this simple drive today that anyone -- one of us wants to penetrate beyond his own lifetime in both directions, you see; and want to place this, his own lifetime, so to -- they hang it up in this, between past and future, to make it meaningful. That's called "education," Sir. The -- lifting up from the flat level on the ground, you see, where you lie dead with your own 70 years of life, you see, to lift it up in such a way that the past and future can stream through it, and can -- so that you become a part of this process of time which has existed when your parents marriage -- married, you see, without your knowing it, and which will exist when your children marry. And which -- therefore man is lifted up higher and higher in the stream of time. If you only cover the time from your parents to your -- your children, this is a smaller education, you see, than the education to the highest, of the divine time of the whole creative process, when God said it was light, and -- to the Last Judgment Day, when He said "It will be o-" -- "It's over." If -- people want to behave right in this fuller time, our education will obviously have to dispense with all purely temporary act- -- goals and aims of ours, you see.

And just yesterday, one of my colleagues here said very nicely -- the meaning of my life must be to praise the -- the Lord. So whatever I do, I must try to make it a Psalm. Here, you see, my life must be a song of praise of my creator. This is a very wonderful way of expressing the real -- eternal relation of any one life, you see, to the whole process of creation. How do you cre- -- praise your creator? That's a different question. But he has felt he should lift himself out of the boots -- you see, out of the goals of his private life. And it's quite remarkable that a man at this university could formulate it this way.

And if you look at education as a constant attempt to reach this historical level in which all the influences of the creative acts of the past are allowed, are fostered by us, are promoted by us--so that we do not block them, do not obstruct them--you see that time has started. And we are purely accidental inside of this time. And I -- always mention this fact: you are obliged to teach your children the English language. And if you don't, you abdicate your parents' rights. And now the schools are already taking over, and now they say the parents cannot teach. In this moment, there are no parents. Then there is no reason why they shouldn't be gotten in -- in -- in ovens, the babies, I mean. And artificial semination is a complete consequence of this abdication of parents, you see, giving over to the schools the right to teach children English. Because to teach language, of course,



is the acknowledgment of history. The English language didn't exist at one time, you see. It probably will not exist all the time.

If you enter history, you feel that at this moment, the English language is something still to be held onto. We do not say that it will be forever. We do not say that it has existed forever. But while it is here, you and I have to speak English, Sir. You must understand that this is an imperative. This is an order given. You -- this is a command: "There shall be English."

Now all history therefore cannot be understood without the future.

Because you must know, when you take up the study of English in the English department, whether you mean still to say, "No English any longer, Esperanto," or whether you want to say, "Let's cultivate English." Therefore the future is a -- has a decisive voice in the stud- -- your study of English. Because if you want to prove that it can go, that you no longer -- have to know English, that the universal language, you see, artificially seminanted, can replace it--as -- like Volapük, or Esperanto, or how all these artificial languages now are called, you see--you will treat English, you see, as a superfluity. And therefore the history of English will -- sime -- seem to you a -- a fluke, that has passed like a dream in the night, as the Bible says of such things, you see. But if you say that English is so marvelous, and so rich, and so expressive of the history of the human soul, that it must not be abandoned, you see -- there are 40,000 words you cannot -- they cannot die, because they are all -- you see, verses of the spirit, that you will defend it, and you will be down on the artificial language, or you will put the artificial languages in their place, and say, "That's good for commerce. But that's not good, you see, for the deepest imaginations of -- of the human spirit." And so you see that first you know already whether you want to expand English or limit it. And from this on, you will study. And you will give hours of study and place to English, accordingly.

I only want to prove to you that even in the simplest way of using language, and teaching your daughter to speak, you see, we are not only turning to the past, in the English as it is written. We have decided that it is worthwhile to keep English alive. Now that's a decision over the future, don't you see? The same is true about political science. If you want to talk about democracy and its development, you -- you already have decided whether you want to abolish it, you see, or you want to cultivate it.

This -- only to bring out that there is no such situation in which the pressure is not on from both sides. This is why this figure is perhaps quite useful, you see. Now history is an attempt to unfold, backward and forward, and your

freedom from these cynics is that you say that you do not live in past and -- and future, you see. That's part of the { }. We look backward, and we look forward, and the future looks on us, and the past looks to -- towards us. The past expects us to be saved from destruction. You -- on -- on you this English language depends, Sir. On you the Declaration of Independence depends. If you throw it into oblivion, you destroy it. That's an active act. Oblivion is destruction. You -- give it over to the -- to oblivion. So the past implor- -- knocks at the door and says, "Please," you see, "don't forget." Can you understand this? The past is not there, but it's a ghost that has to be en- -- encoun- -- wants to drink your blood again. And the future is impinging on you, saying, "What -- what do you think your future of the destiny of the human race is to be?" you see.

In this country, you are so hard-put, you -- all of you, because Manifest Destiny has meant a space development. To go West, that was Manifest Destiny. But please recover this wonderful word, "destiny." It's a notion in time. Your destiny, you see, is not geography, but is history. Obviously "destiny" means the end of time. Can you see this?

And this is -- one of the reasons why Americans destroy history, why you are slayers of history. You are really -- you slay history, every day, every one. Every American is a destroyer of history, because you have transposed the term -- "destiny" into space. That's the fate of America, that an historical venture--to discover the West, you see--was allowed to absorb the whole term, "destiny," whether -- obviously that's a passing phase, that you went West. Here, you are in California, you see. This cannot be now further destiny, you see. Therefore, it is very difficult for you to recover a sense of sanity with regard to history, because it has all been dismissed into space. Destiny seemed a walk over into the Nor- -- Cas- -- or Rocky Mountains. But is this your destiny, Sir? Your destiny is whether you have 12 children or not, because that's in time, purely in time. If you can recover -- I don't know if the word "destiny" can be saved in this country. Would you say it can?

(I think so.)

That's why you do not understand predestination. You see, it's one of the wisest insights of the Christianity. You always say, "That's Calvinism, predestination." Don't believe it for a minute. It's in the Letter of -- to the Romans by the Apostle Paul. And it's the -- central word of Christianity, that man ha- -- is free if he changes his future. That is, if he hears the voice of the future, you see -- a new voice from the future, then he is predestinatus -- then his destiny is able to change his background. Obviously, you -- you just take any conversion of Paul,

himself, as a "homo predestinatus" as a predestined being, you see, he can read that certain things of the past have to be changed. They have- -- he hasn't to adhere to them. That's destiny. In the light of destiny, all my past becomes movable, mobile, changeable, you see. I take it, yes, and I say, "Yes, but I have to do something with it. I -- it cannot go on like that, because my destiny, you see, is predestined."

So we go before this past into our origin, you see, into our father's hands and man is then -- God's thought. And even your mother and your father are already disguises of your full destiny, you see. They can be, because they have a limited environment. And they are just your step-parents. Because God wanted you as a creature as it -- has never existed before. And so that's the story of the Holy Ghost, that -- conceived by the Virgin. This is nothing -- all these superstitions are not there. The -- it's an attempt to express that Christ was a thought of his Father in Heaven before He was the carnal son of Joseph and Mary. And that's true of you -- all of us. You cannot live, if you do not believe that your -- everybody rebels against his parents, you see, now, because we are all just shot through with Christianity, and everybody believes that there is a destiny which he has to re- -- discover, which makes him predestined, you see. That is, before he is determined by conditions -- that's the difference, you see, between determination and destination. My destiny is recognized destiny. And determination is outside of me, hangs over me as a cloud, and as a compulsion.

And so the -- history is the only means of -- for us to get outside our environment. And -- ja?

(I'm not -- I'm a little unclear about the difference between predestination and determination. It seems to me that the -- I got one glimmer there that maybe predestination is something from the inside, whereas determination is from the outside. Is that -- but I'm -- not clear.)

Yes. Come nearer to the sense of history, now. I mean, it is necessary when you make this distinction. Now the whole difference -- you -- nobody brought a Bible. Anybody has a New Testament here? That's all obsolete now. Well, if you read the letter to -- of -- of James in the Bible, there it's made very clear that he lived by the law of liberty. That is, whereas all things in nature live, you see, by the necessity of the law -- by natural law, James tries to express it in this stupendous way that he says, "We are children of the law of liberty." Now what's the law of liberty? It's a contradiction in terms. Where there is law, there seems to be no liberty.

If you take -- American teamwork, and improvising camps, settlements, Gold Rush, and {Klondike}, that's meant by the law of liberty, that in the process of being free, we discover the law of the action which this action needs from us, you see, to be fulfilled. What we call "teamwork" is such a law of liberty, that is, voluntar- -- -teers, you see, get together and in their good will -- people of good will discover the law that this one action, you see, makes necessary: the division of labor, building a bridge, you see, fighting a forest fire. These would all be laws of liberty, you see, because the first instinct is "I wish to help." And if I wish to help, I -- in order to implement this, there is obviously a lawful proceeding, necessary, you see. One has to be first, one has to be last, and so on, and so -- so forth.

The law of liberty is that -- a law that comes about by the power of our speaking to each other, our inviting, our obeying, by commanding. The wor- -- the word is the whole difference between a mute nature and humanity. You are called into life and your parents admit, by giving you a name, that you are bigger than just their dependents. They cannot kill you. They have to teach you language, you see, they have to make you a citizen, you see, of the kingdom of Heaven. Simply by -- teaching you English. You must not under- -- overlook that the fact that you learn to speak emancipates you from your parents. You see, if you wouldn't speak, if you would be an animal, you see, with our constitution, we would be under -- under the yoke, you see, of servitude, all our life. Because never would we be able to get outside our environment, and to replace it, you see, to change it. To speak means to be no longer under the servitude of the accident of our own time and space. That -- to speak means already to meet our ancestors before our birth, and to meet our children after our death. This is the secret of -- the -- that's why the Gospel of St. John says, "In the beginning was the Word" for man.

We are only people because we speak and can therefore can speak us outside any casual form of existence, any passing, you see, chapter of our life. The word saves our identity -- you are still Mr. {Erskine}, you see, after this class. You are not the prisoner of any one state of affairs.

Now this is then the whole difference, gentlemen. Predestination means that you can, by the names from the future and from the past, by sacred names from the past and by sacred names {becking} you from the future, you see, as in Israel, you see, the -- the -- the -- the Messiah, the expectation of the Messiah beckoning from the future, and the creation of the whole earth by our Lord, makes you and me absolutely sovereign, compared to any one phase of history to which we are born. What does it mean, 1959? You see, I am of a much longer

ancestry, you see. And the casual laws of this moment, you see, cannot bind me. When the pope revolutionized the Church, Gregory VII in the 11th century, the imperialists, the people who were adherents of the old state of affairs said, "But -- but 400 years, the Church has lived by the rules of Constantine, or even 500, and 600. How can you revolutionize the Church?"

And he said, "What? Our Lord has allowed the -- the devil to govern the world 5,000 years before Christ came. And then He came. And so you see, 5,000 years makes no difference. There is no prescription. There is no statute of limitations for human abuses. If something has gone on for 5,000 years, that's no reason why it must go on any longer."

Now this is all human. And I think any American feels an echo of this in his -- in his person, you see. -- The statute of limitations doesn't run. Isn't that true? But how do you? How can you claim this? You can only claim it if the claim made on you is from time immemorial; that is, before you have been bewitched en masse into the temporary form of your existence. Otherwise there isn't. You have otherwise no claim.

Now all this then is put on us by being spoken into life. The language is very wise -- please take this down. Predestination presupposes that we are called into life -- called into life, you see. That is, that we hear a voice that commands us to go beyond the present moment. This is very wise in the language, to call into life. That's why man has a calling, and why -- has a vocation, which is just the same word like "calling," you see. And why it has to be expressed in this way? Because when you wake up, here as students in this university, you have been talked into existence and called into existence for 20 years, and you must not overlook this fact that people already have constantly pressed home on you the fact that you are allowed to speak back. It is the gift of the community to you that you are allowed to speak, and that we expect you to speak.

You always begin with your own contradiction and say, "I." This is not the first sentence of the living word. The first -- word that is spoken to you is "you." Man wakes up as somebody else's you. Perhaps you take this down. You wake up as somebody else's thee. Because your parents say "thee" to you in the name of humanity, you are entering history, because you are called into this stream by being addressed. Not as an animal that wants to eat and to drink, but--to shit--but as a being that has to participate in the creative process of history. So you begin as a "you." And in this moment, you are made into a citizen of destiny. You take part in the direction of the march of events. Through being called by an

older group of people, you see, strangely enough, the avenue into the future is open. This is this dualism of -- of life, you see, that because they hope and look into you, their expectation that you will continue, you see, you are suddenly thrown into the forefront of the future. But it is their throwing you, you see--that's the problem of your education, you see--that the educated person cannot be self-reliant. He must know that he has been thrown.

That's why I have called this, you see, this -- these two stages in my -- man is a traject from the past. And he is pr- -- prejected into the future. And in history, object and subject do not exist. But at this moment, gentlemen and ladies, here we are: trajects from history, you see, and prejected into the future. And this whole division, of object-subject, doesn't exist for the historian. If I tall -- tell you about the Declaration of Independence, you see, we recognize that somebody has thrown us here, you see, that we have been trajected over an abyss of time from before our birth, you see, into this moment. And we know that we are prejected into the future, you see, and have to reach by hook and crook through our great-grandchildren some future destiny of the human race.

If -- if you would see this, you would understand why the center of my -- my thinking has been crucial. You and I are not, as you think -- are -- we are here sitting on our fannies or standing in space. This -- this is, of course, the aspect of the schoolroom. That's why this whole idealistic philosophy was possible. Plato and his students, you and me, we sit here on our fannies. We don't move. We sit on a table -- in front of a table. So it's very easy to say, "Here is your mind, your wonderful mind," you see, "the minds of men, and they are all abstracted into one mastermind"--whatever that may be; I've never seen one--and in -- in fact they are only 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 people at this moment, 12 minds, you see, forgetting their physical -- external, and using their brain. That is, the mind is the abstraction where I neglect the other limbs of my body for a moment, you see, and think on what can we agree. The mind is the instrument of agreement between people, isn't that? There -- in -- by neglect of time, and we sit here, and we stare then at history; and this has become our object.

Now gentlemen, this is an abstraction. I mean, that's a cross-section of your and my life. In fact, you are a steaming, breathing, loving, hating, aspiring being. And for a time you are just -- in -- in the refrigerator of suspended animation, can you see? You are kind enough to -- to be patient for an hour, and that's a stopping place, a railroad station. That's not the railroad of your life. Here we sit back, and meditate for a moment. In this moment, the world appears split in space in this manner. But if you kindly look at yourself, when you get up and leave this building, and run elsewhere, and have an appointment with your

sweetheart, and are very anxious not to miss it, you see, and are looking forward to the next appointment when you have to leave her--because it is terrible to leave somebody we love--then you know that man is in agony -- "agon" meaning a race. You see, agonistics, as you know, Samson Agonistes, what is -- does it mean? You know Samson Agonistes? By whom is -- Samson Agonistes? Never heard of it? By Milton? Well, there is a book by Unamuno, The Agony of Christianity -- of Christianity, the great Spanish writer, you see. And it means, of course, the -- the fight in the arena of Christianity. That's the -- "agon" is the fight in the arena, you see, the--how do you call it?--th- -- well -- a match, you see. That's the a- -- agon.

And so we are in agony, constantly. It's a good word. Take it up, I mean.

We are not just in agony when we are sick. All life is agony, you see, because it is all the time -- are -- we are in danger of leaving -- losing our breath, isn't that true?

And once you see men, panting -- like the -- that's why the Psalm says, "We are like" -- "the human heart is"--what does it say?--"like a heart panting --. (As the water.)

Yes. Well, that's simply true. That's not poetical. That's a much better description of mankind, than to call him a -- a rational animal. We are panting, poor breath, because we are in such a hurry, and -- and have so many duties to fulfill, and so many desires to -- to -- to complete and -- and to -- to respond. And you see, this race run, and then I think I am right to say that in looking backward, I recognize that I have been trajected from the cave man, through many dark ages, and here I am, you see, in the light of the present day, as a traject, over many abysses, through a mysterious bridge of human history. These human ancestors are the bridge-builders who have carried me along so that I haven't been -- I am not sunk. And I am already -- that's why I mean -- I'm already on a certain level of behavior. You take it for granted. That's, again, I mean -- the word "educated" means "lifted up and inducted into this tension between the past and the future."

And if you look -- think -- at the human situation, here you stand, or here you sit, or here you run. And at any one moment, you can allow yourself to sit back in space, and to take stock, and to measure, and count, and to -- to stand still. And in this moment, you become, you see, the subject of an objective world. And you follow out your objectives, and so on. But that's always in space. But when you treat creation as your brothers and sisters, like your sweetheart, you

forget all about the -- she -- your -- your girl is not your object. And you -- Sir, I hope you will not think that love is something subjective. It is a pre- -- project of the future. You assume that this is your destiny. And you are one, and not two. And -- as soon as a man or a woman dares to try a -- the man -- person of the other sex as their object, they become prostitutes, and they become murderers, you see. And they become perverts. The -- the English, and the whole Cartesian era, you see, has masochism and -- and -- and -- and what's the opposite?

(Sadism.)

Sadism for this reason, you see. It's a temptation of treating the person with whom we embark on a common life, you see, as an object. Cruelty is always the result. It's a very simple thing that in a Cartesian age, you must get masochism and -- and -- and sadism. They are simply the -- the -- the fact that the man has become so helpless that he thinks everybody, even the person he wants to melt in with as one body, is -- is an object of his lust. Then of course, it makes no difference, if you want to have objects around you, the best thing is to explode them. The atomic bomb is the -- is the best expression of a Cartesian age of space domination. Because the whole world is becoming an object to which I prove to myself, to my great satisfaction that I can do as I please.

So wherever there is -- there is love, the -- the -- the life -- looks like this, you see. Here is my mind, it is true. And here is some outside person. But we try to seize -- I want to make this girl from an object of my admiration and from my -- my good looks into -- into somebody who shares with me, into my -- as we say, partner. At this very moment, she has ceased to be my object, and I have to cease to be her subject, you see. We -- we must be pre-projected into a common future. And people who have a common future strive for a common history. And when people have no common future, gentlemen, they are outside history. And Americans have no future at this moment. That's why they have no relation to history. That's corresponding.

You see, this may -- may solve your problem: mind and body--because, instead of "objects," you can also say "body," you see--mind and object are only split as long as this somebody who is against you--in the outside world, you see, in front of you, whom you see, whom you like to know--ceases to be an object, you see, and becomes a partner. And as a -- you see, the more you forget your own mentality in the process, you see, the more your mind and her body become one, or vice versa.

The whole illness of schizophrenia is, you see, that you can -- most people



cannot do this. So they remain split in mind and body themselves. It is really very simple. I -- I feel -- you see, the -- the --. This I call the Cross of Reality, and I -- because man is in a crucial position. Your liberty is at every one moment to plunge into the stream of life, or to retire from it. In retiring, you objectify. In entering it, you take the plunge, and forget that there is this division between objects and subjects. If you become President Eisenhower, you are simply George Washington. You can't help it, you see. You are projected into this situation, whether you like it or not. And even a small man, like Mr. Truman, suddenly is president of the United States, you see. And he had this feeling, you see, that he was projected, and had been trajected through a series of grand- -- you see, grandiose magistrates, into his own responsibility. And where there was no mind and no body, you see, he simply was acting out the voices of the past, trajecting them into the future. And it's the greatest story I feel in American history, that Mr. Truman was able to fire MacArthur, because he had read the story of Lincoln and McClellan. That's encouraging, you see. That's history. That's the sense of his- -- of history, you see. He had learned that in a democracy, the civilian authority has to remain, you see, on top of the generals. And that's the -- the great danger of any republic: it perishes as soon as this is, you see, lost sight of. It perishes. Whether you take General Boulanger in France, or whether you take Napoleon, or whether you take, you see, MacMahon -- I mean, the whole French story is of course--take Napoleon--strewn with these corpses of -- civilian authority. And McClellan, as you know, ran for president, and thought that he had it in his bag, and very tempting: the successful general, because he -- he invented a good pack saddle. He wasn't successful general, but he thought so. Now Clemenceau said the same, you see: the war is too serious a business to leave it to the generals. And he deposed Monsieur Foch, and -- and made Pétain, really, you see, the supreme commander. Very strange story, and -- because he -- he disliked Pétain. But he said, "The man has faith, the man has the sense of the -- future survival of France, and Foch hasn't," you see. Or Joffre -- no it was Foch.

And so -- ja?

(I don't know if this is -- I think this is -- might be on the point. But the word "subjective" has always bothered me for what might be a -- even a naïve reason, because I don't really understand what you mean when you say "subjective." I know that we're subjective in the sense of our feelings -- to -- to love someone you -- this is -- on the basis of our own purposes, and -- and we sort of throw a block off --.)

Good question. Good question, I {think}. Put your mind at rest. You are absolutely entitled to your feeling absolutely confused. The word "subject" has changed its meaning 200 years ago with its opposite. And literature is strewn with the corpses of the -- two usages, you see. So you are quite right to say, "I don't understand it." You --.

(It seems that --.)

It's just poison.

(It seems that what you -- what you have to appeal to, when you say you're being subjective, you appeal to some objective reason anyway, you appeal to the fact that I want to do this, because -- because I want to satisfy myself. This is { }.)

May I explain to you what it meant in the anc- -- with -- for the ancients, for the Greeks, and the Romans? "Subject" of course is the translation of "{hypokainenon}," that is, the underlying in -- in the -- in the Eng- -- Greek language. You don't have -- we have to -- { } in the Greek, but I want to explain to you that the grammarians--it's not a philosophical term originally, but a grammar -- term of grammar--said there is a verb. Most verbs have somebody who does the act. "The king reigns." So the king is, when I say this, submitted -- submits to the action as passing through him. And he becomes the vehicle, the instrument of this act, in order that -- that there is reign: "I need a man who does reign -- the reigning." This is the idea of the subject, that he is subjected to the act which passes through him, and thereby becomes invested in him.

And now you see the word "agent" is a very good ca- -- case in point. By acting, you become the agent. If you take upon yourself to perform a certain act time and again, you first are the agent--in real estate, you see, the agent in--finally you become the actor, as of the stage. Because 2,500 times, you will enact Tobacco Road. A decent person doesn't do this, just actors, you see. That's why in the ancient world, actors were despised, as Plutarch says, you see. You remember -- we read the story of -- of { } in Plutarch. Don't you remember the chapter when he said, "A decent man isn't an actor"? -- You must understand that this is very deep-seated. An actor is -- who does arbitrarily subject himself to acts that aren't -- you see, not necessary in his own life. I still have a suspicion against actors. And I think it's an -- indictment of American society that the -- the movie stars are the one thing that is the shingle of this country, gentlemen. That's impossible. Actors are ab- -- subnormal people, because they submit voluntarily to repetitive actions. He is the greatest man on earth who did every-

thing once -- does everything once, {when it is needed}, you see. That's the story of Jesus, why He didn't write any books, you see, had no bestseller, because He would have had then to revise the second edition. There are no second editions of any saying of Christ, in the Bible, you see. It's all original, and all once, because the -- what He wanted to preach was that every moment was absolute--fulfillment and prophecy--and had -- all related to the beginning of time, and the end of time, you see. Every minute being a -- a diamond in -- on this necklace of time.

And I mean it. I mean, a society that is for mass production must worship an actor who plays the same role 2,500 times, as they did in Tobacco Road. You must -- I despise these people. And I think it's right that they are overpaid, because they abdicate their soul. And the devil -- if you sell the -- your soul to the devil, you must get some reward.

I have never, to this day, ever repeated this -- a lecture twice. I have never given a lecture twice. But I have a colleague, when he came to America, as a young man, as a student, he told me the story himself. He was a German -- is a German professor. He said he gave the same lecture 200 times at 200 colleges, and thereby financed his travel to the United States. I looked at him in di- -- in dismay, because I certainly couldn't have financed my journey in this -- that way, because I cannot give the same lecture 200 times. You understand?

And this is why you have such a hard time today to understand history, because to you, doing the same thing every day is more -- so to speak, obvious, you see, than doing something different every day. The -- you are such -- you see, the routines of life, the schedule has come -- completely disjointed if you think it is normal to be -- go three times a week to a lecture. It isn't, Sir. Quite abnormal, you see. The great events are the great events, because they cannot be repeated. You can't miss them, because -- once you aren't -- been there, it's too late.

(I was just thinking. Wouldn't you say this is the reason that the diaries have gone out of vogue for quite a while, whereas in past times, people always felt { }.)

Yes, always felt that days were different. Quite, quite, exactly. And you feel now it's the same thing every day. Breakfast food, et cetera.

So. The historical sense -- time will be sharp, now when you still agree that every day differs. As soon as you begin to think that the days are repetitive,

just the same day all over again, you have ceased to live in the sense of destiny, because destiny, of course, is the creation of all time to its appointed end, of which you are a modest, humble servant, or -- or partner, or sharecropper. And so the uniqueness of time is -- can only be reached by degrees. There are routines, of course, you see -- are less vital in our life. But every man says during the day one sentence which he hasn't said yesterday. And the -- he will not say again tomorrow. You read -- have an accident on the road, and there are certain outbursts of your feeling and of your -- you see, of your response. And they'll -- they'll stamp the day. And everything that is more unique is more historical. The more unique an event, you see the more it -- it belongs to history; and the less -- the less, the more it belongs to nature. If -- anything that is--like the sun rises, and goes--that belongs to astronomy. Already an eclipse and an earthquake belong to history.

Even they not quite, because they can pre- -- so to speak -- an earthquake, no, we cannot yet pre-figure, I mean -- we -- we are unable to do so. The earthquake of Lisbon is an event of human history, because in 1775, as you may know, the big city of Lisbon in Portugal was destroyed, and people in Am- -- in Europe--and America too--woke up to the fact that God was not a benefactor. Because there were thousands and thousands of people destroyed. And the deep pessimism of Volney's on the ruin -- A -- *Sur les Ruines de l'Histoire*, appeared in 1772, I think it was, and -- for the first time, you see, the Enlightenment was balanced, so to speak, and checked by an inkling that we did not live in -- in a good nature, that nature was not good, that it wasn't so simple as that. The optimism of the age, you see, preparing the French Revolution, the American -- you see, independence was crushed in the earthquake of Lisbon.

Only to show you that there can be events in hi- -- in nature, which, because they are so unique, you see, enter history. I mean, I think an historian of the 18th century must mention the earthquake of Lisbon, you see. He doesn't have to mention that it rained in spring, you see. Except in Los Angeles. And -- because that's repetitive. But the earthquake of Lisbon has, you see -- woke people up to a different sense of their existence.

This is just an example. You have a yardstick -- you see, all this is dynamic, all this -- as you call it -- all this goes in degrees. There is more history and more nature, less history and less nature in any event. The most unique event is the original sentence spoken in a certain moment as in response to a certain need, you see, because the word is the freest; it is the most changeable; it is the most original. You see, it is least hampered by space, and environment, and

conditions. The Gettysburg Address is immortal, you see. And that's very strange for you, but the -- the originality goes in this way, you see: spirit, passions, reason, rhythm. We say something has "neither rhyme nor reason," then it is quite dead, you see.

Rhythm is when you are in slee- -- asleep. Reason you use when you are awake. Passions you use when you are hot, on fire. And spirit you must use when you stand, when you are created, and when you -- have to act in the night of despair, in the place of God Himself, and if you have to say, "My God, my God: why hast thou forsaken me?" Because the son shall be equal to the father, you all, gentlemen, have in one moment in your life to take it upon yourself to say the word, to -- to stand up and be counted, you see. And if everybody says, "Yes," you have to stand up and say "No." And that's the moment, you see, of your -- that's not -- you don't do this impassionately, because you are in love with the girl, but simply because truth must not go out from this earth -- this a big lie, a lynching, you see--everybody wants to lynch, you see--you cannot -- you cannot go with it. Although you don't do -- do passionate, you do it for the sake of -- of the truth. And there are these -- these -- and this is down there, you see, there is just gravity. Now you can imagine what happens to a universe which is explained by gravity. This is Number 5; this is Number 4; this is Number 3; this is Number 2; and this is Number 1. Lynching, murder must be abolished. Human society cannot be based on murder. You will admit this, will you? Therefore the spirit rules, because this has to be upheld whether I like it or not, you see.

All spiritual demands are demands against my self-interest. I'm not asked whether it's interesting. There is no humanity left, speech is destroyed, if I can murder the man to whom I have spoken and who has spoken to me.

Therefore, everything is here, you see, on the creative side. It lays down the order of our existence on this {world}. The spirit pronounces judgment, how you and me--with regard to the dead and the living--shall behave. For example, can you kill a 90-year-old man, just because he's too old for you, you see, because you want to inherit him? He's no good for anything, but you have -- cannot, you see. He is your predecessor, you see. You have to wait till he dies. That's a very s-- -- important rule, today, where people already begin to kill these people by retiring them at 65, and putting them into a -- old-age homes. That's a way of killing people. Don't be betrayed. That's a way of killing them, because what they need is the spirit. And you deprive them of any participation in -- in the life of the community. And they do die. And they become of course terrible people, full of vengeance, and full of boredom, and -- and -- and they are like a blight on our

society. Because you have murdered them. You can murder people through 20 years. I mean, don't be betrayed. Murder is not just shooting a man.

So would you -- if you take these things, you see: there are bodies that are ruled by gravity. And I meet you in the ro- -- and be polite, and I have only treated you as a body, you see, as a --. Obviously then we apologize. What does -- does it mean to excuse, gentlemen? To say "excuse me"? It's a very wonderful word. It means in the realm of causes and effects, we treat each other as dead bodies. "To excuse" means to eliminate a cause. It means to say this cause shall not produce the effect that you slap me in the face. Can you see this? History begins where causes are eliminated, and are not allowed to take effect. That's history. History is the abolition of natural causes.

Now, for example, gentlemen. The first act in history is the funeral. The original idea of the -- process of death is that any -- animal goes -- leaves the herd when it feels it must die and it goes into a corner and dies. The Africans -- Negroes -- some still do this. That is, any horse in a herd, or any cow that feels her hour has come, runs away from the group. This is isolation. Funeral is the abolition of the isolation. It's the abolition of this cause of the breakdown of continuity in history. Where you do not bury the dead, gentlemen, you are outside of history.

That's why it seems so important in the -- when the Filipinos -- dies, the whole family, the whole clan crowds into the sick room in the hospitals -- 18 people, 25 people, because everyone has to receive the breath of the dying man. You know, that takes -- takes some reluctance to overcome. You cannot do this. You cannot be in a dead room without feeling chilled. You run away. Most -- any man -- the natural man in us wants to have nothing to do with death. I assure you, that our tribesmen here, the -- Indians, are only men because they attend funerals. You see, this is the first victory over a cause. It's an excuse. That is, an excuse means, you see, to ex- -- eliminate the cause. Can you understand them? The word is very simple, but nobody pays any attention to it. When you say, "Excuse me," you want to abolish the effect of a cause. And you shouldn't slight this word. You should say, "Excuse me," and you shouldn't -- not say "Hello," as the people here say. It's a great word, because it's the first word of history, that we excuse. That man is able to abolish causes. That's his -- predestiny, as with your parents. You are predestined to excuse yourself from being just these parents' son. You have also a destiny. You have a higher office. If they want you to be a farmer, or a banker, or a teacher, you can say, "No. My destiny, you see; excuse me." Because by all causes, you would be the heir to their fortune, you

see. But you can excuse yourself.

You all admit this, but you never give it a thought that this "excuse" is an historical feat which doesn't exist in nature. In nature, every cause has its effect. But we can revamp the past by saying so, Sir. The word "excuse me," has this creative power backward, that you and I can agree, and be treated as though it hasn't happened.

Now you begin perhaps to see that the past is what we look into. Here, looking backward, I say of certain events, "They shall have no result." Cain murdered Abel. But that doesn't mean that everybody has to murder his brother, you see. So we abolish the precedent by saying, "No" to it. We negate it. Part of being in history has -- means that we eliminate certain causes, that would otherwise lead to constant bloodshed, I mean, disaster. The same with war. We conclude peace, we -- and say, "This war must not go on. It must not happen again." And if we abolish the causes of this war, you see, then it doesn't happen again. So all history is an act of freedom, in -- of rewriting the past. This is the {secret}. That's why it has to be rewritten in every generation. There's plenty to do for an historian, you see, in every generation. Every past has to be rewritten in the light of -- of the present.

By the way, this is also done, I mean. Every generation of historians discovers a new slant and -- and do this. Only they say, "That's scientific progress." It isn't, you see. It's just their responsibility to the future which forces them to -- to eliminate certain causes from the past, you see, that -- are still hanging -- over-hanging us. Mr. Bar- -- Bird -- Beard, you see, tried to have a new economic order of the United States in the future, so he wanted to eliminate the worship of the rich in this country, you see. So he wrote his economic history of the United States. Can you see this? No?

(I don't understand it.)

You don't. Wie?

(I understand what you're saying. I haven't read Charles Beard.)

Oh, you haven't. Ah, -- it's very interesting. A very conscientious book, by the way, I mean. It isn't -- he is not a cheap man. He -- he was -- acted in good faith.

So if you kindly would -- would adopt this freedom, that neither objects nor subjects are the heroes of history. They are always heirs and ancestors, founders and -- founders and successors. These are -- I think all quite good words. We succeed into succes- -- successions of, for example, of speech, of writing, of law; and we found. And nobody escapes this. If you pass a law in the legislature, never think that -- the law is for yourself. The law is for -- you have suffered. You wake up to the necessity of a new law. To you, the law comes too late. You can put this down as a rule: all legislation comes too late to those who wake up to the necessity of a legislation, you see. And even if it happens to you a second time, the reason why you pass a law is that you care for somebody else who might be hit by this, you see. And it is this which makes legislation possible. The people who have suffered from an injustice do not enjoy, the -- you see, the result of the readjustment. Can you see this? Because in their life, years have been spent on this fight in the legislature, so their life has been licked. It has been -- used up.

{ } Lincoln's Gettysburg Address again, how he -- he keeps on emphasizing the fact that those who have died are not going to be able to enjoy the fruits of their victory, but we are { }.)

Ja, exactly. Once you see this, all your political, democratic ideas will be sobered by historical insight that it isn't for our enjoyment, or delight, or pleasure that we -- we pass laws, you see, that we are already there, enacting a process that reaches far beyond my generation and my own time. Even if -- if I should live 90 years, I will not be in this position which has sharpened my, you see, eyes that I have not suddenly known this was unjust.

I always appeal, when I have to speak to capitalists, to -- to their identity with their daughters. I say, "Nobody can protect his own daughter against becoming a secretary." Therefore, the richest man in this country still has a solidarity with the working man because his own daughter in due time, you see, may find herself in a dependent position. And today you should not appeal to the identity of mother and son, which is a prehistorical situation, but the situation of father and daughter, by which an employer, for example, you see, and a boss must identify himself with somebody in the next generation, for whom he cannot possibly make real -- real rules, except by law, I mean. Except that -- he creates a society in which young women are not abused, and not -- tortured. I feel that in this symbol of father and daughter, you -- you can melt the heart of the hard- -- most hard-boiled industrialist, you see. That's the only point where he is weak, and you can show him that his own daughter is the victim of the society which he runs. Because -- it is very simple, that in history, man -- the



father is -- identifies himself not with the son--who is a rebel, anyway, you see, a no-good, an anxiety--and never does what he is expected to do, but the -- the daughter is. There is the complete, simple identity. And -- and -- and through this, men -- fathers are living already in the -- in the future.

By the way, that's a -- interesting historical sidelight. The -- the real inheritance of the spirit, gentlemen, goes always through the maternal grandfather, you see: grandfather, mother, son. That's the true story. If you look into family relations, never look up the paternal grandfather, because that's just a misleading thing by name, you see. Because the name is the same: Smith, Smith, Smith. But the spirit is usually transmitted from the grandfather via the mother to the son. That's the true story. Because the mother is identified with her father, you see, and in turn is identified with her son. And the father is not identified with his son, but he's identified with his daughter. That's a good -- I mean, anybody has to read -- write a biography, I recommend highly this investigation, all the -- that's a true spiritual pedigree. The physical pedigree, and the name-giving, you see, is from father to son, to grandson; they call themselves "Seniors" and "Juniors," you see. But the originality of every one generation depends on this -- on this strange transformation, because that's another rule: only that is important, gentlemen, which can be expressed in both sexes. I mean, a truth that is just carried from man to man is little, programmed. I mean, free masonry, such things can be transmitted from male to male, you see. But the true spirit, you see, can only be transmitted if it stands the test of being -- can be expressed in feminine terms, and in male terms. The spirit has both sexes. The brain has-- -- the mind hasn't.

Well, pardon me for getting so -- waxing so eloquent again. But I want you only to see that in history, we unfold; and in science, we shut up. In science, we say, "This is nothing but." And in history, you must always say, "But imagine!" you see. That is, history makes us always bigger. And nature makes us always smaller than we feel at this moment. You see, there are two tendencies towards growth and diminuti- -- diminution. Science catalogues you and says, "Well, don't get excited. I-- you see, don't -- you don't have to care. We know all about it," you see.

I had a colleague--I told you this, perhaps already--who used to say, "I can tell you all about Goethe in 10 minutes." Did I tell you this? You see. Never forget this. He -- he tried to -- to treat a -- a wonder of human, you see, history as a "nothing but." As a -- "nothing but." And so you must tell your cynics, that history and nature are two methods of dealing with reality. You can have a history of nature, which begins with the creation of light, and says, "Let there be light, and

there was light." And then you build it up into something big. And you can tone it down -- scientifically, and say this is nothing but a source for -- that developed, and began to circle, and expanded, and -- and so on, and we get the solar system. Every human being can treat a thing as doomed to die, and as predestined to live. You can treat me -- I have a very -- much shorter life expectation than you have, and you say therefore, "This man is already done in. He's nothing but a senile old quack." Or you can say the opposite, that -- you can admit that you learn something from me. In this very moment, I become very important, because I become the head of a school.

So will you kindly take this away? I think this is the very best I can offer you, that history and -- and science are two methods which cannot be confused. History is trying to educate you, you see, and nature is -- is a training ground, you see, to make you into an animal that jumps as it is expected to jump. -- Perhaps you now understand that there is really a difference between determinism and -- and predestination. Predestination depends on your cooperation, on your explicit participation. And determinism describes your actions, regardless of what you think about them. And -- would you now understand this? This is really something, you see. This is -- determinism comes from the outside, upon you; and predestination waits till you have heard, you see, and have reacted -- responded. Predestination is able to base the decisive act into your -- your own free will. Because hearing can be resisted, and it can be, you see, obeyed. And there it runs freely.

(I always get the feeling from Mr. Calvin, that there's something of this determination from the outside entering into it -- his idea.)

Well, I -- I -- if anybody's interested, I will -- illuminate this. This -- are you? I have a very fruitful argument on this for the last three years with a professor of -- who translates Calvin at this moment into a new English version. They commissioned, and he's the editor of the { } Calvin, so I'm in -- at the center of the controversy. And -- and it has something to do with our story.

You see, Luther is -- is so natural in history, that all Eur- -- Germans are by nature historically-minded, I mean. Histori- -- sense of history is -- is a German sense. And -- I just received a review that I was a German of the Germans, because of this historical sense. And I have inher- -- inherited that. But Calvin isn't. And there is -- is -- therefore we have to study this. It's quite good. If you have the level of determinism, of course, you have also predeterminism. You are predetermined by your hormones, and your genes, and your sex, and your --

environment, and so. And here we have predestination, and predestination can only be...

[tape interruption]

... and I, for 50 years, I assure you, never used the term "free will," because I said it had been talked -- over-talked, and there are certain problems which one cannot deal with usefully, because they have just been, you see, have -- bandied around too much. Perhaps the time has come where we can fruitfully cope with it. Where does free will go? If you have a natural universe, ruled by natural law, free will is just like a cork on top of it. As many people, the -- the -- agnostic liberal will say: "Everything is determined by nature, you see, or by chance, or by fate, or by accident, or natural law. But man seems to have some leeway." And this is the argument of the natural man, of the humanist. "Free will is an exception from the rule; we don't know quite how." But humanists -- you find many humanists who -- who do not see the contradiction that there should free will in this one animal, you see, and the rest of the world is under iron law.

Now this then is the picture. Christ is predestined. Everybody has a feeling -- and I think there's even the -- the worst nihilist will admit that Christ gives you the feeling of freedom, that He -- He was free. In every minute of His life, as -- as Gals- -- Galsworthy has expressed it, "He is incalculable. Christ is incalculable." That's freedom, you see. You cannot predict Him. He's unpredictable. And to be unpredictable means to be free, and to be free means to be unpredictable. That's the same thing. And I think you should learn this, because today that's all confused. People do not -- no longer know what freedom is. It's not anarchy, you see, but it's only that nobody can, from any law, derive, you see, what he's going to do next. That's freedom.

And that's why there are so very few people in this country who are free.

They pretend that they are free, but they aren't, because they never do anything in- -- in -- un- -- unpredictable.

(Everyone that I meet -- well, I -- I think all around us in this country, they want to be free. They want to be free to such -- to such a degree that they don't want to have any costs. And this is what these -- in -- in 180 the other day when these fellows were asking the question. This is the thing: they can't think of being free, and yet still have anything that's determining you in the sense of any -- any destiny.)

Destiny; well, I know that.

(To be free -- to be free means you can also be free in something that's making a demand on you, too at this point. Such as -- I think you're freer in a sense when you love somebody.)

Ja. Exactly. True. You're quite right.

(You're a lot more neurotic when -- and determined when I think -- in the sense when you don't love anybody.)

Ja. Ja. Love makes you free, because it gives you the power to sacrifice.

Where there is sacrifice, there is freedom, because it is unpredictable. You can never rely on a man's sacrifice. It's -- you see, it still is a miracle of -- our existence, that man can make sacrifices from love. The society -- the laws of a state cannot ask sacrifices, you see. They can ask duties, and service, and obligation. But a sacrifice is something beyond the call of duty. And anything beyond the call of duty cannot be predicted. Isn't that true? You cannot predict that a man will do something extraordinary. Or a mother will save her life, you see, as the -- this young woman who -- you -- you read in the paper perhaps, extraordinary story. She -- girl -- a little child was bitten by a rattlesnake, and the mother had the double presence of mind to -- but she had learned it, of course, in first aid, I suppose -- to -- first to -- how do you call it? Tour- -- tourn- --?

(Tourniquet.)

Wie?

(Tourniquet.)

Tourniquet, you see, turn on the tourniquet, and then suck -- suck it out herself, to -- for herself which is quite dangerous, of course. Sucked the whole poison out, and the child was saved. That's beyond the call of duty.

(I wanted to ask, are there in any sense of -- the use of free will, you submit yourself, or enslave yourself, or become bound to some -- something --.)

Well, now -- well, it goes in -- allow me to go on from here, you see.

Because you are quite right. The question is: where is this free will really rooted?

But let me -- let me finish this. Because you will see that this humanist position: here are these strange 2 billion human beings who allegedly have a little bit of free will, and here are the laws of nature. So then every man is a miraculous

something, without direction, because it just -- he's just free to do something. But you don't know what. Is he going to restore the Stone Age? He's free to do that, you see. So life has no direction if everybody has his own free will, private. Therefore, with free will, we come to anarchy. With free will, we certainly cannot -- you see, history has no -- no -- no sense, no meaning. Two billion people just milling around, and doing arbitrarily -- you see, then this free will becomes arbitrary.

Now in this life on our earth, if you look up from below, you see here the earth, iron-clad, and here are the stars--also iron-clad--on top of us. And in the middle, man is dancing a dance of free will. Isn't this ridiculous? And it is not free will at all, but it is 2 billion free wills, will of the wisps, you see. That's really the picture of humanism. And it is unsatisfactory. Then -- ah -- I will always surrender to economic materialism, and I say, "Marx is right." Because that's the better -- more reasonable solution, you see, that we are the products of our environment, I can -- understand. But I cannot understand why, in the midst of -- of earthquakes, and geology, and mountains, and rivers, I suddenly shall here be free, when all the animals, we say, are -- are subordinated to -- to laws. I am -- under law, too.

No, the -- story is very -- allow me to show you that it really is quite complicated. -- With Calvin, it was this way. Here are -- is stars -- I -- really, I think "stars" and "earth" is better than to say "nature." It's much clearer. The heaven -- the sky, you see, and the earth teach us laws. There are seasons, there are sunsets, there are sunrises, and please be concrete. It's the sun and the moon that make us feel that there is a lawful order that's repetitive, that we cannot change by our will. And without this majesty of the natural laws, the whole problem of free will wouldn't be so shaky, because -- if -- if the -- the world was anarchical, and wouldn't move in certain -- certain avenues, you see, if we -- then we -- as the old people, they had their freedom of the will, because they saw the lion, and the tiger, and the wild animals. And they seemed to follow no law, and so man was quite lusty about it, you see. They didn't -- very -- had no astronomy. And -- the oldest, the -- the Indians, and so, they based their faith in freedom, because they compare themselves to the royalty of the lion and the cruelty of the tiger. And they feel, "Well, we jump as they do." But stars and earth are simply {adamant}.

So here is law. Then you get this strange sphere of free will. And now enters of course the scene, the majesty of the creator of all this, the problem of the deity.

Now the unfortunate fact is that for historical reasons, because of the struggle for sovereignty in France, and in the Netherlands, and in -- all the states, secular states, the word for the majesty of the image of God on earth was "sovereignty." The high magistrates, the princes were not called "free to act," but they were called "sovereign." The word "sovereign" in the 16th century had a -- a tremendous theology, just like "economic materialism" or "revolution" today. And a man was a sovereign, because it had entitled him to revolutionize the government.

And -- and so God's sovereignty was abrogated. And it -- it was said that the community down on earth took part in the sovereignty. So Calvin would say that his church in Geneva was as sovereign as the papacy, in order to express his equality with the papacy. He wouldn't speak of his own free will, but you would speak of the sovereignty of the church of Geneva -- of the church of God -- was as sovereign as God is Himself.

So you get a break -- a bree- -- a breach in the vocabulary. Here is God and His church, which are sovereign. And here is free will for man--as an individual, everybody--and here is the -- the -- a law of nature. And of course, these three orders are so confusing--God is sovereign, man has free will, the earth is under law--that -- Calvinism can be accused of having -- made things un-understandable. And now I'll tell you the simple reason--that's my -- has been my argument with my Calvinistic professor in Hartford--that I said, the whole thing there could have been avoided, if Mr. -- Mr. Calvin hadn't always spoken of the sovereignty of God, but of the--or majesty, as he also does--but of His freedom.

I have written a book -- you may -- some of -- may have heard of you -- The Christian Future, in which I end on the note that God is free to re-create the world in the light of the mischief His children make. That is, He always opens new -- avenues when we have reached an impasse. And the divinity of an inspiration we -- is always when people find a way out -- after they haven't -- made a terri- -- terrific mess of things. When we say, "Excuse me," that's exactly what we try to do, to re-arrange the world, you see, regardless of something that has happened. That is, we abolish a certain consequence.

Now what Calvin tried to say, and what -- Jonathan Edwards tried to say in his famous book on the freedom of the will, was: that men were ambivalent. That is, they could -- throw themselves under the creative act of freedom by sacrifice and love, or they could follow the inclination, the first urge, the stimuli from their being, of course, involved in the process of nature. That is, man -- as separate from history, is unfree, as a part of nature. And as entering that which

has to be done tomorrow in order to recuperate the past, you see, and to say, "Excuse me," you see, makes him a partner in the creation of the world by God, through all time. Because he can only reach this state of freedom if he does something that is meaningful in the continuity of the race. If he decides murder had to be punished, obviously he makes a law for the future, and he abolishes another law of anarchy or, you see -- or cruelty. Therefore, Calvin--and all theolog- -- gians say that we are at -- every moment tempted to throw ourselves upon the creative freedom of God, and be partner of His freedom, or sink down into the -- into the magma of natural law. And it's either way. And you know it that it is this way.

Now, mercifully, however, the saints, the creators of new ways of life create institutions between God and the individual man--like Church, and state, and universities, and arts, and families. And so, even though you and I are not at every moment up to par, and we cannot always be creative--that's nonsense; you are creative -- you see, one minute a day. But we can participate in all the sacrifices made by our forerunners and predecessors. And we can marry, and undergo the ceremonies, and the law of marriage, we participate in the acts of freedom which these monogamists created when they cured the Don Juans from their running after every {shirt}. And so on it goes.

Church, state, universities, families--whatever you take--the sports, the health, medicine, they are witnesses of God's freedom in former times, and man's participation in His creation in -- before. Therefore history looks up to the founders of these social orders. And there comes the law of the historian, gentlemen: the historian looks up to the people of whom he speaks, and the naturalist looks down on the things about which he talks. And if you do not look up to the history, don't -- don't say that you are an historian, you see. Plutarch is -- is humble before Pericles. And that -- that's why he's allowed to write about him. Can you understand this? And if you are not humble, you are not an historian, because the -- you as an historian are less important than the event which you try to -- to contin- -- you see, to report. Can you see this? This is a condition of history, that there is a -- a rank, and order, because we report the acts of freedom. But in the reporting, we -- we may be {appointed to do it}. But that's not bad. We participate -- we have the great honor of commemorating this event. But we can only commemorate it if we put him up and us down. And since this is never understood, we today have historians who act like physicists, you see. This is not -- nonsense. The physicist hasn't to respect electrons -- electrons, you see. But I have to respect George -- Washington.

Now -- so the whole problem today--and I think we enter a -- new era of

theology, religion, in every field, because everything circles today around the question: is God fate, or is He free? What you -- you call Him "creator," you call Him "redeemer," you call Him "revealer"--doesn't mean anything if He isn't free. If everything is already known to Mr. Tillich, then it isn't -- God isn't free, you see. And you read these theologians, and they know God by heart, and they can never be surprised.

So the -- theology today has talked so much about God -- what -- who God is, as though they knew Him. And therefore, God's freedom today is not understood. If God isn't free, all the talk of human freedom is impossible, because you can only act meritoriously as a free -- an animal, if you participate in something that lasts beyond your life. That's why I told you, legislation is meant for your -- the next generation. Therefore, you would never be allowed to pass a law, because it comes too late for yourself, you see, and it must be valid for the future. Now if it is valid for the future, you take upon yourself to direct the stream of time. This you can only do if you know where you're coming from and where you're going to.

(Would you say then that predestination is not something that is pre-ordained for all men, but something which man can choose to enter into?)

That's why I put -- of course, you discover it! "Pre-ordained" would still be God's plan forever. You see? But "predestiny" means that before I go on from "pre" to "destiny," there is a hiatus in which the whole of creation holds its breath: will this man be tempted by the devil, or will he survive?

That's why the story of Jesus begins with the temptation in the desert. It He hadn't, in this hiatus of 40 days, you see, listened and weighed the other paths, down to gravity, to earth, He would just be a chi- -- an angel, but not a human being. We all are -- ambivalent, and the greatness of the -- perhaps the greatest piece -- piece of evidence in the -- New Testament is that this story is reported. And at the beginning of His messianism is -- reported, you see, because that's unique. And it is unrepeatable, you see. Here, He must have told Peter and John the story, that -- that His -- His whole messianic office begins with His looking down on the temptations of the natural man in Himself, you see, feeling them very strongly and said, "I can become an emperor," "I can become an economist," you see, a big feeder, and "I can"--what's the third?--"become a genius." "I could jump down," you see. These three temptations, you see, is -- the pharaoh is the feeder, the chieftain is the tribal hero, and the genius is the Greek temptation. And these three -- He had to forgo.



And all antiquity gave itself rendezvous in His soul, you see. Because these were the three routines -- way of life: you could become a priest of Egypt, you see, a sorcerer; or you could become a chieftain giving laws; or you could become a genius, like Archimedes or -- or -- or Plato, you see. And this was not His business.

(Then is this why Calvinism emphasizes the fact that man is responsible to God for his acts, even though God predestines you because there is this hiatus in between where you can choose to accept God, anticipate Him, or fall from His grace?)

This hiatus -- these 40 days in the desert every one of you--women and men--have to undergo. You can sell yourself short in marriage, or you can wait for the right husband. I mean, it's the same thing. I mean, every woman knows very much about predestination. This is determined whom you marry, you see. But it is predestined. You can discover, but it is your word that makes the say-so stick.

No, I think the -- perhaps the whole word "pre-" -- "predestination," you see, is -- is doomed. I don't care to recover it. What I mean to say is one simple thing, gentlemen: that man as an individual is unfree; and man, as participating in history, is free. And therefore, I would -- propose that it is wiser to speak of God's freedom in which we participate by throwing us -- upon -- the not-yet-existing part of creation, by doing something unheard-of, you see, and -- participating in acts which good free souls have done before us.

If you -- if parents today send their children to school, they are act al- -- acting already under the Christian inspiration that the children must be emancipated, that the children have a soul of themselves, you see. This is all in Christian tradition, that they can discover their own destination. You understand?

So the -- in -- the 19th century, demanded from the parents the incredible sacrifice of their egotism, you see, to such an extent that we now recoil and said, "It goes too far." The parents have -- haven't allowed them -- the children to have their own religion, to have their own polit- -- politics, or their own convictions.

And there is absolutely -- nothing that makes a parent into parents anymore. So we have gone too far in this respect. But I -- the hero -- I could -- you could write the history of the 19th century as the constant sacrifice of parents, you see, giving up their authority, and then asking the children, "Discover the truth yourself." It is not the much -- people in this country always speak of rebel thought. I think America are very soft, and just no rebels. But parents have forced their children

to rebel, all through the 19th century, you see. They have inculcated into them this -- this -- these powers to go on their own -- to go it themselves.

And the greatest part of American life in the 19th century--I have seen it -- you must see it -- have seen it in many families--has been the willingness of the parents not to make any demands of their -- children to an excess which I think is exaggerated. I mean, it has gone too far. You -- if you raise families, you will not be able to -- to do the same. I mean, your children will demand from you authority, and leadership, and values. I'm quite sure -- they must. And you have to give it. And I think the situation is totally changed today, you see. Ja?

(I still get the feeling though, that with Calvin -- that the -- that the road -- whichever road the man takes is not of his own choosing.)

No -- well. Let me complete this argument. Jonathan Edw- -- there was a revolt in 1616, at the -- at the center of Dordrecht in -- Holland, the Arminians were condemned. And there came this break, which is -- goes through all Puritan tradition in this country, between Arminians, you see, and Calvinists. And the Arminians said, "Man is half-free and half-bound," you see. And the others said, "He is -- has no free will." Now I'm siding with the austere ones, with the Calvinists. I think it is absolutely illogical to say that I and you are free, without a magnet which allows me to enter a flood of light, and freedom, and creativity. If I cannot participate in the history that has, you see, given me free choices already, you see; if I am not, as an historical being recognized as sharing -- as be- -- maying -- made a partner by the -- by the -- by -- the lure of the saints, so to speak, of the heroes, by the choice of my hero on whom I look as my predecessor, by the -- by the -- by the founding fathers, and their voices, then I have no freedom. All -- by himself, a man without speech has no freedom. To speak means to be able to listen to what people have said to me--and have asked you to perform, you see, and have challenged me with--and to speak myself into the future. So -- since I believe the Holy Spirit is the more important aspect of the deity than anything else -- if you and I today want to understand what is meant by God, you cannot be interested in the god of nature, and you cannot be very much interested in -- in merely individualism, but in the Holy Spirit that makes it possible that men, and women, and children, and old men speak the same language. Although they have different interests, they have a different outlook on life, you see, yet we can speak to each other. The miracle that is not the human mind, but the human spirit. You can take this down, too: "spirit" means that people of different interests speak the same language, of different insight, of different perspective. And "mind" means that people say the same thing about something. "Mind" is always identifying. In mind, you neglect sex, you neglect

age, you neglect parties, you neglect -- religion, you see, "regardless of color, sex, and -- " et cetera. But "spirit" means that a Jew and a Catholic sit down together and have peace, despite the fact that they are Jew and Catholic. That's the miracle of the spirit. Or that a -- a child and a grandfather can act together, although the child has to have legends and fairy tales; and the grandfather, you see, is -- is enlightened, and -- and -- and has nothing of the kind. This is the miracle of life. Children must read fairy tales. Don't make them into the Cartesians. But the greatness is that although they read fairy tales, you see, and you read scientific facts, you live together. That's the spirit. And that's not the mind. Now it's so hard to talk to you, because you constantly -- you have not -- never heard of the spirit anyway. You don't know what the spirit does. That it does this multi- -- you see, this -- it allows you to be in harmony with people who say different things, and have different opinions. You think that the mind is the ideal, when everybody thinks the same. This is not an ideal at all. That's a -- on a very low grade. We must agree on things. That's science, you see. That's the mind. But you must never agree on anything important. Because the world exists only of mankind because a mother is interested in something different from the daughter. Heavens! What would happen in a family where mother, daughter, father, son would all have the same -- you see, ideal? You -- you would die from boredom. You wouldn't marry anybody. You would be impotent. Because you only marry somebody who says something opposite to you. That's so interesting. That's the spirit. Now in -- I do think therefore that the Arminians wanted to have it both ways. They said, "Man is half-free -- {heart} and free, and half-free." That's Arminianism. And that's usual American heresy. You both -- all believe this. I mean it. { } for daily life. Most people act as though it was -- couldn't be quite decided. Half -- so the psychologist -- treats you as not free, you see, he knows all your reactions in advance, and so on. And you go to him. And after all, by the free choice of this psychiatrist, because you think he's a good man. And so you get into this trap, you see, that he treats you--once you are in his room--as a mouse, you see. But you go there of course by attraction, that is, by a free choice of the allegedly better man. Well, this is still the humanist attitude.

Now I feel that it is -- I -- this is only what I come to believe. It is much more simple to say that man is not free. Man is under necessity. I must breathe, for example. It's obvious that I choke, if I do not breathe. It is necessity. So why quibble? I am under necessity, you see. But when I throw myself on the mercy of God, I am allowed to forget myself. All love forgets its own interest. All passion

does. Even hatred does, you see. Hatred is self-destructive. So there are innumerable actions in our life. Even just rhythm, just marching in tune with the -- with the music. Where we forget ourselves, and where this -- this self-interest simply is not prevalent.

By the way, how do you spell "prevalent"?

(P-r-e.)

I mean, every one in this room seems to ignore the -- the laws of spelling.

"Prevalent" is spelled p-r-e-v-a-l-e-n-t. And not as you have spelled it. Everyone here spells it pre-vel-ent. v-e-l. Just shocking.

So my { }. That's -- special, isn't it?

Now if you -- if you decide that man is unfree, then the divine is a voice inside himself. He is attracted by the creation that has already gone on before. There has been a Constantine. There has been Caesar. There has been Pericles and his funeral oration. We are all magnetized by the greatness of these men who overcame their natural fears and anxieties and spoke up. And therefore, we can throw and join ourselves on the mercy of God as I said. Or you can say join the -- the battalion of -- of freedom fighters. You can join the Lincoln Brigade and -- of life, of history. And in this moment where you forget yourself, you forget -- take -- you are inspired. And since the word "God" today is so shame-faced, and should not be used in vain, anyway, forget about -- the sovereignty of God, call it "the freedom of the spirit" that it listeth where it blows -- or blows where it listeth. I al- -- never make out. Wie?

(Bloweth where it listeth.)

Ja. That's a very important saying, you see, that at every moment, the spirit seems to make the rounds and look for somebody who will act as its transmitter -- as His transmitter.

So if we become trajects of the spirit, we enter the not-yet-finished process of creation, because we excuse a part of the universe. What I'm -- what is meant by freedom is not to be subject to cause and effect. Not to be under necessity. You have two husbands. One is very rich, the other has a promising future. The wise woman will choose the man who has 30 years to go before you know who he is, and the -- will not marry the palace on -- in Beverly Hills. But why? The wider response, the more remote and the more invisible, you see, is the more

delicate response of the deeper understanding of the layers of creation, because God moves, of course, more in centuries and generations than He moves as of the moment. Everything just of the moment is -- is the devil. The devil always sells you short. The devil doesn't do anything wrong, except that he says you can have it immediately.

Now the woman who marries the man who will be rich in 30 years listens more to the divine processes of creation than the person who wants to have it right now, you see, without marrying of -- either husband or wife, just by inheritance, because that's the devil. The devil said -- told Hitler that he could have an empire of -- for a thousand years to come, in 12 years. And after 12 years, it was all over. And that's a typical devilry story. And I think it was enacted for your benefit, gentlemen, because you grew up in a world which doesn't believe in the devil. The devil is any moment the temptation to do something in a shortcut. To get something for nothing -- is the American description of the devil. And -- like the installment plan, you see, {culcating} your freedom by simply prepossessing your whole future. And the devil governs in this country for this reason at this moment, because everybody wants to have things faster than they -- he shall have them.

Wherever a man tries to get something faster or cheaper, you see, he's selling out. So that the creation is then destroyed and replaced by some substitute.

That's why I think the problem of God's freedom is not -- is -- is not abortive, or -- by the freedom of the spirit. It is a practical question today. If you want to be understood in education or in law--take juvenile delinquency. Freedom of the person -- if you want to make him a child of God and of the s- -- allow him to be inspired, you will treat a -- a delinquent of 15 quite differently than when you think he has to be immediately reformed, you see. The problem: how much time do we have? is the assertion: how much faith do we have? Faith is the -- is the -- belief that there is time. War is always the expression that there is no time, and it's always an act of disbelief. I mean, the South in 1860 is a typical case of disbelief, you see, not even waiting for Lincoln, they said, you see, "We have to act immediately." It's a very good case of -- of -- of having no time.

(Well, the -- devil must really be in me, because I'm -- I'm very --.)

What?

(The devil must be into me...)

I'm sure it is!

(...because I -- I'm really in agony about this -- seems to me, I don't understand, and I'm -- I'm very anxious to find out what -- seems to me you've been using "freedom" -- the term "freedom," to mean that there is a choice which is -- well, and it seems to me now you're saying that there isn't, that -- that man is not free.)

Well, Sir, are you free to breathe? Or not to breathe?

(No, I'm not.)

Therefore, be careful, you see. Are you free to live forever, physically, I mean?

(No, I'm not.)

You are not. I mean, so let's not betray ourselves. Obviously the word "freedom" is -- is not something in the -- in the -- abstract, in the air, free. It is -- under the limitations of our earthly existence, isn't it?

(There are limitations to freedom, but you're not --.)

No, the meaning -- not even limitations. But -- I wouldn't call it "limitations," because it is -- if you do not first submit your earthboundness -- I -- I -- and your mortality, Sir, you cannot place that which is free in us in the -- perspective. The spirit is free; and the body is not. You want to place freedom where it doesn't exist.

(No, no. I don't want to do that. But I'm just trying to understand what you -- what you mean when you say that it's a heresy to say that man is partly free and partly unfree. But it seems to me, you just said this, that there is a -- the spirit --.)

{ } it's -- the complicatedness that arises from this.

(But I'm just trying to understand what -- to reconcile what seems to me to be two conflicting statements, here.)

Well, "man" in the singular, this man--but be quite concrete, quite

specific--this one man, is not at the same time half-free and half-unfree, because if he forgets himself, that he's just this man, and becomes an instrument--he can become an instrument of the devil or God, that's true--he becomes -- he joins in a partnership, the society of -- of souls, so to speak, of all souls, who take part in the creation. They become -- from creatures, creators. And in this partnership, the creation of the world, you see, his self disappears. He has an office. And therefore, I would not call this man then -- in -- in this this-ness, in this concreteness, "free"; but only in his holding office in the -- in the economy of salvation. That's a different thing. This man changes his -- his character. Anybody who forgets himself in -- in saving your child, this mother becomes from a -- this woman -- this child's mother, and the good angel of the child -- whatever you call it, you see. It is therefore that here falls upon us this mantle of history, of which I have tried to speak. You see, we are lifted up and hold office, again. And we are not -- our naked individual, but we are clothed in authority.

(Well, this is what I'm always felt -- or thought of as being a slave of the truth. I mean, if you -- do follow what -- your belief, then you no longer are free, once you --.)

Well, look, because I think we both share agreement, you see. You have here an -- an -- an order which has completely disappeared from human thinking, what the Bible calls "dominions and principalities," and "powers." And "angels and archangels," and "cherubim and seraphim." Now take the nation. America has -- is an -- an in-between -- God and you, because you feel it is enough to be Americans. But America is bigger than individual man, and has a -- kind of spirit, you see, of independence, and -- and -- and Manifest Destiny, and democracy, and -- and many, many qualifications, which say "this is" -- you say, "that's -- know-how, and that's America."

Now this I would call in the Bi- -- biblical sense, "principality," or "power," or "dominion." It holds dominion over every person who is born here. -- We just can't escape it, you see. It holds us in its sway. But it is not earth, because it is historically created. At one time -- America didn't exist, and it was created by the word. It was created by the Declaration of Independence, by the Covenant of the Mayflower--you see, by the word. This -- these words may have to -- may be transient, but they have created free men, participants in the process of creation. Wherever you participate in being an American, you are no longer -- not simply an environmentalist, so to speak, the product of your environment, but you are invited to share in the creation of the world, you see.

Therefore, above men are these offices. Degrees of office. I would say the

simplest degrees of office, the simplest office is to be -- to be an American here in this country. Then you are an American missionary. That's already a very complicated office, if you go to Samoa. Then you are perhaps a senator. That's the devil. And then you become president. That's the archangel Michael. And this is a country under God.

Now any American has these temptations. Now to be just an American, and to be a missionary of -- ambassador of good will, as you call these children we have to send out to foreign countries, you see, in exchange; it's all the missionary idea, you see. And here you have politicians, you see. You are in politics, as in a good democracy. And I would say, for example, the college professors have no American office. If you are here a professor at the university, you are -- this is just a German or an English office, so to speak, that has been imported to this country. It's not a very American office, you see. I mean, it hasn't been created in America. It has been imported to this country. But I would say that missionary--and just being American, or pioneer--is -- is -- is -- is something only American. You have neither pioneers nor missionaries in the same, naïve sense as they are here, where everybody tries to pioneer some time in his life, and -- or to camp, at least, you see, and where everybody is also a bearer of good will. And -- and you -- I -- have been sending now a 16-year-old girl from our village to -- to Greece, as an ambassador of good will. That's a typical American, you see, idea which we are now spreading over the rest of the world, I think, with -- with great success.

So there are American offices into which every man is born. But obviously there is a moment where this same man has to ask God for a -- a new commission, which will not be simply missionary, or pioneer; there may be something new, you see. Perhaps there even has to be teacher -- teaching now invented in America -- as a specific American office. Because it -- has never been one here, yet. It's all imported.

And so I would say, whenever such a man is hit by a ray of inspiration, or a ray of service, he ceases to be this man, what -- what Whittier calls, "The prayer is -- clothed me in my righteous mind," you see. A very beautiful idea, too. You know the hymn? Wie? No? By Whittier? The prayer, in -- this hymn. Asking of God to clothe us in our righteous mind, which means participating in His free act of creation. And therefore the word "m-a-n" then disappears. It is no use to imply that the naked man of flesh, the carnal being, you see, has freedom. So -- only if he gives himself up to the -- you see, does he become free. But then he receives an office.



(But it's the giving up which constitutes the -- the freedom, doesn't it?)

All right. The negation of my own will, "Thy will be done," and not "my will": this is the act by which man predestine -- recognizes his predestination.

(May I only ask one further question?)

So it's a "no" to oneself. That's why I call -- I shouldn't say "forget oneself," but I say, "negate oneself."

(But can you only then tell me, who is -- who is it that gives up?)

Wie?

(Who is it that does the giving up?)

The listener.

(The listener. All right. I have my answer.)

This is the quality which doesn't exist in nature, you see, that we can listen to voices from the past and the future. No animal can. An animal has only this -- present moment. But you can listen to voices that are not represented in the flesh. You can read the Bible, as Augustine did, and -- you see, and -- just be struck by something that was written 400 years ago.

(And this would be the first act of freedom, the -- the act of listening. And -- but then there could be --.)

That's why the First Commandment begins, "Hearken Israel." Without hearkening, no Ten Commandments.

(But then -- but then whether one actually heeds is also an act of freedom, isn't it? Or -- or a negation of freedom, you might say; if one does not heed, it's a negation of freedom.)

Ja, but that's the power to love. I think you're quite right in asking this question. But that's not an intellectual question. It's a question of affection, you -- you see. Can you be affected by the word in such a way that all your passions are overcome by this greater love?

(This is outside of us.)

And that's not truth, you see, but love. Wie?

(This is outside a person, I mean. Whether he has the power to love is not something in his own -- of his own will.)

No, no, no. There come of course -- come these Augustinian secrets -- mysteries where you -- I'll tell you a joke. The -- the father confessor of the emperor of Austria in 1908 wrote a book on the -- on the -- on the fate of sinners after death, whether they all had to be in hell forever, you see, or whether in good universalist faith, everybody went to -- heaven finally. And at that time, there was already the softening of the brain, and -- universalism, you see, even invaded the Roman Catholic Church -- I mean. It was -- seemed to that -- be such a hard doctrine, that sinners were eternally damned.

So Mr. {Joseph Mechner}, father confessor of the emperor, Francis Joseph of Austria, wrote this book on the {Das Fortleben der Sünder nach dem Tode}, the -- the -- what -- how you call it? The After-life of Sinners after Death. And I bought the book. And I am very proud that I own such a wonderful book. Because it says, "After all," at the end, after much discussion, "After all, you cannot -- we cannot be surprised that we do not know much about the after-life, because hell is so very dark."

And so I would say to you, you see, this is very dark. If you wants -- want to -- to quibble about the equipment of a man -- person to love, I think that's like a vicious circle, because the -- love is imparted to us. If a child is loved, it becomes not only lovable, but it becomes able -- capable of love. And people who are not given love, cannot hand it over. So that's what's meant by original sin, you see. The depth of our fall is in this, that the sins of the parents are visited on their children. I mean, if a child cannot love, and therefore cannot act in freedom, really, because -- cannot throw itself beyond its- -- love means to forget oneself. That's potency. And if a child hasn't been hurt -- we -- we talked about this professor in Harvard, you see, { } and his wife, who -- who brought up their child psychologically, because they -- anthropologists, and so he went to a jail, of course, because he was incapable of loving.

And you -- so there is the tragedy of man. We are so much under law, that my not loving is the consequence of your not having loved me. And therefore, we are all conc- -- there is a concatenation, there is a solidarity in guilt of the human race. And this is of course the deepest secret: that we are so much under

the law, that you can never attribute to this man his failure to love -- alone, you see. We all have borne our share in -- in not loving, so that he cannot love. And therefore, you see, the -- nature in this sense, exists. The moaning and groaning creature. And therefore it makes no sense to speak of me in the singular, as "this man." Because I share this guilt of not enough love with, you see -- or I'm immersed into this guilt. I do not -- wouldn't say "share," but I'm a product there really of not enough love in -- in the world.

(Well, on this point, Calvin is compatible. I see no conflict.)

Quite.

(But now -- then the other day, you made the statement in class --.)

Well, you understand now. You see, the -- the -- the two logics are possible. Either I am immersed in this lovelessness of a society, and am for -- therefore simply an atom in this social pressure group, you see, and I haven't received enough electricity so I can't hand it on. Then I'm not counted as a person, you see. I'm not the person. But I'm just a particle of a mass. And on top, if I throw myself upon God's mercy, and be -- ask for His commission, you see, I join the company of saints, or of the -- fellow travelers.

In between, there is my power to negate myself. This is the act by which I escape from hell and brimstone of the mass of {perdition}, you see, and so it is very true that this hyphen between "pre" and "destination" is the moment in which I become a person. And therefore it is not use to argue the man -- before he has become a person, as though he had qualities, before I have heard my own command, my own words addressed to me, alone, you see, among all millions of men, I am not a man and a person. That's the mistake of the individualist, who want to argue the case as though here is a man in the abstract, you see, and -- having, so to speak, to -- to decide -- with the -- here was this free will, and here was his necessity, you see, ja. This is not true. It's a process. You wake up one day, and are put up.

You see, there's a scene in Carlyle -- scene in Carlyle -- I wish you would read this -- on his experience of freedom and the devil. He goes in Paris to the Rue de St. Thomas de l'Enfer. Now that's -- has of course a symbolic value: Thomas de l'Enfer, Thomas of the -- of hell. That's one special saint -- the rue -- the street still exists. I've been through it. It's -- I think it's the most eloquent page in Thomas Carlyle. There he describes himself, his discovery of being a person. And he has to make a decision, all himself. Before, he played, I mean. Playboys have -- are

not persons. If any- -- everything can be taken back, you see, you are not yet -- yet a man, and you are part of -- {pathology}. There's one point where every man -- or -one made a decision, when he should have spoken, and doesn't, I mean, go to the mat, or where he does speak and becomes a man.

And so, you see, the argument runs this way: to speak of this man is in impermissible anticipation. What we really meet in -- in the world are products of environment, you see, to whom something is imparted. But there is this power to listen to the deeper voices, you see, who come to you on a -- on a wider wavelength, you see. And in this moment, you can be redeemed from the -- fetters of this immediate -- and you can -- the more fu- -- past a man acquires, the more future he acquires, you see. To be back to Adam means to be completely free as in the moment when God created man first. The funny thing about history is this: you have exactly as much past as you have future; and you have exactly as much future as you have past. Nobody can have future without past; and nobody can have past without future. That's all unscientific, you see. But it's true of a physicist. If Mr. Einstein understands Newton right, and -- and then he can go forward and -- you see, continue physics. But he has to dig up the first crevices of this science, in the dark past of Archimedes, in order to renew it. And that's what his principle of relativity, after all, did, you see: to go back to the premises of Greek thinking, that time could be neglected, and said, "No, it cannot be."

(Well, now we spoke the other day about such physicists as Mr. Einstein who now maintain that with regard to law, it is not something inherent in nature which the mind discovers, but rather a kind of a supposition of -- let us -- let us imagine that this law -- and let us see whether this might be a way of explaining nature. And -- from this, taking of law within society out, and seeing whether it applies, as against the opposite of seeing the iron-clad laws impinging on society, and governing us, there's a -- a similar conflict of freedom and --.)

That's why the Bible begins, it says -- "God created heaven and earth." So the laws of Heaven and earth are abolishable. That's the meaning.

I'll give you a very simple illustration -- { }. Can you still bear with me?

Ja? I didn't { }.

The -- the Egyptians, you see, discovered the -- astronomy. They discovered the constellations. They discovered the movement of the stars. They figured the calendar. And they said, "Everything has to be kept moving." So the poor pharaoh had to move like a star, you see, every day he had to rise exactly with

sunrise, and had -- everybody had to behave, so to speak, astrologically. That's -- you still get from the horoscope. The simple experience of the Bible -- I think we talked about this before -- is to -- well, it is so important -- is to say, "We have the Sabbath." That is, we are not astronomical, you see. We are not always on the move. For a moment, like our creator, who created the stars, we set time aside, and we don't do anything. And this freed man suddenly from the -- you see -- completely apoplectic devotion to astrology, that there was one day in every week in which people -- the Jews laughed at astrology, and said, "The sun may have to rise, we don't." And we -- they -- the -- you see, the sun boils, in Egypt. It does, you see. And we -- we don't {bake bread}. { } No -- no -- no fire in the oven.

This negation is -- is the -- an act of freedom of the Jews. And -- bears out my insistence that it is this hiatus of the "no," you see, which creates freedom. As to the existing order, you have to say at one time, "no." I can only tell you, when I escaped from the academic clannishness, it happened in the -- exactly this way, that when the -- we -- at the end of World War I, I was asked to go back to the university, become a full professor, et cetera, et cetera. And I knew this -- had other offers, and I said to myself, "Well, I do not know what I'm going to do. I have to wait. I haven't got my commission." I -- I felt that since July '18, that something completely different would have to occur. But I did go back in January -- '19, when the troops returned home, and gave a lecture at six weeks, always with the deep feeling, "God, what shall I do? This is all over." But I -- only know that it is "no." I haven't found my "yes," you see. And the "yes" came then only four months later. So after all, a full year -- no, 10 months later, after I knew already that I was through with what I had been doing.

So I do think that a -- an inspirational freedom, I mean, an act where you do not act for your own aggrandizement or because to -- for self-expression, but because something has to be done or the world goes to pieces, you see, where you have to ask for -- obey the highest orders, you see, of your commander-in-chief, the "no" precedes the "yes." And that's meant with the 40 days in the wilderness, I'm sure. In the -- and it's meant by the 40 years in the wilderness of the Jews, you see. That the "no" to Egypt had to precede the "yes" to the promised land. Now that's all against modern psychology. People think this is impossible. And -- on a lower level, you can only help a person usually to cross a -- cross a bridge -- cross a -- a stream when you have jumped across it, and pull him after you. And -- that's what love does, so that you see already where you're going. On the highest level of human behavior, where you have a complete change of life, the "no" precedes the "yes." Because the "yes" is not yet created, it

is an absolutely new thing you have to invent. I had invented a new career for me, that didn't exist. I had to persuade--very strange story--I had to persuade a man that he needed it. Man like me, he didn't believe it at all. You see, but finally he hired me, you see, to his own surprise. And -- an act of real creation, gentlemen--would you consider this for a moment?--new creation can only happen when the thing is unforeseen, untold, unpredictable, never has been mentioned before, you see, an act nobody thought of before. Like the rainbow in the sky. That's why the Americans worship the rainbow. It's unpredictable, you see. It's -- there it is. But you couldn't -- a minute before, you didn't know that it would come.

Now in order to make room for this rainbow of a new creation, you see, you have first to feel that something -- old is dead. So this is already over. But a wise person will then --. Take a daughter; she knows already she has to leave her parents' home. But the man -- right man hasn't turned up. She will be -- go on, and--at least she did in the old days. She doesn't have to go to college under all conditions. She can stay home, but she's through with it. But she serves it out, the full term. As Jacob did with -- by the way, with Laban. And I warn you: God is very original. Where God speaks, where the spirit speaks, the "no" is patient. And you know already that something is over and dead, but you wait before you -- know what positive steps you {may need}. You can only even probably receive the message of the positive, because you have inside yourself -- tugged yourself from the -- you see, allegiance to the old gods. Can you understand this, that the "no" is necessary to wipe the clean slate, so that you -- this new sound, this new command can be -- reverberate in you? You can be engraved on this waxen plate, which we are.

(This is why Augustine says that the only way he can explain God is by what He isn't, and not by what He is.)

Exactly. He is nothing preconceived. He is nothing preconceived.

No -- ja?

(There seems to be some confusion in my mind, arising out of this definition of man's freedom. You said that when he leaves his individual "this man" idea, and he enters his office, sacrificing, that this is when he attains his real freedom.)

Well, in grades -- in degrees. There are these nine degrees of the hierarchy of the angels of -- in -- in -- in -- . And it is not a bad idea, what the -- medieval

people said. Look, you are an American. You are a pioneer. That is, you risk your life against grizzly bears. Then you are a patriot. You go to -- into the army. And you are -- can be shot dead, even by a stupid sergeant on the -- on the -- on the training field. And so everywhere you take upon yourself, you see, meritoriously, sacrifices of self, in degrees. It isn't quite personal, yet. But it is already lifting you above the pigsty. Can you see this? And since you are not limited to the functions of your stomach, and your genitals, and your bowels -- movement, you see, when you entering -- a soldier has already a uniform, you see. But that's not the highest degree of personality, is it? If you would think in terms of personality degrees, really of the -- American discussions on -- on character, personality, and so would vanish, I mean. This boy in class -- who -- who -- who is -- attends this class?

(I am.)

(I am.)

Well, you know this, who -- what's his name?

(I don't know his name.)

What?

(His first name is Bill. I don't know his last name.)

Ja, well, he's a typical example of this unfortunate character who can only think in these abstract absolutes, you see. He never sees himself in these many colors which he wears, you see, in degrees. We are -- we are all -- already held by the grace of God in historical forms, you see. And he wants to have it in the absolute, you see, his mind. But I nowhere find people who have -- his mind. I, if anybody, have my mind, have I not? I mean, I have a good mind. But I cannot -- exaggerate its importance, I mean. I have so many ranks and orders surrounding me that this little bit of a mind at times is an excrescence, you see. That's not me. So what was your question?

(So -- assuming these various degrees, can we say that there is one, definite, highest degree of man's personal freedom, or can't we make this --?)

Ja, ja. I would say. The going to the Cross. If you take this case of Bill Mitchell, for example, to heart. Here he is a -- participating in the freedom of a

naval officer of the United States. That's all -- that's all right something -- that's already -- responsibility. And he is already beyond self-interest. I mean, any naval officer could say, "Well, I'm just a good patriot as you are." But there's an unpreconceived office which he takes upon himself. An office, you see, of contradiction -- dicting the existing order. And that goes beyond the call of duty. And that's a higher freedom, is it not? But the so-called brass has its freedom, too, because these people are fearless. They'll go to their death, these same captains who obstruct Bill Mitchell. In their own right, they are marvelous people, perhaps, you see, because they will take any risk, and any chances in the -- in the -- this jurisdiction of already known and conceived duty.

It is always the non-preconceived that -- that is -- has a higher rank. And this is why, today, you see, where the people poke fun at martyrs and saints, we are in a very bad way. If -- if a woman, historian, can write a book, The -- what was it?

(The "martyr complex.")

Ja, the "martyr complex." We are in a bad way, because the historian then is allowed to look down on -- on the leading creators of our lives, you see. We have nothing else but these saints and created -- martyrs, and revolutionaries, and heroes. They are -- that's me. We have nothing else. Don't look beyond. Through them, the divinity has entered -- humanity. We know nothing more, but there have been good people who went before us. And when we -- as soon as we turn the wheel, you see, and say -- look down on them, we are absolutely in the fog. We are -- we are just nowhere. And when women can do this, I think the country is -- is -- goes to ruin. She -- such a person has the obligation to make clear where she stands, you see. There can be martyr complex, perhaps. But nowhere -- I have read this book. Have you read it? Who has read the book, by the way? I think it's the great scandal of our time.

(You say there can be one -- there can be such a one? Did you say --?)

-- Well, of course you can be a sick person who simply wants to be a martyr, at all costs. I mean, I will not deny that there are fanatics, you see. But this is quite a different story. She simply -- she simply -- this woman has no -- no discrimination. Every martyr to her is just a fool, just stupid.

(Well, we don't even use the word "martyr complex," though. Even for these people we -- I mean, Freud has already called it "thanatos" or some such term.)



{ }. You have to discern the spirits. Anywhere where -- anywhere where people want to go behind the created persons of humanity in history to their own abstraction -- values, there's the devil. We have nothing else but the real sequence of the generations. And you have to choose your heroes to whom you look up. As soon as you give this up, gentlemen and ladies, you are absolutely lost. The idea that by -- by righteousness, virtue--all these abstractions which everybody can explain as he pleases, after all, you see--you can get rid of the example of -- of Heracles, or Christ, or Moses, you are mi- -- completely mistaken. There is nothing to go behind these really -- real creatures of God. Isn't that -- any one of these people ten times more real than these abstractions of virtue, and faith, and justice, and --? These are just words. And you can put into -- into these words all the explanations you want. But you cannot deny that Moses forwent, for the sake of your and mine, the satisfaction of being a conqueror of a land. And he said he -- "I have to wash myself clean by 40 years of no- -- negation from these idols of Egypt." And what it means to believe in non- -- in a non-preconceived god, we only owe to him. There's nobody else who has taught us this, you see, that God is incalculable, that God is not in any -- in any form of worship that is -- can be predestined. The -- the voice of the prophet must come tomorrow. You remember the --.

By the way, gentlemen, one of you had the effrontery to write that Ichabod was the son of Eli. Now we read this chapter together, that the glory has departed from Israel, and it said that the daughter-in-law of -- Eli begets this son, Ichabod. So pardon me, I have to end on this -- on this creaky voice -- note. Why -- do you do such a terrible thing and not even quote the Bible correctly? Cain is the fa- -- the founder of Israel, and Ichabod is the son of Eli! When the whole shame comes about, that the sons of Eli are no good, and Samuel has to be brought in, you see, as the real spiritual successor, as a prophet of -- of God's mercy, you see, of God's grace, and -- and Ichabod is the grandson of Eli. Who -- who wrote this? Con- -- admit it. Who -- who has -- who has said that Ichabod is the --?

(I was confused on -- on -- on the genealogy. I --.)

What? Well?

(I hope not. I -- I said I was confused on the genealogy. I might have put that in by -- by ignorance.)

But how can you? The whole story makes no sense. If Eli had said, "The

glory has departed Israel," he wouldn't have lost his sons. Now, so --.

(Anyway, that's what I wanted to say about the scientific time { }.

That's what I wanted to say about { }.)

Forgive me for -- for -- I have talked too much here. But please allow me to -- explain this to me. I have had to make a choice. I mean, if you have this opportunity in a -- in a -- in a -- and I said to myself, this is -- you will never hear these things again. And they aren't said in this country. And I felt it was more important that you heard them than that you would get a -- a fine training in -- in stupidity. So thank you very much.