

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

... On it goes. The academic situation is neither in space nor in time a fitting place to discuss serious questions. I always tell my students that they should deny that they believe in the soul or in God in a classroom. It's obscene to make confessions of your faith in a classroom. Because in a classroom, you must only mention things for which you can get credit. There is no reason why we should tell the -- speak the ultimate truth in a -- in an academic institution. Certainly not as long as you are promoted for the answers you give to please your teachers. The space, the place is wrong. And the time. I just happened to read this afternoon, to idle away the time, La- -- Love's Labour's Lost by Shakespeare. And there the princess says, "This time methinks too short to make a world without end-bargain." A world without end-bargain. A very good expression for the tie-up of a Christian and a Jew, who believe that there is one word spoken for the whole mankind from the first day on which Adam and Eve were created to the last Judgment Day. That's a world without end-bargain. Such bargains are unknown in the academic world. That is, only always a 60 minutes' bargain. Mostly a 45 minutes'. Sometimes 50.

That is, we here in the academic world are hired for novelty, for change, for new ideas. Everything that is making here for promotion, for success is the proof that we think differently from yesterday, and that we're moving along into the next abyss.

So the academic world is a world of kaleidoscope -- of kaleidoscopic change. And to pretend that we should strike a world-without-end bargain is preposterous. It would be -- just what it is, ridiculous for professors and students. They know -- of no such world-without-end bargains.

They look at Jews and Christians as they look at animals in a zoo. Because they look at everything. God is an object of -- theological thinking in a department of religion. And -- I just have here a very strange book, Space, Time, and Deity, by S. Alexander. I could have taken any book in the philosophy department. It makes no difference. And this man has the -- sublime attitude that he says -- his opponent, Mr. {Bradley} says that he -- "we may think a time whose order is the reverse of ours in which, say, death precedes birth." But of course, he goes on to say, that's nonsense.

Now Christians, you see, believe that they live in a world in which death

precedes birth. They know of no other time. The Christian era is based on the death of the founder. And you are on- -- I can only be a Christian because I am born after His death. So what this man thinks is the ultimate of folly, the ultimate of idiocy, that you can think hypothetically of an order of things, where death precedes birth, is the dogma of the Christian faith. And so there is no reconciliation between the philosophers in Barnard College and myself.

The listeners here, in this room--and I, myself--we treat each other as the public does to a public speaker. Now again, let me tell you that the notion of belonging to a public is forbidden in the Christian and in the Jewish faith. It is impossible to think of any group of Christians, or of Jews meeting at prayer that they should consider themselves as on the lookout how the other people behave. You can't pray or sing as long as you look at the other people. If you do, you have excommunicated yourself. But it is the principle of every objective study of religion that we should do just this. And so for the last 150 years, as you know, this country has given up the -- the notion which carried along Judaism and Christianity, that we were a people, and have proclaimed that we form a public. May I emphasize that this is -- has -- goes to the ultimate debate. Mr.

William O. Douglas, the great judge from Washington, is going to speak here in your midst next week on "The Individual and The Crowd." That is, the notion that we are -- form a people is completely dismissed, and the individual stands here and is either submerged by, or deteriorated and corrupted by belonging to the crowd.

A high -- other justice of the Supreme Court, who was made a justice there because he belonged to the Jewish denomination, has written a book *The Public and Its Government*. And it always seemed to me that this book title tolled the bell of death for the American Constitution, because that was written for the people. And it was the "government for -- of the people," and not the "government of a public." A public is a perfectly unre- -- irresponsible group of all listeners, auditors, spectators, out for sensation, swayed by the forelock of Mr. Kennedy, or his wife's forelock--I don't know if she has any locks--but certainly only by externalities, by things that can be seen.

And we live today then in a climate in which, under the influence of institutions like Barnard, or Columbia, or Harvard, or Dartmouth--they're all alike--the people have been persuaded not to think of themselves as people, but as a public. You have the right to look at every speaker and size him up whether they like him, or what he -- so that they can weigh him, so to speak, on the scales of their private judgment.

Where there is the public, there is no faith. You can't discuss religion in front of a public. If you do, you just blaspheme. But this is not all. In -- the 19th century has ushered in an era in which the people said farewell to the notion of "We the people," and said it is better to speak of "the public and its government." The public -- the century of the public is qualified by all these movements of the suffragettes, of the Anti-Saloon League, of the Abolitionists. Public can only be gotten together on some abstract principle. And the whole 19th century in the United States is a collection of -- of groupings of -- for abstract principles, as you well know. Began with { } in Massachusetts with the -- the Abo- -- with the Anti-Saloon League -- and then came the Abolitionists, and then came the women rights movement; there's pacifism, vegetarianism, I can't number them all. But wherever you have an abstract principle, you can only gather the people around such a principle, you see, as a public. You know nothing more about these people except they send you \$3 for Union Now.

Then -- when all these movements, you see, have been aborted, they never fulfill their purpose, so we have now much more drinking than ever before in the United States of America. Even in Kansas.

They must go wrong, those movements that base themselves on the public. Because a public is the essence of fickleness. "Public" means that I have one idea today, and the opposite idea tomorrow, and that I'm not dishonored by this. And as you know, in this country, the public must never be reminded that the day before, it had a different opinion. It has always to be flattered that today it has the right opinion. It never has. It has just opinions.

Now this would be difficult enough then for me to talk here in such a grouping of the public. But we have gone a step further. Mr. Justice William O. Douglas is not going to speak about the public and its government as his colleague, Mr. Frankfurter. But he's speaking one step lower down about the individual and the crowd. He could have called it also "the mob," or "the masses." And I prefer, as -- to tell you the truth, "the masses." Because that's very serious. In an industrial society, you can only produce if we have masses that can be laid on and laid off in production for a different purpose and on a different machine every day. It's the honor of modern industrial society that we can all be transformed, transiently, into masses. -- I do not is- -- dishonor this term. I'm neither a Marxian nor a capitalist. For capitalism, I haven't enough capital. And for Communism, I'm too lazy.

And I don't think that me, as a person, or as a human being, or as a speak-

er to whom it is perhaps worthwhile to listen, has anything to do with the fact that I can act as mass, and I can act as public. Because I can be transformed into a teamwork, I can be used to clear the court here, where the snow has fallen--I'm still g- -- quite good at it, and there I'm acting just as a day laborer, my immortal soul is not destroyed. But as soon as the mass in me, that mass-man in me, the man -- the muscle and the brawn is treated as the important side of me, the side that should be considered for its private fears, then I have a situation which is much worse than being treated as a public. The opposite from public opinion is private mass, private fears, subjective traumas, trembling, prejudice, what have you. Everything that today is looked into you and me as children of our parents who want to sleep with their mother and kill their father -- that's the private darkness of an unredeemed soul that neither belongs to the Jewish people nor the Christian people. Because among people all these things do not exist. They only exist for mass-man. They exist for the crowd. They exist for the individual in the crowd. They never exist in any family, to speak of, I've seen. They exist only for those people who want -- to have a special savings bank with their psycho-analyst.

The -- the modern mass-man who goes to the analyst correspond--they correspond, of course, the analyst and the mass-man--have transformed this case here into something that it has never been before, either in Greek, or humanistic, or 19th-century days. The colleges have become the harbingers of this idea that everybody has private skeletons in the closet.

When a friend of mine asked that at Union there should be taught a course on St. Augustine, he got his course. But the content of the course was not the father of the Church, St. Augustine, but the man with the mother complex. So even where the topics are Christianity and Judaism in the college, they are distorted. They are treated as though they -- we had to do with -- with the offal, with the feces of humanity, with the dregs.

Now I say it is quite true that the dregs must come to honor, just as we exploit the feces in our cities for fertilization, so it is quite true that the character of mass has this tremendous -- value for modern soc- -- industry, that you can take unskilled labor and use it just for anything, you see. The machines are so well in -- organized that you don't have to be a professional, now, to serve them. And so I think--don't misunderstand me--there is a place for the mass-man in modern society. A very important one. We couldn't eat, we couldn't drink without having this voluntary service of the mass-man in us. But please consider

the place in which people in sociology, and economics, and psychology are treated as mass-men, or as public. That's not the place where you can discuss the very obsolete tradition, that you either belong to a people of the blood, or a people of the spirit. That is the Jewish and the Christian proposition, that "we, the people" exist.

As you know, the United States Constitution begins with these words, "We the people." And Charles Beard has done a good job in destroying this notion by pretending that the writers of this Constitution were under the influence of Marx, and therefore only considered their own economic interest. Unfortunately, they didn't. They were people of the 18th century, and they believed in the people, and they thought they were a part of it. And -- you know the literature on -- about -- on Charles Beard is quite considerable. There is a very nice book now that is called again, *We the People*--perhaps you have seen it--in which, point by point, Charles Beard's thesis, that the private interest of the signers of the Constitution had anything to with their decisions is refuted, man by man, state by state, colony by colony.

But what of it? Fifty years have gone by and you are all under the -- have -- the poison has worked. The experts now know that the thesis was wrong, but the people don't. You say it is Darwinism. If you are a zoologist, you don't have to be a Darwinian. But if you are a layman, of course, you believe it. And you have to believe it, in a decent society.

I heard -- I saw that a man was fired in Oregon two days ago--did you see it?--because he had said it was all swindle. Didn't you read this? For -- he was dismissed for his anti-Darwinian views. So we have gone quite a way from 1934. So this is the situation on which -- which I would like you to consider seriously. We have four units to which a person can claim to belong: to the people of his blood; to a people of the spirit; to the public, which comes together in common mental, intellectual pursuits, as you are here at this moment; and we can unite as masses, who are starved, who are fearful, who are afraid, who can be treated as a Dompteur treats the lions, you see, under the promise of food; and circus, and games, you can get anything out of these masses. But you can't -- one thing you cannot do, except you live in Los Angeles: you can't talk religion with these people. To the mass-man, beware. Anybody who gives the little finger to the masses, ends as Mrs. MacPherson. That is, it is just a caricature. It is not worth talking about.

I have lost one of my own students to this strange débacle. He left Dart-

mouth after two years, went into the army, had a nervous breakdown. They sent him away. And he is now in Los Angeles as a yardman, unskilled worker. And in the evening, he studies with one of these sects, you see, and will become a preacher of their little faith. That's a very -- tragedy. The man is -- is doped. Doped by his work, which is meaningless, you see, but very well paid. And his -- his state of values is quite interesting. The man worked six weeks in Los Angeles as a yardman. That's unskilled worker, after all his antecedents and college education. He got enough to buy a jet plane ticket back and forth to New England, which he proceeded to do. After five weeks, he had earned enough. So the air- -- -lines of course are very happy. Nine-tenths of his income, you see, he throws into their -- into their mouth. They swallow it up and there he is. Quite a strange world, but I -- I think they call this "the affluent society."

But why talk to such a man on religion? I didn't. He stayed at my house overnight, and I had to avoid all serious business. I -- I'm not going to cheapen myself, and not to cheapen the content of my real faith with such a child who has -- thinks that he has -- can have a good life within 24 hours, and who has written off this whole question of belonging to a people which goes through all ages, from beginning to end.

Nothing with which you can come to me as an issue for this year goes very deep, under my skin. I am trying to hear those words that will be perpetuated, that -- my grandchildren still will have to hear, and that my great-, great-, great-ancestors have heard. They are the only words that move Heaven and earth. And to tell you the truth, if you transform the heavens down to earth and go behind the moon, it's still -- it's just very earthly. You can shoot the -- a rocket there. But to me, that's very boring. I hope all the boring people go there. It is not important. It is perhaps necessary. But if I have to shovel the snow in front of my house, that's necessary, but it's nothing important in the sense that -- that I must philosophize about shoveling the snow.

So that, I think, is something I would like you to consider. Only if you -- I have no blackboard here, which is terrible. It's green!

I think I'm worth the immense honorarium which I'm paid here just by giving you these four items. It has disappeared from public knowledge that Jews and Christians are not theologians, and are not a clergy, and are not denomination, but that they are peoples. And "people" begins with four generations, at least. Under this, you can have nothing that has anything to do with Judaism or Christianity. That's a minimum, four generations. Christianity existed with Mary,

Jesus, the Apostles, and the missions. Jerusalem had to be destroyed. You get the Church only after 70. That is, there are four generations. And that's why Mary comes into the picture, you see. That's so very important. Jesus, His mother, up -- up -- way, and the Apostles and the bishops -- below.

As soon as the public began its successful march into the souls of this country, as you know, the -- Christianity was changed from a way of life of a people into a theology on the life of Jesus. That is, He was isolated; He became a man of His own time, the only thing He has carefully avoided ever to be. And the man who was the contemporary of all of us, at the price of not belonging into His own time, was launched on an adventure, you see, of being treated, well, as a hero of a novel. That's this "Life of Jesus" business of the last 150 years. And it disgusted Albert Schweitzer so deeply in 1908 that he went to the Congo instead. And said he can never have any interest, or any right to deal with the life of Jesus. In Columbia, and in Barnard, that hasn't arrived, yet. It's 40 -- 50 years later. But I assure you, anybody who is interested in the life of Jesus doesn't know what Christianity is.

And that's -- was one way of killing Christianity, of changing the members of the Christian churches into a public. Because of course a public stares at some other -- other man's interesting life, or death. And -- and -- and whinnies, neighs at it.

So this transforming the world into a public, or into masses is the content of the education -- secular education and science of the last 150 years. And since I am here, therefore, in front of the enemy, I have no reason to tell you the truth. I have to defend myself. I have to protect myself against you. Because in as far as you sit here as public, or as people who want to be tickled to death by some sensation, by looking at me, and see what an interesting -- idiot I am, I don't owe you any truth. Not the place for it. Why should I confess anything to you? I don't know you. I haven't even eaten bread and salt with you.

With the people with whom we live, we have to speak. With the people who come to listen to a lecture, they have to be entertained. That's something very different. As the word "entertainment" tells you, it's an interim. It's in between. It's enter -- inter. And it's as weak as "international." It's a worthless term, you see. "I only want to entertain you at this moment," that was -- goes on before, and that what goes after, you see, is the important thing. And this is only to idle away the time.

I understand that -- it is better to be inside here than outside at this

moment. But otherwise, I don't know. Perhaps we could talk better in a snowstorm. Now I thought that this -- I owed you this. And it is not -- I'm not speaking jokingly. I'm including myself into this situation, which is very serious, that in the way in which our public lecture system works, certain topics are mistreated by establishment. And I don't see why that which I have at heart should be mistreated.

And this -- as I said, I was taken by surprise with this topic over the telephone, and I said first to myself, "First of all, I have to be frank with these people here, and tell you that it is the least fitting place to talk serious business, because in a classroom, in a hall, in a public speech, we don't want to rouse -- satisfy curiosity." They call it "intellectual curiosity." I've always this -- considered a -- a crime. As I say, it's like tickling people. I don't like to be tickled to death, even. And so I think a speaker on serious items should not be stimulating. He'll -- tickle people. But he should, quite the contrary, overcome the barrier of making things very difficult. That's the only condition under which I would accept the challenge to talk to you about these things: if you think it's hard going, if it is really a difficult proposition, if it takes you out of your routines, and if it is something you have a difficulty in accepting or in digesting. Why should it be easy?

The public, you see, has to be bribed. Otherwise, they don't buy the ticket for the Metropolitan Opera. That's the public. But I'm not a -- unfortunately not a tenor at the Metropolitan Opera at all. I'm going around in -- preferably in -- in sack and ashes. That is, the serious business of life is inconspicuous. The people cannot be seen. The public: you can count heads. The masses: you can weigh them, and you -- you can need the police to cope with them. And they are very dangerous. They are physically there, on the spot. The people: there may be one in every generation. And they may still be the people of God. One in -- every generation is enough to carry on the tradition.

I know such steadiness, by the way, my -- in person. Where through three generations, there is only { } one to carry the flag; but has been sufficient. And finally in the fourth -- it burst forth, and there were -- there were 12 heirs. That's unheard-of here. You count heads here in this room. But that's no -- no item for something important like the people, that there are a hundred people to -- listening to me at this moment here, or no, 50. The important thing obviously is: is there one who will still remember what I say 50 years from today? That's the only interesting question. Because then he has treated himself as a member of the people. And otherwise he has treated himself as a member of the public.

And we all constantly--I, myself, of course, just as much as you--we are all the time changing. You know this little game of pepper and salt -- Hell and Heaven { }? Two of the paper -- sides of the paper are blackened with pencil, and the other are left white, and you turn it around. You know this. Well, that's how we are, you see. Any minute you can act as public; in any minute you can act as member of the people. And -- since this is our regenerated aspect, our aspect as -- as the -- which is lodged in our deepest -- center, in our heart, in our genitals, we usually turn out the public, and we turn out the mass-man. And we hide the other side of us, which goes on through et- -- from eternity to eternity, and from epoch to epoch, and from age to age. And a -- nobody can ever predict when he reaches the other fellow's deeper being, where he is not himself. That's not very deep, the self. But he is representative of humankind, where he stands for the race. He stands for the whole of the human being on this globe as the link, from the past to the future.

So what shall I do now? I -- was proposed to me that we should have a break here, that everybody could ask a question, and as far as the criticism of my -- the locality here goes, and that then perhaps we might reverse the process and people may ask about Judaism and Christianity on their part, and I shall -- try to answer it. I'm not sure that this will succeed. But we can try.

Harold Stahmer: (I have a proposal, and that is that I get some more chairs in here, or move us to a larger room. So...)

[tape interruption]

If there are any questions with regard to this quadrilateral, which I -- spoke before, I'm very grateful to have them brought forward now. I'll try to answer them.

If not, I'm condemned to go behind the appearances, and to -- pardon me? Oh, here was -- well, I saw you move. But then you hesitated.

(I just wanted to clarify my mind, when you said that when they teach a course on St. Augustine, they teach a course about the mother complex. { } or that psychology in itself has no place in religion? I mean, if you take something like Jungian psychology, which has a lot of resemblances to { }.)

Well, first of all, psychology knows nothing of the mother complex. That's limited to the psychoanalyst. And you must really be very careful. The word "psyche" has four meanings at this moment in this country. And none of them is

understood by the people who use the terms.

The -- the best thing is you -- is: you look up the letters of St. Paul in which he inveighs against the psyches, and which everything is said that has to be said against psychology today. Funny enough, the theologians never do this. They go to the psychoanalyst. I have a Catholic bishop friend who went to the psychoanalyst. It should be the other way around, obviously.

The -- St. Paul has said everything about the psyche. As -- soon as you do not believe in the Holy Spirit, you must believe in the psyche, Sir. It's -- very simple. I am talking here for two hours or { }. If you are on my side, you will see that I tried to say one thing in two hours. If you are on the reporters' side, for the New York papers, you will ask yourself how many words I am speaking in two hours. Psyche -- the psyches, you see, add up. There is an individual, and there is an individual. He who starts with the people of God knows that there is one people created of which you may have the honor of -- of being a member, or you may have the dishonor of destroying these people, which most people try to do today. So there is one man -- God created man, even this some of you may have heard sometime. Did He create you or me? He obviously created man for all times. So I'm a little cell in this great body of His, and I can be thrown out; I can be rejected; I can be outnumbered.

Now the psyche people, these -- they are the sorcerer of Pharaoh. They are back, you see, with the public, we went into Greece and -- in the 19th century. And now with the masses, we are back to Egypt. And the psychoanalysts are exactly the people of the sorcerer of Pharaoh, who interpret dreams. That's what they do. And they get a pile of gold for this. And it's just funny. It's a re- -- we -- we all dig up the old superstitions. I mean, 400 years ago, you had to build St. Peter in Greek style, and now we build it in Egyptian style, so to speak, our human mind. But both is idiotic. The popes of the Renaissance were overthrown by the Reformation for their -- this very reason, that they gone -- went pagan. Julius II called himself "Julius" because he wanted to be a second Caesar, Julius Caesar. Literally true. It's the great pope of Michelangelo. He called himself Julius II for this reason, that Caesar had been called Julius, you see.

And this is the same today. I mean, if you see the waves of the human history over the thousands of years, you are not very startled by this abject spectacle, that people today imitate the sorcerers of Pharaoh. But you go on and laugh it off. I mean, it's not important. If you give it importance, then you are just a victim of --- of the public, of the public advertising business, the sensations of the market day. But I mean, you shouldn't. Or why are you a student?

I have never seen a psychologist dealing with any living person. They are only dealing with its dregs, with the offal on it, what they can see. And what you can see of a human being is what is dead in him. The retina of the eye, his muscles and so. If you want to believe in God, you must not try to see Him. And since every one of your brothers and sisters has something divine, don't look at them. Listen to them. To have faith in a person and to love a person is the opposite from looking at a person.

I mean, this mental disease, what is called psychoanalysis, is already on the wane. Everything in this country, you see, because it is so very fast--it has a telegram at its disposal, the Associated Press and the United Press--nothing important penetrates here unless 40 years have gone, you see, on. So in Europe, nobody wants to talk any longer about Freud. But here it is -- perhaps at Barnard you still think it is important. Ten years from now, people will have forgotten it. It is of no importance. You can -- you can deal with it, of course, especially if you have too much money. It's -- a game for the rich, and so people --. I have a friend who is a schoolmistress -- schoolteacher. She had \$8,000 in savings; she gave it all to the psychoanalyst for two years' treatment. He has the money now, and that's a very good result.

I mean, let's call this by the right name. I mean, just as the Egyptians worshiped the golden calf, so it's a monetary proposition. It's the greatest corruption and bribery I've every seen, the exploitation --. You talk of Communism and exploitation of capital -- who exploits the poor and this woman? The psychoanalyst.

And she boasts of it. He says they must pay much, otherwise they won't -- they won't give credit to her, they won't appreciate it. They even have a morality for their immorality. It's one of their dogmas, as you know.

Well, I won't go into it. If I give you the whole story of the inside of this racket, I really will get very angry. But you want it this way. You want to be treated as mass-men. You want to be treated as an individual in the crowd. You want to have the lonely crowd, you see, written under your portrait. So you get the treatment. Anybody who says, "I am lonely," and "I am in a crowd," of course gets the treatment by the cir- -- circus manager, who treats you as one of his horses -- in his circus.

To be treated as the people is a very different thing. Because obviously the

first thing our heart and our genitals are afraid of is that our hand and our eye may corrupt us. If you divide the human stature into these four, central organizations, you will have the genitals, which are directed by the sense of flair, and smell, and anticipation, the sensitivity of the future. If you have the heart, you have the sound and the song, and the praise, and the curses which you hear. If you have the eye, it goes all through the bra- -- to the brain. The brain-man, you see -- the eyes, {of course}, directly to the brain. When you have an alarm clock, and it wakes you up, the sounds falls upon the heart. But if you put on the light, you see, the -- relation of the eye is to the brain. So you are all worshipers of the brain, I suppose. And as mass-men, of feeling. Tickling, as they say, tickling to death. Skin-deep.

Anything that goes to the skin, of -- of which the hands and the feet are the main organs, is for the individual, as of the moment. The heart and the genitals are not moved that fast. They are connected with eternity. The heart is the path of the universal lifestream that is lodged in you, that is, it represents more than you. The genitals even more so. Because the genitals of course contain that in you which will not come to fruition in your own life, but which has to be carried over to posterity.

If you allow me -- then to say, what I spoke of, the people, the people of the spirit, the people of the blood are represented by the heart and our genitals -- genitals, our organization as male -- men and women. Academic thinking has destroyed this. It says that man has sex. It's ridiculous. Man has not sex, but he has the honor of carrying the -- the race in himself in his genitals. That is, he is not the owner of this sex, but he's owned by it. That's a very great difference. As long as you talk of sex, I cannot talk of people. That's opposite. In the word "sex," the eye and the hand have won out over my belonging to the people, you see. Then I'm treated as a self in itself, as a piece of m- -- the mass, a mass-man, or a member of the public.

Now you are all sick with this abuse of the word "sex." I cannot talk to people as long as they do not have an hon- -- more honorable place for the great function which they fulfill in propagating the race. They call this "sex." They are lost. And we always play into the hands of these people, because I know -- pardon me, Mr. { }, but it's the truth--the -- the chaplains are only too willing to talk about sex. As long as they talk about sex, I think, they are not chaplains. They are just modern, depraved men.

You cannot eliminate sex by calling it "sex." But you can only -- win in this battle, you see, if you -- if you show these people that what they call "sex" is

something quite different, something waiting to be fulfilled by them, and something demanding sacrifice.

Now we come perhaps to the interplay of the two people of God: the -- the people of the blood and a people of the spirit. The old and the new Israel base their existence in opposition to the public and masses on the importance of our hearts and of our genitals. And as they are not Greeks, they laugh at the superstitions of the brain, and of the eye; and as they are not masses, they say that we shall certainly labor with the sweat of our brow -- brow, but this -- that this is, so to speak, our Tod -- our mortality, that it is something to be dealt underhanded--that is, quietly, and without much -- emphasis, without much -- without giving it undue importance.

This is the order of things as we were created for -- for time immemorial. Whether you go to a savage -- the so-called Stone Age, or whether you go to a -- Egyptian in the Nile Valley 5,000 years ago, they all knew this, that man had these four aspects, and that the important thing was to see them in proportion. And that the heart and the genitals had to make the important decisions, and that the itch of the skin, and the sensation of the eye were allowed to make the immediate decision. As: if you have too much sunshine on your head, you better put on a hat. That's a very reasonable measure, you see, by which you respond to the stimuli of the moment, to the day. But not to the permanent, not to the eternal, not to the epoch, not to the eon.

Formerly, people could express this -- still 150 years ago, you could say in this hall -- in such a hall like this, you could speak of moment and eternity, day and eternity. Today, "eternity" is I think such an empty word for most people, that it doesn't carry much conviction. I've given much thought to this anemia of "eternity." And I am sure it cannot be used with any great imprint on the modern mind. Perhaps if I tell you that -- your heart and your genitals make you as -- into members of a people, it is enough to stress the fact, as I said before, that with this decision to pay attention to their demands, you enter the lifestream of at least one epoch, which is four generations.

The important decision in this is that you find yourself in the middle, between your father and mother, and your grandfathers and grandmothers on the one-hand side, your children and their children on the other side. If you can bring yourself to see your decisions in the light of these two generations -- up to two generations down, that's enough eternity, so to speak. And I want to sell you the idea that the people of Israel, new and old, will be homecoming, will get their -- back their strength not when they talk big about eternity, even not about God

Eternal too easily, but if they really manage to see themselves in the perspective of two generations before them and two generations after them.

That's the content of the religious problem of a people, that we do not become more important than the generations before us and the generations after us, and that the more we make those other importance -- important to us, we learn what is important for us. That is, the thinking in generations is an attempt of selection, of selectivity. So that you know whether it is really important to invest on the stock exchange at this moment, and to lose everything.

If you look at your own life, you cannot know whether this is important or not. If you, however, look at generations, it becomes a very minor proposition, despite the New York Times. "Invest," you always hear, you see. But the people obviously are more interested in what we wear through the ages. The ritual, the liturgy, you see, that's something you wear through the ages. And it is only important that there is baptism and circumcision, because it goes through the ages. You cannot explain any of these rites in terms of the living generation. If you do, as the liberals try--rationally, you see--it goes by the wayside. It has to fall, you see. It has to be explained away. It has to be weakened, and -- as all the liberalism shows in the last century, where the -- this discussion, to make it palatable to the living generation, you see, always led to -- to a complete abandonment of these forms, because the greatness of all religious forms and all -- people's ways of life is that they can be accepted unquestionably by all generations. That's their criterion. I don't want to belong to a faith that isn't as old as Adam and Eve.

I was very much relieved when, as a young student, I ran into a book by a father of the Church of the 11th century, Hugo of St. Victor, in which he said, "Of course, the Church has existed since Adam and Eve, and -- Christ has only made it visible." Nothing less than that is -- which is common to all humanity is good enough for you and me.

The Church has existed since Adam and Eve. I think that's one tenet on which I may be able to explain what a people is, that is called together by the spirit. As soon as you begin to enter this notion that perhaps you have not sex, and you have not inclinations, but you have a heart, and you have this great {safe} entrusted to you for the survival of the whole human race, that at that moment, you may ask yourself, "How do I join this march through time? How do I become a people? How do I become a member of this strange household which survives death, and funerals, and immigration, and change of language?" And even change of -- of the building in which you publicly worship.

What is a people, then? It cannot be the 8 billion people whom we expect in the population explosion in the next 20 years. A people is a very small group, two or three. Christians say, "Who are gathered in His name." That's the Christian people. The real people, not the thousands of people who go to Church on a Sunday in -- in one building. By what are they knitted together? From my experience, by a very simple thing: that nobody can be blessed, and can be -- go to Heaven, so to speak, or { }, can be in bliss except he shares it with his sister or his brother. That is, every one of us will make the experience somewhere in his life, that at this moment, if he cannot carry conviction with the man or woman with whom he shares his life for his decision, he's doomed. Whether a husband has to convince his wife that he must pull up stakes and move out to California, or whether he has to convince the political enemy that they have to stick it out together, there is in every moment -- in every man's and woman's--should be woman's, it isn't, yet; that's the problem of women today; they have not solved this, quite--that where two or three are in an {immersion} together, the -- word must be spoken that all two or three can underwrite.

This is the re-establishment of the Church at all times, that there comes a moment where -- with an expression that is only binding for these three people, perhaps. I make it into a minimum at this moment. I exaggerate on purpose--to make you see that when -- Mary Magdalene found the Lord, and He said -- and she said to Him, "Rabbi," and He said to her, "Go and tell the Apostles that I have gone to -- forward to the Father in Heaven for them," that at that moment, the Church was founded, by two. That's all there is to it. And it is difficult. There had something new to be said. She still said in her old ways, "Rabbi," to Him. And He dismisses it. And He -- the only place, by the way, in the whole New Testament, in which the Lord calls a woman "Mary." There is no scene in the New Testament in which He calls his mother with the name "Mary." Probably He wouldn't. He would have called her "Mother." But here He gives -- Mary Magdalene her honorable name, you see, as "Mary," He freed from her -- all her -- the dross of her life. And it's the lay woman who is in charge of founding the Church, and not the Apostles. And through her the Apostles are told.

That's -- was -- is a very fundamental experience; and I think the next century will base the founding and re-founding of the Church much more on this little scene than on all the great speculations about Church history. Because it is as simple as that. I can only testify to the fact that when Germany disappeared from the map of the world in 1918, my best friends and myself, we found each other in -- in this calamity, you see, under these judgments of God over our nation. And we began to speak a new language. Nothing what we had said

before could be continued. And what we began to speak about was something that -- of which the fact that I am standing here is just one of the little flickers for -- which have originated from this experience. And we were Jews and Christians, and had this common experience; and we learned to speak in the face of this, as I said, judgment of God, a common language.

Now Christianity is based on the experience that in every generation there is so much calamity, so much end of the world, so much catastrophe, that those who are loved enough by their maker to survive the catastrophe, as the fruit of this catastrophe, will begin to speak a new language. That's a people of the spirit. It cannot be anticipated. It cannot be planned. It cannot be pre-organized. It can be believed in. What we call the -- "organized churches" are the receptacles of this -- these experiences. And voluntarily, the saints have always, so to speak, offered their services to the organized Church. You can recognize a saint by his willingness to say, "It's nothing extraordinary that has happened to me. In as far as it is extraordinary, I want to make it ordinary as fast as possible." A saint is obviously not a hero, and is not a titan, and is not a giant, and he is not a genius; but he is all of these four with the one implication that he wants to make accessible his experience of genius, or of titanism to all and everybody. And that becomes then the Church.

That is, there is no Church without a cloud of witnesses, and the witnesses who testify to the reality of the Church, they have all made this experience outside and beyond the Church, and then it comes back with the organized Church. That's why the Apostles and the apostolic succession in Christianity is older than the bishop Church, than the organized Church. Because the Apostles had first to make these free experiences before it could be channelized into organized Christianity.

So let me say before, where in an emergency we don't know in and out, we don't know our way, it is always--every one of you has such experience in his family life, I guess--that where there is real trust and confidence, and real dedication, the -- saving grace enters the picture. And something is said that couldn't have been said before. Whether it's jealousy that is admitted by a husband or a wife, because otherwise he sees that his marriage will be on the rocks, or whether you decide on the future of your child in a way which goes against all your prejudices, that you allow somebody to marry somebody whom you abhor from your former standpoint--whatever this conversion of your mentality may be, it is something that breaks into your mind under the dictates of the heart. The heart is wiser than the mind. And what you call "reason" is a very second-rate instrument of equations, of "2 and 2 is 4." In life, 2 and 2 is never 4, and the heart

sometimes has to tell the person that this is so.

So this founding of a people of His mercy in -- in Christianity is based on this very brittle, very frail, and next-to-impossible proposition that the Word will unite two and three people in a spirit of -- whose existence they had no idea an hour before. Without this novelty of the spirit, and this surprise, and this power, I don't think that Christianity can be called a people. However, if it isn't a people, it is not the new Israel. It is not allowed, so to speak, to take the place of the -- witness of the old Israel. And it's a very serious question. When I look at this building of the -- which you have erected there, the -- these churches, you see, whether we laity have not to immigrate from these organized churches now and to uphold the -- the tempestuous character, so to speak, of the faith, you see. Because this building, obviously, is the same for any bureaucracy. You could produce rubber inside there; you can produce religion in there; you can produce bombs. It makes absolutely no difference.

Now let's turn to Judaism. I, of course, am handicapped. My -- I -- my -- origin from the flesh is Jewish. My convictions have been from the first day of my life Christian. I have many Jewish friends. I have battled -- given battle to them. I have converted some; not converted others. And so I cannot speak with the same assurance about the Jewish situation. But not without a bit of knowledge.

All the people of the last 150 years have tried to be the new Israel. This may make it easy for you to understand the Israelitic situation much better. Since 1800, since the emancipation of the Jews, all the other nations of Europe--not so much of America--have treated themselves as a messianic people.

I have attended, myself, an international conference in 1931 in Heidelberg, in which there were Frenchmen, Italians, Swedes, Poles, Rumanians, Germans, Spaniards, Englishmen--and in which every one of the speakers from these different nations tried to prove that his nation was there for the redemption of the people, of the redemption of the nations. That they all had the messianic complex, as we call it today. I think this is one of the things that aren't taken seriously in -- American theology, that there has been a tremendous spending of energy in transferring the Jewish conception of a messianic kingdom into the nationalism of the European nations. The Ruman-- who thought they were, you see, the men -- messiahs who would protect Europe against the hordes of Russia. The Hungarians, of course, they had fought against the Turks, as you know, and they represented in the same way, these counts of Hungary, the freedom of the western spirit against the subjugation of the oriental masses. And on

it went. For Germany, of course, it was quite commonplace to say that Germany was needed for the salvation of the earth.

Well, every nation has a little bit of this idea that it is needed, and the truth of it is, it is of course needed. I don't think any nation is superfluous. But there is still a gap between being needed in the sense that you -- there is a place for you in the order, and the specific, messianic idea that this nation, you see, is of essential importance to all other nations, without which we would have to go astray. And it is simply a fact that from 1800 to 1940, the Eur- -- nations of Europe took from the Old Testament their leaf, and said, "Now the time has come where we have the messianic privilege, so to speak, and the mission for the other nations."

I don't think that in this country, you see, this has been digested at all, and the consequences of this. It was the condition, you see, that this should happen for the founding of the state of Israel. Only after the nations all had taken a leaf from the Old Testament and had said that they were the carriers of the true relation to the spirit, that had created these peoples, could the Jews think of going Zionism -- Zionistic. They felt, "Now it was commonplace." Everybody believed in the messianic kingdom, so they had the right to disarm and to become a -- just an ordinary nation. Since all the -- ordinary nations had now become extraordinary, the Jews felt--and I think very understandingly so--that they could perhaps be emancipated from the terrible yoke of persecution and hatred which their faith in the one God had begotten. And this is the interplay, you see, between the founding of the state of Israel and the messianic life of nationalism in the last 150 years in Europe. And that's why Israeli is a found- -- has been founded by these people, you see, and not by the Jews from Yemen or from Maroc and -- who now pretend that they can run the show.

So this interchange of Israel and the nations is perhaps the greatest proof that we have to do in Christianity and with Juda- -- in Judaism with something universal, with something that has very little to do with the group of people called "Jews," or with the denominations called "287 different -- Christian denominations." If there were no Jews and Christians in the world, they would originate tomorrow, here. Because we are body and soul. And therefore the unity of our race, of the whole human race can be based either on our bodily relations or on our soul relations. In both cases, the word that is spoken over our heads, the names with which we are called is -- going to move us. I give you a name, "Professor," and you suddenly act as a professor. You are the same silly ass, but because people call you "Professor," you finally find -- find yourself respected.

And this brings out now the living context of a people a little more, and in unison with -- between Jews and Christians. And that's something that is forgotten today. If you belong to a people, you move in three streams of consciousness, streams of speech which very often are contradictory. When you are away, they say, "He's a Jew." When you are there, you are "Mr. Lieber." That is, the people speak to you and of you with different names.

Now the complicatedness of the human history is -- the whole process of history consists in the attempt to make everybody be called to his face as he is called behind his back. If you could achieve it, you see--that nobody is called "Nigger" behind his back, you see--you would have solved the Negro question. That's much more important than anything you do in -- to his face. That's not important. And I think indistinctly, the people in the South know this, you see, that this is important side of it, and they always chant, "The Northerners don't understand the whole issue," you see, that in the absence of it -- that after all, we talk of them as "such-and-such," and in the absence of the Jews, and in the absence of the Catholics, and the absence of the clergy, and the absence of the professor the students talk such-and-such about their professor, don't they? Now as long as the Word that -- ensouls men, and makes their body move to marriage, and to vocations, and to armaments, and into armies, and into -- into factories, as long as the words differ, which you talk -- speak to these people, which they use of themselves, and which you use in -- behind their back, there is Hell. That is Hell. Hell consists in the tripartition of the names that are applied to me as a member of a people that goes through the times, you see. I -- since all important things have to do with more than one generation, I'm first seen as my grandfather's grandson, you see. So people can say, "I know this family, not much -- of them, you see. What can he be, you see? He's just -- he's his father's son; and they were never any good, so he can't be a genius. I just won't believe it."

So we are all prejudiced as members of a people in such a way that people think they know us as members of this group, and they don't take the trouble of coming to know us. So you are -- when once we are resigned that we have to belong to the people, we also have to be resigned to this incognito, that we don't -- the others don't care to know who we are, you see. And this is the curse of the {paradise}, I think, the real curse, that we are all bewitched into a relationship of which we -- it takes the long time to free us. It took the Lord 30 years before He could say that He had ceased to be a Jew. Thirty years; it's a long time. This is the truth about mankind. All important things that have to do with

our genitals and our heart--that is, all the important aspects of our lives--take a longer effort to be purified, and to be elucidated, and to be illuminated, you see, than any act of your or my will. Marian Anderson cannot help being the great singer she is, that she is called a Negro in her back -- and even -- may even "a nigger" in the South. The Daughters of the Revolution, as you know -- remember, didn't allow her to sing in Washington. Now what has she to do with this? Very little. Her grandparents had to do with it.

The modern mind, as belonging to mass and public, is persuaded that these things do not exist. And -- you have ignored them. You have a Fair Practice Commission, and then it is abolished. Look at yourself and how you deal with other people, and ask yourself if this is so simple. That is, the membership in a people demands tremendous forbearance and perseverance. All the lengths of time which you and I -- would like to cope, you see, suddenly fall to the ground, because to be a member of a group puts you under a -- under a history, a fate, a de- -- also a destination which is of much wider range.

And that's never mentioned in our modern discussions. People know that there are environmental difficulties. But it's all put in space. But the real fact is that since we are the children of Adam and Eve, it takes several generations before the thing is cleared up. And most people, of course, don't look in this direction; it's too disagreeable. And therefore, most of the discussions about religion, about freedom, about character, about nations are so very unrealistic to me, because people just don't want to be fa- -- confronted with the real costs of this one simple equation: what do I think of myself? how do I call me -- myself? what do they say to me, to my face?--is the second thing; and what do they say behind my back?

Now we can sin in all three directions. The man who thinks that he is a genius, most of the cases is wrong, you see. And he cannot complain that the others don't admit it, that he is a genius, you see. So there is a failure then in Number -- in the position Number 1, my own position. Number 2, mostly the people are too polite to my face. They don't tell the truth, but they say something in order to get away with murder. And then: what do they say behind my back, in my absence? Well, they usually say, SOB, don't they? I mean, the most popular American term. And that's why it cannot be printed. I never understood this taboo. It's the most important term of the American language, because it -- it is a breakout of this liberal ideology that people use one lang- -- the same language in front of a person, you see, and in his back. They don't. You know this very well.

And as long as we do not face this, you see, we are just -- unreal. It's the whole problem of -- I think of religion, to make people suffer voluntarily this obscuration of their life situation. In some way, it hits everybody. It may be that I am conceited. That destroys my life, you see, if I think too much of myself, compared to what the others think. It may be the other way around, that the people behind my back destroy me. Well -- and I can do very little about it. Now the Jewish position, as you well know, is the belief that this has to be borne. That to be called a Jew in back and to my face puts me aside, puts me apart, separates me, that I'm always in the minority; and that therefore I must believe in the future if I shall stand the present. The prophetic Israel--and this -- seems to me very important--has a notion that it can only be the people of tomorrow, that it is not the people of yesterday. And literally in one of the Psalms, it is said that God is "He whose people will arise tomorrow." That's a very important thing. Even Juda- -- the Jews do not exist as of yesterday. They are of tomorrow. There is a new situation, obviously, with the founding of the state of Israeli. And I have -- I'm very tempted, of course, since I had written many things on bo- -- on the history of Europe in the last thousand years, and the history of the world in the last 6,000 years, I would -- might be able to entertain you with all kind of enchanting views about the future of the state of Israeli, and the nations who have to take over part of the messianic mission of Israel, today. It will be impossible for the Jews or for the Christians to stand alone in the face of the modern masses, and in the face of the modern public. I do think that the two together alone will make it plausible to sell these deprived -- deprived people the notion that they belong to God's people.

The equipment of patience and perseverance, which obviously today is the -- is the most needed thing in the view of the fastness of a jet plane, will not come from any one ecclesiastical group. It will not come from the Catholics. It will not come from the Protestants. It will not come from the sects alone. And it will not certainly come from the Jews alone, who are split down the middle by this founding of the state of Israel. It's a very serious question which you should ask yourself: which group can represent the people? There must be in a world in which every day there is more of the customer, more of the advertiser, more of the statistics, of the questionnaire--how many people listen to Bob Hope, or Bo Peep, or Bob Keep--where people are just treated as a -- as a stimulated, as intoxicated, as misguided, as persuaded -- there has probably to be some representation of the people.

And the one item about this -- two items about belonging to a people

today would be that it's a very lengthy process--it takes at least 500 years before you see any results; and the second, that a people must have a future as much as a past. That is, that the two generations who follow and the two generations above you make you only into a people. Nei- -- no ancestor-worship is enough, and no worship of your dear little children, these awful brats --. The relation of the child, which you have passed through, now, in the last 50 years is ridiculous. It's criminal. And the result is juvenile delinquency. It must be, of course. But it's the parents' fault. And the Teachers College, Columbia's fault. And before, you had in New England the -- the Puritans did ancestor-worship. It is the balance between your grandparents and your grandchildren which makes you into the member of a people. God has created the world and is still creating it. And His future is still in front of us. You and I know very well in our heart of hearts that He has not left man alone from the beginning, and He doesn't leave us alone at this moment. Therefore, every generation is as dear to Him as every other. Progress, which you have been told all about so much doesn't bring any one generation nearer to God than the previous generation. The Apostles knew as much about the secrets of life as you and I. But when I read modern theological books, on "Poor Paul, who believed in the end of the world, and now we know better," I really would -- would like to cry.

The people who believe in generations know one thing which can never be mentioned today in a -- in a classroom: that we all must die. And that the order of the creation is only there where people can survive the death of all the living. Death as the fountainhead of life is the problem of Judaism and of Christianity. The Exodus of Egypt, the burning -- giving up of your fleshpots there, the emigration, the sacrifice of Isaac, that's the foundation of a people, the power to survive that which God wanted us to be mortals. And if what you do in life is as excellent as it can be, if you cannot convey it--to two more generations--the same spirit, and the same power, you have abused your life; you have wasted it. And this is why I come back to my first remark. The people of Israel and the -- new and old, are special people only in this one sense: that they have concentrated on the power to survive the death of the living. That they have concentrated on the problem: how shall the spirit, and the power, and the faith of this chosen-ness, of this vocation, of this calling, penetrate to the child in the cradle--whether his parents, so to speak, want it or not, care for it or not--this living--how is -- what's the term for this?--passing-by, the accidental living generation, that is the problem of any people. All your mistakes, all my mistakes, you see, must never be able to frustrate this course of events by which my generation may be extrapolated, you see, if only the inheritance is handed over to the next generation. All organization of peoples, you see, has to make allowance for

the sins of the living generation, for your going astray.

You see it for -- in this country, there has been a tremendous religious -- as you know perse- -- revival of perseverance with your contemporaries get- -- getting up these large families. That's an act of great faith, you see. And they have, so to speak, thereby said, "Despite all the psychologists," you see, "and despite all the individuals -- individualism, we will have five and six children." And if you have six children, out goes the psychoanalyst. You don't need him, you see. Life is then complex enough.

That is, in -- under your own noses, there has entered the world a new movement of faith, in the very stubborn sense that the Gentiles in this nation, as much as the Jews, are founding large families. And it is therefore not so simple to distinguish the old and the new Israel, one kept together by the blood and the other kept together by the Word. Because you can only get these five children under the blessing of the word that is spoken between husband and wife--obviously, you see. And so there is a word. And this -- such a family is not just -- flesh and -- and blood. It is brought together by the spirit. And in the single family, where people really marry--and where when they speak and if they speak--you have something that you cannot distinguish. Whether it belongs to the old or the o- -- new covenant, you see. It's the heart of the matter that Adam and Eve were created for marriage. And you know William Blake's poem--how does it go? Oh, who -- Mr. { }, you must know this. No? William Blake on Adam and Eve. Don't you know? It's the greatest wedding song I know. But I can't recite it at this moment, unfortunately.

So the miracle of the Old and the New Testament is that it -- they are not mutually exclusive. They are interpenetrating. And if you have a marriage, and a real -- a real sacrament of marriage, you don't know whether these people are members of the old or of the new covenant.

As soon as you move over into this whole realm of peoples, I think innumerable alleged problems of the individual fall dead to the ground. The sense of proportion for your own life can only come when you begin to see that you have received the gift to -- to belong to three generations yourself. Born, you may figure you live the first 25 years by scholarships; and then you live 25 years by teaching at Barnard; and next 25 years you live in Florida. Well, however that may be in your own life, the honor of these three generations means that -- the -- the mystery of a people is reflected in your own life. In every one of your generations there are two or three other generations needed for your existence. At this moment, while you are young, you see, you need the elders; and you will need

the young when you are old.

That is, it's like a projection into the personal life, subjective life of the individual, this people -- this notion of a people. It isn't filled out as yet. That is, the acceptance that the individual and the people are two appearances of the same problem--of living 90 years, so to speak, you see--in one person in three stages, and at every one moment, all the three stages simultaneously, you see, by di- -- representatives of these different age groups, that is not lived.

I have hundreds of students in Dartmouth who go to these -- to these--how you -- shall you call these tempters, who offer them these jobs in industry?--and who lure them away by promising them that at 45 or 50, they can retire. And then -- when you ask them, "What are you going to do between 20 and 4- -- 50?" they say you don't -- they don't care.

So it is not too much to say that most Americans at this moment, as far as they go as individuals, balk at their responsib- -- -bility of being a people. Because by discounting the 30 years, you see, between their college year and the life insurance that they are paid then at the end, they have written off, of course, their -- their real service to the community. They -- they don't want to suffer. And that's -- so naive that they have even the insolence and the brutality to tell you this, their own teacher. They say, "I don't care what I do between 21 and 55, but the insurance comes so early, you see, and I can retire."

Well, all these people will be counted out. Probably some bomb will annihilate them. Must be. Cannot be helped. God doesn't tolerate so many superfluous beings. He doesn't. Emptiness is the one thing God did not create. He finished the void. The world is full of flowers, full of forms that wait to be filled; full of songs that want to be sung. Anybody who excludes himself from this goes to Hell and destroys the universe. And there is -- the so-called good-natured college boy and college girl in this country is the most destructive person I know, because he uses up the elements of our civilization and doesn't want to suffer for it. You're all spendthrifts, wasters. You want to have the good things of life without tears. Impossible. To belong to the people is to suffer this misunderstanding.

Now this entails much more than I'm able to tell you in this short time, you see. Any moment, there is something to cry about, so much is man misunderstood by his brothers and sisters, you see. You just read the papers, and you see enough of his calamity showing up there. To exclude oneself from this suffering means to prevent the day of -- of redemption ever to come. You have to enter

this fight, and you have to be willing to be -- become clear of what you think of yourself is silly. Most things which you think of yourself are silly and shouldn't be thought. The less you think of yourself, the better, obviously. The more you try to know yourself, the more sick you become.

So this first sentence you may not take seriously. But obviously the Christian Church has in -- in the last 500 years given perhaps too much care, you see, to make people think about themselves as being very humble, you see, as being nobodies. That's only one side of it. The other suffering, which I recommend to the attention of the clergy, is that people speak very differently behind your back than that they speak to your face, you see. And the worst part of it is that they are too polite. Obviously the sin of America is that people say more to their face than they can hold, you see. They are far too -- too polite to each other. And it would be refreshing if they would tell each other off, you see, in all friendship, but -- so that the other person, at least, can join in this -- in this agreement.

The measure of the spiritual formation of the people and of the physical formation varies. At this moment, marriage is obviously the -- the big issue before your generation, as far as I can judge. You have no hopes for your education, or very little. It's all employment. And therefore, the only interesting thing seems to be, as you call it, sex. But it is -- should be marriage. And if it is marriage, it is membership in the new and old Israel. Because you cannot be married today without speaking to each other, and without speaking with novelty and new conviction every day. That is, you cannot repeat; you cannot speak routine. You cannot just be satisfied to call your poor woman -- your poor husband, "Honey, wash the dishes." That's not speech. That's phraseology. But your divorce will occur if you do not exercise great persuasiveness and great eloquence in speaking to each other about your real worries. Most -- most marriages go on the rocks for this stupidity of the epithets, you see, of the honeymoon. Where the good -- the -- the word -- names of love are bandied around, you see, in -- in everyday performance. They should be treated very precious. And just as you don't wear your pearls every day, you shouldn't use "Honey," except when you mean it.

This is destructive in this country. The highest terms are today used--like "Sweetheart" and so, you see--every minute. So we have nothing to say when it is decisive. Be thrifty. If you belong to the people, the first thing is that you are astonished to have anything to say. It's rare that we can s- -- tell the truth to each other in love. As soon as you belong to the public, thousand words a minute. As soon as you belong to the people, one vow once given holds for a lifetime, and for the next generation of your grandchildren.

And so you see that the strange thing has occurred that the new and the old Israel today are interpenetrating in the problem of marriage. And this is all I had hoped to bring forward to you. Now, if there are -- I'm very glad to answer any more questions here.