

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

Old friends and newcomers, when I was here last, I was not alone. My wife was here with me. I have been made a widower and I'm --have to speak for myself, which is more difficult. Two people who are married together convince more than one. But there's a secret in this. When I was asked by Page to come here, I said to myself that I would have to offer the very best, in order to -- represent us two. One speaks better and more convincingly when one represents somebody else. In fact, all speaking is, I think, representative. Even if you speak for yourself, he who speaks is not the self, but the speaker; and the speaker claims to be in the truth and in the know -- and therefore, to represent an office in the universe.

So obviously, I will try to sum up here what in 50 years my married life has taught me. It has always been in back of our minds the presence of somebody else when we spoke to each other. The secret of speech is handled today by many groups of people -- by analysts, by poets, by critics -- there are more critics in the world certainly than there are poems written today, the poor poets are crowded out by the critics as you know -- and I will not add to their number. They seem to be -- the supply is really bigger, I think, than the demand. So I have asked myself, "Is it necessary that I should speak here?"

Of the handwriting of my wife, it has been said that she never did anything superfluous. And so when I tried to find something to talk to you about, I felt I had to justify to myself, "Is it necessary?" I come from the state of Calvin Coolidge, whose only blessing and whose only claim to glory is that he always asked, when the law had to be vetoed, or not vetoed, or signed, "Is it necessary?" Three words, you see, was already more than usually this man would speak. But he asked, "Is it necessary?"

Is this necessary? If I can prove to you that it is necessary, my main task will be done. We are in great danger today that speech will disappear from this world. Genuine speech. It has fallen into the hands of the children, the babes and sucklings. But unfortunately when speech falls in the hands of the sucklings, it doesn't mean that they tell the truth. They tell only funnies. The degradation of speech, of language, of anything written, printed, or said, is enormous. Play and serious speech are no longer distinguishable in most cases. You never know whether the man means it or not. And we heard yesterday that there are firms in this country who even train their people never to say anything where you know where they stand. It's "Yes" and "No" at the same time. It's Rosencrantz and

Guildenstern.

Now Rosenstock-Huessy is not that way. I'm pledged that I shall say "Yes" or "No." Either or. It isn't -- there should be no double talk. But how do we find out what double talk is? This is really the question of our -- of today. When is the word true? Well, this -- you know that science today is God, and the scientists tell you it is true. It is true that the bomb will explode. But the bomb knows nothing of this, and so I thought my first approach to the whole question of living speech would be to distinguish the things that speak for themselves and the speak -- things we speak about. So I called this lecture, the first lecture, "Numbers, Words and Names."

It is at first quite difficult today to state the distinction. And before I go into this question, let me show you how important it might be today to discover the place of serious speech -- to be taken seriously at the danger of life. Like an oath, where you can perjure yourself.

The leading biologist of our days is Mr. Adolf Portmann in Basel, Switzerland. He has written a book, *Fragments on the Biography of Man*, in which he states his case very surprisingly this way: that man is distinguished from the animals by one feature -- he's born before time, before his day is really up. If he was an animal, he should be carried in his mother's womb for 22 months. But he isn't. He leaves his mother's womb after nine months and then for 13 more months, all his faculties of speech and hearing are developed -- even physically: the muscles and nerves for this, for speech, because he receives the living language of his people as the -- changes. He is the only animal, the only living being, we are, who are born into an historically changing environment and bear the imprint of the changes. All the animals remain what they have been once the species is created. Elephant and reptile and bird -- the same all the time. We are not. When a child grows up, it has learned American slang, unfortunately, instead of Oxford English. But it means that it lives in America, and it lives in 1962, and not in Elizabethan England. This is the whole distinction, but it's -- enough of a distinction. Man takes part in the further creation of the world, as it goes on year by year and century after century. And in this participation in the creative process of our maker, we are allowed to be remade and that's why a baby is 13 months already in this mother-womb of language, of his mother tongue. That's perhaps the simplest explanation of the expression, "mother tongue."

The mother's womb is then twofold for you and me. It -- one is physical, the living mother, and the other is the godmother of the spirit. That's probably also why we have godparents. We have to have second parents, and if -- whether

the parents know it themselves or not -- father and mother become real parents only if this child is taught the living language by them and learns to distinguish "Yes" and "No," for example, and "Thank you," and "Please," and -- and "Yesterday," and "Tomorrow." All this is -- has nothing to do with the animal in us. It's a contribution to this historical stream of creation. Man is the co-creator of his own life. And he's made into this in these strange 13 months outside the nest, or -- outside the womb, but in a nest made by history.

This is so simple that it is astonishing that a man had to come in the year 1944 to write this up, because we all know it. Or we all could have known it before, you see. But as a matter of fact, as -- it is only that the biologist, Mr. Portmann, discovered it. I think all other people knew it. It is the sermon of the Church. But of course, it has now to be translated into the language, or the lingo of biology, which I have tried to do at this moment, and given you an example of the constant process of change which is inherent in speech.

And at this point, I think I can make it clear to you what is lacking and what my words here will try to supply. Mr. Portmann knows that this womb of time, these 13 months for the baby are different in 1960 from 1940 and from 1850 et cetera. And they must be different in 2000. Yet, at this very moment, there is in the parliament of South Africa, a motion under consideration by the government, Mr. VerWoort, faithful Nazi adherent, saying that anybody who invokes or -- fosters change in his state, the South African Republic, you see, can be condemned to death. Anybody invoke -- invoking economic or political change in South Africa by this new law is threatened with death. Now this man, you see, transgresses the order of humanity. Violence must be the result. It would be the same result if the Welchers and the Birch Society would conquer in this conquer -- country. But by and large, they say the same as the law of Mr. VerWoort.

The older man -- the same baby that receives a changing form of equipment in his ideas, his customs, his mores, his dress, you see, when it is born into this world -- obviously has to produce newness and change when he is grown up. Because otherwise there would be nothing to -- to -- to be received by the newborn baby tomorrow. So we discover that this biological sketch of Mr. Portmann, convincing as it is as -- for the part of the baby, is quite unconvincing, because Mr. Portmann only says negatively he doesn't know why people grow so old, over 50, because physically, they {involve, then} you, see, they go backward. And they -- as you know, they are -- we are pensioned off at 65, because we are then seemingly unimportant.

Now, from my point of view, of course, the baby, you see, is counteracted,

or is balanced, by the hoary head for the simple reason that this baby has to receive a new equipment. And one that is not of the day in which the 50-year-old lives, but will be still modern and fashionable when this baby born today, you see, will be 100 himself.

I once announced a course of lectures, "Spiritual History of the Western World from 1100 to 2000." And when I arrived and saw the syllabus, and asked the students what they expected, "Oh," they said, "Oh, the catalogue said, `Spiritual History of the Western World from 1100 to 1200.'" So I went to the printer and to the -- to the office there -- printing press -- and said, "What have you done?" "Well," they said, "That's the only possible interpretation. You can't say anything about 2000."

So I went before my class and said, "Pardon me, but I meant 2000, because you will be fathers and grandfathers in 2000. And if I do not teach you something that is worthwhile teaching in 2000, you certainly shouldn't sit here."

It's as simple as that. Still, if you mention the year 2000 in this University of Southern California, and it would be the same in Northern California, and -- you are called a stargazer, or an astrologer, you see, or some superstitious man because you talk about the year 2000. Yet, in fact, my dear friends, you must know it yourself -- everything you say today takes effect only in 2000. The -- the -- the -- that's the reason why the 10 Commandments say very simply that the -- the sins of our -- of their fathers are visited on their children, you see, in the third and fourth generation, because the stupidities and follies printed today in the American, or -- or here in the Los Angeles Times -- bear fruit, of course, only earliest in 40 years. They do not make -- immediately lead to action today, but they will lead to action, of course, in 19- -- in 2000. That's why I look forward to -- to terrible and -- cruelties in 2000, because "Spartacus" is played today. That must take effect in the souls of men in 40 years and you will see that man will be urged on to -- to fight each other, you see, for the curiosity and the sensation, as they already do in boxing. But it will be much worse. They will have lions again, and tigers just as in the days of the old Christianity. We do it. We bring it on today. It will take effect in 40 years. "Spartacus" is an example. I -- probably Mrs. Taylor is another example. I haven't seen "Cleopatra," and perhaps I shall not. But the fruits of our words obviously mature 40 years later.

And therefore, may I say, that the baby has to be balanced in our consideration to understand man by the founding fathers, as we call those people, you see, who didn't see the fruits of their labors themselves, but without whom there

would be no republic of the United States of America. The very word "founding" means that you do not see the fruits of your labors yourself. Others must harvest what you have sown.

If you see this in large proportions now for a moment, and see the baby here and the -- the old man on the other side, man is not an animal for these two reasons: that his babies are born into a new and changed environment, compared to himself and compared to the previous generation, and that he himself is obliged to give these -- his children, a transformed environment in order to fulfill this special place of humanity among the living beings on this globe. The equipment of this power to select those things that the children must inherit from thousand years back, and the additions which -- for which he is responsible and his generation, the selection is obviously the mystery of our existence. You cannot be a liberal in a religious sense, or a conservative only. Everybody has to be a liberal and a conservative because for certain things, he has to make room. That's his liberalism. For certain things, he must stand firm. That's his conservatism. In religious circles, or in any religious group, or any group that knows how in dan- -- in great danger the human race is today, the terms -- "liberal" and "conservative" belong to the 19th century. They are absolutely obsolete. You cannot elicit any response. They are unclear. I mean, most people who say today they are conservative, they are the liberals of 1860. Then it was called "liberal." But they call what they are now conservative.

Don't use these weasel words alone. Be clear to yourself that you wish your children are half-conservative and half-liberal, or half-free and half- -- -conserving and half-creating. Without this combination, man doesn't exist. Mr. VerWoort in South Africa digs the grave of his state and government, because he passes a law in which one-half of reality is negated. And the terrible thing is that when such a word is said, as Mr. VerWoort is speaking it, it's an {exciting} situation. Violence, the breakup of this order, is inevitable.

I never knew -- I had friends in South -- living in South Africa. Two sisters of mine are living there. I'm very interested in its fate and I have many reports. It's very complicated, and I'm -- cannot go into this, but I know that this law ends the history of South Africa. Whenever man thinks he can say this, you see, he has not received his own gospel, his own message, his own experience, because Mr. VerWoort, you know, speaks Afrikaans. And Afrikaans is a special branch of Dutch. A hundred years ago, Afrikaans didn't exist, because the Afrikaners were just Dutchmen. And they spoke Dutch. But today, when you come in Holl- -- to Holland -- I lived last year three months in Holland -- everybody, you see, distinguishes two languages, because at -- in Capetown, the language has

changed. It's called Afrikaans because it is no longer Dutch. And Mr. Verwoort defies this.

The famous first chieftain or head of the South African colony at the Cape of the -- Good Hope is Mr. {Stellen}, was Mr. {Stellen}, the town Stellenbosch still bears witness to it. Well, he was -- he was a mixed, a colored man -- you see, half-white, half-colored. Now that's the ancestor of the order of things in South Africa, yet as you know, the colored are excluded from any political rights in South Africa. So the breakdown of this order is predicated. It's inevitable.

I don't have to repeat to you the word of Mr. Lincoln in 1858 in the Douglas debates: that the House cannot stand half-free and half-slave. But in our case here, I wish to advocate that the secret of our existence is in this fact that we have a means of surviving our former self. This is the biological situation and I know -- I know Mr. Portmann personally, that he doesn't object to my claiming that I am adding here the second half of his own doctrine, you see, to the picture of the living animal, man. However, if you look around, this faculty by which he keeps, maintains, and rejects -- by which he adds, and by which he preserves -- is not claimed to be a revolutionary power which makes man man. But you read that man is somebody who says what he thinks, or who uses language as a means of communication, or -- as a psychological something -- as an instrument, as a tool. Now, how can the power by which I am allowed to decide how much I am of my father and how much I am of my daughter, by which I stand between two generations -- how can this be called an instrument? It's my making. The word that I speak, you see, I can be taken up on. The first character of -- of human -- the human being is that you can -- call me a liar. That is, you can distinguish between my truth -- do I mean what I say? And have I lied? I have to behave in such a way that what I have said can be seen written into me, executed by me. Of course, there have been in this strange century of ours, where a man was alone by himself and had no ancestors and no offspring, as far as his intellect was concerned, you can find that in St. Andrews, Edin- -- Scotland, where they have strange addresses usually made by famous men who come there to the foggy season and in order to breathe at all have to speak out loud -- that there -- a man gave a very -- a very distinguished man gave a lecture on speech. And he said the first speaker was a li- -- the liar. That's a paradox, indeed. And he made great fun, and it was a great speech. It's -- it's printed: by Bernard Shaw.

And it shows you the -- the conclusion to which modern man has come -- probably he saw too much of Madison Avenue -- and he saw that men fabricate today images, word pictures, and how these strange word-terms go. And so people are told today that words are within our power, that you and I manipu-

late people with words. That we are rhetorically taught how to make good speeches and how -- or how to treat Mr. Eisenhower after -- according to the father image. I don't know -- is -- what -- is Kennedy my brother-in-law image, or what is it?

Wherever you hear speech confused with images and pictures, you know that you have a pagan, a heathen before you. It is paganism to think that words spoken are coins which I throw out, you see, according to the images I have printed on them. Speech is something quite different. Speech is that transformer of myself. By speaking, we become different people. You know this very well, because one act of speaking is -- of course listening. Nobody speaks alone. I said to you that I have spoken in the name of more than me, but everybody does this. And while I am here, I can only say something, and I am only interested in saying something because you kindly listen. We form a unity at this -- as of this moment, you see, short as it may be. But if you wouldn't listen, you see, it would make no sense that I spoke. And I do not speak here for myself. But I'm trying to hand over something that of course has been said by millions of people through the ages and has to be said to the end of time as long as men have to be born and die.

That is, we speak or we listen -- and I assure it is the same thing -- in order to distinguish yesterday and tomorrow. Now the greatest, funniest absurdity in which I run into today is that people think we invented -- man invented language already. This is such a stupid idea that I invented language. I was taught it, obviously, and I, you see, was very eager to learn it. People think that it was meant to signify chairs and things visible here in this room. If you think that man has to eliminate dead stuff, because his baby must not receive it, must not know of it, and if you think that he has to have the authority to eliminate this dead stuff so that it is thrown out and not remembered and burned, so to speak, and new things have to be put up and impose people -- impress people so much that they're eager to transmit them to future generations, then man of course needs a power that is bigger than he himself. And the first, the first way, of course, for any man who has recreated language is that he bows to its authority himself. No prophet and no poet is interesting, and no savior if he doesn't obey the word that he speaks in the first place himself. If he doesn't set the example that this word is binding on himself, you see, nobody will listen. And for this reason, it is impossible to call language an instrument, because if I have to bow to the authority of this word, you see, then this word is more powerful than I myself.

Now that's a hard doctrine and I don't expect you to believe me, at this moment. But I wanted to announce my protest against the pagans. Wherever --

and in this country, it's unfortunate, the religionists show movies of the Bible to wean people from any religion. And the secret of the living word is invisible and will remain invisible. When we come later to the -- this dissection of the various senses with which God has endowed us, I'll try to show you why vision, the eye sense, is the least perceptive of the mystery of speech, and why we are killing our -- our children's faith and our children's power of trust, confidence, and love by showing him every- -- everything ahead of time. You shouldn't do that. It's -- they'll never forgive you later. If they have been taken into this wrong confidence of -- of picture images of the secrets of life.

God is invisible; and let me break out of the usual style of speech by saying very simply: numbers, and words, and names, of which I have promised to speak here tonight, are very easily distinguishable. Numbers are valid for things that can neither listen nor speak themselves. You may say of 10 oxen that there are 10 oxen, but already of the people here, I could not say 25 -- that we are just 25 -- or 45 people. I must try to come to know you. I must be intro- -- be introduced to every one of you. Otherwise you could go home, rather offended, and said, "He has treated us very superciliously and very contemptuously." Now "contemptuously" is a very important word. You expect me to treat you as equals. And we have to exchange words. I cannot speak in numbers -- of you and to you, but I have to speak in a human language, and this is -- happens to be my poor edition of English.

[tape interruption]

That is, we speak in an -- in an idiomatic tongue to each other in order to feel that {we} respect each other. Respect, that -- is, that we take -- have regards for each other, and that we take -- speak together. Now the word "together" is of course today a rather platitudinous word, perhaps, but "together" means that everybody is with the speaker in the know. All listeners, all of you -- here in this corner, you too, Lady -- have -- must be taken into this speech. I must assume that you as well as the people right here in front are not falling asleep, that you are with me.

That is, everyone to whom I address human speech must feel that he is privileged to be taken out of dead nature, of the dead world, of the non-speaking universe, of the number universe, you see, that he's not treated as a number. And the more any eloquent speaker can convey this, you see, to his audience, the better he is. You know the story about Governor Curley, of Massachusetts. He was a very eloquent Irishman, but he did some crooked things. Among others, he -- among others, he did something very charming, he took the examination for



somebody else -- the Civil Service examination. But unfortunately he was caught in the process and sent to prison. I think it was rather uncharitable of the judge. But he stayed in politics and became Governor of Massachusetts just the same, and was a headache for Franklin D. Roosevelt. And one day he went into a -- into a gathering of politic- -- a political gathering -- and made his speech. And a heckler threw in, "How was this, Mr. Curley, with this man for whom you took the exam?"

And Curley beamed and said, "Yes, and I would it do for you also." Now that's a real speaker, you see.

What's the difference between numbers and words? In this example, you have the whole case. Mr. Curley spoke of the future of the man who listened to him. He said that this man might come in a situ- -- get into a situation where he needed Mr. Curley's help. Any politician, you see, does this. No scientist does it. No scientist could have said this sentence, because he deals with past things, with things that can be numbered and measured. But a man who has a living audience must consider their tomorrow, you see. And therefore, where you have words, you have the alphabet of tenses. You said the -- the number is timeless. Ten, ten, a million, they have no place in time. No even perhaps in space.

But I have the great honor that a man from Madison Avenue came to my house and said, after he had listened to me, "You are statistically unimportant." Now, that's a great honor. He had to speak to me, you see. He couldn't number me. A man who is statistically important is nothing else but a statistic.

Now, I'm quite serious. This is the -- very much -- the dividing line between numbers and words, that in order to be important in human speech, you have to be numberless. You have to be perfectly statis- -- unimportant in statistics, because otherwise it makes no se- -- it is not important that you should speak. Most people strike you as -- it is unimportant what they say.

So words are spoken to living beings who have to distinguish -- that's the deepest secret, I can tell you, as of this evening, at least, it seems the most important -- language was not created to tell you, "This is a chair." I could have always pointed with my finger to this chair. And mothers and children do not have -- babies have -- do not have to speak to each other in a formal language. It's perfectly unnecessary. You just show it to them. Let them -- let them gr- -- grab it and let them feel -- probably they try to eat it.

That is, there is a -- it is not true that the world of our five senses would

ever have created speech. Speech is created for this great act of the Founding Fathers

to distinguish past and future. Therefore, language is not the power to say, "This is the chair," or "This is the -- St. Augustine Church." But it is meant only for the power you have to say, "My father no longer is alive, but I -- a child has been born to me." We speak in order to distinguish past and future. Just as much as we -- speak in order to say, "Here, we speak English, and across the border we speak Mexican." You distinguish then inside and outside.

These are the two only reasons why we speak and that's why every word -- verb in -- even in English, half-dead as it is, can show tense. You can distinguish "I have said" and "I shall say." So, the root of language -- are not words, and are not numbers, but is this wonderful bridge across the times by which you stand in the middle of the -- on a raft, so to speak, in time, and say, "This is behind me. This has happened."

I always give this very crude example that you have the liberty at this moment to say, "Europe was a great civilization." Or to say, "Europe is a great civilization." Depending on your creed about the future of mankind, you will say these sentences with different, you see, intonation and with different vitality. If you say, "Europe was a great civilization," then the two world wars have destroyed Europe. Perhaps they have. If you say, "Europe is still the white man's -- not only the cradle, but its," you see, "its mainstay" -- then you throw in your faith together with the Europeans and America can't go it alone.

This little word "is" or "was" is for you and me, for all important purposes, the mystery of language, because it means that this strange fact that within our own lifetime certain things have been condemned to death, certain mores, certain ways of life, and some new will have to come into being, is entrusted to your own decision. Every one of us is a remaker of the universe simply by his being allowed to change between "was" and "is." That's the reason why it is important that God is that -- called "He who has been," you see, "who is and shall be." He is not concerned with this change in us. He has planted it -- in us in order that we may participate in his further creation. This little word "is" and "was" then gives you the secret of what speech in words really is. It is our power to distinguish yesterday and tomorrow. Past and future. We look backward and forward, and if you would give up this ridiculous idea that we know anything from the past and present about the future, and would say -- see that we look backward and forward, you would be already be above naked heathenism, as it is rampant in all the social sciences today, who tell you that language is an instrument, a tool to persuade people to buy at Sears, Roebuck.

What is -- who is God? God are all the powers that make us speak. We have to define then the names as all those powers whom we must invoke in order to survive. The first names are the names of our gods, and pardon me for obliging you for a moment to speak of this in the plural, because the languages were created, of course, in the dark night of -- before the -- full revelation -- and you must not take it amiss that I mean really to say that people who do not know that Venus, and Apollo, and Zeus, and Hera can be gods will today miss the bus into revelation. It is because there were many gods -- and the Bible is full of the Elohim as you know -- Elohim means "gods" in the plural -- that Jahweh, the god of tomorrow, could be proclaimed. And with all our poetry and all our symbols in architecture and sculpture and painting about the gods of antiquity, I think it is high time that you convince yourself that you too, you see, either invoke Americanism and the American flag -- that's your god at that moment -- or you invoke socialism, or Communism -- as people reproach others -- or you invoke neutralism, or you invoke pacifism, or you invoke bellicism, or you invoke the Marines or whoever your god is as of this moment.

That is, all men have between the God who has created man as this changer of things and as His speaker of words, and the invoker of powers, and -- there are always between Him, the Almighty, and us powers -- the powers that be. And I like to call them "God" for good reason. Because all these powers make you cry out, shout and speak, whether you dance around the flag or whether you spend -- your money collecting pictures, you see, of Picasso. And it is always the same. You have some authority which forces you to go around and speak of them, and name them, and invoke them. The names are not words of human -- between human beings. But they are invocations of powers that make you speak. I happened to run into this famous song by Shakespeare:

"Hark, hark the lark at Heaven's gate  
and Phoebus 'gins arise,  
His steeds to water at those springs  
On chalic'd flowers that lies;  
And winking Mary-buds begin  
To ope their golden eyes:  
With everything that pretty is,  
My lady sweet, arise.  
Arise! Arise!"

You know that love must speak. It must invoke. Here the whole universe must dance around the sweetheart. "With everything that pretty is, my lady sweet, arise." You will see that whenever we speak fully, we try to assemble the whole universe around the center of our thought. You bring not to your sweet-

heart everything you have. That's not accidental, because we always turn to the gods, to the powers that are much bigger than our little environment and try to enlarge it, to show that this power, this omnipresent power is really present here at -- this minute. And when it and if it is present, and if we can convince our sweetheart that it is present, she'll say, "Yes." She cannot -- she can resist me, as myself, but she cannot resist the divine power that blesses this moment and enters this room and says, "Phoebe, I have endowed this man now with the divine spirit. He brings you the -- the -- all the goods of creation.

If -- this sentence -- this little poem, strangely enough, has accompanied me for -- through life, since I was a boy. I always thought this was the -- the greatest poem, so to speak, the most essential. It contains this element, you see, of comprehensiveness, of taking with me the universe and bringing it to this one point of excitement at which it must serve now, you see, at -- so that I can focus on creation from this one viewpoint. You will ever -- always -- find that all eloquence consists in this power to unify the universe under the impact of this one thing that now has to be said, and this one person that now has to be convinced and won over. This is what we call eloquence: to speak out of the fullness of the whole, you see, into this one little point into which we concentrate all the power. And that's the secret of the divinity. That's why the child in the cradle represents God. It is the weakest moment in this hitherto creation into which the divine spirit can enter and co-create and go on with the next act of creation. God is only powerful in the weak.

The gods, then -- let me repeat -- are the names that we invoke in order to be tolerated, in order to be -- and of course, the sweetheart itself is such -- should be such -- treated as such a person. There's always a greater power, I said to you, present when we speak. Here, I speak -- obviously in front of you, in this very affectionate group, because there has been something developed between you and me. You trust me, although you cannot label me at this moment as a -- I don't know what -- "logologist," or something like that. I'm not posing here as a scientist. And I certainly think these things are all true, and they -- yet they are not science. And what it is I'll leave to itself -- probably couldn't meet unless for three years there had been some basis for confidence and mutual trust, and that you were willing to know that I would invoke the power of truth and of necessity between you and me.

I feel very strongly that there will soon be -- as I said in the beginning -- no language unless we purify its purpose, and we bow to its importance, and we know that the names which we invoke are not of my own making. How can speech be instrument or tool? If I need the words, "Lincoln," or "America," or

whatever I choose to -- to take; and our religion has taught us that the name, above all names, is the man who has taught us under what conditions change has to be completed, has to be undertaken. Our savior is the savior because He has distributed between the old and the new, between the law and grace, between free -- future and past, between the people's order and the innovation of the first founder, the light and the shadow in such a way that everybody in every situation can decide how much he is a baby who has received, and how much he is a founder who has to bequeath.

You all are torn by this decision, in every one moment -- whether you educate your child or whether you don't educate your child. If you don't educate it, you decide just as much, of course, about his future or her future. We are exposed in this frailty of ours to this violent battle between dead -- the dead things which we can number and count: all the television sets, what have you, all the dead things of which you can only speak in numbers, you see, and in prices and price tags, but which do not talk back. And you can then speak to people, and take them with you on your journey and try to find out how many will accompany you and how many you have to leave behind because they are hopeless. And then you have -- can only speak to these living group of people in the name of something -- you call it "the future" today, or you call it whatever, "America," or "peace." I don't care, these are minor gods. They are only parts of God because God is the power who makes us speak. Words are the ways of communication between people. And numbers are the means of mentioning things.

In a thing, the first quality is its number. In a human being, it's the last one. When you go to this -- to the Marines, you see, and they begin to count the members of the company, you feel pretty low, you see. You're dispossessed, because you are a man without a name. And that's a first impression you get when you are a recruit in uniform. And that's why the word "uniform" means that there men are -- we attempt to -- to use people as means to an end for the defense of the country. They have to obey orders and you cannot help treating them sometimes, you see, as tools, as means, as instruments. They are instruments to victory, you may say, but still, any general has to use his men, you see, in such a way. And when General Patton didn't, you see -- didn't do it, you remember what happened in Sicily. He had just bad luck.

That's all I wanted to say to- -- tonight. Perhaps you have followed so far that you begin to believe that numbers for things, and words between people, and names of the powers above us are real, and are really distinguishable, and that names are not playthings.

In this country, however, and now give me five minutes more, rather to oppose, people have desperately tried since they are enlightened, and liberals, and rationalists and have gone to high school -- they try to prove to themselves that the names of their children are { }. There was a governor of Texas -- of course, Texas -- Mr. Hogg, and he called his first daughter Ima Hogg and his second daughter You Are A Hogg. And so Ima Hogg and Ura Hogg have gone through life -- but they have become by the way very decent people. It is very difficult, with this name. Only because Hogg was written with two g's, it was still possible.

I have read in the paper, in the Minneapolis paper on April 2nd, that to a Mr. and Mrs. Albert First a child was born, and they called the child, because it was born on the first of April, April First. So, all through life, this poor creature will be called -- since the father was Albert First -- she will be called, or he will be called, I don't know -- April First. Now, who is April? I think it's a curse on this child, you see. For a joke, this child was sold down the river for the next 70 years. That is, you see, we have reached this point where instead of knowing that we speak in order to bury the faraway dead, from the beginning of creation, the cave man, and to invoke the future, the man of the future, the blessed grandson, you see, we sacrifice everything to the joke of the moment. This child, because it happens to be born on April 1st, is denied a Christian name, and it has to run around with this joke that it is April First.

I have a colleague. He is a -- teaches German literature and -- in Dartmouth College, and he is a young man. He has three children, from a Roman lady -- from Rome, Italy. And she really is a Roman, in every respect, a very wonderful person. And we had dinner a few days ago together before I came here, and she explained to me that names were nothing. They were something traditional and, on the other hand, they were something aesthetic, according to sound.

And then I asked them, "How did you label -- name your children?"

And he listed three Italian names. So I knew, of course, who had the say-so in the family. If you call your children Civero, and Cavallo and, I have forgotten who the -- Nicolao, or something like that, I mean, the children are in -- in this country of America forever, you see, distinguishable as of Italian origin. And since he is a Mr. McCormick, and has no Italian origin whatsoever, he ceded simply his birthright to his wife, you see. The story of Eva and Jacob should be written anew, between husband and wife. For the soup of lentils, which she

cooks, you see, he sold her his children's names.

This is quite serious. He did not think that he had done anything of importance and we had a long { } on this. She understood completely. He didn't. Now this man teaches a language. He is a philologist. He is a -- teaches German literature and yet he was inaccessible to his own action with regard to his three children. I think that's such a remarkable situation that I decided I wa- -- was going to talk to you about this. -- This is serious. That's why I feel it is very necessary that we should recover our senses. If namegiving, for a child who has to live with this name, not just in his own lifetime, but with his own grandchildren, too -- that it has to be remembered, you see, in the far-fetched future of 200 years from now, as Ura Hogg and Ima Hogg, then something has {gone} utterly wrong. For a joke, we are selling out our birthright. And our birthright is this very simple thing that we can decide what deserves to be remembered in the future and what does not deserve to be remembered.

When at the -- in the -- in the -- in the legion service on Mem- -- on Decoration Day, or in Arlington on the cemetery, it is said "Killed in Action" -- the name is called forth, the name on the roster. And that stays. Man has invented by namegiving those divine powers that survive the human body and the human flesh. And names, therefore, are always divine, because they always claim -- or diabolical -- to last longer and to last independently from my and your physical existence.

This may in some cases not be, so to speak, ostensible. And yet, you only have to read the -- any old history book. They lived through the names that are used. And we live through the names that are remembered. You have to know that Benedict Arnold was a traitor, because only by mentioning Benedict Arnold can you know how difficult it was to swear allegiance to the American flag. That was a new thing. It was very doubtful -- who were these Americans? Could you betray them already, you see? He had to be -- a case had to be made of this case, you see. And he had to be -- in order to introduce the fact that you could commit high treason against the United States of America, at the moment of the -- of the trial of -- against Benedict Arnold, you see, his name was written into the history of this country, you see, in a negative manner. He had been sorted out and found wanting.

Names, then, are the positive and the negative vestiges of eternal life. We have no others. The name of Christ and Jesus is all that stands out; and yet, there is a tremendous power. There is a gathering, a collectifying power. We can gather under this name and wipe out, delete the distinctions of time, the abyss of

time. Well, on this, I'll have to -- we'll have to talk the next meeting.

(You wanna --)

Well, perhaps you will allow me.

(Yes.)

It is common here to ask questions. And I -- ask you to ask these questions next time in the beginning. I have always felt, and I have dabbled in -- quite a bit in these matters, so believe me, it is not -- not laziness, and it is not lack of interest that at the end of a -- an address, the questions dissolve thought. If it is an important question, however, it should be asked. And so I seriously invite you to ask all your questions at the beginning of the next meeting. And it will be the best introduction to the -- to the sequence. If this is agreeable, I would like you to follow this in the -- with the last -- next five lectures, you see, that we should begin with a question period. So don't forget what you have now to ask, please. Write it down and ask it the next time.

(Uh, we have cof- --)



{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

So, whoever would like to ans- -- ask a question? Ja. You would? Yes? So you did raise your finger. Please.

(If I understood it correctly, I found that you put -- numbers at a secondary level in comparing them to words. You put numbers as a secondary {existence} compared to words.)

Yes.

(Which you said denominated names and certain parts, whether logically could we figure the beginning of such a phenomenon, then we could place the priority {of one and the secondaries together}?)

Well, the -- your word "priority" obviously is in this ambiguous. It can mean two things. One is more dignified than the other, or the other is logically earlier. Of course numbers, and names, and words cannot be ascribed to any one moment in time -- one earlier and one later -- if you mean this by "priority." There probably -- according to the Bible, the names are older than the words. If you read the Bible carefully, the man -- man names, gives numbers to the things and their names. But he is called first and he receives this notion that he is to be called "Adam" from his maker. So the Bible is very -- quite explicit in distinguishing names and the words for things, you see. The word "name," you see, "nomen" in Latin, is ambiguous in many languages. It may mean "a word" -- "nomen" you see, as in the word "nominative," in grammar can just mean "word." And there's some ambiguity then in our speaking to each other. The word may mean "word" or "name." And let me make this quite clear. I'll put this here for your better understanding.

Of things we speak. To people we speak. And from gods we hear -- or we are made to speak. I've defined, you see, any power that -- who makes us speak, who forces me to speak, you see, or to fall silent -- that is, to change my approach to reality, we call a god. Love makes you speak and sing, you see. It is not the girl who makes you speak, -- sonder- -- because -- that you are in love with her, you see. So she has this overpowering influence. And 10 years later, she doesn't make you sing, but cry.

So it isn't true that she, in her -- simply as a -- as a person -- makes you speak. But the power, you see, of Venus makes her speak, for example, the

goddess of love. So in the -- if you take three simple words, you may not confuse one and the other. And you will also see that we cannot decide what is earlier and what is later. From the gods, we are forced to speak and we speak to people and we speak of things. And you can -- it is very easy to make this distinction between people and things, you see. Wherever you speak to, you humanize. You can speak to flowers and animals. A tame -- your tame horse or your tame dog you speak to. That means you treat it similar to a human being, you see. But on the other hand, you know very well that you can in general only speak of dogs, and not to dogs. You can't -- couldn't have an assembly of dogs, and give them a talk, as I try today, at this moment, you see.

(My problem, Prof. Rosenstock -- )

Ja?

(When I talk to a certain thing, or a certain person, I presuppose things --)

Huh?

(When I talk to something other than myself --)

Well, you presuppose that it can talk back, don't you? You fear -- I dread that you talk back now to me, you see. So I treat you as a human being. But -- of this table, I can say that it is brown, you see? But I expect not the table suddenly to get up and contradict me. You may contradict me. He -- it cannot. That's the difference between men and things. Isn't it?

(Yeah.)

So. That's a decisive difference. But in our modern world, we have neglected this. Speech has been degraded to something, you see, about things, and we always forget that the words we use may come back and tell against us, you see. I mean, most people are in safety, especially journalists and professors, you see. They -- they have made sure that nobody can talk back. In an examination, they have to answer questions.

I think this may really help, you see. From the gods, we are inspired and compelled to speak. Any love that is overwhelming -- we'll speak of this at the end a little more explicitly. It is very strange that this should have been overlooked all through the 19th century. And -- they said, there are no gods. If you think that God is the power who created the world, what do we know about

that? The geologists tell us this was 900 million years ago. It's probably not true, but they say so, and we can't contradict them because they use numbers. And the -- we have just, you see, to be silent.

And, however, from the gods comes this compulsion to speak, and -- to men we speak or among men. And we are equals with others in this respect. And you can also now see -- follow this perhaps -- it's a -- good moment. I had reserved this for the beginning of tonight but your question leads to this. In men, the two worlds of speech meet. Here we are. You have a name and I have a name, and we participate in the divine presence. But we use words to each other, you see, and in this way we are in human society. And so in -- in men there is a division. I use words in society, but every one of the men participating claims that he has a name, that he is not to be confused with anybody else. And you of -- insult a man, if you insist that he's only a number -- in the state of Arkansas, any child born, you know, gets a number. You may know this. I think it's for -- all of the United States for fingerprinting purposes. Isn't it true? That we are all now -- they introduced this is during the Second World War, isn't this true? Ja. So, but fortunately we ignore this, you see. Mr. Winter is Mr. Winter and he's not 0003476.

So we try -- only prisoners are degraded to have numbers. It was the great invention of Mr. Hitler to take away the name of a person in the concentration camps. And they ended up as numbers, you see. And once you make a man into a number, he has ceased really to live. I mean, it is a -- very refined cruelty to treat prisoners to numbers.

So, what now? What else, please?

(May one speak to a god, to the god which has given him voice?)

Well, one can respond, one can obey, one can answer. If you think that the gods can be spoken to, I decline to answer this question in such a way because you haven't committed yourself, Mr. Hirschmann, to the question if they talk to you. Before you have not admitted this, it's no use talk -- telling -- telling -- saying that you can talk back to them. Most people today, you see, say there is a God. They are all deists, you see. But they would not acknowledge that the gods talk to them. And so this philo- -- philosophizing of Mr. Voltaire and family and -- you see, doesn't interest me. That won't lead anywhere. Of course -- I could admit it, Sir. But it would be misleading in this audience because the real mystery of the divine powers is only that they make us speak. As a consequence, we implore them. We invoke them. We may turn away with them. You can deny

them. You can -- all prayer, you see, is an answer to their -- we acknowledge their power. But this acknowledgement has to come first.

And therefore, your question cannot be answered in this. You see, it's a second step that we answer. If you are interested, I mean the -- as you know, most modern men cannot define what prayer is. They say, "Well, the gods don't listen anyway, so why bother?" Prayer is -- something airy in church from 11 to 12 or from 9:15 to 10; but otherwise, it is something for children. Now I don't think so. I'm very serious in this matter, but it is very hard for me to make myself understood. Most people today think that it is a petrifact, prayer, and it is not something that happens every minute. And this is quite serious, the question, "What is to be achieved with prayer?" you see. Only through prayer does anyone place himself in the universe, because only vis a vis, and in the face of the gods, can you or I know who we are. No- -- nobody of you can tell me who I am, you see, because it's mostly either flattery, or cruelty, hatred, or love. It's certainly not the truth.

So I invoke the gods in order to learn what a human creature on this earth represents, in general and in my personal case. Take a man rejected by humanity. That's why Christianity, you see, begins with the man who is rejected, you see. The stone whom the -- whom the masons have -- have rejected, you see, has become the cornerstone, you see. Because in his prayer, God alone could -- say -- tell him the answer, who he was. The men declined to know, declined to recognize. So, prayer is something constantly in everybody's mind. Whether you sigh or laugh or what -- whenever you have to readjust your -- your true nature in comparison to the flatteries, or the vituperation, or the insults, you see, or the ignorance of the crowd, you try to recover who you are and who -- else can direct you in this respect unless there is a power greater than you -- in the face of whom you try to -- to pass muster -- you see, to be tolerated, to be insulted. Now think -- since we are abominable sinners, this is not so easily done. You know better about your shortcomings than anybody else, or at least you could. We know our shortcomings much more than anybody else, and that's the meaning of this Sunday prayer in church, you see. "Abominable sinner," you see, "and there is no goodness found in us." But it is not limited to the church. I mean, any honest man knows that most people have too good an opinion of him, you see.

Now to recuperate your sense of balance, you have to -- have a vis ... vis. The secret of all speech is that it always takes two people: one who listens and one who speaks. All self-reliances to my -- leads into the lunatic asylum. The

people who say, "I'm the emperor of China" usually end in a -- strait-jacket, you see. And it's very funny that the philosophy of the last 200 years begins with self and ends with self, with the dissolution of self, you see. It's not an accident in the last 20 years this country has introduced into its vocabulary the word "schizophrenia," "schizoid," you see, et cetera. And you all take it for granted that most people in this country are schizophrenic. They probably are because they want to be alone. If you pray to God, you will not be schizophrenic, because somebody else will face you and you will face him and then you can learn who you are. If you tried, however, to organize inside yourself this discussion, "Who am I? Will you kindly --" saying to yourself, "John," you see --, "Johnny, will you kindly tell me who I am?" you split. You have somebody has to -- is meant to tell you. And most people do this nowadays. And so of course they go crazy. And schizophrenia is the American disease, as you know. -- No country is so overdeveloped than here, because obviously atheism is the most widely spread virtue of this country. And is a practical atheism. I don't mean churchgoing or not churchgoing. That isn't decisive. But prayer. That is, the -- the knowledge that you can neither receive from yourselves the passport into heaven, nor can you receive it from your fellow man. Their esteem may be based on false assumption and yours certainly is based on false assumption. And therefore, the clarity only comes to anybody who speaks with somebody else.

And for this reason, Sir, you see the connection, you see. Prayer is an answer to the position that there are gods. There are -- is not a proposition to the -- to the truth that there is one god. That's already a conversion. And a convergence and a revelation that there is one god. But I speak of all men. You take the Birch Society people who begin with the allegiance to the flag. That's all right. It's a partial -- divinity whom they worship. That's very serious. And it's better than nothing, you see. It isn't enough, because it's only one god among many, the nation. It's not the only god. And -- and the research professor who -- asks for -- for a million dollars for his research, I mean, he has science as his god. Why shouldn't he? It's a master. But it is not enough, because he must also be willing to admit that it's sheer nonsense what he does. In many cases it is.

(Dr. Rosenstock-Huessy, you made a statement last time very quickly, but I wondered if you would go and clarify what you meant to me. You said, "God is only powerful in the weak.")

Have you never realized that? As you -- as long as you strut and stand before the mirror with your new dress, you are just human, you see. Obviously, any communication of the divine spirit to others can only come when you give way with your new -- put away your new dress and your spring hat and let the

word of God pass through you as its -- His receptacle. As long as we strut, obviously, there is no God. So God appears only on the scene when we make ourselves very brittle and very frail. I mean, that's why the Christmas child appears in the cradle and on the Cross. In both -- in both situations, the Lord is perfectly weak, you see. He has no power and no beauty in the sight of man. And the --  
(And you define "weak" as being no power and no authority? Is that --)  
Ja, ja, ja, ja. What? You can test it in every one case. It's very easy.  
(You mean -- you're not thinking of physical weakness -- that's what I thought you were -- )

Well, the baby in the cradle is probably chosen as the Muster for the physical weakness. But then there's moral weakness and then there is, of course, the -- no authority, I mean, no -- no security, I mean, that's Jesus on the Cross. All the situations in the life of the Lord are, you see, one of accentuated weakness. And it's physical weakness. It is auth- -- how would you call the weakness in authority, I mean, the absence of authority? We don't say the -- so much then the word "weak." But St. Paul meant all weakness is inducive, you see, to make visible the glory of the Lord who speaks through us frail receptacles. That's why out of the mouth and babes and sucklings the Wahr- -- truth may be told.

(But you don't consider Christ weak?)

Pardon me?

(You don't consider that Christ was weak, do you? In this sense, you would, wouldn't you?)

Well, if you read kindly the second chapter of Philipians, He -- He -- He de- -- declined His divinity and became man in order, you see, to -- through His weakness to glorify the Father. It's everywhere in the New Testament, this -- I -- it's not -- I haven't invented it. It is difficult to understand if you press the word "weak," because in the eyes of man, you see, the inspiration which it makes gives you power to testify in any one moment to an important truth that -- otherwise has been neglected. You may feel very powerful because God speaks through you. But in the eyes of the world you are, "Who are you, mister?" you see. Very weak.

What is the trouble in your -- in this -- my answer? You are not satisfied?

(I'm thinking of moral weakness. I'm thinking of all types of weakness, and --)  
Well, when Lazarus died, Jesus wept. That's certainly very weak in considering to the event and to the demand made on Him to resuscitate him. You see, men in our society are so strong, they don't weep. They just go to the lunatic asylum, instead, you see. If more Americans would weep, they wouldn't have to go to the -- analyst. Weeping has been abolished in our society because it's a token of weakness. But I assure you that the shedding of tears is a very healthy -- function. And if peo- -- more people would cry, you see, they wouldn't fall prey to the psychiatrist. Too many people in this country shed tears. I assure you. And that is of -- it is considered a sign of weakness. I assure you it is not. The tear -- tears are just as divine, you see, as all love is, because you only wa- -- cry in sympathy with somebody else you love. Or some dread -- fear you have for the community. This is a -- very sore point with me in this country, you see. Crying has been abolished. People don't even cry at the cemetery. You see, the beloved -- you read just The Loved Ones. You have read it, {I see}.

(If you're saying humbleness, then this would not be weakness to me in the sense that I think of weakness.)

Well, it's a quotation. God is, you see, strong in the weak. I have not said it. The Apostle Paul has unfortunately -- has said it.

(It was translated from another language. { }.)

But it is Greek. It's {asdonaiou}. It means "powerlessness." If you want to translate it this way, you see, that's the -- that the great truth must come to you not with the police force, you see, but as true. And that makes it powerless. It is -- the larger and greater and more pronounced your freedom is to reject this truth, the more directly is the truth, you see, to be understood as divine. God doesn't force you. He wants your allegiance. The allegiance must be freely given. If it isn't freely given, you see, it is false and forced. And you will admit, that if the -- the teacher of this truth, or the spokesman of this truth can use force, and has force behind it, there's little merit in your obeying this, you see. You are only, so to speak, meritorious; you deserve, you see, as -- our esteem if you do it freely. Therefore, the word has to come you -- has come to you outside a power stream. Not through the -- through -- under the power of -- be it the police force or the SS of Mr. Hitler or the Com- -- Comosols or the FBI or some such organization which simply doesn't ask for your consent. It acts, you see, over- -- overpowers

you. Can't you see the difference?

(Yes, Sir. I see -- but I -- my interpretation of "weak" has always been quite different from the way you're applying it in this sense. We're not in disagreement with what you're saying. It's only in the implication of a word that I am having --}

Well, it is -- I can see it. The -- you see, the -- it is not -- wasn't my vocabulary. Perhaps I would have expressed it differently. But it's a quotation, and therefore I didn't tamper with it.

Ja?

(I was been a little confused by something, and I'm sure you can straighten me out easily. You said that one of the great importances -- one of the great importances in language, in words, was the tense. I mean, in the sense of -- of tense. And I was thinking afterwards, that most abstract language, like the language of theology or philosophy or law quite explicitly is not concerned with tense. And

--

)

Is not? Do you think it isn't?

(Well, I don't know ---)

Thou shalt not kill. Thou shalt not commit adultery.

(Well, conditional sense. But only in the conditional sense. Not in the sense of past, the present, the future. You know?)

Is it not?

(No -- )

That's a very important point. And you will allow me to build up the whole lecture today -- the whole -- on this question. It's -- if you are right, I speak -- I am speaking in vain. And since I am right, of course, I'm not speaking in vain.

Please. One more. Ja?

(Would you have something more to say later on your distinctions between the gods who inspire men to speak and the God who is with man in



prayer? That is, between a plurality of gods and a singular god?)

Very glad. That's, of course, the deepest secret. Certainly. I do feel, however, let me say this today: I -- will not answer the question because it's really a -- the question of the transition from paganism to revelation. From pre-Biblical worship of any god -- god of -- our athletes wor- -- worship, you see, at the altar of sport -- and the -- and the patriots worship at the altar of the American flag. And so there are many gods among us, but we know a little better and we feel that these gods should be under God, you see, the singular.

And -- however, the relapse into paganism is so prominent today and it seems that so very few people represent the discovery of the unity of our God that I had -- had to stress the fact that the pagans also worship, you see, names. Only they don't worship the na- -- the Name above all names, as the Bible calls it. And so I left it dangling in the air for the time being, because I tried to say something that is valid regardless of the weakness of any one man's creed, or belief, or theology. It's only to universalize the -- you see, my remark on the gods that I wanted to embrace all the -- the Voltaires and Rousseaus just as well. And after all there are very few Americans who have resisted the modern trend to s- -- to say, "Well, it makes no difference. We are all good, and we are all nice, and we all go to Heaven," you see, this un- -- universalism is, after all, at this moment, the -- the general religion, you see, of mankind in this country. And it isn't enough.

And as a hint, I may tell you already today: the gods of the heathen, you see, are not understood to be the sources of speech. The word -- the living word of the Gospel of St. John is a great discovery: that God is the power who speaks. I couldn't have given you the definition of the gods who make us speak before the Gospel of St. John was written, you see, because in the word, the secret is revealed that through our maker we possess this wonderful gift of -- orienting us by speech. We co-create with Him. We can talk to each other about His purposes, you see, His aims, His creatures, and thereby participate in the divine spirit. That's what we mean by the Holy Spirit and by the Son and the Father giving us this revelation.

So today, it is easy to say that the -- say that the perfect divinity of course must be the source of all human speech, you see. The pagans didn't know this secret. They didn't know that Venus and Aries were only little fragments of this great power of man to speak, to sh- -- and to sing, you see. So that's the relation of God and the gods. And that's why the Bible is full of this -- of this scorn for the gods who are deaf and dumb. You see, they can neither listen nor speak. They are only little fragments of the real power. The Americans' flag is quite ob- -- you

see, obtuse. It does not hear when you dance around it, you see. You may worship this god, but the American flag certainly does nothing of the kind. And, so there you have the limitations of any limited gods, of -- but they are -- the -- the Hebrew language, as you know, has always distinguished between the Elohim, as a name for God and Jeho- -- Jahweh, you see, the one god, of course. And it is just as well if I go on from here perhaps now? -- is there -- are there any other questions? -- and tell you, you see, that the Hebrews, in the first chapters of the Bible, as you know, use this common word, Elohim, which simply means, "all the gods, anywhere" rightly worshipped. There are many gods. Youth is such a god, and any old person will tell you. And if he leaves us, it's very -- double -- painful. Love is such a god, you see. Courage is such a -- sports is, science is. Gover- -- government -- good government, is. And friendship is, certainly. There are family spirits, whom we rightly try to maintain and to -- to worship. And they are gods. And the Bible is full of this word "Elohim," you see. And there're also sentences in the Bible -- Mr. {Husak} will know this -- where it just says, "the gods." The gods ruled by the one God.

The discovery of the Bible is only that there must be one name which distinguishes the living God from these God-established deities, you see, like the nation. And the word, as you know, is Jahweh and there has been a big fight over the significance of this name. And people have -- as Moses receives his message in the burning bush, he is told that the name means, "You do not know where I'm -- shall be tomorrow." This is the best translation I can find. "You sh- -- you do not know where I shall be tomorrow." Usually it is translated, "I shall be whom I shall be." But the meaning is, you see, that you cannot tell where I shall appear tomorrow. And that's the living God. And God always appears where He is most unexpected. And -- in the weak, you see. In the inconspicuous, in the ugly, you see, in the rejected ones. There you have to dread the certain apparition, you see, of the next revelation. That's so exciting about life. You can never be sure that it isn't the president of the United States. He may in rare cases be blessed, as he certainly was in Lincoln's case, you see. And the more inconspicuous this Mr. Lincoln appeared to the gentleman from Harvard, you see, the more he was divinely inspired. And -- after Mr. Everetts had spoken for three hours -- Everett had spoken for three hours -- at Gettysburg, he got up and spoke 10 minutes, and then the paper disappeared in the wastepaper basket, you see. And it was the Gettysburg Address.

(I thought that was strength.)

That was weakness, because Mr. Everett and his clan thought, "What a

weak man," you see, who mumbles a few words and then puts the paper in the waste-paper basket and Mr. Everett -- has written all up and was ready for the press. Is that -- would you really not see the p- -- my point?

(No. I -- the other man thought it was weak, but I thought it was strength in this man.)

But that's no contradiction. That's no contradiction. Strength in the man and weakness in appearance.

(Weakness in opinions?)

In appearance.

(In appearance.)

The public thought, "Who is this man from Springfield, Illinois?" See? He hadn't gone to any higher institution of learning. Not even to Yale.

(Would the word "meek" satisfy us all? Blessed are the meek. I mean, wouldn't "meek" be the word, rather --)

It is not, because it is not your own feeling about yourself, { } humility. But that the word thinks of you as -- as just nobody. That's very different from meekness. You can take this treatment by the world with pride, or with haughtiness, or with contempt, or with meekness. But obviously, whether you are meek or not doesn't change the fact that you appear in the eyes of the world, you see, as a very im- -- unimportant person.

When Hus was burned at stake, you know, the -- and the old women brought the faggots to the fire. And -- and he exclaimed, "{Sancta Simplicitas}," O Saint Simplicity, you see. He certainly was weak, but he made the -- the Reformation -- unavoidable. And a hundred years later, coins were coined in Bohemia and -- that said, "100 years have elapsed from the burning of Hus. Therefore the Reformation is bound to happen now." And it was true. This was in 1500 -- 1550 and two years later Luther stood up. And wasn't Hus weak? But God was -- was with him. And he testified that the old order could not go on. I mean, that's very serious. It is weakness and not meekness. You see the --? Meekness is only in your acceptance of your weakness. But the weakness is objectively and truly there.

(Weakness is strength then?)

Can be strength. It can become strength, yes. It opens up for strength, oh ja. When -- when Jesus said, I mean, sure, there's strength. When Jesus said to the people who made Him carry the Cross, "Father forgive them; they don't know what they're doing," that is great strength from -- on His part. But certainly He appeared the weakest of the weak at this moment, in the eyes of the -- to the eyes of the world, isn't that? Who was He to say such a thing? They probably laughed.

You can say "weakness" in this sense is always when other people think they can laugh wantonly, without im- -- im- -- with impunity. That's a, I think, good description of "weakness," that when the other people say, "It doesn't matter whe- -- if I laugh at this man, nothing will occur. I will not be punished for it." Most blasphemers are of this -- the sort that they do not see when a divine command or order enters the -- the scene, you see. And they laugh it off. Wherever there is such laughter in the -- I have heard too many people blaspheme -- and it is even not known what blasphemy means. I -- I mean, the word "blasphemy" is going out of business, and -- because it is so rampant that people don't know what they're doing. I'm -- that's the sin against the Holy Spirit, and it shall not be forgiven. And I believe it. That's simply true.

I once talked about some martyrs under Hitler, to a group of very educated people. The lady was the wife of the editor of once "The Living Age." Some of you may know that there has been such a magazine in this country. So she certainly was obligated to believe in the living spirit. She didn't. We talked, and the -- her grandchildren were present, and they all were -- touched to the quick and had tears in their eyes when I talked about these martyrs under Hitler -- Catholics and Protestants who suffered for their -- righteous faith. And the old lady began to -- to chatter and destroyed the whole impression I had made -- in the -- in these children, by saying, "Oh, it won't have been so -- so hot."

And she had no reason to say this, but she did -- was able to destroy this bridge that had been built, you see, between the sufferings of these people and the hearts of these innocents. And it was -- that I call blasphemy, you see. She couldn't stand the solemnity or the rigor, you see, of the situation, that something bigger than she had happened. She was the measure of her own -- of -- of greatness. Many people are like that in this country, you see. And probably as the editor of a journal, she was ruined for life. I mean, the printed word of course

ruins more than the spoken word. It -- it freezes you out, I mean, you become superior in your judgments and more -- more arbitrary and more hard-boiled. But this is just a little example of -- of the fact that -- here -- the weakness of my story. I had no authority. The people had all died under Hitler's hands. If -- if there was nobody who exalted them in his own heart, you see, to the majesty in Heaven which they could claim and can claim, there was nothing doing. She had, of course, the power as the Devil to laugh it off, and to chuckle and to say, ""Well, well, what's all of this?" you see -- she did -- proceeded to do. Perhaps it proves to you that God is weak -- you see, powerful in the weak -- but if you decline to believe, and if the -- God doesn't speak to you, nothing doing. She -- she was within her -- not within her rights, only within her power.

And it happens every day within this country, I mean. Blasphemy -- no -- no minister I have ever heard preaching about blasphemy. They don't dare to tell you that you can commit blasphemy. It's very strange, probably they commit it themselves. Ja, it is very serious. You see, there is no belief in God if you do not believe that blasphemy is possible. Then I don't care. If you think you can say what you please, and think what you please without committing blasphemy, obviously the -- the fact that you say, "I go to church," or "I'm a believer," makes no sense. One is the corollary of the other. If we cannot commit blasphemy, we cannot commit ourselves to the living God. We cannot fall into His hands. And He cannot create us or re-create us, either. It is so -- too -- too -- too simple, I think, to be believed. Let me -- may I now break off -- off this discussion?

Otherwise, we can't follow through.

I do feel -- pardon me for now claiming a little -- a little importance for the main statement of last time that language has not been given to man for the purpose of saying, "This is a chair." It has not been given to us to speak about things and number them. That is subordinate to the fact that we are made to speak, to be called into an event, to fulfill it, and to leave off and to get out of it, free again. All word- -- all names, invocations are command -- begin as commands. The first form of any name is the imperative, or the vocative. In your grammar books, you learn differently. You learn that the word, let's name -- Tuljus Cicero -- "Tuljus" is the so-called nominative, you see. The poet, the table, that's the nominative. You have to learn it in French, and -- in German, and when you learn a foreign language, you're plagued with the nominative, the genitive, the dative. Even you have been, Carter, have you?

All right, so this is perfectly untrue. The Jewish -- Jews, as you know forbid -- forbade the use of the word "Jahweh" and say instead, in all the -- places

of the Bible when it is out -- read out loud, the Lord. {Kyrie -- adonai} in Hebrew. And people today imagine that the -- that's a taboo, as it taught -- called by these modern blasphemers, the so-called anthropologists. And that's of course non-sense. It's -- the vocative, Jahweh, can only be used by the high priest when he invokes the mercy of God, you see, by speaking to Him in the temple. Jahweh is an invocation, a vocative. And the nominative, dative, genitive -- when you speak of Him -- cannot be the same word because He's omnipresent and He's even there when you speak of Him, as -- though He was absent { }. Even when a theolo- -- professor of theology talks to his students about the qualifications of the divinity, God happens to listen in, whether the professor knows it or not. He does -- mostly does not know what -- and he thinks He's certainly absent. But He isn't.

Now will you kindly -- keep this in mind? The taboo, or the -- the -- what's forbidding -- I mean, the -- the noun for "to forbid" -- the -- the veto -- what is it? Wie?

(Prohibition.)

Ja. That you should not use this term comes from the fact that you may use this name only in the imperative. The -- the true God, the living God, { } that is important for you, is the power who only can be spoken to in answer, because He has spoken to us, who must be used in the vocative, who has no other grammatical forms like this chair, or like you and I, you see, of whom and to whom we -- we can speak as though they were datives, and genitives, and accusatives. God cannot be put in the accusative, in other words, which is a very simple -- in His majesty, He is -- He is the only "I" in the universe, you see. Martin Buber tells a story of two Jewish men in Poland. One comes at night to the door -- window of the other and knocks and says -- and he is asked, "Who -- who is there, outside?" and he says, "It's I, Martin."

And the old man inside says, "Who dares to say `I' except God Almighty, Himself?" You see?

And you understand? The vocative is the only form in which God can really be treated decently. You cannot speak of Him as you can speak of things. We all do, but -- and that's how God has lost His punch, so to speak, over our souls. But the people -- when we speak of the -- God, it is wiser to speak of the gods, because this is not the living God.

So I have some reason to use the plural, you see, because otherwise I couldn't treat this in such harmless manner.

Mr. {Husak}, you may be interested. This is the problem, you see: the vocative against the other cases in grammar. That is the problem of the treatment of the name of Jahweh in the Old Testament. That's why it's -- put, so to speak, on ice, and cannot be used wantonly, you see, in the other forms, not even in the nominative. Not even the Lord, you see. You can only say "O Lord." But you cannot say "the Lord." Because "the Lord" may be spoken of in his absence. That's impossible; it's a contradiction in terms. The only way of speaking of Him is to speak to Him, and in His face. And what we -- I do here is -- can only be forgiven as an instruction, a preliminary measure to lead you where -- where this is no longer necessary.

What I was trying to say is that all speech begins with an invocation. I must hear myself called. Then I begin to operate. I begin to move. So all speech is provocative -- "evocative" is perhaps the old word, you see. The -- when in Rome, war was declared, they had a special college of priests. And feeling that war was a terrible thing, just as modern pacifists -- the Romans, this belligerent nation, felt just as pacifists feel today that it was an ugly thing to -- so they called first on the gods of the neighboring city against whom they were going to war and asked -- invited them to leave their city and come over to Rome. They evoked the gods. It may sound to you primitive. I think it's a very pious gesture. They felt they could not make war against a city in which the -- gods still were alive, so they asked them, "Come over to us," the fetiales, the priests of the fet- -- college of the fetiales had to do this. And after they had evoked the gods from the other side, they felt free then to make -- wage war against humans, you see. They -- they didn't want to make war against the gods. I think it would help if we felt the same way, you see -- that we do not wage war against their gods, but only against them as mortals and men. And that's the issue today, again, of course, among us, to make us feel, you see, that we cannot make war insofar as these other nations have also inherited part of the divine spirit.

If you -- understand that all language begins with an imperative, with an order to which you have to give obedience, that you are moved, then you understand that the secret of language is to go through this movement -- for example, "come." "I am coming," "we have come" -- "gone." "It's over with." Language is a drama, acted upon with any action that can be taken in human life, and we are always involved in such a process that we s- -- halt at any one moment in the midst of such an evolution from imperative to analysis -- to the analytical sentence: "It has been done." Consummatum est, the Lord said on the Cross when it

was all over. And He's the only man who was em- -- empowered to look back at His own act and to say, "It is done."

But we all are involved in small things. "Read," "I'm reading," you see, "I have been -- I have read." The Hindus have a very beautiful story about the right order of things. They say that when a father says to his children, "Break wood in the forest and bring it to me," what is the correct answer? And the grammarian Pape- -- Panini has stated that the correct answer would be, that the children first go out singing, "We are going into the woods, breaking the wood for our father," that they must not say anything to their father before they have been -- gone and returned. And then they must say, "Father, the wood is broken." That's the an- -- right answer to the command, "Break the wood."

In -- in this country, you see, or in the New Testament, the Lord mentions the same type of schoolchild, you see. You s- -- tell them, "Go and do this," and the child says, "Yes" and does nothing.

That is, in our language today, we have lost the time sense, we have lost this miraculous fact that any one verb wants to be conjugated through all its tenses before this word leaves us uninvolved. It frees -- we are free then from this one obligation. Any one human being says on one day -- let's take a -- take this modern scientist who -- has to say one day, "I'm going to be a scientist. I feel that is my mission." He's under the imperatives. God seems to tell him, "Become a scientist." As long as he hears this, this is a long stage. He has to prepare his parents for this fatal step, and himself. And his fiancée, of course, she has to support him many years. And then he -- he sings in his fear, of course, of the great task, "I'm going to be a scientist," you see, "I am going to be a scientist," and he whistles in the dark. And finally he can say, "I am in research," you see. "I am in research." And he begins to sing. That is the attitude of being involved in something in the present. The command {points}, "Become a scientist." That's the future. The song, "I am in science," you see, "I am in research," as they all try to say now -- sing now, "I am in research," that's the so-called -- what you call the present tense, which is a very complicated thing. And then they -- people give him the Nobel Prize for the research he has done. And then, in the history of science, he occupies a place, and his role is analyzed finally, you see. And people look back on this man, Mr. Faraday, or Mr. Einstein, or whoever it is, and say, "This and this has been achieved in his day, you see, and now we are up to other things. We -- analyze him away." Analysis in retrospect tries to free the way for new tasks. You go to the analyst to get out of your sickness and begin a new life.



So we have four tenses or four orders of speech for any one verb. And the meaning of our language is not that I can say, "This is the chair" and "You are Mr. So-and-So" or "Mrs. So-and-So," but the meaning of speech is that any one act can be looked upon before I get at it -- it is in front of me in the future. I go through with it. I'm in it. I can -- I am allowed to state that I have done my part. I'm allowed to get out of it. And finally, other people --third people can look upon it as having d- -- been done by me. And now -- then it can be criticized, and that's what happens to the poet by the modern multitude of so-called literary critics.

And today you all, ladies and gentlemen, act and treat language in the opposite sequence and that's why we live in a dead country. What's death? When you begin with analysis and then -- try to deduct from analysis what should do. Nobody can ever know from analysis what he should do tomorrow. That's the end of a good life, and not the beginning. But in this country, you see, you think seeing is believing. It isn't -- not even in Missouri.

There's a deep illness today in the world. It's a complete relapse in- -- into paganism, because you treat speech as though it began with numbers. There are 3 billion people on the world; there's a population explosion, therefore you have to use artificial means for prohibiting new births. These swines who go around and proclaim that because there is a population explosion children must not be born -- they try to deduce from the analysis of figures the commands of the living God. It's just incredible. Decent ladies do this. And perhaps some of you are in -- members of this society, too. And -- I'm not, because that's a most personal manner. Every one couple of people may decide or may not decide, but certainly you cannot generalize it. That's the end of the world if you do. That's everybody's unique decision -- how he should lead his -- his life with his spouse. It's very serious, I think.

I -- I know a lady in Chicago, she's one of the richest ladies of this country. A very nice lady, by the way. And she has innumerable millions of dollars that's now going into the billions. As you know, if you want to be decent in this country, you cannot be a millionaire; you have to be a billionaire. She is -- and she also has a house in California -- and she is of course a prominent member of this birth control society for the Japanese. She has four children, but the Japanese must not.

This is fantastic, but it is true. And -- but this -- not her fault. In this country, you see, you have -- you ma- -- confuse the senses. All commands, where you are called in your name, place you in a -- in a new situation. Gropingly you run

somewhere and you scent perhaps, you flair -- you have a flair for -- a hunch where God is turning to. Gold rush -- that's a scent for the new -- the new -- how would you call it? -- a new direction of life. It is not the eye that redirects humanity. It is the nose. And just as we carry over from the eyesight the word "insight," so you must understand that from the -- from our scent, and flair, and our sense of odor -- by a sense of smell, we also smell the future. The English have for a long time known this and they are very fine chemists, who have -- yes, chemists, I -- you wouldn't be s- -- believe it, my dear Baldwin. Chemists who have followed the meaning of -- followed out the meaning of smell. And it -- they say smell connects man with the future. You'll run where there is a good smell, you see, because there's life. A flower, you see, flowering gives off this wonderful odor.

And -- a very learned chemist in Germany, a -- a Mr. -- na- -- great-grandson of Mr. Virchow, what's his name now? pardon me -- I've used the word -- book so often; now it com- -- just escapes me, it will come back to me, his name -- already 40 years ago proved that there were only six forms of smell. Three towards death and three towards life. Ja, you wouldn't believe it, ja. And -- flowery, fruity, spicy -- that's life, you see. And burning -- and -- burned -- and foul, and one more -- au go-t -- how would you call it? -- the au go-t of -- of -- of deer or -- au go-t in French -- and it's just at the verge of, you see, turning from freshness to -- to -- { } seasoned. Wie?

(Moldy?)

Ja, well it's just this side. Tolerable.

(Gamy.)

Gamy. Yes, exactly. There are only these six classes of smells, and they -- are degrees of vitality, degrees of futurity, or degrees of passé, you see. Burned means it's over with. No -- nothing can grow there anymore.

I mean to say the imperative has in its translation into action, the power to attract us into a new -- realm where we haven't moved before. It involves us. And that's -- is meant by hunch, you see, government by hunch. -- Mr. {Keppler}, who spent -- this may impress you, he m- -- is my authority -- who spent in 10 years \$74 million for the Carnegie Foundation, always said, "I -- I give it by hunches. I have no time." Seventy-four million dollars to be given away in 10 years. That's very difficult, you know. And he said, "I cannot read questionnaires and memoranda," you see, "I must," you see, "I must follow my hunches." And he

managed to get rid of the money in 10 years. And very wisely so. You may have heard his name. {Keppel}.

And I'm very serious. -- Where there is -- man has a nose, he can go into politics. We have a minister in Germany who is very famous for his economy, Mr. Erhardt. He has not the slightest nose. No sense of -- you see, of scent. No flair. So, we all hope over there that he will not become the successor to Mr. Adenauer. But the bankers don't know this. They have no -- no nose, and so they think he's wonderful. He -- knows statistics, all at his fingertips, you see. He sees the world, but the w- -- he who sees the world is perfectly inadequate for governing it, or for leading it. Leadership doesn't come from eyesight. And the curse of this country is, of course, "Life" and -- and all the other magazines put together. I mean, the photographs, the still -- still life, you see. That's life, still life, stillborn life.

It's very dangerous. This country is in great danger because it tries to know the future from seeing it. And that's impossible. That's forbidden. The sequence is odor first; hearing and obedience second, you see; touch and contact third; and eyesight last. I will now put this on the blackboard. Where is it? Of course, I'm -- { } do you have to leave? Ja.

Because my whole discovery -- or the discovery, of our time in the last 40 years made by anybody who has approached language with the -- reverence as a religious fact, and not as a fact of acoustics, or the fact of -- of -- of -- what shall I say? -- of -- children's three R, but as a serious business of a -- as our privilege that we are allowed to speak, who have taken this serious- -- have discovered that the meaning of speaking is to place us in time and space. This -- the -- the Kantians, the philosophers as you know, for 150 years, have poked fun at this limitation that we only -- that there is time and space. The divine brain, of course, was declared superior to time and space. And the truth about the bomb can be known at any time and any space. Mathematicians assure you they think outside time and space. Except for their own promotion.

And -- nobody can live one moment outside time and space. He needs a name even to be tolerated, and not executed when he's born. The child has to receive a name, because otherwise anybody can kill it and say it's not a human being. So speech is the protection of -- around our human existence, and therefore it is our divinity. It is nothing technical. And you have today the -- every one of you has to decide whether he's on the side of the devils or of the angels. The devils say, "Speech are tools. Language is a tool." Most books I read, I open and I know noth- -- I can learn -- can't learn anything from them because they believe

this: language is a tool. And then, you see, they are suddenly very much surprised that they are treated as Americans or as Japanese just because they speak a certain language. {And it} has tremendous religious and political consequences, whatever you say or whatever people say of you. And they are quite confused because in fact, we all live by words and by the names said to us in our absence and to our face, you see.

And only to show you the involvement -- now very simply I would like to put this on. Wherever something new strikes you -- where, for example, a politician says, "There's something foul in the -- there's -- rotten in the state of Dane," and moves in this direction, he is led by his hunch or by his flair. And that's -- I put up the word "flair," or I could use the word "scent," and you can think of all the nice Parisian scents that you could buy at Orly Airport in Paris without customs. And it is this what moves men. Whenever a man takes a new direction in politics, for example, he must have a hunch, you see, like in the Estes case for Mr. Wilson, that there's something to be gotten out of.

The second thing is, as this man in research, he said -- he's -- whistles in the dark and he says, "I am in research," as this beautiful English ballad, you may know it: "There is a ship, and it sails -- she sails the sea; And the sea is as deep as deep can be; But not as deep as the love I am in; I know not if I sink or swim."

Now this, "I am in," is the best definition of the second step, you see, for anybody who has obeyed a temptation or a summons or an exhortation, you see, or a duty -- whatever it is, the second step is, "I'm in, for --" you see, "for better, for worse." And I -- that's why I quote it, because I haven't found in any other connection this simple word, "I am not so -- not so deep as the love I am in." I -- this I like very much. But as I said, you can also say, "I am in research." "I am in love."

This being inside is expressed in our language by a special form, "I am going." The "i-n-g" which you hang onto the imperative "go" is the answer of the man who has obeyed the order, you see, and says, "I'm going." He's in it. He's drawn -- has been drawn into it by this command. Now all religion begins with commands. There is no religion by theology. Again, this is the curse of modern times that people believe today when they say "theology" they mean "religion." It means irreligion. Theology is after the event, when you look over religion and describe it, and analyze it, and systematize it. Most theologians who -- whom I know now -- I will not be impolite -- but this has nothing to do with faith. Faith is when you obey an order, you see. Religion is when you are already accustomed to do so; it's a routine. Theology is when you look back and said, "I don't

understand why my grandfather was so superstitious."

Now -- this country dies now by mis- -- confusing theology and religion, and religion and faith. Religion is nothing but crystalized faith. And theology is looking back on religion and making the best of it, or the worst.

This is quite serious. "I am in" is the second station. This is the first. The third station is -- when Mr. Lindbergh returned from Europe, he wrote a book and he called it *We*. And all looking back is "we," never "I." He was asked why he called it this way, and he said, "I had to include my plane at least. I was -- went alone but the plane was with me, and it represented all the workmanship of Am- -- the United States. So I called it 'We.' The plane went with me and I went on -- in the plane." It's a very beautiful story and I think it was Mr. Hoover who welcomed him back. Isn't that true? Ja -- Hoover. And he mentioned this in his -- in his welcome to Lindbergh that this was Lindbergh's humanity that he said "we." And it is.

The various persons of the grammar -- "I" and "you" and "we" -- are not at all lifeless figures of a grammar book. They belong to various forms of action. God s- -- calls us by our name and "thees" and "thous," as the Quakers think He does. And if you call God "thou" in your prayers, it is obviously that He will not say "you" to you.

It is very strange, of course -- it is very strange in the English language that the "thee" has disappeared for men. But you still say, fortunately, "poor me," and that's better than to say "I." The proper form for humanity is to call ones- -- us "me," and not "I." That's -- is the true form in which we find ourselves. When somebody's hammering on us, "Do this!" you see. And we answer, "Poor me will have now to go to the market," instead of the wife.

It is four -- the fourth state of affairs for any such verb that you tell the story, "Once upon the time, there were people who... " you see, and you speak of them in the third person. And the place for the -- and -- of the -- of the -- the right word, the best word for the analysis, is "it" and "they," you see. That is objectify- ing. Now in America, everybody begins with objectivity, as you know. Never is, but he says so. And objectiv- -- -tivity has become the plague of this country, because you can only be objective when you are outside of the thing. To begin in this way is not possible. You will never get volunteers who are objective. You -- a man who's -- has to enlist in the Marines cannot act objectively. He must do the opposite. He must obey orders. And he must long for getting into orders. He must have a hunch that there his honor, and his personality, his

whole -- his heart -- will grow.

And so, the sequence of speech is always from verb to verb; from one through two, to three, to four. This is in the event. This is before the event. This is after the event. And this is from the outside, when the men who have done it are dead or outside of it, you see. Or, I feel, this is over with. Like Mr. {Rodia} now, in San Martinez, California, the man who built the towers in Watts, you see. He now no longer says, "I've done this." He doesn't want even to speak about it, you see. It's objectified. It's outside of him. And that's a tragedy. It shouldn't.

I was privileged yesterday to see the towers, so I am quite filled with my -- the impression that this is a great thing.

Could you for one moment see the result of this little analysis of living speech? We constantly halt and pause at a certain state of action. We are either in the fourth or the second, or the third, or in the fourth act. It's a drama, whatever we say. Whether we go to bed, or whether we get up or whether we eat, or whether we write, or whether we are in love, or whether we vote. It's before the event that we have to be attracted to -- that the event may take place -- may eventuate, you see. And we -- eventually, we say, when something is not yet, you see, quite certain that it might become an event, but the event spreads out its -- its wings over our life for quite a certain time. In certain things like marriage, and profession, and political conviction and religious conviction we get -- stay involved all our life. And he who has received the name in the cradle can only depose his name and be analyzed when he is buried.

And the whole meaning of -- of a name -- we talked about this last time, you will remember, at the end. And I said the blasphemy of modern naming is in this fact that -- a name is something of a moment. But a name is something -- is a -- is a -- is an assignment for a whole life. It's an imperative. And my whole discovery of the reality of speech began in 1912 when I wrote in my first book that proper names affect the -- its bearer as an imperative. And this was considered unscientific, and my -- the faculty which -- which commissioned me with my first professorship said if -- I had to omit this from the -- from the 200 copies I had to hand over to them of this book. Well, I did omit it in these 200 copies, but it is -- was printed in all the other copies. And I think still -- this is an important discovery that names are imperatives, you see. They are commands, and if -- and as long as men take their names as honorable orders of enlistment -- enlisting in God's army on earth, you see, man knows what he is there for. And otherwise, if this name has not this power, and he is cursed. He is the most unfortunate being among men.

All this has -- is denied today. The -- the man, you see, who thinks -- he begins with theory and he begins with analysis to live, and forms will, and order, and direction after he has looked at things -- totally reverses the order of the universe. In the universe, the little flower, you see, in the spring, attracts you by its smell. And foulness, stench, makes you flee this -- this part of the world where there is something rotten. And it should. And just as we use the word, "insight," in a metaphoric sense from "sight" and know that "insight" is something that takes place not only on the things visible -- with the physical eye, you see, but to be seen with an inner understanding, so it is, of course, with smell and scent, metaphorically, the whole world consists in dying and growing substances. Every minute, something comes to the fore and has to be, you see, thought out as the promise of the future. And other things are rotten as can be, and have to be put on the city dump, and have to be --.

Any one moment, the metabolism in us demands this dec- -- decision: certain things are dying and must be eliminated, and other things must be helped to come to life. And they are inconspicuous, the important thing that has to do with "God is powerful in the weak." The beginning of any seed, you see, of futurity, of a promise, is inconspicuous. And I think that's the deepest reason why St. Paul says, "God is powerful in the weak," you see, because inconspicuous is a form of weakness, you see. You can be -- it can be like this woman, where I had so- -- elicited in her grandchildren some deep feeling; she extinguishes, you see. And this extinction is possible in the beginning of any new seed.

How many s- -- germs have been extinguished by raw -- coarseness, you see, because they were not given time to gain weight, and the protective coloring, and all the sheathes of defense which, in the process of living, we develop? You see, the first is the weakest. Therefore, God is where the creation begins. Something new. And the newest is always the -- the feeblest, you see, the -- the least visible.

And this is so terrible because we try to discover, as you know, all new things before they are seen -- visible. Before they can be seen. You want to see God, as in these religious movies for the abolition of all religion. And so on. The d- -- really divine cannot be seen. It can be scented. You can have a flair. And it can be obeyed.

A very fine book by -- written by an English lord on St. John and it said, "Every religious act begins with a command." And I heartily agree, you see. But in this country, it begins with a theory. And nothing begins. Children are not

born by insight. It's against all visible that the new things start, you see. Against that what is visible. Against the powers, you see, that be, against the skyscrapers, the new -- newness takes its way.

So, language is not a dictionary in -- to be found in dictionaries. In the dictionary, the frozen-out words appear. Language is only there where the verbal process engulfs me in such a way that I know not if I sink or swim, because -- I'm -- so deep with the love I am in. We all can only live with some love, some involvement in any one moment. If you go home, it isn't that you are separate from the rest, but there is an involvement which carries you through. Some love, some affection, some hatred, some fear, some greed, some -- some pride. Any moment, there are innumerable numbers of commands pressing on us, you see, and are fulfilled. And you -- if you ask yourself, "Where do you stand?" you will find -- and that is now Step 2 I would like to take still today; I will not plague you very long, but a little bit I would like to say -- not only that every action which can come to man is only with you and understood by you if you follow it through from obedience to analysis, and not in the wrong direction. If you honor our senses in such a way that you begin with the un- -- invisible and then let it incarnate -- become visible, it is al- -- a good lesson in under- -- what this means to understand. The word "understanding" today is a poor second against this word "theory," and against the word "insight," and against this whole creed of "seeing is believing. Make it visible. Put it in a picture. Photograph it. Illus- -- illustrate it." "Understanding" obviously literally means to stand under. Under great pressure. Under the pressure of some command that waits to be fulfilled. And you know very well if you -- if you back out, it will not be fulfilled. One man has to do it.

I always like the story of the man who -- the commissioner in Germany, in the inflation -- who was appointed to eliminate all superfluous offices and his last action was to abolish his own office. And that's a good man, you see. He blew himself up in -- fin- -- in the -- in the last analysis.

It is this recklessness of our devotion, be it to duty or to beauty, which makes man vital, makes man alive. And then he understands. That is, understanding is not to be had unless we carry through the act through its various stages. Now this has tremendous consequences. If "understanding" means to absolve oneself from this involvement by these four steps of following the scent, of being the command -- narrating the result and the community which has been founded in the process, the "we" that you found necessary, you see, to form in order to pull it through because nobody can act alone. Everybody needs in the process of such an obedience to join the Marines, or to join a group of scientists



or to -- you see, I cannot speak here without your kindly coming here. We form, at this moment, a "we," you see, just because I have obeyed the invitation, you see. And I need you. But you -- I hope you need me, too, to -- to follow through. So, all mankind is in this constant process from -- from "me" to "we" to "it." This coming to life and -- of one action and then burying it, and saying, "It's over with; I go on to the next." Because we must die to our former actions. We cannot just stay and look back and say, "I did this once." It doesn't help an older man. He has to go on doing something.

And if this is the -- the full understanding -- a dramatic march through the various forms of my own being -- then you will understand that our four -- the senses which our maker has given us, may represent these four stages. What are the senses? I have already mentioned them. To smell, to see, I have mentioned. To touch would be number -- another sense. And to hear is the fourth sense. The sequence of these senses, I think, is smell, hearing, touch or contact, and seeing. Seeing is the most distancing one. When we see, we look back; it's done. We get out of it. You can only see something outside your own {side}. You look at a picture; it's even in a frame because this is hanging in a second space. Your space and this space is -- are clearly two spaces. They are separated. That's the meaning of a frame.

As long as you -- this -- these brick walls -- they are much more part of us than this picture. This picture is detached. Now, the eye sees only, as you know, at a certain distance. If I put my hand here before my eye, I see nothing. It has to be there, outside of me. So all eyes -- the eye estranges objects. And what you call "objectivity" means that the thing is rather remote, that you can distinguish between you and the object seen, thing. This is very different than a man says, "I am in research over my ears." There you see, he can't see anything. He is himself in this business; it's -- he's in the dark, even. He's in doubt. He's tormented. He's basking perhaps, one moment in the glory of the discovery; and the next, he is visited by doubts. He is in -- more -- much more as in a -- in an ocean wave, up and down, tossed around, that certainly he cannot see. If he tries to see at this moment, he'll make no dis- -- important discovery. I mean, with his physical eye, he may observe a little machine, but he must be in this research over his ears. Now, all this is today poked fun at. People may know that a man in research is a little crazy. But they do not worship, or they do not revere this craziness, which he has to go through in order to make any important discovery. But it's the same with something -- with anything a -- a housewife does in -- in preparing a f- -- a feast. I mean, there is at this moment no objectivity. But there's

devotion or obedience.

And the word "obedience," you see, and "hearing" in a -- are in a strange manner unfortunately separated in the English language, which has divided the spiritual and the physical in all -- in every respect. It's a great curse. In other languages, "obedience" and "hearing" is just the same word, you see. And "Harken, Israel," there you have still in the -- in the 10 Commandments some identity between hearing and obeying. It is the same thing. He who listens, really, you see, obeys. And it's a serious question, the disobedience of man has { } produced this wonderful result that he can hear without obeying.

We only hear in order to obey. If you, however, now see what happens physically to the man who hears and the man who sees, in -- in hearing, you are inside the musical or tonal word which gives off sound. The -- funny thing is when you are at a concert, or when you are singing yourself, the waves are around you and you are inside of it. It's the opposite from a painting -- a painter's situation. The painter has to hold the -- painting away from him. And you as a concentrating animal certainly stand at a distance. Otherwise you can't see it. You even have to find the right distance for every one modern painting. It can be quite far away. The opposite is -- the opposite is true of the musical event. If you analyze it carefully, the -- the flood of waves goes through you and you basking inside of it. And it's a very strange fact that it is an inner cosmic situation in which you find yourself. The world is not divided there in two spaces, this -- the world of this picture and your own world, but it is unified. It is one world full of sound, and the sound enters you and leaves you. And you -- in hearing, we coalesce with the event. That's perhaps the best expression. You know we commit this crime today because everybody starts with the eye, that our children are forbidden to -- to lipread. They must lipread! It's a scandal that in this country is it allowed to kill the -- life of a child by asking him to read -- eye- -- eye-read -- or how do you call this vice?

(Sightreading.)

Wie?

(Sightreading.)

Sightreading. It's scandalous. Speech is living speech. It has to be joined, and lipreading is the proper -- I lipread. I read very fast, I can assure you. And -

but I to this day -- lipread. That's why I have -- kept my -- my reason. A person who eyereads must go insane. He treats the -- the -- the -- the read things not as something to be heard, and to be obeyed, and to be consumed, and to be digested, but as something to be looked at!

You will earn -- harvest the fruits of "Spartacus" where you see other people martyred. Martyrs are not to be seen. It is a scandal that this film can be shot in Hollywood. And it will have consequences in 30 years. The people -- the mob will demand bloody sacrifices and bloody -- bloody -- games, you see. It will not be enough that people die in boxing and wrestling. They'll have to die in their fight against animals and tigers.

You conjure this up by your own practice of making everything visible. It's forbidden. You can't do this. If you had -- would hear the cries of the victims inside of you in a musical symphony, that wouldn't happen. I mean, this is the inside approach and that other is the outside approach.

So we have learned something. Every act of mankind has to go through four stages. It ends on the outside, where it can be put away, and forgotten, and buried. It has to enter our inside. And we feel that we are inside the universe when we are in love, or when we are in research. We are part of some greater pro- -- process which carries us away. As we say, the language is very eloquent; it carries us away. And when we can speak of the community we had to join in order to carry anything {on} -- this flood, which carries us away carries us to a shore in which other people do the same thing. We have to find friends. We have to find helpers.

So we -- the community speaks in what we call the epics of the story, the narrative. That's another -- form, and the sense which -- the art, which best represents this seeing clearly where we have come out and how it has all come about, is strangely enough, in words, its history. But in -- in the sensuous world, it's architecture. If you look at the statehouse, that is organized movement, already know- -- or the courthouse, or anything -- the railroad station; the highway; here, this room -- we are here the heirs of history, pro- -- proven forms of movement to each other and from each other. How we go in, you see, how we leave. This's very simple. All this has to be tried out.

As you know, it -- was not so simple to construe even the seating in this room. Only experience of the first time taught us that there should be nobody seated there and nobody there. Now we know. So the -- the outcome today is that we have learned the architecture of such a meeting. How to do it.

So, it will surprise you, but just as in -- politics are the -- the largest expression of the hunch and the flair with which the grouping of political parties is the program -- they cope with the future of California, of the United States, of the nations at large -- so architecture is that remnant of past experience where we know how people should move cooperatively and in -- in unity. Whether it's the organization of a factory, or a railroad, or a highway, always there is built in experience of groups who have moved in this way without hurting each other, you see. We only repeat those buildings where we do not perish in the flames or in the cons- -- weak -- too weak a construction. And it's very strange that this high character of architecture is not even welcome today to the architects. They have lost sight of -- in a strange manner, that they're building on past experience, on organized movements that already have been tested. Because -- but that's the only thing they have to go by. They must know if people in this way -- take the -- the -- the corridors, the halls of a big -- of the Pentagon, you know. You get lost in this building. I think it is an anti-architectural undertaking. -- People had no experience how so many people should cooperate, you see, only with paperwork in a building.

They tell the story of the captain -- or the colonel, I will beg your pardon -- who went down to the restrooms in the Pentagon and -- with his -- with his typewriter and put a table up there in the entrance of the -- you know the story of the restrooms? -- and sat down and began to type. And they asked him why he was sitting there in this part of the building.

And he said, "Because it's the only place where the people know what they're doing."

So that is the consequence of wrong architecture. It stifles movement.

Our four senses, then, assign us to different stages of our way through life.

That's very important. If you look up the dictionary about the senses -- the five senses -- it says that these are communications to the brain, with which the outer world sends its messages. Nothing could be further from the truth. The five senses are split to the bottom -- they give us contradictory messages! When you hear something -- the melody of a nightingale -- you certainly don't know how the nightingale looks. And you cannot at the same time listen to the nightingale and -- and look at her. She would run away -- fly away, I assure you. The funny idea of the monistic century, of the liberal century, of the 19th century, in other terms, of the French Revolution, of the Enlightenment, is that man is simply observer and there's the world for the asking. And so there is this tremendous

abstraction as though man existed here as an intelligent being, and there was the world of our maker, or without a maker, you see, and we look at it. We stare at it. We exploit it. We buy it. We -- we sell it. And that's all our relation to the universe.

Any verb, from "love," "to write," "to dig," "to travel," refutes this, because you cannot commit any of these acts without commitment to this good earth and to your neighbors. You have to get involved. That's why people now speak in literature, Mr. {Hirschmann}, of involvement, you see. That's the slogan today. And schizophrenia is the result of this desperate attempt of the scientists and the monists to say that all these four senses are simultaneous -- at our disposal simultaneously. They are not. One after the other, Lady, you see. If you do not wish to follow their fl-- your flair, you will never discover who your proper husband should be, if you wait and sit down until you see him.

Seeing is not believing. That's very serious. You have to combat this -- this slogan. It's considered a joke, but I think it -- the -- American manhood is ruined by this idea that seeing is believing. It is not believing. You cannot see and believe, and you cannot believe and see. It's divided. At different times of life -- a young man who doesn't believe cannot become anything important. If he wants to see, as they do now in Dartmouth College, they come to the seniors and bribe them, you see, to join this company or this company. The only thing they can make them see is the salary and the pension plan. That can -- they can see. So I have asked one young man, "Are you going to join and to follow this corruption?"

And he said, "Yes."

And I said, "What are you going to do between now and the moment you will retire?" He said, "I don't care. I can retire at 65. That's all-important."

So the poor man preferred, you see, a visible misery at the end of his life to an invisible life. He would never have any life. And most of these young are today the -- inherit the heresies of their grandparents, who have seen - - said that the world is visible. God's world is not visible. Man's world at the end is visible when the roads are littered with -- with toilet paper. I mean, the -- the -- the -- our -- our world, of course, we make it visible. But that's the end of the world always, you see. Then the world must start again invisibly.

Well, that may be too -- too abstract a lesson, but I mean to say -- mean to say,

and that's the important rediscovery, we are involved. Our four senses promote us from one state to another. The four senses can only be -- I'm only speaking of the four, I could also speak of taste, although that's -- in this moment -- perhaps it may be forgiven if I omit it -- smell, eye -- ear, and touch -- transf- -- transpose, traject, carry men into four quite different vital situations. Where you use your touch, you move -- can move already. You inherit the earth, because there are roads, there are paths, you see, there are hallways, there are staircases. All this is history which you inherit. You enter upon a process that has been already formulated. When you follow your hunches, and you go, you see -- that's quite different. You are in the unknown. You are the first. You may not look -- others may have done it, but you don't care. You don't follow other people's path here, but you blaze the trail. And the trailblazer must follow his -- here, it's very hard to describe. I wished -- we live in a very dangerous world. I have to rediscover this by words, because your children will not be able to go into any land which has not been chartered.

I am the last American, I think, who has been able still to climb a mountain that had no name, that was not on the map, and give it a name and be accept- -- found acceptable by the geographical authorities. And I am very proud of this. And it's gone. There is no white -- spot on the map that is the visible simile of the good life, that as young people we enter the unknown, you see, and follow our hunches faithfully, can no longer -- the parallel in the physical world -- can no longer be handed over to the young. It's all too well known. And I don't know what's going to happen. That's probably the -- this yearning for the space travel, you see, that they try to find something that is not yet traced, and is not yet, you see, projected to the eye sense. But I'm afraid the next time that Mr. Carpenter goes up, a photographer of Life will accompany him.

It's more serious than you think. I think we cease to be able to found communities, as we are already now, when we begin by eyesight. The person next door doesn't look nice enough to join a community. Religion can join a community. That is a common obedience to a common command, as this whole country has been settled by religious communities at first, you see. Because that's the only way. What they saw was horrifying. It was deterring. They looked poorly. They were in rags. They froze. They had red noses and blue -- blue ears -- and they certainly were an ugly bunch in this distress, you see. But that -- what did it matter? Their children looked...

[tape interruption]

...for anything. I mean, this man is just pestiferous, and he- -- he'll corrupt

anything. Any order of society that is -- is filled only by people who want to be shown, cannot stand for one moment, because we cannot tolerate, you see, anything that is not perfect. Now we are very imperfect indeed. The first thing is -- we have to learn is that in the meantime, as we say, you see, we look mean. I think the time is up. I'm not satisfied with what I have done today because I have not carried the thing far enough. I'll try my best next time.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

(I'm troubled by your -- your ranking of senses. It seems to me that {to} put the nose first excludes what is obviously a much more intimate sense -- taste.) I apologized in the beginning. Perhaps you overheard it. I said last time I would for brief- -- -ity's sake, omit taste. I wouldn't deal with it specifically. I might have, you see. You're quite right that you argue. But I have -- I think my argument doesn't suffer from this omission really, because the other senses are the ones that are, for example, used in the mental -- so-called mental processes. I mean, when you corrupt the children in your school, you use the other senses, hearing and -- and seeing, you see. So, since I want to rescue the child from you, I had to stress this abuse of seeing and hearing, you see. The smell in a school is very poor.

And so this would apply to taste, I mean { }. You're quite -- I mean, it is quite right that taste is even more central. But -- it would take me just a -- perhaps at the end of this turn, I can come back to this. There is -- it's a real omission, I know it.

Ja?

(Yes, I have a question. Maybe you haven't -- you -- you're -- you were going into this further this evening. Considering our -- your criticism of our being analytical of things before we do them, that we see it pass before us, we analyze it before we -- or tend to analyze it before we go into it. I wanted -- I was very confused by what you mean by "analytical," I think, because as an example, an architect builds a building. He has to draw on past experience and be fairly analytical about what he's going to do. In other words, he doesn't want the building to fall down. On the other hand, too, he can exhibit his flair for this particular task by architecting a different sort of a building, for instance, a church. He -- he could -- )

Well, you know well that we emerge from a period, from a century, in which a façade was drawn first and then something was put in. On our campus where -- at Dartmouth College -- we have an old Dartmouth Hall. That's the oldest building of the campus, allegedly, you see, and when you look at the front, which was rebuilt twice because arson burned it down, you have no idea what's going inside. All the rooms are carefully concealed and this they call architecture. So I mean, if you follow the eye, the architect is a poor architect. If



he, however, reproduces his movements through the building, then it might be possible for a visitor -- for a Pentagon, you see -- to find your way through it. But we emerge just from a period in which the eye dictated to the -- to the architect his behavior or his -- his craft, and the results are terrible, or have been terrible.

(So, he was being analytical...)

But you now call functional is an attempt to overcome, you see, this dead, still-life of -- through -- through the eye.

(Well, I -- I -- I think maybe I'm being too specific. I'm -- I'm trying to generalize in -- in the sense of, what is being analytical about something and -- and drawing from past experience?)

If the architect analyses movements, he's doing all right. If he analyzes vistas, he's doing wrong -- going wrong. So you see the eyesight { } difference.

(Yes.)

The word "analytical," of course, can mean good things and bad. I mean, in the -- I tried to show that it is the exaggerated importance of what we see which is behind this -- beginning with analysis. Because you can only analyze, usually, what -- what can be seen, or can be made visible. Rorschach tests, you see. And so we are all treated as insane. Well, we misjudge people from seeing, don't we? Is there more? I mean, your question is a -- is very useful because we must -- of course, I'm very willing to sacrifice the term, "analytical." What I've started with is the --

(Well, that helps a great deal.)

Wie? What else? Ja? No? Eloise, no question? Ja?

(I might have one for Don {Hartzog}, the Presbyterian chaplain who was here last time, who asked about the -- the odor of death that one associates with Golgotha as -- as one of the senses; wanted a response.)

Well, I'm very glad you asked this question. The difference between ani- -- the animal and the human being is that all animals run away from death. And

man has -- begins to be man at the very moment where he buries his dead; that is, where he stands by the corpse. That's super-human. And the recognition that my -- your death is my event, an event in my life, and has to be recognized -- as such, you see, is the beginning of history. The funeral is the first state. That's why all tribes, you see, all primitive people lay great store by the dirge, by the -- Jew -- the Jews, who are the most conservative people of mankind -- at this moment, as long as they have not gone back to Palestine, you see, still have wailers. The women wail and the -- men intone. You can see the transition from the animal cry to articulated language in this relation -- up to St. Paul, you see, and his famous and notorious words about the women -- the women in the services of any group shouted, wailed, cried, and did -- the men spoke. And when he says, you see, that the wo- -- women shall be silent in the congregation, he means -- he prepares them for their role today where they are allowed to be ministers because for 2,000 years they haven't wailed and shouted. This is unknown. And the suffragettes abuse poor Paul because he has -- he has trained the female sex, you see, in coming over to the men's side by only -- by talking also -- speaking also articulately. All services of the magna Mater or Venus, of -- of Hera were -- such a way that the women, you see, would represent the -- the first stage of sound and tone, and as -- as I said, wail, shout, and chant -- sho- -- what's the opposite of -- of wailing. What would you say? Ju-- what's the verb of jubilation?

{{ } "be joyful"?)

And a -- a friend of mine -- just to show you how primitive people go back to this -- a friend of mine lived on a -- on a broad way in Berlin, Germany, when Hitler came to power. And had a -- very beautiful windows looking over the -- the main street and -- Unter den Linden. And one day he was in his front room when several women appeared in Nazi uniform, and said they were ordered to come -- go here. There was a procession, you see, something big for the party, for the Nazi Party.

And he said, "But what are you going to do in my room here? In my lodging -- I don't understand."

"Oh, we are -- have been ordered to -- to jubil- --" to -- what is it? To jubilation?

(Rejoice?)

No! To make the noise of jubilation. Not enjoy at all. Make others enjoy it, or frighten the others, I don't know. But I mean, certainly make a terrible noise, you see. That's a return to real primitivism. And this -- this division between men and women was -- and in the first days of mankind -- that only the warrior spoke articulately and the woman shouted. And -- and with Christianity, you see, the transmission of articulated speech to the woman, even in religious exercises, became common. And the ignorance of our ministers only is so great that they do not even know what to tell the suffragettes. They don't understand that St. Paul, you see, created for the first time the qu- -- the equality between woman and man. As you know, in the synagogue to this day the women have -- do not participate. And the orthodox synagogue, you see, the man still says in his prayer book, you see, "I thank you, God that I have not been created a woman." That's very important, you see. Because all these old stages of -- of utterance have been kept and the transition from animal to man is marked out by man's fortitude to face the death of his hero -- of his leader. And what we call hero-worship is exactly this, you see: the worship of the hero. A great passion is necessary is to overcome your first reaction to run away. A corpse is not a -- nice thing and it takes some persuasion to say "This is such a great man that he has to have a state funeral," you see. The natural man simply -- as a horse does, I mean, any -- any animal, you know, runs away from the herd when it feels it must die. And retreats. And the others leave him alone. No animal -- when it can, I mean, when it isn't shot by men, I mean -- dies within the fold, you see. It runs away into a corner, hides, and is no longer seen. And that's the way it ends its life. We have drawn death into the limelight of the group. And we gather around and the blessing of the dying man is, of course, through all antiquity an important part of his -- of the correct, so to speak, career of a life inside the group. And we, of course, have lost sight of this. We have -- we conceal again the dead people. We let them die in a technical way. We dr- -- I mean, we -- we drug them, and so on. That's just -- a sign of the complete disorder in our society -- that -- a father and a mother don't say farewell to their children when they die. I have been privileged that my father took his leave from all his children and gave to every child what had to be said. And it's -- I'm told that this -- most people avoid this. It's quite a different world in which a man lives who has been blessed by his father in his dying -- on his bed -- deathbed, and somebody who hasn't. It makes a difference. And certainly for the origin and the power of speech, it is very decisive. All imp- -- the words that tie together nations, communities, congregations, you see, reach only stature and stability when the living and the dead and the newborn all belong in -- to some continuous stream. I mean, nothing is worth

doing that doesn't outlast your or my life. You can leave everything that is only for your own fashion and your own appetite. This isn't very important. You can do it or you cannot do it. I mean, it is of no relevance. It is indifferent. But something that will be done by your child becomes very serious. And that's why education is a tormentious process, because mostly we -- we achieve the opposite. That the children do the opposite from what we want them to do, after we have gone. So it's a big mystery. How can we, you see, live in a society in which our grandchildren still will continue the path we have started on? I think that's a concern of the -- of the Birchists. It's their better instinct -- the better part of their instinct is this continuity, you see. They express it in a funny way, because it certainly is the -- the wrongest way which they try to achieve this end, you see. Coercion will never do, or fright, fear, or so. But the riddle of your and my existence is, "What have we in common with our grandparents" and "What have you in common with your grandchildren" If you have nothing in common, good night to Southern California.

When the great humorist and Catholic, Chesterton, came to New York, you see, the waiter showed him the city and said, "Isn't it magnificent?" They had all the skyscrapers which you now intend to bring -- build up in Santa Monica. And he, Chesterton, of course, was frightened to death and said, "Oh yes, Sir," to the waiter. He was very polite. "You're right. It's a wonderful city, but will it be here tomorrow?"

You see. That is the whole question of all -- everything we do. And if death is not conquered, or realized, or faced, there's no hope. Mankind then will go in w- -- in circles. You all assume that you have the power to achieve something that your children will continue, and you all do continue -- mein the whole University of California, the state of California, everything is based on the assumption that what in 1849 has been started in -- by some hook and crook -- is going on, a very mis- -- despite the death of everyone who lived that -- there 100 years ago.

That's what we are concerned with here. The topic of my lectures is, "Which power enables us to establish what is called history and what is called society and what is called continuity?" And where -- the first question you wi- -- you may ask me is, "What does it matter? Tomorrow I'm dead." Because the funny thing is that not one of the existing people here in this room will live 100 years from today. And yet, what I say here is for this reason not irrelevant. I -- it has to be said here today, for this very modest -- attempt to -- for all of us not to go so astray that there will be no 2- -- no 2050. It's obvious, you see, that we speak

for this purpose here. Therefore, the death of every one of you has in one way -- be noticed, because you have to be replaced. And in another way, it has also been acknowledged, because it is true that we all die, and we are gone, and there must be room for others. But they are not just others. But they are successors. They are our heirs.

And so, the -- your question -- may I sum it up? To the senses, which man has been given and shares with the animal, there is given this strange metamorphic power. We not only smell, but we scent, and have a flair for politics because it is not that -- a physical living body only dies, but you can flair -- scent that something is rotten in the -- the state of Dane, that something is dying. And I told you in the beginning, you weren't here, Mr. Meyer, but this was my first point and I like to stress it very heavily, that man is in this strange position that he is born into a changing universe. As a child in the first 13 months of his existence in -- outside the womb of his mother, he is still in the womb of language and this language changes every -- ever so often, all the time, so that a child born in 1962 receives an equipment of speech into his nervous and muscular system which is quite different from what his grandfather received. And -- that's the first great difference from the animal that every one of us is born into a -- into a different equipment, and I told you that the biologists say that man should be carried in his mother's womb 22 months. But instead he's only carried 9 months in his mother's womb and 13 months outside and the protecting society, with its swaddling clothes and its cradle, you see, and the -- its wet nurse, make up for these 13 months and while the body of the mother functions, of course, in the natural world without any historical change, the 13 months in this second womb of time are constantly changing.

And I told you this raises, of course, the obvious question that we, in our lifetime, after -- we have born -- been born into a changing environment, are obliged at the end of our life or before the end of our life to change our legacy. Our children must not inherit the same world into which we came, you see. But we have to bury that part of this world, you see, which deserves to be buried. And man is an undertaker, if he understands his position in this world, you see, as much as he is -- historical being receiving a changing world. And so -- your question is the central -- brings up the central distinction between man and -- and animal. All our senses can be used for transcending the living environment. They -- we can reach into the past because we have the scent -- not just for the animal next door, you see, next -- our neighbor in space -- but we also can have a flair for what is rotten in the wider environment, which has been taken out and buried. We not only bury heroes, we also bury laws. We bury -- tear

down houses, you see. We re-erect houses. That is, the change between -- life and death is our constant commission. We are trustees of this life process, you see, just as a child, as a baby is so wonderfully new. Every child who tells the truth is a genius, because it can receive new elements, and no animal can. And every man is a founder, because it is -- entrusted to him to decide what has died -- what has to be buried, and what shall go on and has to live. He makes the decision, or she makes the decision. Every mother does when she selects the words the child learns, you see. And if you omit all the four-letter words, then the child will learn them somewhere else. It is better you tell them. I mean, there is an over-burial. You can bury too many things. Then -- then all proper -- you cannot bury something that's alive. It will take its revenge and crop up in unforeseen places.

Second, if you look at the eye, there's insight. We see also things of the past, and we have to decide by our insight -- the human eye doesn't see it physically here in this room -- but insight tells us, you see, which wisdom has to be taught again. And so is this with the other senses. I hear with my outer ear. But already St. Paul said, as you know in Acts, that "They have ears and hear not." The prophet said it, by the way. And "They have eyes and see not." Our eyes again can jump -- jump across the abyss of death. And there are things that have lived before us, you see, that are so monumental that they must not be allowed to die. Take the Constitution of the United States. Take the American flag. You take it for granted, you see, that you are responsible for their afterlife. They must not die. And so this decision bet- -- of life and death -- I'm going to speak on this at the last meeting, I hope, and you -- you know in your -- in your index, in your schedule, it's the -- the title of the last lecture, that speech is a life-and-death struggle.

But at -- at this moment, it's { } I have said, useful for you to consider these words, "insight," "obedience," "flair," and "style" in architecture, for movement, for stylized movement -- there are other words, by the way, too; just have not -- don't have them on my finger -- or the tip of my lips -- where we transfer the physical act of -- of seeing, you see, to this larger confrontation with everything that are in us. "I can remember," you see, and then make this decision, "Is it alive or is it dead?"

So, I've -- I thought it was too difficult to start today with this question of -- this decision between the living and the dy- -- dead, but it's just as well that you brought it up. There's much more to be said, as you can imagine. But the first thing is: men must face death, animals can't. No animal can face death, the death of its -- a part of it is --. It runs away from it. And people today become

animals because they do run away from death and leave it to undertakers and paid agents and -- to -- to bury their dead. That's not the way of dealing with death. Death has to be faced. And of course, it can only be faced by a greater love that overcomes the awe and the atroc- -- atrociousness of death. Dea- -- dead people look badly, I assure you. I mean, if you come to think about them. They do not look it, because the embalmer today shows you a face, you see, of the Archangel Gabriel. And that's -- that's so wonderful. You pay for the angelic face of your beloved. But I haven't to say anything. You just go here to the cemetery and see what they're doing.

I mean, we -- you live in a -- the big lie, you see, that death is not to be contemplated. But it's constantly with us. And if you don't exercise this, your privilege to decide between death and life, you just become perfectly in- -- unimportant and you are in the hands of rabble-rousers and demagogues and -- those are people who shout, and usually shout that -- that Jesus has to be crucified and Barrabas has to be set free. That's exactly the typical decision, you see, of the -- the masses who are not accustomed to decide between life and death. If you -- if they don't decide, you will always kill the savior and always worship the Neros. It -- can't be { }. Mr. Hitler is a very good example.

{ }, in this meeting today, I thought -- is there -- are more -- any more, further questions?

Here is still one seat. A good seat. There. Come. There are here two seats, yes? Let me go backward for a moment in order to go forward. Again, that's a very human thing. No animal can take a head start. Because it means to go in the opposite direction, you see, for the direct -- opposite from the direction wh- -- which you really want to take. No animal can make a detour. A circus may teach an animal to go round. An animal, when it see -- knows there is the door, it has to go right to this door, and it -- it is a very, you see, takes a long training because you -- before you can teach a horse or a dog to go around. That's the -- is -- we can. We can act visibly against the intention which we, you see -- in the end, wish to fulfill. Any lady whom you meet on the street, will not tell you by her walk into which door she will turn. You can say it of every man in which -- where he goes. You can never say it of a lady. If you can, she is not a lady. Let us look back. I have tried to show you that our speech consists of three

layers: names, with which the speaker and listener greet each other and make peace between each other. We meet here in the name of truth, or of common interest in the secrets of our togetherness. And so the name of -- well, say, truth and the name of you people who have written in and paid your dues, and my name, you see, bring us together. Now we exchange words. That's our human side. I speak to you and you ask questions. And so we are on a level of words. They are totally different from names, because your and my name sticks to us for a lifetime. The words come and go. They are of every -- of one day. They have a short life. Names are long-lived.

But there is something else to names which I would like to add today. Most people -- most all linguists ignore this. From the very first day of mankind, man has desired a universal language. Not a technical language like Esperanto, but a really, fundamentally one, unified language, an ir- -- irresistible unity, the same unity that we mean when we speak of the fact that God is one and unique.

You see this from the fact that names are international. The name of Christ lived -- can live in any language. Unfortunately also the name of Mr. Hitler. The name of Julius Caesar. The name of Charlemagne. The name for "king" in Hungarian is still to this day Karl, Charlemagne, you see. {K rolyi}. I can't understand why people do not see that the -- the language of mankind already has one-third of worldwide validity.

A friend of mine, a surgeon in the First World War, had to treat a Hindu who had been -- who had been made a prisoner and was -- had to be operated on. And the Hindu trembled. He was afraid of -- what would these -- these wicked Germans would do to him. And my friend saw his fear and so he bent over his bed and said three times distinctly, "Rabindranath Tagore." And the prisoner began to smile because he knew the name of this great Hindu poet. And anybody who could intone this name had to be a friend.

That's a great story, I think, to show you that from the beginning our names overlap. They go through the whole world, negatively or positively, as blessing or as a curse. But all the linguists, the grammarians in their nationalism of the last hundred years have tried to persuade you that even names are only part of your own little national group. That's not true. The names all, you see, go across, so that Miss Anderson and -- and Luther King are even known in Alabama. That's very serious, because it shows you that man -- it is not true that primitive man, that Adam and Eve did not aspire at the same unity of the human



race as at which you aspire. We are forced now today, under the impact of the bomb. The unity of mankind is the yearning of every human being since man was born on this earth. He didn't have the technical means to achieve it. He was separated by incredible obstacles. He had to dread his brother man so he -- the Eskimos went into a region where they just wouldn't meet anybody else. And -- yes, we can prove they were the Quakers of their days. They just didn't want to bear arms. There have been such tribes. In every time -- at every period of history such a movement as the Quaker movement has existed. You mustn't think that's very original. As all other denominations have existed, I mean, the other trends, you see. Even Episcopalians. And in -- in some form, that is, the aim, the -- emphasis has been on all these problems of all the denominations, you see, and every one type you may call is a -- an anticipation of one denomination. Today we have 287 denominations in this country, and a thousand years back you had 287 tribes. I don't see much difference.

Yes, there is a difference. There is the knowledge of all these denominations that they belong to each other. They spread from one root. And that is the essence of the -- our -- Christian era: that now people have enacted this worldwide namedness, you see, and can act upon it. And the other -- the prophetic era, you see, of the era of the old law to which not only the Old Testament belongs, and all the nations of the earth, of course, they waited for the moment in which they could make each -- the other understand that they were all out for the same, that they wished to achieve unity, but in their own -- on their own -- in their own groups { } exactly in the same direction. Only the other groups, you see, did not know, that the -- the others were on the same way. Some even knew. If you read the history of the red Indians, there is a great awareness between the five nations -- that, you see, that's why they united, these five nations, with great ceremony, that they were destined to become one.

This I wanted to bring back to you because we today in the la- -- in -- in -- in the last 150 years have been, as you know, sold down the river to the naturalists who say that speech is something natural: the -- the animals grunt, and groan, and shout, and cry, and in their estrus they sing even, the birds; so man does just the same. That is untrue. Man's common language begins -- language begins when he names the dead and doesn't forget them and stands by when they die and accepts their parting breath.

In China today, there are s- -- is still a great group of people who lay great store on the presence of the children when the parents die. And when this isn't possible, some substitution has been made. The breath of the dying has to be received by the living, so that they cannot forget that a part of their system, you

see, goes on. And the same breath, you see, is transmitted through all the generations. And where there is one name, like Iroquois, or Apaches, for one tribe, it just means that death is overcome. That's a victory over death, because the name lives on. We have nothing except the name. At -- at first you can, of course, have a -- a tomb. But for a migrating tribe, the tomb is not very important because they leave the place; and so the tomb, you see, cannot constitute the center of their existence. They have to be on the move. That's why language is the very mysterious gift to man because he can conquer death. The living know that they have been named by the -- by the dead and they know that they have to give the s- -- name of their father to the son. That's why the grandfather and the grandsons usually have the same name, you see, in many peo- -- in many nations, because in this way the memory is testified to. It is no superstition in this that they think the son is, as some anthropologists pretend to know, is the grandfather. It's simply the reverence for this sacred gift of the name.

I have always found that in -- at -- at closer inspection that the natives certainly are wiser than the anthropologists. The exaggeration of the anthropologists, I mean, a man like Malinowski, is just unbelievable. It's a scandal. This {distort-} -- I wouldn't think this possible that people poke such fun at -- at -- at great realities.

We have in our -- in our tradition three words that specialize with regard to names, words, and numbers. Since this is unknown, especially also to the theologians, I thought you might be interested to see that hope, love, and faith have very much to do with these three groupings.

We hope when we know something. That is, hope is coordinated with things. Something to be hoped for means that we know the appearance of this and it's worth to think that we would wish to have it again, or we wish to have usually more of it. You have a child and you hope that you will have more children. Or you have seen a child and you say, "I hope to have children." That is, hope is always -- and that's unknown in this country. America is the country of hope, but it is also the thing of bric-a-brac and things and of Sears, Roebuck. And in the catalog of Sears, Roebuck, you can see all the things you hope to possess one day. Well, I'm quite serious. I do not poke fun -- it is necessary to have things. We would be naked if we didn't want them. But it is only one thing to hope for things.

And numbers express -- if I have one child, I can hope for more and if I

have one Auto -- car, I can hope for two. In -- practically, numbers express our relation to -- through hope -- with -- to the universe, sufficiently. We hope for more of what we know, or we hope for less of the plagues we are suffering from, you see. Hope always means that you start from the path of knowledge. You have already touched, and seen, and smelled, and heard what this thing can do. You have one transistor, so you get 10 more. That's un- -- since America has specialized on hope and since everybody in the in the rest of the universe will s- -- tell you that the Americans are the most hopeful people, it is quite unknown in this country that faith is of a different description.

Faith has to do with names, because it has to do with the dead. The Italians for the last hundred years had very little hopes. They were industrially backward. They were very poor. But if you came to a -- to a good family in Italy, you felt that these people lived on faith alone. There would be no improvement in their standard of living. The wages would not go up. The career would not be great, you see. Quite the contrary. Two of the children would become celibates -- priests, you see -- and two would become nuns. That's not -- there was no hope. There was resignation. There was renunciation. But there was great faith that this life deserved to be lived, because it was ennobled by a great tradition. And if you were -- Veronica or even Monica, as you are here in Santa Monica. Santa Monica certainly lived not on hope but on faith. In the -- great despair, she fell over her son, St. Augustine. And the -- all the old Church had no hopes. The old empire was -- was going down.

I just read yesterday for the -- the -- the great city of Glanum at the Loire -- at the Rhône River near -- near Arles, I saw a picture of it in your -- in -- the -- university, I think yesterday, or in some official place here. And I went to the encyclopedia. I had never heard of Glanum. It just said dryly, "Great Roman city at the Rhône River. Destroyed in 480." Well, I assure you, thousands of cities were destroyed in 480. And the people had to live that down. And there was no hope, you see. And the whole first thousand years of the -- our era have only become the cradle of Christianity because people had to show that the secular ruin did not alter the way of mankind. That is no reason to despair, because our life is not built on hope, but on faith. If it isn't, it is not founded at all. It will be shattered. And most people in this country you talk to, or most ministers, do not know the difference between faith and hope. And that's truly hopeless.

Now faith defies numbers. Because a grain of seed, faith, one little power enables a -- a child, for example, to begin to swim. You push a child into the water, you see, and it had -- it has to let go. It's not act- -- done by hope. By this act of faith, you have told him, "You can swim. You -- I've shown you -- to --

shown you the movement." At this very little moment, you see, which is infinitely small and short-lived, you see, by an act of faith a new act of life can begin, a new scene, a new stage of life can begin.

Faith, I expressed it in the sermon which I gave here a few weeks ago -- not here, but in the East -- that by hope you can produce bigger and better elephants. But by faith, you can know that you have to stop producing elephants. That is, faith say -- can say no, you see. I can assure you that all the great changes in my life have been brought about by an act of faith that I knew something would happen, and I wouldn't have to do -- {were} not allowed to {move}. I had to wait till this thing would occur. I only could get ready. By hope, you see, I would prepare everything. I would know where to go. I haven't come to this country on hope. I had nothing to hope here. I came on faith. That's something quite different. And therefore it didn't matter what happened to me here, you see. I had no ambitions. I o- -- came here because I knew I had to go to America. And my only prayer was, "I want, I'm ready, Dear God, to go to America, but please spare me New York."

So now I'm in Los Angeles.

May I invite you to be quite serious? Faith can never be a quantity. It is quite impossible to numer- -- ma- -- use any numerical thing. Hope can always be thought of as quantitative -- in quantities. In some form or other, you can put the numerals to your hope. You can say, "I hope for two children, up to five, but not more."

About love I have nothing to say. That is the intervening grace, you see, by which we try -- are allowed to tie together faith and hope in -- in the meantime. And to -- to keep the peace between those people with whom we had -- have common hopes and the new group with -- we'll -- we meet in faith. I can give you another contrast between hope and faith, between numerals -- or numerical life -- life in quantity, life that can be numbered, that can be measured by income groups, by dollars and cents, by weight. Any hope is shared because we have learned to hope with the people with whom we live in our community. The good things of life, nobody of us enjoys them alone. You come from a good family and there was a sofa, so you ho- -- hope always to have a sofa or a couch, or a bed to sleep in. We are very spoiled today. We think it -- it is just ordinary that everybody has a bed of his own. As you know, a hundred years ago that was very great luxury. Very few people had a bed of the- -- their own. But let's -- take it -- see then that hope is always connected with some "we." Our hopes can be understood by others who share our experience of the good things of life.

Faith is -- will always found the next church, the next congregation, the next community. You're all alone. While I was preparing my emigration to Am- -- America, I lost all my friends, the old ones. I had no new ones. That took time. I'm very happy to say that now after 30 years, I wouldn't change. The "we" has come, but it hasn't come by hope, because I didn't know any one of you. I didn't know who even I should meet, you see. And the whole stratification of society in this country is so different from the other that certainly all my friends here are of a different denomination, connotation, profession than they used to be in Germany. This is not an identical -- you see, I -- and no identity. Impossible. This is quite unknown, because -- people always only think about life, but they don't speak it, or they don't listen to what they are saying. Faith then is before we enter the next group and has the pow- -- power to found groups. By faith, we are allowed to find our friends. By hope, we remember those hopes which we have -- they have -- we have shared with others. So faith is based on our power to stand alone, and hope is -- based on our gratitude and our -- on our loyalty to the -- to those good things which we have enjoyed at home, or in our country, or on a journey. We remem- -- remember our comrades, our friends. Since -- I had to say this, because people, of course, when you talk of names, words, and numbers, they go to dictionary -- as of the end of Webster, you have a biographical gazetteer, and you think that's names. And then you have numbers, then you look at the arithmetic book. And then you have words for the -- from the dictionary. This is not what I mean. I mean three levels of human speech. We speak in words of things. We speak to people, who have names and with whom we exchange words, and of the things we have numbers, I wanted to say. And we are called by names, by the power that make us wince and make us speak. And we call them -- the Bible calls them "principalities and dominions" and the ancients called them "gods." And the gods under God are all those powers that make you speak either the scientific jargon or the -- the ch- -- you see, the baby talk in the -- in the nursery, and all these various jargons which you can exchange ad {lividum}, but were all held together by the superior -- language of important names. All your nursery rhymes cannot dispense with the fact that you also have to know who is the president of the United States, and to write to Washington when it is necessary.

So three languages, and languages of -- on three different levels of you- -- of behavior -- one down below us, the things that we can use, peruse, throw away, waste. The people we have to reckon with as our equals we speak to, and the gods from whom we receive orders to be a scientist, or to be politicians, or to

be mothers, or to be teachers or whatever the command is. Any profession you have, any state of life has come to you by -- if you did right in life -- by a divine order, by some superior authority. Many people, of course, have their divine authority in their wife, but that doesn't -- is not bad at all. Authority dispenses, you see, with your own will, and you gladly conform to a general will, to a universal will, to something that has to be done. If this country needs doctors, I hope we'll always find people who obey this call and become doctors. And if you need chemists, then more people will study chemistry, as they do today, to my great regret.

In the second lecture, I tried to show you that we are torn and schizoid to the bottom of our being at every moment. Demands of -- on us are made to different parts of our -- of our living body that are contradictory, because the sense of smell introduces the new attraction. We are attracted in a new direction, when we have the s- -- flair, there's life. When the Gold Rush occurred in -- in 1849, as you know, the people went there like mad. And half of them lost their lives. And Mr. Orozco, the Mexican painter, has painted in Dartmouth this terrible picture where the people lie on the ground and -- trying to smell the gold. As you know, gold doesn't smell. And it is a perversion, a gold rush, of course. It's a terrible story, I think, that people lost their lives just for this stupid purpose of letting other people steal their -- their finds. You -- I just have to bring to your attention the -- the Swiss -- what's his name, in Northern California? Wie?

(Sutter.)

Sutter, you see, who lost his life in the process -- or who lost his fortune in the process. He always stands out for me as the only wise man in the whole battle about the gold. You see, he had just settled there and they drove him away. He had made the -- the country fruitful and the goldseekers -- well, at the end, it was all in Boston.

The nose is not given, as I think, for seeking gold, but for what is the future, what is lively, what has life in it. And the smell in us is connected with our deepest systems, the most eternal, with our sperm, with our genitals. And it is that system that is least vocal, and it is that part of us that is usually covered up by everyday speech or it's the everyday -- men or women speak up about these things, they use very often obscene language because they are afraid of it. It is so mysterious and so secret -- the destiny of man through the eternity of our gene- -- genetic powers that when the everyday man turns to them, he has no language for them. That's the reason for the obscenity, you see. That's why books on sex are not obscene in themselves, but only when they use everyday language

for the greatest divine powers of man to be eternal. Sex in itself is, of course, not sex when it is transfigured by song, as The Divine Comedy is on love, but nobody would call it obscene, you see.

But the American mistake is not to know that sex without song is sin. And sex, naked, as to the physical moment, is -- is -- is revolting. It is endless. When we fall in love, we enter eternity. And this country will only wake up, I think, to its destiny if it drops decisively the term "sex." That's an unnecessary word. It's -- it's my equipment for love, but it is nothing in itself. It's very strange. If you {maybe even} have two kitchen spoons and you will not call the dish which you prepare with the instruments. Very funny idea. I can't understand it. Now this reaches then into the depths of our unconscious or subconscious -- that's why Mr. Freud could sell you this idea that the subconscious is, you see, the -- the realm of sex. Consciousness is too cheap. Consciousness is of the moment. A man who has only consciousness is a very poor third. I had -- that's another thing do not understand in this country. Consciousness in this country is at a premium. I thank God when I don't have to be conscious. I mean, I don't understand why this is anything better than to be unconscious. Why should -- self-consciousness is a curse. Do you think that while I'm speaking I am conscious? I try to tell you something. I'm perfectly unconscious.

This is another vice, you see, this -- which comes when the five senses you think are lodged in the brain and photograph, as you think, a universe that is lying before you to be seen -- a still life, you see, and you take it all in. I answer to this, and I provoke -- want to provoke you on this, that our senses locate us in a constantly changing universe. While our smell works, you see, we are moving and attracted to the living future, to what is to be created, what is to be produce. Whether it's beauty that attracts us, or the political direction this country has to take -- take the abolitionists, or women's suffrage, or today the Peace Corps -- a -- a man smells that this is the future. And he goes there, although he will perhaps see this future realized 100 years from now, you see. It has -- can last long beyond his own lifetime, this aim that he participated in. No movement could ever have been started by this scent, by this flair, unless people were totally indifferent to their own routine existence, and their own little bit of physical, individual { } {business}. But their sperm, the eternal race in him, the eternal man, that had to be carried into this new form and whether his own body went to pieces over this, that's just as indifferent as the beauty of a young w- -- woman who sacrifices so that the children may be born. What -- who cares that a ch- -- a girl was -- was beautiful at 25 if there -- at least when she is 50, there are beautiful children? Isn't that -- that's the important thing.

So please, see that smell appeals to our power to move away from all antecedents. Smell attracts us as faith does. Smell is the physical basis of faith. I printed this in 18- -- 1919 when Germany was down and we didn't know where to turn. I said, where God turns to, we must have the scent for. Wo Gott hingehet, daß müssen wir wittern. And I think that's still the only permissible definition of our relation to the -- our creator, in as far as He beckons us from the future. We have no other relation to Him.

Now with hearing, you see, as I said -- told you before -- embeds us in the universe. The waves of song and -- sound, go through us and we are inside of it. So the tremendous power of music, harmony, and hearing -- when I call you -- is that we are inside the world, this strange world which looks cold and strange from the outside. When people talk to us, we suddenly begin to smile; we disarm; we are no longer against the world. Somebody, you see, who is saying our name with a sweet expression and a nice tone is suddenly taking us in. Now, Americans don't want to be taken in. Be taken in, it's a very nice process. You can -- save any boy whom you meet on the street and who looks desperate and wants to go into a brothel by inviting him for tea. He only wants to be talked to. He's embedded and enshrined and he's completely protected. If more people knew this, they wouldn't talk sex, given Sex Enlightenment, but they would invite people to their tea table and the whole problem would dissolve. Very strange, because you transform a man to another side of his aspect. These passions then come to rest, you see. We can transform ourselves into a -- be transmuted into somebody who wants to hear, and to speak, to sing, and to listen. And he is in -- at peace with the universe, because he finds himself inside of it.

Now with touch, it is different. Anybody who is a member of a group, of a body, who is a representative of a firm, who is a student in UL -- how do you call this university? UCLA -- and -- I have trouble.

And -- any such man is structured. The old Christians said that he is edified. But I can't use this word, "edification," because you take it sentimentally. It meant something very sober, that you were one brick in a building, that you had been built into something. "Edifice," you know the word. And that "to be edified" means to be part of a structured, visible order. Everybody knows where you belong. You, who know where you go, you see, you disappear in the morning into the library, or into the classroom, and what have you, or into the kitchen, and there is your place in the ordered world. And that's the architectural



world. And that's why I said architecture is organized, repetitive movement. We have been -- gone there before, now we go there again. And everybody knows his place. But this place is a mobile place. It's a -- a direction. It's a hallway. That's why every- -- why the modern architects are -- are not liked by me because they build these modern houses without a hall, inside of which you decide into which room you have to go. They do not think of houses as movements, but as places that are dead. And, as they have no room for the mother-in-law to stay, so they also have no hall. They have abolished this first. You come right into one room. Well, then you are not free to live in your house, you see, as you please, because the hallway is the great point of decision. The doctor goes -- can go directly into the bedroom, you see, where the sick -- his sick patient lies. The guest goes into the living room. The deliver- -- you see, deliveries at the kitchen door. These are the secrets of a house -- that the movements are organized and understood. Most people today, however, think of houses as dead entities, you see, where not the movement is decided, but the tin can, you see, where into which you are stuffed. And you get stuck.

This is very simple. I mean, this is -- who -- who -- who argued with me about architecture? Who was it? You did yes? Well I'm all for it. You understand why perhaps, now, that even the architect who -- who analyzes, you see, may have no idea that he is responsible for organized movements, and not for things, dead things. But he wants to -- to -- he has learned if you take the buildings of the Middle Ages, antiquity, the most wonderful thing in -- in -- in the castle in Brühl, near Bonn, is the -- is the staircase. Over this the Archbishop of Cologne and all his -- all his entourage walked, up and down, you see, in the order that represented the whole bishopric of Cologne. Only to show you that a staircase can be a great masterpiece in architecture, because it organizes movement, you see. Now the modern elevator, you see, cannot. You are murdered by a Puerto Rican inside.

Ja. We have abused all these forms and transformed them into the dead things. But they really recapitulate man's history with things and that's what architecture is. That you are moved in the same way in which your forefathers moved. That's why a church has a nave, towards the al- -- and you see, and you go through the nave, and turn toward the altar, and -- from the other side comes the clergy -- that represents Jesus -- Christ and the 12 Apostles, and there they meet, the mission -- the miss- -- you see, the c- -- the people and the clergy. And as soon as this disappears, our churches then begin to look, I don't know, like subway stations.

Movement is -- frozen movement, that's architecture. And of course, experienced movement, tested movement, movement that has, you see, shown to be relevant and functionally sound. You -- one should only build where movement has already been experienced in which form it should develop. That's why our modern, big factories, and our -- especially our modern administrative buildings are so very poor because they have no precedent, you see. They are a thousand rooms, and the only saving grace is that everyone has three telephones. That's against movement, so to speak. They are all on the defensive in these houses, I have the impression, you see. The one thing they -- they love -- that they can lock the door. I really think that modern building is a total misunderstanding, except the Greyhound bus station. That's functional.

Sight dismisses us and -- or the thing we see. There is a division. I told you there are two spaces. What we see, belongs -- you can paint a still life about it. And you are no longer attracted. You are no longer embedded. You are no longer structured. And the eye is given us to distinguish life and dead -- living and dead things. And we fasten our eye, of course, more easily on the things that do not run away. You cannot see a deer in its course very long. It's disappeared. Then you can look at the woods. And seeing -- you don't see the woods -- how is it? You don't see the woods for all the trees.

Seeing, then, is our dismissal. When the thing is over, you can see. Inside, we are blind. Inside, we can hear. Inside, we can touch. And inside, we can be attracted, you see, and smell. But outside, we see. And this is very important because we will see next time especially that man is of course sick today with -- beginning with analysis. Now perhaps you understand how I use the word "analysis." If you want to see first, you will never enter the kingdom of Heaven. The kingdom of Heaven is given only to those who have faith and are attracted in -- by the dark, you see, but by this deep feeling that their most sacred powers of et- -- of lasting perpetuity, overlook all hardships that they don't get a salary now. But the future in 100 years, the Peace Corps will be the condition under which this universe can hold peace.

And compared with this, you know, all the manufacturers of Los Angeles and the university are of no importance, because if the Peace Corps doesn't function, the only contribution I see America makes today to the peace of the world -- if the Peace Corps does not develop, if not more of you enter it, you can be sure that all of your possessions will disappear. And your life will be wiped out, as if it had never been, and your name will be forgotten. And you will be dead. And the death will not provoke anybody to set eyes on you and to bury you with a memorial, and with a -- a wreath -- maintaining of your memory and

your name.

This is very serious. All this modern society is going to wipe -- be wiped away. You can be sure of that. We are perfectly superfluous. What do we do? Enjoy ourselves. We say even, "Enjoy it." If you could only erase this word from your dictionary -- man is not on this earth to enjoy himself. There's nothing enjoyable about him. And you can double the consumption of ice cream, but then you have to get slimmer and slimmer again.

I mean, the affluent society is a curse. That is, when everybody has everything he wants and more. Then he only follows the most superficial sense of all, his non-genital, non-productive, non-hearing, non-loving, non-memor- -- remembering being, and hears no commands, but does as he pleases. Heavens! Nobody can stand this. I mean, I can assure you that such a society always disappears in a very short time. And why -- why should it not disappear? It's perfectly unnecessary. It doesn't keep direction with the destiny of man. And the destiny of man obviously is that -- that there has to be equalization of all the parts of the universe, you see, and no one part can shoot forward and -- and create peace or wealth all by itself and for itself. Well, I only have to remind you of our grain problem to see that it's very -- an actual problem as of today, I mean. What to do with our -- with our grain, you see. At this moment, obviously, we have -- we are just mad.

If this is so, then we are all -- schizophrenia is not the problem, but schizo- -- yo- -- -somatics. Our bodies, the soma, not the phrenis, phrenia, is split. And this disease of schizophrenia is noth- -- nothing but a metaphor for covering up the rediscovery that Mr. Rousseau and Mr. Voltaire went wrong when they thought that our five senses were just photog- -- photographs, you see, producing a unified -- picture of the universe. Again picture, you see, again vista, of the dead universe in front of us, and we could do with this universe as we understood it. I have tried to tell you last time that to understand means to have the courage to stand under the impact of these four states of our own existence, to confess that we are in love and passionate, to confess that we hear orders and want to obey them, you see, to confess that in order to obey, we have to join a -- the company of the saints, or of the soldiers, or of the professors, of the student -- always joining in with others, always becoming social. No man can hear an order and end up alone. You cannot even become a nun without finding a -- abbess who will hear your -- your vows.

Therefore, man is, by the innumerable commands, the acts of the divine power that calls us into this universe and gives us these strange verbs to understand: "go," "hear," "work," "write poetry," "travel to America," "emigrate to Okinawa," or whatever it is -- without going through all the agonizing stages, and -- because to hear an order means to open up to this transformation. Smell {weakens} us, opens us up, but makes us no longer -- disarms us. Anybody who gives in to smell falls in love, and, as you know, love is -- -making is only possible for him who not -- who lets down his defenses. The armed individual -- all of us, you see -- most women in this country, as you know, suffer from this -- from this duplicity that they don't dare to disarm, because they can't trust their males to be faithful, and therefore they can't love. And he who, or she who cannot disarm totally, cannot -- cannot realize love. It's a condition of love that we disarm. And what the doctors do, and the analysts, and -- you see, this -- they are in face of -- face to face with this, and usually don't know what to do because they do not -- they all think s- -- either because they are rationalists, that these four senses do not describe states of aggregate, just as gas, and ice, and -- and water are different states of aggregate, so he who smells or receiv- -- receives smell, and he who hears, and obeys, and he who moves by -- through organized space, and he who sees is -- is as different as water is from ice, you see. He who sees is ice. And -- however, he who smells is -- is -- is steam, is gas. He's in a -- he's dissolute. He's dissolving. He can take on a new form. I expressed it in my Sociology, you see, by formula, a Latin formula. I do not wish to impose it on you, but perhaps it helps. I said the man who is attracted, has the courage to say, "Respondeo etsi mutabor." I respond, also I shall thereby have to change -- be changed, you see. And there only life becomes worthwhile. If you do not want to be changed, you can't marry. And that's why most marriages today, or one-fourth of the marriages end in divorce, because the -- the lady who marries, as I see it in this country, attaches one condition to the marriage: I must remain the same. That's impossible. This you can see is -- do when you only stand in front of the mirror and see yourself there and your {husband}. Seeing is not believing, but seeing is -- be petrified. He who wants to see all his life or everything remains unchanged. That's why the rationalist is the most bother- -- annoying creature. From beginning to end of his life, he's always the same type. I always can -- I can write his speeches beforehand. This is very tiresome. He's a rationalist. So nothing can ever happen to him by which he has a fresh -- a fresh idea or changes his tropics -- or his topics, and the safest thing for modern man, of course, is to have a ghostwriter. Then he hasn't to live through anything. Well, you can study what it is -- means to live, if you take Mr. Truman, who grew under his presidency every day, because he had the courage to be

changed. That's a great man, because he was such a small man who could be changed. But that's a real man. Mr. Eisenhower certainly was not such a man. He had gone to West Point. That may be { }. Ja. It's the one thing they don't learn there, you see. It's -- I'm serious. The -- they have -- don't have to as military men. Don't misunderstand me. A type of man is needed in -- in -- in -- in West Point which is, of course, against such openness, you see, such acceptance of a historical, you see, changing position, an unknown quantity. They want to know. And they have to, and I mean, we need these men. Don't misunderstand me. All this divi-sion of labor, however, condemns many of us to fragmentary existences, you see. One of the senses is -- is preferred. And that's of course -- other people then have to take the place, you see, where this can -- this change can take place. If you would -- allow me this insight, that states of aggregate are described by our senses, that all these senses cannot develop in the same person, so to speak, as though -- in the abstract. But that while I smell, I cannot see. And while I see, I cannot hear. And while I hear, I cannot move, you see, then you would see that man is a -- really an -- in a -- a -- a tremendous attempt of our creator to tie together times and spaces. Because in our sensory system, there is embedded the power to remember a variety of states through which -- in the -- in the animal kingdom, the animal only goes, you see, in separation. If you think of the larva, and the butterfly, you see how this even ex- -- expresses itself there in a certain change of appe- -- apparition, of the appearance. The animal, you see, goes through four states, and doesn't know of its own former state at all, apparently, or seemingly. We know -- know very little about this, I suppose. But certainly you will admit that the larva in the ground, and the butterfly then later, or the worm, you see -- and the -- the -- the moth -- that all these stages for the animal mean breaks, total breaks.

Our secret is that we, through speech, have a biography. We have an historical existence. And the first biography therefore written has been the Bible, which is the biography of the whole race. And every one of us now attempts to have a parallel -- something of a biography, where his changes are recorded as meaningful, as passing, you see, in fulfillment of our calling through all the necessary stages, although we forget, as we say often ourselves, in the process. Still, at the end, you can see a wonderful harmony and unity between Lincoln, the rail-splitter, and the assassinated president at the end. It's a very painful road, but it's the only road that seems to be worth it. And that's why we celebrate next Sunday Pentecost, because here is an attempt to see in one life the life of the whole human race, you see: Christmas, Easter, Pentecost. That's not just one person, but Adam and Eve in the beginning, and the peace of mankind on earth at the end are united in these three -- three celebrations, you see, as stages in

which the child, and the man, and the savior, you see, seem to be totally separated. And yet, you and I know that they are one.

And there is one name over this whole process, you see. And you all, whether you know it or not -- the -- it makes no difference today whether you are in church or outside -- we all have taken a leaf from this example, and believe that every one of us is not a larva, and a worm, and a butterfly, you see, but is a man who has to live out his name from the cradle to the grave in the fulfillment of these -- these four situations, because we all are attracted by the love of the world. We all have to obey orders from our ancestors. We all are heirs. And we all are founders. That is, we all have to bury the dead, you see, to begin ourselves. And this brings out the -- the strange part of this situation which most people overlook. All these philosophers of the last 700 years -- from Thomas Aquinas or Abélard to Mr. Hegel and Mr. Nietzsche, have only philosophized for males, the male sex. Therefore, they have always stressed the doing, the active part, of every process.

I can only say that when you look into the secret of this growth, of the four senses through which we move, then -- of our being attracted to something new, of our obeying the orders of the game, the orders of society, of our taking up the membership in the structured body, and of our leaving alone the things that are no longer to be moved -- which you can only see from afar -- it makes little difference whether you are a worker or the owner, whether you are doing or whether you are receiving. If I speak here, I need listeners. So I can't see much difference between your allegedly passive role, you see, of listening, and my active role of speaking. Obviously there is a bridge between this role of speaker and listener, you see, and in some secret sense, we are one. You see, it's a polarity between you -- us and -- but you couldn't hear if you wouldn't speak while I am speaking, you see, in your inner man. If you only would grumble, you wouldn't understand what I'm saying. And -- I mean, if you only would constantly geh- -o against it.

So your listening is, of course, a part of this and we have overdone in the last century the distinction between action and passion. If you even know -- know that the word "passion" is a very noble word, you'd think it is just being in heat, being violent. Passion is better than action today. It has to be preached from the hilltops that people must have passion, because they overact anyway. Everybody is overactive, and the women in -- at first, when they conquered men's rights, wanted to be activists. I don't think that's the problem. But the problem for our society is to recognize that the doer and the sufferer to -- by -- both create the new order. And -- and that may be changeable. At one time, the men maybe

have to act and the woman to receive, or vice versa. In the house, obviously the woman has always been active and the mother -- the father always on the receiving end. Only in the world outside he has seemed to do the acting. And she received.

But I think it is high time that we say that our language is deficient. As long as you think that any verb, "go," "listen," "obey," "volunteer," -- that's perhaps the most general term, "volunteer," you see -- that this is always an active thing, you see. It can just as well be that y- -- the wife has to say, "Go," because he has to act -- and she has to suffer that he acts. Most great men have been saved by their woman's -- womenfolk's readiness to undergo the act of the man, al- -- although the community exorcised them, you see, exiled them. If she hadn't -- if Mrs. Marx hadn't shared the fate of Marx, there would have been no Marx. And his action, you see, and her passion are two sides of the same picture.

What I would recommend is that in -- in linguistics, you have been sold down the river because people usually only tell you "J'aime," "Je vais," "Je fais." You have not learned that "Je suis aimeé" is just as important.

Most people who go -- come to the analyst today are people who cannot be loved, who don't allow people to love them. And that's their great ill. They think, "I will love," you see. Unfortunately, to will love is just to use a bomb, you see, for lovemaking. It's impossible. Will and love are totally distinct. But in our society, in our cu- -- so-called culture -- I think one has always to sneeze when one uses this word, "culture." I always catch a cold when I he- -- hear it. There is no such thing as culture. There is obedience or disobedience. And modern man thinks that he can will those states in which active and passive are in balance. Obviously in the word, "love," which I put here as a third { } -- you see, are now speaking to each other, the receiving and the giving must be in balance. If you both want -- say, "I will love," it's out. There is no love. The divorce is necessary, because people mistake their will for this being in love, you see, being embedded in something that floods you and goes over you from both sides. And nobody can discern who's doing and who is receiving. And I think that's perhaps the greatest illness that has been done to a rationalist's theory of language. The Greeks have a special form for expressing this ambiguity, "I know not if I sink or swim," as I quoted last time. That's ho- -- called the "medium." It's a third form between passive and active. And although it -- may seem to you just a grammatical oddity, it has saved the Greeks from -- and has made them into eternal carrier of wisdom and philosophy. Our language is a dying language -- I assure you it is -- because it cannot express, except in a very circuitous way, this being in love, you see. Nobody decided who does what.

If you would know that in relation to your -- to your -- the people you love in relation to your nation, in relation to your profession -- take a doctor who loves medicine. But medicine must love him, too. He's a representative. That's a very mysterious thing, to be a representative of anything, you see, because you must do something to the thing you represent. You must change it. It must be a living process. And on the other side, it must also mold you. After 10 years of being a doctor, people must feel, "This is a doctor." That is, you get a doctor's attitude, and a doctor's face. And yet, if you are a real man, something enters the profession that hasn't been there before. You do something to medicine and medicine does something to you. Or you are just nobody. You are just a number. If you make a name in the profession, like Mr. {Osler} or {Ca- -- Cannon}, you see, then the profession looks different, after you have been there. But you -- nobody would ever be able to decide who has done what. What has medicine done for you? And what have you done for medicine?

They tell the story of Mr. Taber, the first governor of Colorado. He had much money and had an opera house built in Denver. And they le- -- led him in when it has to be opened. And he looked at -- do you know the story? -- he looked at the painting there in front of the hall and it was -- he asked, "Who is this man?" And -- and they said, "That's William Shakespeare."

And he said, "What has Shakespeare done for Colorado?" And he had his picture removed and had his picture painted.

I meant -- mean to say, those people do the most for us whose name is even forgotten, you see. That is, active and passive are minor matters in language. You must know that when we speak of an act, it is always a superior act of God. The ancients called God "Actus Purissimus." The purest action, and no persons attached. Not defiled by earthly connotations of Mr. Smith doing this and Mr. -- Mrs. Brown doing that. He is the act. The -- the crisis of 1929, the Great Depression, everybody feels it's an act of God. Who has brought it on? You can -- people have tried to -- to name the people who have brought it on. It's impossible. It's meaningless, you see.

There are always acts which we undergo. And then we run through the whole gamut of this, what I have tried to show you, of these four stations. And it's rammed down our throat indeed, that there's something there to be digested. All the verbs of human language are experienced acts where -- of which man-



kind has learned that they have to be born, that they have to be represented in us by some carrier who volunteers to take it upon himself, whether he has to govern the city, you see, or whether the -- he has to mold the metal. Think of all the professions. They're all imperatives. Somebody has to do it, you see. Or you have -- it has to become your personal hobby. Do it yourself, you see. Because the -- the craftsman dies out, you see. If there's no carpenters -- you all have to do some carpentry.

That is, these imperatives of life are processus, I would call them, and not acts. They are processes. God is the pure process. And He demands participants. And man in a strange way can hear His commissions. And he is first attracted by them, or deterred. He can run away, of course. The Bible is full of stories where the -- you see, where the man -- does run away. And the c- -- city of Los Angeles, I'm sure, is also full of people who do run away. And we all ha- -- are half and half. We obey certain commands and others we brush aside. The world will exist as long as there are volunteers for these processes that have to be undergone. And they are very painful because they transform us. We grow old under them. They take our beauty; they take a toll from us.

But we have the great honor of doing a higher will that isn't ours. And our will is so be- -- be- -- benighted that anybody who is -- tries to live by his own wits, and his own will, goes under, perishes. He has no peace of mind, because our mind is not given us to judge the universe, you see, but to participate in it. I'm sorry. I have kept you too long. But I propose at the end -- can you still bear with me for five minutes? I'm sorry. I have overstepped my time. I w- -- wish to leave with you only a picture, nothing more. And we'll talk about this next time.

I have tried not to persuade you too early that these -- smell, hearing, touch and sight -- can be put in a -- quite a different order. I call this the "cross of reality." The future, you see, beckons us from the -- from in front. We are embedded by the sound of our -- of what we hear, of what we are told when we learn to speak. We already know that we are "John" and our parents are "Father" and "Mother," and these are all orders given {us}. From now on, you have -- you can ask to be called "John" forever. So you have a claim, a civil right. And that's the inside of life. Then you -- we are structured as members of society, and that's our historical construction, our past, I call it. Structured into membership, that's the past. And then finally, we are discarded and thrown on the dungheap of forgetting, forgetfulness, and then we are out.

So every human being is -- begins as ultravert. He is thrown beyond his former self when he hears a new order. If you say, "I'm going tomorrow to marry this man," you change your status, don't you? That I call "ultraversion," because you go beyond the state of affairs as it has been yesterday. And then you turn -- in order to carry out this -- this new commission, you have to be embedded, you ha- -- you have to incorporate. It has to enter you, your system, your blood-stream. You have to be filled with it, and I call this "introvert." You may say that is -- used for other things. We'll talk about this next time. Then you go and look back on what you have achieved, and you celebrate the wedding anniversary. Anybody who ce- -- ce- -- celebrates an anniversary does this in retrospect. He's a retrovert, you see. He looks back on something he has to -- hold onto. And that's why we all celebrate a birthday today, because it's safest thing to assume that everybody has at least this one thing to look back on, even though nothing else is there.

And the last thing is: we look outward. We are extroverts. We look at this, you see, discard it, and say, "That's over with," you see. "I move to San Diego." So let's stop here. This I call "the cross of reality." Every human being is at every one moment in all four states, and that's why we are deeply torn. Man is not a harmonious being. But only if these four situations, you see, are connected with -- with other people, and they bear with -- us, can you ever find peace. Not -- in one of these states can you be all by yourself. And the problem of man is that he is not self-reliant. That's the only thing he certainly is not.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...has asked me to remind you that this is -- today's talk is called "The Blind Spot of Science." I'm a little --

(Say that over again?)

Pardon me? "The Blind Spot of Science." But I have first to finish up last time, before doing so, and sa- -- t- -- saying a little more about the cross of reality, I would like to ask, are there any questions? I think it was very profitable the way it went the last meeting, but you were asking questions at the beginning. So please -- Mr. {Hirschmann}? { }

(I was one of the { }.)

Pardon me?

(I was one of the { }.)

Well all the more you should ask.

(I have a question. I'm not sure if it's the right time to bring it up. I'm interested { } -- that you refer so frequently to the problem of schizoid society. { } psychoanalysis { } psychology only increases it, rather than helps it -- corrects it?)

Ja. I think so. I brought a specimen of such go- -- gorilla psychology to you -- so -- to try to -- show you what they are doing. And I may remark for others. I think I went too fast. Last time I tried to say that it isn't that the society -- members of the society themselves are schizophrenic, but that -- that the society is schizosomatic. The body politic -- or the body of Christ, as it used to be called formerly by the Church -- is itself split. People move in departments, especially of course, the scientists. They even call their existence departmentalized. So you can imagine what happens if the leading people -- boast of belonging to departments and knowing nothing of the other departments and establishing a complete chaos so that there's no department that leads the others or that is -- towers over the other, as formerly divinity did, or philosophy. But today, you have every field of human endeavor split up into smaller and smaller units.

They tell the story of the professors of history: one was appointed for the

Middle Ages that ended in 1500; and one began with the modern times that began in 1500; and an unfortunate Doktorand is -- doctoral man wrote a book on 1490 to 1510 and it couldn't be -- you see, it could not be censored, couldn't be marked. None was competent.

Any more? No { }.

To round out what I said yester- -- last time, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that the scientists have evaded their possibility of seeing this enmeshment, this embedding of us in four different processes through time. I tried to show you that the respiratory tract, the digestive tract, which I omitted for brevity's sake, the regenerative tract of our genital organs, that they represent different relations to time, to the moment, because before the act, we have to be attracted by the scent for the future. In the act, we are embedded, { } anxious, we are singing like children in the dark who go through the woods and there we move in musical {and} inside the process that is demanded from us and from our fellow man.

In retrospect, once we are construed, once we are built up into some unity, like a church, or like a college, or like our own family home, we have the possibility of celebrating anniversaries. And as soon as we can repeat and it has the feeling of recurrence, we have a -- quite a different organ to express this: it's our memory. Tradition is not based on anxious feeling, on expectations; but you celebrate a birthday not the same way in which you undergo the birth. That's a very different attitude of the s- -- human soul and you are just a different person when you are able to celebrate your 25th anniversary. A bridegroom, as you know, on his wedding day is a moron. He's trembling in his shoes. It's the worst day I've ever lived through in my life. I had a migraine. I don't know if -- bridegrooms never confess this, but I think it's the most awful day for a bridegroom and the nicest for a bride. Now, certainly that is not true 25 years later. There is no anxiety then involved.

And then we said that in saying farewell to an act well done, to a pro- -- process well finished, we can analyze it and can pay the bills. And we get out from this act to which we were summoned and which we underwent and which we now maintain. History is maintenance, feelings -- the ar- -- the lyrics of a -- of a life are feelings -- I -- is emotional. But the beginning is imperative. That's very different from what people tell us today is the only reasonable approach, the objective one. And the great heresy of our time is to begin with the objective instead of knowing that this always is the end of things. It's the ash-heap. It's the dump. It's the city dump on which you dump your analyti- -- ana- -- analyses.

Then it's all over. Nobody can fall in love when he begins to be objective. No girl can be married objectively.

And on this I have to say something more. In our body, there is an archaic organ which hasn't even received a decent name. It's called corpora quadra gemina. Corpora quadra gemina. Most of you have never heard of it. It's right here, and holds out against the brain. All our modern scientists in the last 200 years have insisted, as I told you, that the senses that telegraph their impressions to us, you see, are just landing in this brain, that is, of the moment, that is, in our mentality. But this archaic organ of these four little hills, it's here in back of us { } of the anatomy of the brain, seems to -- to be created to hold out for the completion of those stimuli that by the calling out of the name are evoked in us. You cannot hear the name of your child that is in agony without trembling while you are telephoning to the doctor, while you are taking a taxi {right away} to the hospital. There are many acts on which you have to use your reason. But all the time underneath there is this knowledge that a name has been called out and desires to be, you see, listened to, and acted upon.

It is this contrast for which obviously this archaic organ of the { }, the quadra gemina folds are the vestige. They serve as the polarity. The {crying}, a shout, you see, a deep feeling moves them, and they may tremble for a whole life. I'm sure that Michael Faraday had his -- had his quadra gemina moved by his decision. You know, he was a valet of a great physicist, Mr. Davis -- turned out to be the greatest physicist of the 19th century. And this command he has dutifully expressed in many of his writings, letters, and books that -- this was his lifetime vocation. I don't have to tell you any artist, any politician, any statesman, even I think Pat Nixon -- have their archaic -- gemina moved, you see, if she wants her husband to become president. Everything else is subordinate to this. Now she -- {commits} many rational or irrational acts in the process.

These acts are under what you call the scrutiny of your brain. They are rational acts. But the passion that tells her, forces her, you see, to do this, that has to be preserved somewhere and that must hold out against the little acts of the day and of the year and must live longer than the last election or the next election, you see. It's a ruling passion, as we call it. A -- quite a good expression. And strangely enough, this observation which any one of you can make, that you are somebody who then undertakes any number of acts to execute that what you are or are meant to be, this has found no explanation by the {analy- -- -ysts}. They have ruled -- they tell us, or they try to tell us, persuade us that everything moves on the same plane of today's stimulus and tomorrow's stimulus. Oh, just watch your s- -- your own steps. You know very well for the next year what you have to

do. You want to become a doctor. It takes seven years, eight years of preparation. Now what -- where are you with your mind in those moments? You undergo many different mentalities. You know exactly that you have to be supported by your bride for many years, so -- as long as she does this, you obey her orders. And many other relations -- social relations are ruled by this, your well-known, you see, received order, "This is what I have to complete."

But you confuse the little rational, logical acts which we have to commit, you see, every day with this ruling passion which holds out against all the disappointments, that makes you repeat certain steps. You may take the exams twice, if you flunk them the first. That's never explained.

Well, it isn't my invention, of course. A friend of mine was a great doctor and -- who fled to the Caucasus from the Ru- -- Germans and who then wrote me letters from the Caucasus, from this Russian bathing resort after the last war. Between '46 and '49, I received his message. We were old friends. We had published together a book on Paracelsus, the great doctor of the -- Renaissance. And so he turned to me. It was very strange, the letters actually arrived from the Caucasus in this country. And that was more than you could expect. And it was filled with his theory about the quadra gemina -- that's why he had to tell me -- and carrying out some insights Paracelsus had. He is -- who was much more modern than most doctors of the 19th century -- today are -- because he knew this counterpoint, you see, this point and counterpoint. And he knew about the -- the five causes that make us act, which I have tried to explain to you -- four of -- at least, of them. Paracelsus has said the great word which I recommend to all the ladies who are hysterical, that -- he has said every illness of man can stem from five different { }, different spheres. You can never say because you have a cold from which of these spheres you got it. It's the same with ulcers.

It's very profound. I only want -- wanted to hint at this. And I would -- ha- -- thought I should tell you that there is also physical, anatomical evidence for what we hold, and it is not true that the rationalists have the facts on their side. They have neglected this fact, that under a permanent and perpetual stimulus for a life decision, you see, the -- reason runs through all like a little mouse, you see, from one hole to the other, either tries to escape your commission, your duty, you see, or tries to find access to its fulfillment. But these little movements which the brain here harbors, and which take place in the brain, must not be confused with your destiny, must not be confused with your having heard the call and holding out. And I think those four quadra gemina hills or corpora as they are called in the dictionary, with a strange impotence of naming them, these quadra gemina points, are implanted in us -- that's why they are called archaic -- to

preserve those deeper {cries}, which our smell, our eye, our ear, and our sense of touch, the sensory nervous system, convey to us, with such majesty, and such power that they ring in our -- forever, you see, in us and cannot be dismissed. And they create the bad conscience, so to speak, when they -- we do not -- are not on the way of following out their orders, when we try to escape.

I -- this is all said only to counteract your feeling, perhaps, that I am simply singing poetry. I think the facts are on my side. It is remarkable that as -- the school of anatomy that has now prevailed in philosophy, so to speak, for 400 years, has never taken account of this possibility, you see, that there is a polarity between the older archaic organ implanted in us, because we are humans and have to fulfill our destiny, and the little stimuli of everyday life when we wake up and wait till we can go to sleep again.

May I ask you now to look at the importance of this quadrilateral of our various systems. They are all of a -- different time lengths. The regenerative tract obviously goes by generations. We fall in love, and our love stays, you see -- as long -- children can be born and our potency and our relation to old and young {with this}, so we have one tract that -- that at least is 30 years long. The eye is of a glimpse and today -- that's why people have lived so speedy because they think if you have seen it, you see, you go to -- you go to Italy, and -- you know the story of the lady who went to Venice and -- with her daughter -- and, you know it, of course? I'm sorry. Well, I can't tell a joke that's known. And --. ({ } do it anyway?)

In German, you know, the time span for the eye is called "Augenblick," what you call "moment." That's a very wise expression. What the eye embraces is the moment. But what your generative sense embraces is the generation. What your ear embraces, I would think, is a year-week. The great commands of life conf- -- dominate, I would say, not for a li- -- for a generation and not for the moment. But they might dominate seven years, 10 years, perhaps -- 15 years, perhaps. In a university, the character of the place changes every 15 years. It is twice as fast as the physical change. If you -- have visited a place 15 years ago, which is called a -- here, Harvard, or -- or Heidelberg -- don't think that it is the same place. It's one of the great illusions of the -- our age that you think there's something attached to UCLA that remains after 15 years. Nothing remains. It's a different place. If people only knew this, they wouldn't send their schools -- their children always to the wrong schools.

A school has a s- -- a -- a faster -- a faster turnover, mentally, you see, and

rightly so. The words, you see, vanish faster than a political decision to go in with a democracy, you see, or to fight slavery. Everybody ni- -- knows when he embarks on such an undertaking that is far beyond his own lifetime even, you see. That's what I have said, with 30 years is really the minimum of anything important in political life. Emancipation, you see -- independence of this country, you see -- you cannot expect that -- that this can be fulfilled in less than a generation.

And the important decisions of life, you see, will only be fulfilled by people who come after you. And if you cannot im- -- implant in them the eagerness to fulfill your task, nothing important can ever be achieved. You look at anything in this world. Greatness of our master was, as you know, that He knew this and ended His life when He was probably 30 or 34, and left it to the Apostles, because otherwise He couldn't have been -- understood. The greatness of the apostolic succession is that the Apostles were the second half of the life of Jesus. They were not just the Church, you see. But they were something between -- later the Church of Rome or the Church of Corinth -- and the Lord. They could -- if -- by -- because they were able to look back at His -- then, you see, lived after His suffering -- they could express in their -- as you know it, in the Gospels -- as well as in the letters of Paul and Peter, they could express its meaning. And He, knowing this, is the only man who anticipated their lives and left it entrusted to them, you see, the saying what it all meant. He didn't, Himself. There you have a clear example, that He impressed them by His physical walk through life with a decision to undertake something that would outlast their own physical existence. I have never understood why the Church makes so little of this abdication of the Lord, you see, in favor of the Apostles. That's His greatest act. That's real faith. He put Himself into their hands and said, "You will have to do it." Because only through this connection between His death and their preaching is there anything like Christianity left. It -- it is this way in which -- by which it came into this world. It is a very remarkable story and a very rational story. And if the people today think it is irrational, it is only because they have -- built up a psychology and a sociology in which the -- the time of Jesus is completely separate from the next 30 years. They only write life of Jesus. If they would write the death of Jesus, as it was meant to be written, you see, then they would understand that the Gospels and the letters of St. Paul simply carry out the act, you see, which He committed to their explanation and didn't try to explain Himself. So I would -- I hope still to be able one day to write just a book on the 12 first years of the Church, because we know nothing about it, when the Apostles lived in Jerusalem, you see, and the Gospel of St. Matthew was written. That's a



great story, that people worshiped the Lord every day, just in holding onto an event that had happened, you see, exposed to this political decision that worked in them: this must not be left unfinished, you see.

The moment, the 30 years -- I would insist, the 15 years -- of course, 15, you know, is just {to} say something -- and history is timeless. The retro- -- in re- -- any anniversary can be duplicated, and multiplied. You can have the 50th anniversary, the 100th anniversary. Nothing changes, officially, so to speak. In retrospect, time stands still.

Now, yes- -- last time I gave you four expressions. Stands still, time. I gave names to this. I said man, in every moment being involved in these four different circles of his activity, of his decisions, of his hopes, his fears, his expectations, also his faith -- is for this reason to be considered, as at the same time being ultravert, being retrovert, being introvert, and being extrovert. When we hear, we are embedded in the tones that flood through us. When we look, we are extroverts. We look at something outside of us. When we are thrown forward, as the Apostles, you can really call St. Paul an "ultravert," because what we call with a philosophical expression, "transcendent" -- not a good word, I think. Has the same meaning as ultravert. Beyond, more. Tomorrow is the important day. And here in { } the past, of course, you have the retrovert.

These expressions were preliminary. I must invite you -- if I shall now today criticize science -- invite you to look at the terms they use -- the people who do not know that we hang in these four different spheres, who put our senses in a -- something rather dead or sta- -- static, you see, into our brain and say, "Here I am and there's the world, and telegraphs to us smells, and -- and words, and sounds, and impressions, through the eye or through touch." These strange people, who call themselves "reasonable" -- I've never found more irrational people than the so-called rationalists; I'll tell you later why -- they call -- speak of objectivity, as you know, and subjectivity. Now these are very sick words which I do not like to use too much myself because in the 18th century, the word "subject" meant object and the word "object" meant subject. It is only -- for 700 years they had this meaning that what you call "object," you see, was called "subject." God was not an object of your praise, but it was the subject of your praise in the 18th century. It's a very recent usage which has led -- use or abuse this term, "objectivity." And I think it is necessary for you to know this, that it is a very temporal thing, this word, "objectivity." And it means that people begin at the dead-end street and end there. To be objective means to deal with things in as far as they are dead. So an objective scientist must treat the universe as something that can be weighed and measured. And where you have

quantity, you have death. Dead things can be weighed and measured. Living things cannot. You will never catch -- say anything reasonable about any one of us in this room in as far as he is alive. You can describe him, you see, as weighing five tons, but only because he's doomed to die. Weight is dead weight. That's why people want to be slim.

It is very strange that this -- this incredible perversion is -- has occurred, that people pride themselves of being objective. That means that they hate me, that they leave -- omit me from their worries. They -- they don't dream of me. If I am treated -- to be treated objectively, I don't count. Well, my answer is, "They don't count." Why should I count people who -- who try to live objectively? Let them be killed. Let them be executed. I don't care. They have said that they don't want to be loved by me. So I won't love them.

This word, "objectivity," and "subjectivity," however has reached -- they have reached such dimensions that before going over to their -- the scientist's primary sin, or crime, or omission, or idiocy -- I would invite you to use other terms yourself, from now on. Or more terms. That is, to include into your thinking not just the subjectivity of a singing girl who is in good spirits, or the objectivity of a mathematician, but also the tremendous jubilation of a man who finally knows what he has to do and who is projected into the future. The Apostles were neither objective nor subjective. But they were projected into the future. Under the pressure of the Crucifixion, there was nothing for them left but to carry out this command. Every one of you does the same. We are all projected when our task has to be considered as unfulfilled. This has nothing to do with "objective" and "subjective." It's just in another dimension. It's an -- a dimension of yesterday and tomorrow. And you are only satisfied when you can go to bed and say, "A little bit has been done." That yesterday, you see, is not all that is today visible, but there is already a beginning of tomorrow made.

I do not understand how anybody who acts -- and this is, after all, a practical nation here full of activity -- can ever have been satisfied to divide reality into "subjective" and "objective." I know very little of subjective or objective. Subjective usually -- I have a bad mood. My digestion doesn't function; then I am subjective. That's what the people, at least, tell us, you see. And objective, I'm bothersome, I'm the bore. All objective people are boring, because -- there's no contact. I'm not interested in mathematics or in -- in zoology, but I'm very interested in a bird that is singing. That's very different. The other things are for encyclopedias, for dictionaries. You have to know, of course, what to avoid. All the objective knowledge is exactly like the eye of the horse. That wasn't given to the horse by its creator for seeing, positively, but for avoiding

obstacles. If you have ever ridden, you know that the horse is very poor in its eyes- -- eyesight. It sees very little. But it must see enough not to run into a wall, not to run into a fence. And this much is the first implication of seeing -- that we can avoid obstacles. And I think if you would treat the eye today a little bit to its original meaning, that we must see in order not to run over a -- a person in -- when we drive a car, you would make very good use on your freeways on your sense of eye, of seeing.

Seeing is avoiding collision. This is the first. All the other things are transformations of a rather artificial character. The Madonna is not the Madonna of Raphael. In any deeper sense, if you haven't first heard the story and, you see, suffered with Christ and been initiated into the history of the Church -- then you can see the Madonna. Without it, it's just nothing. And our modern people who try to -- to isolate the eye sense cease to {contain}. There's no content. Abstract painting is not abstract painting, but it's objective painting. Again, this fantastic attempt to begin with seeing, without sympathy, without fright, without impression.

It can't go -- won't last long. At this moment, it seems that nobody has any commission for the future, and nobody hears any commands, and nobody has any story to draw on and therefore what else can the painter do? He is, I think, genuine today in insisting that he is deprived of the relationships to the other senses. That's very serious and painting must be -- all the senses must be trained, but you must see that we are in a -- in a complete destruction of the unity of our five senses, because of the sermon in the valley.

The last sentence -- term, which I would like to introduce therefore is "traject." Anybody who is today an American citizen, or cherishes Western civilization, or looks back to the history of science, or thought, or religious -- Church history has been transferred from generation to generation until he -- you here is -- are sitting, and in you, obviously we are in St. Augustine by-the-Sea -- even antiquity, even the time before our own era, you see, is represented. And so, any human being that speaks to anybody -- else in a -- in a civilized language which has existed now for so long, of course is trajected, transferred -- you know what a traject is -- as a ferry -- he has been ferried across the River Styx a thousand times, because the people who have formed those words and those expressions which you and I use daily, you see, -- of course have all died and yet they have been, you see, their -- their labors have been transmitted to us that we can feel that we are more than ourselves.

This is very important for all of you who have to teach the children or

students that a teacher never only speaks out of his own generation to the child of the next generation. His authority is based on this power to connect all times and condense them into a talk, you see, of the living generation to the next. This is his dignity. If he doesn't do this, if he only teaches his own nonsense -- it isn't worth anything -- he has no right to teach, then. He's just an individual. He must draw on the wisdom of the ages. And on the other hand, you see -- also see the immediate consequences, that he must treat his student as the protagonist of the whole future of mankind. You may train them -- a boy -- on tennis in his own body for the moment. If -- you can instruct a man for being a technician and a plumber. But you cannot teach a man only for his own lifetime. You must teach people so that even against their will and without their understanding, they carry something to the next generation.

Very many people are like Isaac. He was a very deep brother, as you know, and was perfectly sufficient that Abraham's teaching reached through Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph, you see. They are only the successors, but Isaac was -- had to be there, you see, opening up to future generations what had been left behind. I think he had no power. He had just an experience. He had to speak of his father, because he was miraculously saved. You see, his own execution didn't take place. And you will always therefore have to criticize -- you will have to scrutinize the modern educational methods which always begin with the child and end with the child. The child that receives an education is very unimportant -- as unimportant as the teacher is.

But today I have to say a good word for the teachers, because in our schools in this country, I think, it's the slaves -- are slaves, these teachers, because they are made -- told that they are there for the happiness of this -- children. Perhaps the parents are, I don't know this. Teachers certainly are not there for the happiness of these children. Make them unhappy, if it helps. You can't tell help -- some people -- children have to be made unhappy -- some may have to be happy. It -- alternates. But I don't see why happiness of the child has anything to do with education or teaching. There has been a great story, and it mustn't be forgotten, and who -- willy-nilly, these children must be told so that they have enough shame and enough reverence that they tell their -- their children and don't call their children Ima Hogg and Ura Hogg, but give them a decent name, for example. Mr. Hogg obviously wasn't -- had just a schoolteacher who made him happy, and so his happiness, you see, outran all bounds.

This is incredible, this theory of education. What has education to do with the living or the next generation? It is the missing link, the -- the tie between the whole history of the past and the whole future of the human race. And these

two very feeble links in between, the teacher and the student, you see, as of this moment -- cannot understand what they are doing if they think they learn for themselves. You know this expression which has driven me crazy -- { } here in my college here in America -- that the student has the right to say, "I don't -- didn't get anything out of it." He has no right to get anything out of it. He has to put himself into it. That's all. And if you -- he can't, he's just a poor student. I mean -- but the idea that he should get something out of it is absolutely foreign to the process of teaching, has nothing to do with teaching. It's a complete capitulation to the jukebox, where you throw a di- -- 10 cents in to be entertained. But entertainment is certainly not education.

I'm very serious. I feel that the only revolution due in this country is a revolt of the teachers of the -- of the grammar schools. Because they are slaves to the alleged happiness of the children. And so every year the children are more unhappy. The child is only happy when it can forget itself, into some bigger task. The rest is all nonsense. Look how they play. They all want to be different. No child that is really devoted to play wants to play itself. It wants to forget itself. They play marriage, they play soldiers. They play something that takes them far afield, outside of their impossible self. All ourselves are impossible. They smell, but not attractive.

So would you, therefore, understand why I insist that the Church, the family, the poets, the artists will remain mutilated, paralyzed, as long as they receive this stilt- -- stultifying vocabulary from the scientist that divides the reality into object and subject. For a person who has to live daily, he himself is a traject, a miracle through time, you see; finds himself at a certain point in -- in time, 1962; and has great trouble to find ways and means to elicit some hopes and some expectations for the year 2050. But that would be the minimum of any educational effort, for example.

What do I care for -- for this moment? And as soon as you use these terms, "preject" and "traject," you suddenly understand the crisis of today. The -- the dialectics, as the Marxians call it, the logic, as the secular mind calls it -- is unable to realize this quadrilateral of our true le- -- true existence. These four senses, which I have tried to make important for your thinking, are so im- -- important because they take you outside this logical twist that -- there's only A and non-A, B and non-B, or A and B. That's not real life. That's timeless life. That's a life purely in space.

The real life of -- all of us -- and now let us begin with the -- and come here over to the blind spot of science -- real life is invisible to the scientist, because he

cannot assume that not everything can be made simultaneous. The fiction of science is that we can know everything at the same time, in an ideal en- -- {state, so to speak}, because all the truth is available.

Now I've tried to show you that a man who is attracted, or a woman who attracts, that a -- a musician who fiddles and a listener who hears his music, that a historian who looks back to "we," to the flight across the ocean, or to founding of the founding fathers, and the founding fathers themselves -- that these people cannot be realized at the same time. You open the -- your Bible and you can understand one-fourth of it, perhaps in a -- at a happy day. And the next time you open the Bible, you can understand quite another chapter and other writer. It is a lie that any one on any one day can understand the whole Bible. That's the fiction of science. I understand these things very often not at all. And I have to wait a few years until I do understand. This is the same as with any Shakespeare play. It's the same with Homer. And if people would only admit it, they would be very happy, because they would know that our mind doesn't work simultaneously, because we undergo mentality. And not every mentality in our various moods and our various situations opens up to what is to be found there. You will just have to see that the -- the -- the Bible is written lyrically, dramatically, epically, and analytically. I mean, in the books of wisdom, as -- as -- for example. And obviously we are not in the full understanding of all these four states at the same time. When you have deep feelings, you see, you cannot understand complicated logical processes. And on the other hand, when you are a logician, then woe to your wife. Sh- -- he will not understand her lyrical mood at this moment. It's very strange at -- that the fiction exists today that we can know everything at the same time. And it -- that's a curse. And that's the blind spot of science, on which I now have to ask that you to follow me a little more precisely.

The -- anybody who reduces knowledge to a timeless {sum-}word, to a true mind, to an eternal mind or what you call "reason," abstracts us from our real experience. Our real experience says that at any one time, I live at a different front, you see: forward, inward, outward, backward. And you all can test this. The family is given us to realize that even externally the daughter is on the forward front; the son is in the inner front with his new toys, mercurial thoughts; the wom- -- mother is at the backward front for the dignity of the home; and the father is on the outer front to keep out the enemy, and to look for the wherewithal on the material front. The son is the idealist, the father is the materialist, the mother is the historian and the -- or the ceremonious person. I mean, she says how any family celebration shall be held. That's dignity, but that's also tradition. And the daughter, as -- with her attractive beauty, changes the whole aspect, brings a new man into the home, and she marries. And that is,

she renews life.

In these four people, you have a kind of example of how the human mind is beautifully distributed. And in bride and bridegroom, you have the pair, that therefore is spoken so vividly of in the Bible, who unite these four extreme polarities. Daughter, mother, son, and father -- they all meet in bride and bridegroom, you see. And that's why the human soul is the bride and the world is the bridegroom. And that's why Jesus is called 16 times in the Old Testament the bridegroom, because He allows us -- He transforms from any one of these stages into all the others, you see. He has created an open access to all these four fronts of life.

The scientist cannot -- neither see this human family as a necessary distribution -- division of labor so that nobody -- no one of us is the whole man, you see, but always need his -- how do you call it? sup- -- supplement? ja, probably -- implementation by the three other types of the human family. But the scientist can therefore not discover the existence of the human soul.

For all psychologists today, mind and soul are identical. They call this "psychology." The famous -- most famous textbook on psychology in this country, written by William James, is -- begins with the -- with the incredible sentence, the blasphemous sentence: "Psychology is the science of the mental processes." Do you understand? If my mental processes, which change every day, you see, from these various fronts of existence, you see, to another -- where I can write poetry, and solve equations, you see, and vote in an election, you see, and read the Chronicle, since they are all made one by the scientist, the mind is all. One mind, you see. And they even dream that my child should have the same mind as myself, and I am so pleased that it has quite a different mind. This idiotic -- idiocy, one mind for all men, is, as you know, the curse of our age.

You try to give it -- I had a -- I had a case -- my son is a psychiatrist and to him came a -- came -- parents who had ruined their child. Was very musical. And they insisted that the baby -- who was one and a year-half and a -- one year-and-a-half old when they started this -- this crucifixion -- had to know the names of the composers whose music this child listened to. And by three, it was a vegetable. And it has never recovered. They have been able to destroy this child in their adoration of the one-mind mentality.

And that's quite usual, I mean. I read today in the paper, in this Los Angeles Times, that a 13-and-a-half-year-old boy was allowed to take -- finish his freshman year at UCLA. Shame over you! This man must go crazy. It's not al-

lowed to change the ages of a human being in such -- in such -- tyrannical measure -- measure. And all the IBM is -- you see, was only due to the fact that the boy was allowed to go to Harvard at 14, and to graduate at 17. Then he invented -- of course, with a childish mind -- a childish machine.

Obviously. This is truth. That's what the business computer is about: about the mentality of a -- of a child. And you know even the man's name. I know him, too. Or it, too.

The giant mind today, is the -- is the destroyer of nations, of whole peoples, and also of the peace of the world. They can't sleep, the people who have only a mind.

The soul is something quite different. The soul is the power in us that can bury mentalities, you see. The freedom of all of you consists in this fact that at any one moment, you ta- -- actually do decide -- everybody does it, who is healthy, you see. You can dismiss in the evening all your worries and go to sleep. And an- -- nobody who cannot do this, you see, is a human being. And this dismissal of the state of mind in which you were the day before, you see, is a condition of your survival. So unimportant is the mind. The -- a mind is of the day.

But to -- we write "mind" -- not just the "m" is a capital letter, but "i," and "n," and "d" are, too. It's a very small thing. The human soul is denied by the scientist. Mind and soul coincide. They have, therefore, a strange science called psychology, which is a -- you see, a science without its object, the soul. "Psycho- lo-" -- "psyche" means soul, you see. But it's quite an achievement for these -- all these psychologists to -- to deal with something they deny exists. And they literally do deny it. They call it now the "subconscious," you know, to make it into something swinish. But the soul is very noble and it is not just unconscious. But it is better than consciousness. It's the power to change your consciousness. What is consciousness? As I told you last time, I think, I'm try -- not to -- I'm not conscious while I'm talking here. I'm trying to tell you something that's important. And in order to say it with conviction, I have to be quite unconscious. If I'm self-conscious, I s- -- begin to stammer and forgot what I wanted to say the next minute.

But, here, I have an example of this gorilla psychology. They make us into gorillas. That is, in people who have no deal with future or past, who are of the moment. It's quite serious. This is a book on contemporary theories and systems in psychology. And the man quotes -- it's a quotation -- "Semantically, death is a



misleading term, since no such thing as death ever existed." Quite an achievement.

So, sorry the man isn't here. We could turn his -- twist his neck.

This I wanted to read to you. Such nonsense can be printed in such fat volumes:

"Semantically death is a misleading term, since no such thing as death ever existed. The name "death" does not contain any designates, nor does it represent any object, function or state or any category, class, or system of object, functions, or states. Actually, one cannot make logical statements about death, because the only meaning of death is non-existence, not-life. Life includes a variety of phenomena. Death does not include any. Life means "is." Death means "is not." So, it doesn't exist."

Well, it's natural that you should have The Loved Ones here in -- in Los Angeles, because it is an attempt to -- to deny that death exists. And this is the -- the -- the -- as you know, the -- the -- the power of persuasion which science has gotten over the populace, that people repeat this and eliminate death from their thinking, while it is dominating everything we do. I mean, you can't -- you can't build up a trust for your children, you can't make a will, you cannot decide that your childre- -- child should move into another country, you see, where the future, it looks brighter. You cannot emigrate from Italy into the United States, for example, or from Sicily, if you do not hope that something shall survive your death. Most people whose lives I observe do all their reasonable and important acts only from fear of death.

So this man, who calls himself a psychologist, you see, bases his statement that death -- death is not in existence on this gorilla fact that the gorilla does not know where he came from and where he's going. He's of the moment, you see. The gorilla cannot look beyond his grave or before his parents' grave. But tha- -- that's why he cannot think. That's why he has not the -- this freedom of going -- undergoing several mentalities and switch to various means of understanding. Here he has to understand the mountain. There he has to understand the flood. Here he has to understand his neighbor. We can. We know how to cope with living beings, our brothers. We know how to obey the divine powers, and we also know how to use commodities, things, you see.

I have tried to show you that words, numbers, and names, you see, convey to every one of us this tremendous trinitarian power, you see, that -- in relation to our maker, in relation to our comrades in arms, and in relation to the dead weight -- things around us -- we use very different language and we use

different means of em- -- exploiting, or employing, or obeying to them. So this -- this exaggerated sense of objectivity, which leads to the picture-journals today, and to the movies, and to the attempt to make religion the "verbofacture" of man into manufacture of man -- we are created by the word, because the word enables us to change, as I have tried to show you even in the -- in the grammar of a word, you see. There is an imperative, and there is the subjunctive and there is an historical tense, and there is the infinitive and the participle which says it's -- consummatum est, it's -- has all been done, now let's look at it.

Since we are able to do just what the gorilla does not do, it is only decent to say that we owe this to our prescience of death. Because we know we die, everything centers around the ways and means in which we can -- have -- celebrate victory over death. That's why death is the cornerstone of our existence. Man is not an animal because he knows, in advance, of his death. And accordingly, all virtue, all asceticism is the shelving of your -- momentary passions, you see, in favor of those who are needed to continue the work of creation in general and for the whole. Every one of us is asked to forego certain pricks of -- of your senses or some sensuousness. Nobody who would indulge for one day to anything his -- his sense of sight -- suggests could survive. He becomes -- obviously, a waif of the society. Either it's the drinking and a -- you see, becomes a drunkard or a drug addict, or he ends in a brothel as a lecherous person, or it -- will be -- go bankrupt because he spends too much.

Not one of our actions in life can be reasonably computed and organized without this respect for death. Death is omnipresent. You may know it or not. And of course, as I've tried to show you, it's not death at the end of life, but it's the death of being a child. It's the death of being an -- adolescent. It's the death of being in California and moving elsewhere. We bury our dead constantly. And the -- more often we do it, the more we have life. Why did St. John live to be 90? Because he was present at the cross -- at the crucifixion of his Lord, and took the death of Jesus deep into his heart. Anybody who faces death in time can live long, because we must die partially very often. And then you have long life, and life everlasting. And the people who want to live long don't live at all, because they do not dare in the meantime to die to the stages of their existence. As you -- we all must. Look at all the mothers-in-law, and this misfortune, you see, that it breeds when they cannot die to their motherhood.

I heard a fine story yesterday. You -- may I quote it? My hostess yesterday told me that when her child was born, her mother said she wouldn't interfere

with the child's education, but she wanted to say only one sentence. "Your child you only have 18 years, but your husband you have forever. Make this the law of your behavior. Then you can't go wrong." This means that after 8- -- at 18, at the -- on the wedding day, there must be some death, voluntarily, you see, accepted. If not, a crisis is on hand and all end at the analyst.

Ja, obviously. That's what happens. Most people who go to the analyst cannot bury their dead in time, and we have to bury many things in -- during our life. The whole problem for every one -- human being is to decide what is mortal and what is eternal, you see. But that's not arbitrary. And certainly the relation of parents and children, you can become grandparents, you see. But in order to become real grandparents, I assure you, you have to cease to be parents. For a while you are just not caring, then you become grandparents. And then you are very much in demand.

Isn't this true?

(Too true.)

What I've tried to say is, I think, of primary importance. Every act or process that the divine creator expects us to perform -- peace among men, the building -- the settling of the cultivated area, the bringing up of animals or of children, the building of schools -- whatever we -- we do un- -- with the -- with the knowledge that this is what we ex- -- are expected to do runs through this gamut of command, of getting involved, of looking back and holding on and fast to it, and of saying one day, "It's all over." And life is therefore -- is not so much our own physical death at any one given moment, but our respect for this cycle that everywhen -- -where where we undergo and understand a will higher than ours, we have to take the pain of loss upon us. You cannot gain without this loss. Nobody can foretell you when the Lord says, "It's over with." I didn't know that I was -- would have to come -- leave my country where -- in -- in -- at the age of 45. I already had become quite a -- a vain man because I was the special article of -- of -- in the encyclopedia of my country now. Anybody who's in the Encyclopaedia Britannica thinks he's arrived, and the next thing is a peerage. And -- but my story be- -- only began. And so it was compressed, so to speak, in half a generation, in half a life, what usually would be extended into a whole -- a long -- longer life.

All these things are known to everybody. And I think in America, it is even -- this cutting your losses is very common. I think people know this, and do it. But it's done strangely enough without any relation to their mental philoso-

phy. The scientist has completely ruined their thinking about this cutting your losses, this moving away to another place, this alibi -- I mean, this saying, "It's all over." I find the -- the American male in a tremendous tension between his innumerable locations, his innumerable positions in life, his willingness to change, and this exile from -- of death from his mind: death must never be mentioned because it occurs constantly. I don't know. There must be some relation -- no European dies so often to the things he has created, to the positions he has held, to the achievements he can muster, you see. And no European who wouldn't complain and feel miserable. Yet, when it comes to the general statement of fact, what this means, you see, that death is in us, with us, de- -- makes demands on us, he has a complete repulsion, revulsion. People don't mention it. "Death doesn't exist." It does exist. It exists as much as life. It's like breathing in and breathing out. Nobody can live who cannot die.

And the more we voluntarily die to those deadening circumstances, the more can we hope to save life for another chapter in our existence. Well, I think you all act upon this, but it is very strange that you allow the scientist to tell you, as this gorilla does, that death doesn't exist. It exists as much as life exists. It's the condition of life: no life that is not, you see, condemned to die.

And that's the meaning of the cross of Jesus. He really died. His resurrection is not -- is not not-dying. And it is infamous, when D. H. Lawrence wrote a book, you see, in which he describes how Jesus escaped death. I don't know if you know this book, it's { }. I think it's the greatest blasphemy ever perpetrated in the history of Christianity. In his dying day, D. H. Lawrence, who didn't want to die, and had always only described vitality, and life, and being vital, and so on, wrote a book -- 1927 I think it only appeared -- do you know it? Well, how is it called?

(The Escaped {Cop} is one title.)

Wie?

(The Escaped {Cop}, The Man Who Died.)

Ja, Ja. Well, I think it shows you. I mean, I hold the -- the clergy responsible for this total misunderstanding. The poor man, of course, had never seen a church after his 15th year, probably, you see. And up to that time, the Resurrection was misunderstood for not-dying.

Now, this brings up one more important point. The scientist cannot

under-stand that children -- that people who have not been visited by a vital command, as in this quadra gemina organ -- can happen, who have not fallen in love, who have not made a vow, cannot understand the divine truth. There will always have to be two languages for the whole, ultimate truth of our life or religion, for children and for {adults}. And all the attempts of the last century have been directed, as though the child of 7, or 8, or 10, or 12 could be told. It can be hinted at. It can be promised that one day it will understand. But woe to the church that tries to teach only things that children can understand. That is impossible. And it is not meant to be, because the senses of these children have not been realized. They have not gone through such movements of the soul. They cannot love. You cannot tell a 7-year-old child what love is, or what sex is, before the -- they are capable of loving. Now our children of 14 also, they know sex, but they don't know what love is. So they -- and -- and a -- a man must first learn what it means to promise and to stand by his word. As long as he -- just running, running, running, how can he marry? It's impossible. So it's -- it must break down. This is, I think, the greatest curse of the scientific mentality: that they say that anybody who has a mind at all must have a scientific mentality. And therefore there is no -- no such thing as preparation, and as gradual understanding, you see. There are no secrets that must become known. And they poke fun at our favorite term of old, "revelation." And they can't understand it. They say, "Nothing has to be revealed." Well, if you don't feel that the veil is before our eyes, I am very sorry. As I told you, many a time, I open the Bible and it's perfectly un-understandable to me. I have a veil before my eyes and by an act of grace a day later, I may understand it better than anybody who has ever read the Bible. Because we all change between moments of ecstasy and megalomania and moments of humiliation, and clumsiness, and blindness or deafness. I think this is the most important handicap today for -- for any spread of spiritual unity among mankind. It's a wrong monism, a wrong idea of democracy that everyone can understand everything. This is simply not true. And as long as you hold to this, you will have mob rule. And it will spread. And that's the mob. The mob is the -- the demons, the people who are corrupted by the heresy that everyone can understand everything at any -- all the time. We don't. I don't, certainly. And you don't. And anybody who admits this, ne- -- knows that from the hands of the -- impure hands of the non-understanders, you see, the truth has to be saved. It has to be protected. You cannot entrust everybody with the truth since we all have in our lives three-quarters of the time not the ability to understand it and to treasure it, and to protect it. We -- we run away from it. We sacrifice it. We say, "It's un-understandable. I know nothing about it." And the special case of course is

the -- with the young child. With regard to love, I think the whole 19th century -- "the century of the child," as it has been called, as you know -- was naïve in this respect, that they thought, "If only all the great news is told to the children, then mankind is saved." Then it perishes. It's the end of the world.

This is the hardest doctrine I know, to consume, and -- because people feel they -- it may be true what I say here, but how can I say this to anybody else without being called a reactionary? I'm sorry, but it is. The truth must come out, I mean. You know it as well as I, that this is a fact. And I think you can convey this message to everyone when you say it of yourself. When we begin to admit that we move through these various spheres of understanding, again I want to see the universe -- I know very little of what it's all about. When I am obedient, I understand a little more. When I go into history I understand still more. And when I obey the next command, I suddenly understand that the whole world was comma- -- created by commands of the same character.

Again, I think the Church has been very negligent in this respect, to oppose the scientist. You know there has been Biblical criticism, there has been Church history. But nobody has told me. I had to rediscover it myself, and my generation had to rediscover it, that in the days of Samuel, and Saul, and David, and Solomon, the Bible was written re- -- in retrospect. And these two good ch- -- people -- Hannah, the mother of Samuel, who had no child, who was barren, and implored the Lord, and -- was given a child, and sh- -- dedicated it to Him, is, obviously, the starting point for the whole Bible story and what did these -- these Israelites say to themselves. They hadn't existed when the world was created. They didn't want to write fairy tales. But they said, "As we have experienced the mercy of God and our prayer has been heard and -- fulfilled, so the world must have come -- everything in the world must have been created in the same manner." While you -- people today, the Nazis, you see, tried to breed people as cattle, the Bi- -- Biblical tradition says, "We have been created by love, and obedience, and prayer, so the world has been created in the same way." That is, you can apply your experience of life to the rest of the world, you see, and say that it has been always the same way. That's Biblical, the Biblical principle: to go back and say, "God said to the lion, 'Be there.'" And it was like -- just as Hannah was told, "You will be with child," and she was with child.

This is one method that the faithful -- a matter of faith. And the scientific method says, "I go to the farthest electron, and then I deduce myself." And here come -- I come to the second expression of the blind spot of science. If you try to breed children as we breed cattle, you see, then you follow the science principle that goes from the most remote, smallest entity -- most far away from you, you

see -- and tries to rule your life not from your experience, you see, but from these deductions -- from far away, from Mr. Niels Bohr, or from Mr. Einstein, or something like that. These people -- these science- -- tists -- the scientific theory has only one little fault: Mr. De- -- Bohr and Mr. Einstein are { }.

Christianity today in the eyes of science is only represented by the scientists. They are the real McCoy. They are the real guys. They can talk of electrons, you see. And they are living for the future of science. It's the only point in the scientific heaven where the future is not the result of the past. Every scientist of any greatness, of any genius, you see, is the man who knows everything that people have known before, dismisses it with a shrug of the shoulder, and says, "We have to start all over again." This was done by Planck, when he said, "All the -- theory of gradual," you see, "graduation, of graduality, must go. There are quanta in reality," you see, "which nobody has seen so far. But there just there. They are creatures." And don't allow your children to say, when they are 13, and look up the Encyclopedia Britannica, that they are in research. "Research" is a very religious word, and a very important word, but it has fallen among the dogs, and among the scientists, and among the psychologists. Rescue it. Research means that man is free to stand at the end of a line of Noahs and to say, "This knowledge isn't good enough," and to resist the whole burden, you see, of tradition, and to defy the authorities, and to go against their sacred word and say, "It is all wrong. I found out differently."

Today this is unknown. We pay so much for research that the people, of course, in order to get the funds only discover things that can be known beforehand. I despise this situation. This country is not yet secure against the total stagnation of its industry and its discoveries, when you go on bribing your young with money. Pardon me, Mr. {Baldwin}, but that's very serious.

So far, for 300 years, scientific research has Christianized the universe. That is, has torn it away from God, and from witches, and from the spir- -- evil spirits and has made it a beautiful whole, as long as there have been scientists who defied the tradition of their science. That is, nothing -- no -- there is no continuum in -- in the -- in research, but there's a break. And the condition for your right to un- -- you see, to interrupt the thinking as hitherto obviously is in the fact that you have suffered patiently in filling you with the knowledge hitherto acquired.

A scientist must be able -- and here I come back to my central theme -- he must die to his own best knowledge and to the knowledge of his time. And even -- there must be a seed of faith, a grain of faith in which he said, "Although all

the authorities say this, I cannot help feeling that I must enter a new -- usher in a new day, a new dawn, a new life."

What is con- -- totally overlooked by these foundations and by the young who now are attracted by the money available in research is the danger, the risk that they have to stick their neck out and to say something that is not approved by the authorities, that goes against the tradition. And only those truths are important. The other is -- just technology. And in this country, as you well know, technology is mistaken for science. Technology is the carrying out of good cameras, because you have learned on faith. That's one thing. But science is something quite different. Science is the courage to die to your knowledge, or to let this knowledge fall to the ground. And when Copernicus said, or Galilei, that the earth was to- -- turning around the sun, they knew everything anybody had ever written about the movements of the -- of the sky, in the sky, you see, and then said, "It isn't good enough." That is, a youngster cannot be in research because he has to search first for what is already known. At 14, the child has to know what people have -- other people have said. And if he stumbles on a discovery, that's not research. That may happen, I mean. I will not deny it -- deny it. But pardon me, for I see to be down- -- seem to be down on the children, but they have been spoiled in our reasoning processes, you see. They have been admitted to the inner court of justice, of mercy, of wisdom, where they don't belong.

Therefore, science has this blind spot, that the scientist is a courageous man, a man under God who dares the community, who is not a conformist, and he -- who dares to stand alone. If you think of the great scientists in the 19th century, {who} -- Semmelweis, {who} discovered the -- the puerperal fever, you see, and saved millions of women, you see, from certain death. He was persecuted, he was put in a luna- -- lunatic asylum, just because he was right.

Now, you may say, "We abolish this. We adore research." I doubt it. Real research will always appear dangerous. And if it is not dangerous, it is not a branch of the life of the Church. That it is. To me, the natural sciences are just the next step to Christianize the universe. And after the fathers of the Church, and after the scholastics, you see, came this era of the last 400 years in which the world was free from incubus, and succubus, and witches. And that's a great step. But it was connected, as you know, with great diffi- -- trials and troubles for the men who discovered it. And that's as it should be. Why do we -- you tear apart the history of the martyrs of the Church and the history of these martyrs of truth? It is a limited field. The world, of course, of things, is a negative to man, because it's the world of the dead things. The stars are not alive. But if you do



not un- -- investigate their movements, as mathematically proven, they might again become gods. And you might have the astrological column in the Los Angeles Times.

Well, all these things, if not achieved in one direction, you see, will always take you back in the opposite direction. And pre-Christian superstitions loom very large here among us today. And I think in Los Angeles you have a good cross-section. I think you could just write Encyclopedia Americana from collecting the evidence here, and you wouldn't have to go outside Los Angeles -- 6 million people and 10 million superstitions. I mean it. It's very true. And if they wouldn't be guided and held up by the rest of the world, they would indulge in this, you see, and all become oranges.

It is very tempting. Any small part of the -- mankind is in -- constantly in danger of doing just this. And I think the scientists are exactly in this group today, that is absolutely superstitious. It has abolished the distinction between mind and soul, without ever investigating whether a mother shall ever talk like a father, or a daughter ever shall talk like a son. They shall not. To the end of the world, a bride must talk differently from her mother and from her little sister. It would be in- -- terrible if everyone's mind contained the same equations. Every man who lives in the future has to say, "Two and two is four? Not at all. Not for me."

So this so-called scientific truth today has become a hindrance to living. Death has been abolished by these scientists. And now comes the climax, the last thing I would like to say today. Would you bear with me? Is it too much? I'm always overstepping my rights, I know.

This is: there is no present in the world of science. It's -- it's a fiction. -- You speak of the present state of affairs according to which a cancer has to be operated -- cancer of the breast has to be operated. A doctor is obliged to do this under the code of his profession. And he uses the term, "Today, we do this. Perhaps tomorrow, we'll have found a way where we decide not to do it." What is this "today"? In reality, in the outer world outside of you and me, "today" doesn't exist. The present doesn't exist. There is only in -- if you observe the facts in the external world, there is only "yesterday" and "tomorrow." As Homer calls it, it's a razor-blade edge, you see, that divides yesterday and tomorrow. Today, or the present, which we all heed here, in our presence here, I -- you gave me kindly now already one hour and-a-half -- and this is one moment in time. And it oversteps the visible dial of -- digit of the clock. One hour and-a-half we have been transforming into a present moment. And you see, the -- I can prove this to

you, because at the end of these one hour and-a-half, I'm still able to convert or to retroact anything I have said in the beginning. I could now come out and said, "You mustn't misunderstand what I said an hour ago," you see. And as long as we are here now in our confidence, in our room, together, the newspapers haven't reported my {speech}, you see, I'm perfectly free to contradict myself, to explain, to convey. Man has the divine power to bring time to a standstill, to the eternal presence, or the divine presence. It's a miracle. Now all sciences do this. They have a today, which is set off against yesterday's results and tomorrow's hopes. And they meet, and they have conferences, and during this -- conferences, time stands still.

We only, and only the human soul can create a presence. We call this with a more political expression, "We can create peace," where two people are not animals that are greedy for food, but sit together at a common meal. You don't begrudge your husband the best food. Wherever this happens, where a meal is taken together, some artificial, historical, religious creation has taken place. Have you ever thought that animals cannot do this? That any animal will try to get at the food of -- of the neighbor. You cannot feed two horses without risking this. Domesticated animals may do differently, or the mother and her -- her cubs. But I once attended a CCC camp meal in which the morale had sunken so low that these boys -- they were 18 to 22, perhaps -- grabbed the food from each other. And the educational officer in this camp said, "You see, they are like dogs. They have fallen so low, there is not even the morale, you see, that they can have a meal together."

You remember that Mr. {Meyer} asked me about the five- -- the fifth sense, the taste. And I didn't like at that moment to go into this secret of the taste. Our four tracts, of which I have spoken, you see, are all drawn together in this most momentary, the digestive tract. When we eat together, you see, a tremendous creation takes place. We taste together the same food, and that's the ultimate peace you can establish between people. Not when they think alike. Not when they speak alike, you see. But when they are so one, that what one, you see, receives is received by the other. It's a great miracle. It doesn't exist in the animal kingdom. And as you know, the Church has been built on this very simple ritual, that all, you see, are glad that the other fellow can ta- -- participate. Participation is the secret of this created peace though which, wherever peace exists, it's a creation of a power higher than your or my will. You cannot create peace. I cannot create peace, you see. It can only happen when a third -- third power is present. You can have peace in the name of your profession. You can have peace in the name of your country. The highest peace, obviously, is in the

name of God, because any enemy and you can participate in this peace. And it is, strangely enough, the most realistic -- the digestive -- and the most short-lived tract in our existence, you see, which points to this completion of all the other senses in one great act of reconciliation.

I only wanted to say that I didn't omit taste, but as you can imagine for good reason, I didn't want to -- to prostitute it too early. At this point, I think I may say I haven't done enough, but all I can do today.

(May I ask one question? { } of { } come together. Does that begin the very beginning, when you're born? Is that {developed}?)

They always exist -- it's in every human -- every human brain. The quadra gemina corpora, as they are called. They are called in anatomy an archaic organ. That is, an -- and organ that ceases -- stops having any development. Why should it? { } not to develop.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...was their ignorance of the scientist. They had no idea where the scientist stood, that he certainly did not stand in the time which the physicist, or the chemist, or any scientist considers. I like to say a word more about this -- these qualitative distinctions in time.

Modern man, who lives by the clock, believes really that this mechanical time, which goes from the past into the future, is experienced time. It's abstracted time. Nobody lives in this time that goes from yesterday to tomorrow. Everybody lives between the future and the past. And the conflict between the two is -- creates this, what we call the present. Whether you agree with me that this is God's time, that it is only a divine power in us to create the peace which overcomes our panic, our fear of death, and our running, running, running, which allows us to stand still and to devote seven years just in preparing ourselves for the study of medicine. In any case -- in all these cases, the future impinges on our actions, just as much as the past, and I hope more. As soon as in a country, as perhaps in Germany, the past takes over from historicism, the country is lost and goes to the dogs and Mr. Hitler is the correct result of the historicism of the educated classes in Germany. Since they believed that they were living in the past, somebody, of course, a very vulgar and criminal type, had to stand out for some kind of future befuddled as this was.

I think the blind spot of science, then is, so to speak, centers in the famous saying by Laplace, a physicist at the beginning of the 19th century, that the past creates the present, and the past and the present together create the future. If you look into your interior, you will believe this. But it is nonsense. The future creates the present. And where -- where a man -- is not stretched out in tension between his -- or mankind's future and the past, there is no present. And it is very strange that a -- allegedly youthful country like America holds this heresy. It always makes me feel that America is really a very old Europe. It's not a young country. That's one of those slogans which you bandy around, but it has no meaning.

Hope, as I told you, is a carry-over from the past, because it's -- deals with known values. You cannot hope for what you have not seen. If this is only a country of hope, it has no future. Future is only with faith, and faith deals with the unknown, and is ready to meet it, even at the danger of death.

So, all -- although I cannot go into this, as you can understand, from the

vast program have still to fulfill, I would like to remind you that in this cross of reality, man is standing here because the past tries to engulf him and the future tries to attract him. And this is overlapping, just as you -- as any girl knows, who has to decide between her parents and her bridegroom. It's very simple; there's a conflict. It can be dissolved in the happy present, so that everybody gets his part, {but if} only her future is also respected by the parents. If not, if the -- the mother moves in with the married couple, the devil is -- breaks loose. Ich mein -- that's the simplest form in which the -- any marriage will be ruined.

The past and the future form the present. The present is, as in mathematics, the result of this parallelogram of forces between the future and the past. Since this is not admitted, all our schools and all our techniques are bent to befuddle people and to make them -- make them schizophrenic, because what officially is said, they agree with. They say the past and the present create the future, but nobody can live by this recipe. Everyone -- be it a -- big firm, be it a corporation, be it a party -- lives in order to be justified by the future. Therefore, the future already is a reality. It -- it tells you exactly what to do, and not the past. If you only live by precedent, the country goes to the dogs. You cannot -- you have to decide between your right to call it a precedent and your duty to say, "This has never happened before. We must find a new solution." In every moment, any lawyer says, "This is an exception," or "This is the rule."

The -- are there chairs enough?

(Yes.)

Now this is perhaps the most difficult admission from a modern mind, who is accustomed to think that the time in the laboratory or in a factory is the only real time. I assure you it's a -- abstract time, when people today speak so -- so much about estrangement of the worker from his work. The reason for this is that while this work is proceeding, his lifetime is excluded. His future is not present in the factory. Where you work for, and have sold your time to somebody else, you enter this Laplace-time of the physicist, because you are pre-calculated, you see. And therefore your expectations of the future do not enter this hour or these 40-hour weeks, or what -- have you, in the modern labor market.

But everybody feels that this is nothing in the man's life. We say even this. This is a typical expression of workers that they say, "This work in the factory means nothing in my life," because the f- -- the future has been cut off. So he has to find his future in politics, or in sports, or somewhere else, or in his hobby, because his own time is four-fold. { } in the -- the full man is -- hung up

between the future and the past. The lyrical man, the introspective man, who waits, who has a free hour, who goes to the movies, has a dream time, inner time -- and if he goes to the factory, he has an outer time; if he celebrates Christmas or any anniversary, we spoke of this -- he has a -- time stands still. There is no time. That's a timeless moment.

So much for this. You can see that it would take a -- another six lectures to expand on this problem. And I said to myself, I have to choose. I have to hint at this problem, but I cannot completely, perhaps, refute your first instinct that you go on believing that time comes from the past and goes into the future. That this cannot be so, you can also perhaps see from the fact that what you -- we call the past is always selective. The whole past is not included. If you look back at the past, as the Birch Society, and say that 1832 all the misery began, still you do -- wouldn't introduce slavery again. So there are certain strange things o- -- to be omitted, if you want to go back into the past. Nobody accepts the whole past. Everybody selects from the past that which is fitting the pressures from the future and which are -- enable him to, you see -- to -- to solve this conflict between his origin and his destiny. Racial philosophy, of course, has in the last hundred years exercised a tremendous influence in favor of the past. If a man is what his race allows him to be, then he is of course dominated by the past, you see, and we have no future. And you can also o- -- overdo, of course, the future. I was told when I came out to California if I asked a man -- 80 years ago here who his grandfather was, he would shoot me. So that was certainly not racial, but that was more Manifest Destiny.

This is a serious, and I think -- the historian, for example, today is killed by this wrong attitude. The historian is only understandable as a part of the future, as a writer out of the future backward, because what does any historian? He saves those things whose future already got started in the past. It's an illusion of yours to say that an historian writes about the past. He conjures up those elements of life -- like the Emancipation, like the -- like the Declaration of Independence, like the birth of Christ, like Virgil or Homer, like anything that we need to carry in the -- into the future. That's what is the -- the past of the historian, and the rest he has to discard and not to mention. That's why history has to be rewritten in every generation, because our future reveals itself as a changing, and many things about history of the last 500 years, of course, have to be put on the dung-heap in a moment where the nations of the world have to draw together and have to bury their axe, you see, of enmity. And so you cannot indulge in the Napoleonic Wars, or not even in the War of 1812 too much. I mean, the capital was burned, but it seems to me that the emperor of America is still in the making -- if you know the play, *The Apple Cart*, by Bernard Shaw.

So this is -- I had to say I think, to be -- to delineate the frontiers, and to tell you that I think the natural sciences have beguiled with their golden calf of an abstract time us. We live exactly as in Egypt. The -- we are back to the pharaohs, and to the sorcerers of pharaohs. People interpret dreams, and people think that it's all eternal recurrence and that the past produces the future. As soon as anybody believes this, he is prey to any superstition.

My task today is called differently. And it is perhaps just as well if I break off here and tell you that I would like today to show you that this law of Mr. Portmann, my own -- that there have to be founders who present for the nestling, for the newborn child a new environment, that this law has been at work in our civilization in the last 900 years, and that's -- the development { } {ethics}, from geometry to -- to grammar, as I have tried to represent it to you, is a part of this strange process that any newborn child has to bite off its umbilical cord and make sure that it lives in a new environment, in a changing environment.

I have pondered how to do this simplest, and I think the simplest thing is to show you how the liberal arts, on which our college life is based, how they in a strange manner have been Christianized and baptized in the last 400 years. You may be surprised if I say that modern arithmetic, and modern mathematics, and modern geometry are Christian sciences. That is, they have -- they have been baptized and they do no longer correspond to the ancient pagan sciences of Mr. Archimedes or Pythagoras. We today have to solve the same problem in -- in field of grammar. And I'm trying to represent this to you, this new grammar, which has the same different qualities from ancient science as modern mathematics has, compared to Greek science.

There are seven liberal arts. Some of you may even have heard what they are. And I write them backward. They are called: astronomy, music, geometry, arithmetic. These are called the quadrivium, the four higher liberal arts. We go to the primitive, to the trivium -- to that which is trivial, you see, and belongs to the three other liberal arts. And they are: logic, rhetorics, and grammar. All these seven arts did exist before the Christian era. And they are best represented in the great center of knowledge, in Alexandria. The first encyclopedias, and the first grammars, and the first arithmetic textbooks -- all you can find in Alexandria at this cross-point of integration between the pre-Greek world and the Greek world. Egyptian lore and Chaldean lore met there with the Greek philosophers. Now the -- you will say that -- "I'm not interested. That's all historical."

You have to be interested, because in a very strange march of events, these seven arts have been touched upon and have been re-created in the last 400 years. It began with Copernicus, and with the astronomers. And as I say, God today is with the grammarians. You can no longer hope to restore human language or to save it from -- from destruction unless we get rid of our -- of our grammar books, which tells you that language has been created to say, "La rose est une fleur." And I tried to tell you that the Copernican turning point is that you learn that language is meant to place man before, inside, and after the event. And that this is the meaning of any articulated language: that the person who speaks determines his relation to the event of which he speaks, and thereby creates history. There is no other way of creating history. And grammar has never been created for saying, "La rose est une fleur," but it has been created to say, "Europe was a great civilization, Europe is a great civilization, Europe will be a civilization." If you withhold this last sentence, you have taken a position in history, because you have decided that it's all over. Nobody can escape this. No -- even -- even not newspaper -- editors who would like to escape -- { } said nothing, I mean. It's a great art to write much and say nothing. And we have in this country developed a tremendous technique of doing this. You can print a whole forest on Sundays in The New York Times, but there are, out of 150 pages, 120 where nothing is said, with very many words. And I -- I don't have to tell you this about The Los Angeles Times.

Man today is playing with language and I think he's destroying it and I'm quite serious when I say I foresee a future, in hundred years, where very few people can speak. The rest will just shout, and repeat, and echo. Language is on the way out. And that's why grammar is necessary as a saving -- it can be -- there can be a renaissance of language, but it cannot be -- go on like this. Most people cannot distinguish serious t- -- speech and talk. They don't know the difference between an oath and a vow on the one-hand side, and an anecdote and a joke on the other. If they go to the wedding, they still make a joke, and the result is very jocose.

This is -- speech and talk, you see, are -- or at -- different ends and serious speech is always a public act. It's never private. Talk is. Talk you can call in and say, "I didn't say anything," you see. But if you have spoken, you are not a man and not a woman if you are not standing by your own word.

Now, before going into this grammar problem, which -- for which we shall have something to say -- at the last meeting, I only wanted to remind you that from 1543, when Copernicus wrote his astounding book about the revolutions in the sky, mighty revolutions, the British Revolution, the French Revolu-



tion, and the Russian Revolution have occurred always with the ascendancy of a new science. And in the 17th -- here you find astronomy, and the new music, by the way -- I only have to remind you of Purcell, in England -- and here you have the 16th -- 17th century Descartes, the great geometric wizard, and Spinoza, who wrote his book, Ethic in the Style of Geometry. That's why I put on my -- on our card this reminder that man has tried to use these seven liberal arts one after the other to explain everything. Now, you will admit that you can explain sun, and moon, and stars in astronomy, but the attempt made at that same time, of course, to renew the horoscope and to predict man's existence by astronomy has failed. You get astrology and nonsense.

That is, although astronomy has been revived, it has also been purified, and has been limited for the purposes, you see, for which it can serve. It's a pure science today, and not a humanly, so to speak, corrupt science. The same, of course, is to be said of dealing with the infinite -- the calculus, that's an invention of the 17th century -- infinity was shunned by the Greeks. They had a -- real fear and never used it positively. And if you read the brilliant chapter of -- by Spengler on this distinction between the Greek hatred of the infinite, you see, and the Faustian man rejoicing in its -- in its discovery and in its computation, then you will see that there has been a total revamping of what is -- called today mathematics. The mathematics of today have very little to do with Greek mathematics. They have no -- had no theory of numbers, and they had no notion of the infinite.

Now I hold that we today have to do the same with these arts: logic, rhetoric, and grammar. It may even be that this has already been done. But -- grammar is still in this shoddy and shabby state of Alexandria. People still say the single word, you see, has to be learned as a declension. A single verb has to be conjugated, and sentences are the highest. If you look into modern books on language, I'm ashamed of my contemporaries.

[tape interruption]

...incredibly stupid what these people print. I yesterday went over a whole stack of books on language and I couldn't discover anything that I could use for today.

To prove to you the -- the -- the vital character of this gradual renewal, I may -- remind you down to 1500, the Christian Church -- and the -- had their -- her hands tied up with converting the ch- -- the people to Christianity; that is, to

this duty to renew life. They had to be told that regeneration and rebirth is an essential element of their existence, that to hold onto the past or to -- run forward into the -- an unknown future was both not worth doing. Christianity is the solution of the historical problem: how much past and how much future? And it certainly stands and falls, as you know, with the fact that the first Christian stood as far away from the past as from the future, and already took the future into our field of force as much as the past.

Christ is the second Adam and He is the first perfect man. That is, He stands exactly in the middle, between beginning and end. Most people misunderstand this. They talk big today of eschatology. It's a very simple notion, even without this terrible Greek word which you -- nobody can pronounce and nobody can spell. It means just that the Lord has already arrived at this perfection between -- between old and new, which every one of us tries also to attain. The transformation, the power to respond and -- despite the fact that it means change -- that's Christianity. And that's the -- our cross. That's why man is in a crucial position, and a not in a position between A and B of alleged choices. When I hear this word "choice," I always think of -- get very angry indeed. Man does not make choices, but he is pushed forward and pulled backward at the same time, and he has to weigh how much forward and how much backward. That's not a choice, you see. But that's like treading water. That's a balance. He cannot give up any one of the two important things. The future has to be, you see, acknowledged. You have to bow to it. It's the -- exactly as the daughter who has a -- may have a choice between eloping or marrying. But marriage is an attempt to reconcile the parents to the marriage, to the new tie-up, isn't it? Or marriage wouldn't be called "marriage," but just "elopement." In an elopement, the future is alone present, you see. In a nunnery, the past is only present. In a marriage, the rec- -- parents are reconciled to being sacrificed on the altar of the new love.

I can show you this same picture in a more dramatic, and perhaps in a way you -- every one of you has participated in it -- in -- and you are still participating in this revamping of the pre-Christian past. You all have heard, at least, of Dante's Divine Comedy. I'm afraid it's a book more heard about than read, but it's very great book. And Mr. Dante conjured up from the pagan past, the last poet, you know who is this messenger through Hell, the poet Virgil. And so, I put here next to Dante, who wrote his poetry between 1300 and 1319, I wrote the Latin name Virgil. And Virgil is already popular in the Middle Ages around the time of the Crusades. He's called the "great sorcerer," Virgil, because the people at that time knew very little of poetry. But they knew his name, and that in the days of Augustus, he already had proclaimed Christianity in his great epics.

Some of you may have read this long -- lengthy book by Mr. {Brock}, The Death of Virgil. Who has? One only. Ja. Well. That's some judgment.

And when you go on, you find that in the days of the Renaissance popes, I -- it's arbitrary, I could have -- any one of the Piuses, the man who is conjured up from the -- from the past is not Virgil, but is Plato. And if you put somebody in between here, you put Thomas Aquinas, and the p- -- the Scholastics, then Thomas -- Aristotle, you see, is a man who is read. So we get a sequence: Virgil, Aristotle, Plato. If you come to Racine and Molière and Corneille in France in the 16th century, we are a little further back, the people read Socrates and Euripides. So Louis -- le siècle Louis XIV is illustrated by reading the dramatists of the 5th century, before Plato. Let's put in here Socrates. If you come to 1800, you find that people translate Homer, have new theses on Homer. Goethe wrote Iphigenia, that is Iphigenia, the daughter of Agamemnon, who went to the Trojan War; and he wrote "Achilleis," reviving the hero of the Trojan War. And since Ho- -- you all know Homer has been put on the map, not one man read Homer in the days of -- even of Shakespeare. His Troilus and Cressida does not come directly from Homer, that is, from later source.

So, I could of course replenish this list. People also -- Shakespeare as you know reads Plutarch and takes his stories from this biographer of the Roman emperors -- { } of the Roman Empire. What I'm anxious to show you is that man's renaissance of Greek and Rome -- Greece and Rome, has been done by going backward, that the -- the latest was received first. The Renaissance is not an act of receiving Greek and Rome in the sequence in which it was lived -- they were lived and existed, but it's a peeking and a piercing into the past, step by step, so today even Homer is obsolete and you go to Oedipus. Mr. Oedipus and poor Iocaste, you see, even precede Homer and for this reason they are just the right people today for selling and for making the -- psychoanalysts very happy indeed.

Mr. Robert Graves, who is a very sensitive man of our times -- a man on Mallorca -- the English poet, has written a book, Hercules, My Shipmate. I don't know if this is known. Who knows this book? Ja. Do -- do you know that this is -- are the Argonauts? And the Argonauts are Iason and his golden fleece. They precede Homer. In Homer's poem, the Argonauts are mentioned in one place as already preceding him. The poet -- poem -- poems on the Argo and Iason were written when Homer wrote.

A few months ago you may have read about the deciphering of the

Minoan script. That's the great discovery of the last 10 years. Minoan script was written 1200 B.C. Homer wrote, by and large, 750 or 800. Socrates is 460. Plato is -- died in -- founded the academy in 387. Aristotle follows him, is even his pupil. Virgil dies in the year 19, before Christ. A very strange march of events. The whole last thousand years, man has received into his memory, and into his architecture, into his paintings, into his poetry the antiquity in the order in reverse. And at this moment he oversteps the boundaries even of the written word in Greece. We go back to myth and this tremendous interest in myth today, m-y-t-h, which I suspect is a great misunderstanding -- is based on the fact that before Homer, we have no written sources but only this religious mythology, you see, in the form of Oedipus, the Oedipus, or the Zeus, or the Persephone myth. And some of you have seen yesterday, this beautiful play, Persephone in the Hades. That's the religious myth probably developed in Greece in the days of the Trojan War between 1000 BC and 1500 BC. Not later and not earlier, because the Greeks are newcomers to the Mediterranean world and haven't entered it before -- 1500 before our era. They are contemporaries of the -- of the Jews. When they came to Palestine, the Greeks came into Greece. And both have destroyed the old traditions -- or have summed them all up. That is why it is enough today to know of Athens, and Jerusalem, and the -- whole of antiquity is thereby represented. In this strange economy, now, I tried to make you believe that man lives in a very orderly process of historical digestion, and discarding, and elimination. History is nothing arbitrary at all. Every generation is forced and compelled to do something to a certain chapter of our human past. In the Christian era, Virgil and -- used -- is used by Dante, and Homer is used by Goethe, and the Argonauts and the myth of Oedipus is used by Mr. Freud or Mr. Robert Graves are there f -- not for the asking, but they are there because they can demand to be redeemed, to be dis- -- to be -- ja, "redeemed" is the -- real word -- to be saved not only from oblivion but to contribute this part of them that is eternal and to be left alone with what they have to say which is not eternal. We will not take over from the Oedipus complex slavery, for example, you see -- or the punishment meted out there. But we -- very well take over the conflict. It's the same with all the other powers. Aristotle is impossible for science. It's obsolete. Already Jean Ramus in the 16th century proved to his great satisfaction that there was not one true sentence in Aristotle. That overstepped the mark a little bit, but he did it. And he was believed, and Plato took the place of Aristotle for the following three centuries. That is -- it's like a lemon. You squeeze and squeeze and then throw the rest away. These renaissances have judged the past, have been vaccinated by the past and they have been made fruitful, but in a great process of elimination.

Today we live in some danger because this -- this select- -- -tive power of renaissance is denied. If I see my -- the anthropologists of today, I shudder, because they say they have no interest in education modern -- educating modern man in these wis- -- this wisdom of these primitive tribes, for example, but that they only -- are descriptive and they are the most horrid usages and customs there are just with great equanimity described as much as the wisdom of these old chieftains and the old medicine men. Obviously, we would perish if the anthropologist could not be waylaid by our common sense. What can we receive from antiquity is highly selective. You cannot -- human sacrifice cannot be introduced.

If you are only an enthusiast for the past without this critical vein of Christianity, which gives you -- the right to select, then you come, of course, to the pessimism of -- of a D.H. Lawrence, who wrote this great story, "The Woman That Rode Away." I don't know if you know this. It's the reintroduction of the human sacrifice on the American continent. And -- the wife of an American businessman is so bored that she offers herself as human sacrifice to the remnants of the Aztecs in Mexico. And they do it with great pleasure. Dead she is, murdered she is. And Mr. Lawrence thought that's -- was the way of res- -- you see, of reception, of giving birth to the old ritual.

Now fortunately, as you know, only in America has the occupation with antiquity been -- gone so far to re-introduce slavery. And that obviously is a taint on this act of renaissance. Slavery was the marrow of the antiquity. And our South here in this country thought they could afford the same, and they still for a hundred years proved from Greek and -- Biblical literature that slavery could be upheld, you see. So they -- they wanted to go back into antiquity wholesale. This cannot be done. I have to -- tell you that the great process of what we call "renaissance," rebirth of the past, is under very severe rules. You can only receive into our society that which respects the foundation, the cornerstone of our era, and that is the unity of the human race. And nothing what -- speaks against it can be really received. It has to go again. So the process of selection is a very sublime one. In antiquity, this one tenet, that man is one and marches as one great body politic over the earth, was unknown.

I always tell the engineers a story that as late as 1919 in Germany, after the war, a big factory of automobiles stood before the question: How to go back to peace production? And they produced the luxury car, the famous Mercedes -- you know this quite well. And it never dies. You see, once you have a Mercedes, you have to go on driving it for the rest of your life. And -- in 1919, I joined the staff of this factory, and I invited a famous psychologist and sociologist, who later ran for the presidency of the German Reich, to attend this decisive meeting

in which there had to be decided what peace production should be taken up. And they had, of course, been in the armament business during the war. And they all decided, "Oh, Mercedes has such a reputation, we can sell it tomorrow and of course, we go back to the old production." And then Mr. {Hellbach} spoke up and said, "Gentlemen, you will do this, I can see. You have of course every right to decide yourself. But you have invited me to this meeting, so you probably expect me to say something. And I will only tell you that in the Christian era, no invention can be kept the privilege of any one class or any one group. And if you're wise, you will produce the Volkswagen."

He didn't use the word "Volkswagen," but a car accessible to all. You may have your luxury car besides, but that's not decisive. The main thing is if you acknowledge what has happened during the World War, you will know that since all the men were soldiers and all the -- women suffered, you have to offer a product in the long run that is for all. And if they had done -- this is my sideline remark -- there would have been no Hitler. There was no outlet for the individual's thirst for power in Germany, and if there had been what you call now Volkswagen, the people would have something to -- had to -- that showed them that they were somebody.

It's a very great story and I can tell you, I have told this story now after 40 years to a staff of hundred engineers of this same firm and they were all in total agreement with me -- that they had made a -- a real mistake in 1919. This is very similar with anything that happens in our era. You may try to have privileges. You may have a -- a society, you see of descendants from royal bastards, or whatever -- what it is. But it's just a joke. You can have it inside a society where everybody is an equal. You can build in these -- these pleasure trips to the moon. But it isn't the real thing.

The translation of -- then of all the antiqui- -- of all of antiquity into a -- something universal, that's the story of the last thousand years. And it is, I think, intriguing, if you think that from Virgil to Iason and to Oedipus, there have been a thousand years of antiquity recovered and under this severe rule of selectivity. And wherever, as in slavery, the people of our times have tried to forget this, and have re- -- taken over the whole -- lock, stock and barrel -- a tremendous vindication has followed and the Civil War -- you must not think that this is an American event. It is not all an American event. The Russian czar had to emanci-

pate his serfs in exactly the same year as you well know, in 1861. And why is here -- American Civil War always written up as a local, regional, or American event? You will miss the whole point if you do not see that it was the rectification of the Christian era that had to take place wherever it had been demolished. Most events in America, pardon me for saying so, are much more universal than the American historian care to admit it. Yes, Sir. We have here several professors of American history. Treading on dangerous ground. But it is a -- a provincial attitude to think that these -- these acts were done just in a sovereign manner by people who -- who did not try to fulfill God's commands. Most people do try to fulfill God's commands. People are much more religious than the min- -- the priests and ministers care to know.

They -- one is not pious and religious by going to church, obviously; but one is religious when one hears, when one eliminates some such splinter that has gone into our modern make-up, you see, in -- by misunderstanding of antiquity. This selective process today is in great danger, because the -- the people who deal with anthropology and prehistory simply have no responsibility whatsoever. To me, one of the most terrifying gentlemen of this field is this so-famous Mr. Malinowski, who -- who was just a child. And children do not know what love is. And so his description of the love of the {Torrianders} is just one big humbug. But everybody reads it because it's -- thought of -- a very obscene book. It's just an example how you are invaded with something uncritical. Certainly, I myself have studied these things at -- I had to, in part -- ancient marriage, and ancient incest, and ancient -- heri- -- rules of inheritance -- and they are great elements of loyalty, and of enthusiasm which we will have to revive, because our families break up. And the intensity of feeling and the intensity of unity between the generations is something utter -- very much to be desired. And -- but you must always know that the mandate is given to us to select. And we cannot go back wholesale and revive the Oedipus complex.

And -- the -- it is very strange that today there is this division. In the Middle Ages the priests were the Renaissance -- were carriers of the Renaissance. Today we have two groups. The priest thinks he has to hold on to what was true yesterday, and the so-called scientists dig out anything of the past without any relation to the needs of today. And I think this is disastrous. And the common staff doesn't exist. It is in the making, perhaps, under the theme of sociology. The sociology -- -ogical branch of human knowledge, tries to unify the secular branch of knowledge, you see, which is called prehistory, anthropology, social psychology -- analysis, and how all these terms are meant -- and the religious role of the educator, the priest, the minister, the -- the teacher who is in danger, of course, to be too narrow and not to make use of these new possibilities of

selecting from the past something that will revive his poor schoolchildren. But it is a very majestic process. And I thought after having talked to you only of individuals in the {fourth fir} lectures, I wanted to try at least to show you that we, as one great body of men, are marching very meaningfully through the thousands of years. It is very meaningful that the Church, in the -- first thousand years, had enough to do to beg the people out of all the orders into which they were marooned and petrified. None of these orders accepted change as a necessary element, you see, whether you went to Osiris, or Wodan, or Odin, or the Greek god, Zeus, obviously they were there for eternity, unchangeable, and unliving, and mere idolatries.

As -- Christianity therefore, for neun- -- for 900 or a thousand years, had nothing to do but to convince people that a balance between change -- between change and conservatism, between loyalty to the past and loyalty to the fut- -- our future destiny had to be practiced.

And we do not find any such renaissance, as I have put them here on the blackboard, in the first thousand years of our era. And that's why many people today say the Church is just conservatives, reactionary. They forget that the element of change, which is -- natural with you, you see, did not exist when Christ entered the world. Once a Jew, always a Jew. Once a Greek, always a Greek. Once a Roman, always a Roman. Once a slave, always a slave. Even St. Paul had to write his -- his letter about the escaped slave, you see, with regard to this fact that nobody could be compelled to emancipate his slave. He had no natural law he could invoke and say, "There are no slaves." He had to beg from his slave to go back to his master.

-- That is to say, it is totally overlooked today what the element of newness is which the Church introduced. The Church has introduced this chewing process, that we have to bite off something of the past, you see, which must not return, and we have to bring in elements of the past that have been forgotten.

-- Man, if -- I may put this into a formula, which I think is useful for you and perhaps it's worth your while to take it down: man marches forward by looking backward. That is the Christian attitude in which He reconciles men, the past values and the future necessities. It's very strange. You would of course think, since you all abuse the eye, that you pierce the veil of the future. Since the future has been lived by faith alone, the eye cannot see into the future. But it can be used usefully and very fruitfully by explaining us the past and conjuring up the past.



So you, of course, think I'm a fool because I say, "Man gehts forward and -- by looking backward." You'll say that he falls down, because he cannot see where he goes. I assure you that no man who -- or no woman -- for -- by that matter, who takes a decisive step can see what he is doing. He can sense what he is doing. He can trust. He can do many things to secure even a little bit. He can even take out a life insurance, but he cannot see the future. So the eye would be lascivious. It can -- of course, a voyeur can see the future. What's this, I mean? That's just obscenity. But we -- what we can see is the past, in its horrors, and in its nobility, in its beauty. And the selective power of the whole renaissance, which is an eternal process, it is not limited to the 16th century, is -- makes us use our eyes indeed. What has taken shape before can be seen and must be seen. And therefore, funny as it may sound, man can only go forward, as long as he also looks backward.

Between husband and wife, the division is very obvious in many cases that she holds onto the past in the forms of -- in which the household is kept. No fifth -- no Thanksgiving party without the lady of the house determining what shall be done and -- and all the forms of celebrating in the household are in the hands of women who preserve the past. And he, the -- man, brings in the new debt, and the new mortgage on the house, because he has bought too big a place. But -- the decisions come from the man's side and that is novelty. And the regular comes from the woman. But this -- this adding of a forgotten past, this digging deeper than these two people alone can do, that is the -- effort of organized society. We all together must keep in evidence this arsenal, this treasure-house of past things and accordingly select what in this very moment can revive a part of our dying order.

This fills me with great reverence, I must say. It's far beyond your and my doing. Our museums, our schoolbooks, our literature, too -- I mean, the historical novel -- they are all doing this -- nobody commands any one individual to do it, you see. But it is the world in which we move and by a certain harmony, there is a division of labor between those people who dug up the fu- -- dig up the future at this very moment -- Margaret Meade is just as normal a person as Mr. von Braun. And the one is there for the technological innovation, you see, and the other is there for the selective possibilities of the far, remote past.

Now I come back to grammar. If there is a meaningful march -- of events in the field of the mind, then it is no wonder that after we have higher mathe-

matics, calculus, astronomy, the principle of relativity of Einstein is, so to speak, the -- the climax of this reception of the four liberal arts of antiquity, you see -- they couldn't understand this, the -- ancients. And yet it is -- he is, you see, he stands on their shoulders. He has renewed something they could not bring to this perfection. I do feel that we have the same duty to the Alexandrinians in their -- the matter of grammar. That's why I have a good conscience that the Copernican turn of our relation to grammar lies in this, what the ancients could not see: that acts which have to be fulfilled by the community are presented to us in our relation to them as demanded from -- from us, as commands, as in the Ten Commandments, as filling us with excitement, keeping us going in song, lyrically, as having to be told epically, and as having to be put on the -- on the dump-heap, as "have done" in the -- in the analytical form. I have not to tell you that this is eternal. If you look at literature, you will always find these four branches: lyrics, drama, epics, and the novel which -- modern novel which is naturalistic. Take Zola, take Balzac, take Joyce, it's analytical.

People avoid today this term, although they're all analytical and -- but they also avoid the word "epical," and there's great confusion. Most secular writers cannot accept this cross of reality. They want to have done with two. They say, "One is lyrical and the other is -- is epical," or some such thing. I can't help you. We all, you see, as far as something called into us from the future, live a dramatic life. Anything is dramatic which is -- which is unsolved. But the solution of which, you see, pushes us on, and then pulls us up and demands from us expectation, and fear, and trembling. The expectation is the essence of the drama: that the hero is as yet to become known, and -- it is the task of the hero. I have not to tell you that lyrics express feeling why we are moved, and that epics -- looks back at the facts. And Madame Bovary, by Flaubert -- great example of the analytical novel -- is concerned with states of mind, you see. It analyses this. And again, what would be the best example for this in America? Certainly not *Gone with the Wind*. Mr. {Martin} perhaps tries it {today}. Don't you think? That's analytical.

So wherever -- when -- if grammar and when grammar would discover that these four forms of literature are nothing but the forms of grammar on a higher scale, that the past tense and epics is doing the same, that lyrics and the subjunctive, you see -- "Let us go," or "We are in love," you see -- are the same, that imperative and drama are the same. Any one sentence, "Go," you see, and "Suffer" -- you would already see that literature is not using language, but is simply language, as higher mathematics are, on a higher scale, on a higher level. The literature is not using language, but it is nothing but language im- -- inte-

grated, you see, into its proper usages.

I can assure you that when a Hindu heard a command, it was just as exciting as when you see "Hamlet." Because the question is for him, "Shall I kill my father?" And for Hamlet, it's the same. "Kill him" is -- can -- be just as dramatic and can last -- keep you occupied for 10 years, just as in the case of Hamlet. It is unbelievable how people have tried to widen the gap between the language and the literature. It's the same. It is the same in a more complex form, you see, and growing all the time on us. But woe to us if we omit -- this { } to the simple thing that all these four forms of literature represent. If you do not hear a command out of a drama, the drama is rotten. If you not hear -- lyrics but something perverse out of the poem, then the poetry dies, as it does today, because people have estranged themselves from these -- eternal roots of their existence. We do have to represent in our existence the future, the inner, the outer, and the past. And if -- if we decline to do this, a -- total degeneration must follow. And -- life is much simpler than the modern professors of literature care to admit. I'm always horrified with the theories of language which denigrate language as something -- the best is always when a man says, "Of course, I have very deep thoughts, but language is so poor so I -- I cannot express it," you see. The language is then made the scapegoat, because he's an idiot. The language is always wiser than he who speaks it. That's just incredible. Any language is more powerful than the best speaker. But he doesn't know how to speak it. And -- for this reason I believe that grammar today is overdue. For the last 50 years there has been some concern, but nine-tenths of what is written on this is just nonsense. It would be not fair to -- attack individuals in this. It's not their fault. That is a -- the tradition of the geometrical and arithmetical age, that Mr. Spinoza thought he could prove geometrically, and he had to prove geometrically the existence of God. We -- you know that his Ethics was written according to the laws of geometry, and that every paragraph ends with a "Quod erat demonstrandum," -- "What I had to demonstrate," you see. And it's just built up, this whole Ethics, as a mathematical textbook. It's unbelievably stupid. And nobody can read it today, but that's not his fault. The grandeur of Spinoza's undertaking remains that in the 17th century people thought the revamping of geometry, you see, from antiquity into a modern science, would solve all riddles. Now there's no doubt that we only can fly because of Descartes and Spinoza. And don't misunderstand me. He has made all these technological -- feats possible. But as with the golden calf -- when the Egyptians invented the -- found the -- the calf could plow their wheat fields, it was the greatest discovery

of the -- all ages, because it made settlement possible. And people could stay in the same place, you see, without starvation. Before, they had to hunt and to fish; and this exhausted them, so they had to keep moving. In Egypt, to this day, no Egyptian -- leaves the country. They don't go to America as the Syrians do. And the deepest reason why the Syrians and the Egyptians cannot get along together is that one of these nations is a migratory -- group and the other, the Egyptians, do not migrate. They don't understand how anybody could live without drinking this corrupt Nile water. Only the Americans in Luxor don't drink it.

-- I mean to say once more, pardon me. We'll go back to this. The golden calf and Spinoza's Ethics, {More Geometrico}, are exactly parallel. The Egyptians were so grateful to the calf that they made a statue of it and said, "That's our god," the golden calf. They were right and were wrong. The -- gratitude was in order, but not the carryover of this invention to all other fields of life. The same is with geometry. Don't forget that our planes here, on the airport, really are depending on the -- on the doubts and the mathematics of Mr. Descartes and Mr. Spinoza. But when it came to human relations, of course, it miscarried. So if you read Spinoza -- I have brought his book today, I bought it in town -- and -- was quite lucky, this is only one half of it -- I found that not -- never is there any question of speech. Nothing is said. God cannot speak. God is nature, for Spinoza. God is deaf and dumb. He doesn't know that by assuming that he can speak and God cannot speak, he makes man do more than he can, so to speak, has a right to do. If God is not the power that has endowed us with speech, then there is no use for God. And as in fact, Spinoza, as you know, is a pantheist and is quite honest: since God doesn't speak, He is the same as nature. "Deus sive natura," you see, he -- has to say in geometry.

And there's one other thing I might mention to you, which is of some practical value. For the 17th century, in which most Americans today still live, the -- you do, mentally. Pardon me, but it is a fact. Most of you live in the 17th century, because you do believe in mathematics and in geometry as the real -- basis of science. And this, of course, for a grammarian, is just nonsense. It's proved certain things, but nothing -- only of -- about dead things. No baby can be measured by geometry.

What I was trying to say is that the logic of Spinoza in itself is majestic. I can only prove with my new system of geometry, therefore everything must be deaf and dumb. And I alone, I, Spinoza, can speak. It's -- it's -- this neat assumption of all the scientists that what they say has to be listened to, and what we say has not to be listened to.

But I had another point, and at this moment -- has escaped my memory. I like to show you now from a distance the difference of an ethic that is based on grammar. The idea of Spinoza in geometry was that every one of us is out to save his own skin. And he defines man as a being that wants to preserve himself. It seems to be a very poor definition of a human being, but that's what he only can find. I -- now I know the point -- and because he believes that God is -- Himself a geometrical mind. It's very strange that to this day people think if they prove that something is geometrically right, they will admit some reverence of the divine. Now the one thing we know today is that man's geometry is not divine. God creates irregular bodies. God creates neither circles, nor points, nor lines, nor squares. All these forms are just in the human brain and they never reach perfection. There has never been in the outside world anything that is a square, or a circle, or a line, or a point, you see. It's an imitation -- it's an effort of approximation in us. {But} to assume that God is interested in straight lines -- He has made us terribly crooked. And God's creatures defy mathematics. That's just so interesting about us -- our life. You can never -- any painter knows this, I think -- that the -- the form of anything living defies mathematics. But there is, as I said to -- in you a deep reverence for geometry. And I think if I say that God is not a geometer, you think that's rather blasphemous. But -- the only thing I know for sure about Him, that He has nothing to do with geometry. That's very strange. It's really your prejudice. You believe that I blaspheme because I decline to acknowledge that God -- that God is interested in geometry. He admits it, of course, for our stupidity and our approximation, because we cannot do otherwise, to imitate the beauty of His forms. But our mind is so far distant from the divine spirit that we dabble with -- in geometrical forms as abstractions. But -- the first thing any child learns -- that nobody has ever seen a point, and nobody has ever seen a line. And I'm sure God is not interested in them. He's very much interested in children. And they are quite crooked.

In the -- our grammar, in -- the ethics, in the commandments for our behavior, I -- think I can show you one point in which -- is very -- of very practical importance to say goodbye to the geometry of the divine spirit, and to admit that God has nothing to do with this; and that's about the growing up of any one of us into manhood, into maturity, into fulfillment of His task.

As I see it, there are three stages in your and my life: youth, manhood or womanhood, and what you call now "senior citizens." And -- the hoary head, the old man, and the old woman. These people have all their prescribed task. All of

them. The child must come of age. The men and women must live natural, unaffected, ingenious, genuinely. And the old people must feel that they are irreplaceable, that they are indispensable. If a man has not at one moment of his maturity the feeling that he's doing one thing or the other, you see, which is unique, he has missed his -- the boat. You cannot satisfy a -- a young man with uniqueness. He is just one of the tribe or one of -- Boy Scouts. But you must satisfy any old person. That's why all the measures now taken for the senior citizens are so horribly wrong. They imitate the herd instinct of the young, but anybody who has a good old age cannot be subsumed under anything else. He's just Mr. { } or whoever it is.

The cruelty of modern man against old age is -- is really something to behold, because these three stages are never ethically, morally, spiritually distinguished. And it's interesting that a mathematical age -- as the last 300 years actually have been a geometrical, arithmetical, statistical age -- do not even know that the question is not between good and bad. That's Old Testament law. The New Testament knows nothing of this law. How can we say to anybody else, "This is good or bad"? Everything is -- every day is different. Every one of you knows this -- is just nonsense. This is no -- not this moral- -- moralism of a list of acts which you cannot commit. How do I know? What -- I -- if I speak of the acts I had to commit, they certainly were not in the -- under any rule of any moral -- moral code. I created this moral code under the strain of my existence.

I always like to tell a little story. Pardon me. I just say it, really. I have other bigger stories. It's a small story, but it makes perhaps my point. I was -- leading a troop in the siege of Verdun under heavy fire, over a road. We were with horses. We -- ammunition was drawn -- pulled by these horses. I was on horseback. The -- the -- the others were on horseback, too. And great confusion occurred, and the people threatened to strike.

So I took one of the men and gave him a slap in the face. I kept him from being shot in -- in a court-martial. And I kept the troop from going to pieces. And ten years later this young man -- he was -- very young man at that time -- brought his wife to me and said to me -- said to her, "This is the man who saved my life."

Now you can never explain in any ethical code that a man should slap another man in the face. And yet it was the only solution in front of the others which solved my problem. I didn't have to shoot him, you see. He -- could get somewhere. And probably, in -- if you read a modern psychologist, he will more readily understand that I shot him, or had him court-martialed, he'll never

understand that I had slapped him.

It's very strange. This is -- he has choked in his imagination the freedom of the children of God. And there is nothing that you -- cannot be asked to do. I have seen -- I won't go into all -- the illegalities I have done with great fervor. But there is no law for a believing man. But there is a necessity to act, to conjure up, use your imagination to solve a -- a deadlock.

So good and evil, that's for children. It's not for you and me -- because we neither know what is evil nor what is good, to tell you the truth. The -- the results will tell. You have to invent the next act. Every one of us has to do this. And I can show you this in the -- in the simple story of the -- which is -- the ministers are so hectic now about -- and the social workers -- about the juvenile delinquent -- when is a man -- does a man come of age? Or a girl? When can you put her on trial in a court and say she must be judged according to the law? When is she or he in her five senses? And we have talked of five senses. Now obviously, if she has experienced the workings of the five senses. And to make this more clear, a boy of 18 can be judged and be called a murderer if he is able to perceive and to understand the voice of his father, of his mother, of his sister, as much as his own voice. Such a man cannot commit rape. Such a man has to break the law. Such a man has not to be obscene or to -- to over- -- break the -- the -- the habits of the community. It's very simple. Because God has put into us the power to live in a family, these four people represent the full power of human speech. And anybody who has the luck to live in a family or whose orphan asylum has been able to replace these educational impressions can be judged. He is of age if you can, so to speak -- make sure that he has been exposed and has been able to understand at certain times of his life these three other voices. The complete man is the man who covers this ground of which I have talked to you the first lecture -- you remember? -- that he can understand how a -- his sister feels, understand how his mother feels. Two ages and two sexes must have entered the mind of a normal human being before he can represent the human race, and can fall under the verdict of the law. The law protests that it will only deal with people that are of age, you see, that are not minors. And the whole confusion of our society is, of course, in this, that you ask such a boy -- the judge may ask him, "Do you know what is good and evil?" Of course, he doesn't know. Yet he does know in practice very well what is good and evil. He knows that he cannot insult his mother, and cannot rape his sister, and cannot box down his father, just because he's a little more forceful than his father. There is an office for all three people in his own heart and in his own

mind. That's a very practical yardstick, ladies and gentlemen, that you can apply. And it would immediately show you why I speak of grammatical ethics, because it is grammatical that we speak to each other, you see, and that we wander through the various relations simply by coping with people of the other sex and people of another age.

And only then -- and that's why the mob that bands together -- boys only or girls only, or fathers only, or mothers only -- of course demoralizes society. And all the concoctions of the -- against the juvenile delinquents in the streets of New York will not carry weight if there is not a Horace Alger or some nice man of the older generation who is present with these youngsters. You cannot have them in a gang. That is not education. That doesn't make them grow up. They will remain childish for another 20 years. And you can have Al Capones all around.

Very strange you see. If you look into any textbook of ethics, it nowhere has dawned on any minister that grammar is wiser than his ethics. He only sees this one individual and tries to persuade him to be bored stiff and to do nothing in life from fear of going wrong. That's not life. I mean, I reject all such ethics. I think they are the poison of our age, as far as they're still there, printed. Nobody of course obeys them, anyway. They go -- I mean, I know all these priests who recommend ethical -- textbooks to their children. They themselves go to the analyst.

There is a great -- it's like a grave, the Church in this respect. You cannot talk business with them about ethics. There is no Christian ethic, but there is communion. And I have only, of course, picked about the representatives, mother, father, daughter, and son -- it's a much richer world in which we can be entered and there is -- are substitutions. You have orphans, you have parents that don't function. I know all this, of course. Still, I think for the practical purpose of showing you what grammatical ethics would be, it would be the opposite from Spinoza. Spinoza says, "I prove mathematically," you see, "that God is a figure in geometry." And he really says so, you see. And therefore he comes to the result: there is no God, there's just nature.

And I, on the other hand, hear and find people living by speech, and by the way in which we talk to each other and of each other. And I may add to these -- to these eth- -- first ethical rule a simple observation which again, nobody cares to make: every one of you lives under the impact of three streams of force, currents of force, electric currents -- however you call it, it doesn't matter. One is the way you think of yourself. You talk to your yourself and say, "You -- I have made



an ass of myself," which you usually do, and -- I don't know how ladies say { }. And -- well, there are she-donkey. And -- the second way of -- we speak, we know we are spoken to. People behave graciously toward one or not graciously. They scold us, they praise us, they greet us, they -- interest themselves in our well-being. Then there is a mightier ring around our existence. That's the way the people speak of us in our absence. That's also speech. And it's very powerful. And most people know very clearly that most people do not say the same thing in their absence as they say in their presence. And that has a great power, too. And these are the three ethics of the grownup life -- these three cautions. What do I think of myself, or what do I say to myself, condemning me or bearing with me under the load of my dissatisfaction and disappointment? And then there are these two other rings: the way people speak to me and I speak to them, of course, and the way people speak of me.

These three rings must be united. And he is natural and genuine who is able to do something about their union. The second age of man consists in this battle. No boy of 18 can be recognized for what he is. He has to show it. So there is a long way during which he finally unfolds, and if we are lucky in our old -- in -- on our -- last day, the words spoken at our tomb by the minister or by our friend, and what we thought of ourselves, will coincide. They will be identical. If you -- that's bliss. -- It's not too -- asking too much, is it?

Wie? You're not convinced.

(Oh, I'm convinced, if it could be true.)

Well, I think that is what we call a good end. I think that if this is so dissolved, that there's unanimity, you see, between the people who speak of us, the people -- who speak to us and myself, who speaks to myself, there is peace. And then probably my role on this earth has fulfilled its purpose.

Which is this purpose? To do something that nobody else can do. This is the third. Any hoary head wants to feel that in one way or the other, he has been indispensable. If you could convey to any worker this feeling, you see, he is delighted.

I have had such an experience. An old worker in Germany, in this Mercedes factory -- he was a leading pacifist. He had written a very beautiful brochure on his -- at his own expense, naturally -- on world peace. And he came to die and I heard of it and I went to see him. And we had a long talk and he said, "Doctor, any man wants to have been loved and to have loved." And this passé

{de fini} was very beautiful. You see, he used exactly this phrase, "Any human -- man want to have been loved and to have loved." And I think he is right.

Now love is selective. You don't love in general. If you do, you lie. You may be very kind, but you certainly have no love. Kindness is not the same as loving and again, there is a big illness in this country. People think if they are kind that they already are in love. Don't marry for kindness.

So I have solved -- I have given you at least the -- beginning to understand that at the end, this sentence that this man said to me -- this man, {Hasseck} was his name, I'm still moved by the memory of this good man -- and he had gone further. He had construed a -- little bit like Mr. {Simon Brodian} a world globe, a planetarium. And he presented it as a gift to this factory, to this totally heartless, idiotic factory, you see. They didn't deserve it. But -- but he couldn't help loving them. He was unmarried. He had no family. He died. He was perhaps -- I don't know now, it's so long ago -- 75 years of age. And -- he gave to this factory, you see, the work of his hands. He was the skillful mechanic and this is what he did, because this is a unique act. And it's real love. It's not kind. But it's something much more. And there you have the true death and the true life of a very good man.

To do something that nobody else can do, because he's not in his place, will do -- that is the desire of every woman and every man when they look back on -- have to look back on a long life. This is grammar, because the singular and the plural, and the terrible word, you see, anybody can. All these are grammatical -- clauses, and any human being in his heart of hearts is trying to say to himself, "You have done this and nobody else has done it. It had to be done. And at least you have done your duty."

And -- not one of these grammatical rules of consciousness and speech is ever mentioned in any ethical book. I have never found in any ethical book, or in any philosophical book, or any theological book, Sir, or religious book it ever mentioned that it is tremendous pressure on us to think what other people say to -- of us in our back. Think of all the black people in Alabama. They know exactly how they are called in the white -- houses of the white. Do you think that's easy to bear? That's the real pressure on these people. Not the way the white people -- behave in their face, but the way the white people speak of them in their absence. That is the immense cruelty in this country. The Jews the same. The -- the Basques the same. The Dagos the same. Wherever you go, you take the liberty of talking in the absence of these people, you see, in a way you would never dare to speak to their face. That destroys any community. And why doesn't -- isn't this

ever mentioned? The rules are all individually do-good. Oh, for Heaven's sake! Who knows what is good? Certainly not the minister.

"Good" is a -- is a creation of the moment. It's a -- takes imagination to become good for this act that has to be performed. There is no rule in the dictionary what is good. It may be good to slap a man. It may be good to stroke a -- a child. It may be good to pay your -- the -- a -- friend's bill, or it may be very bad to pay the friend's bill. How can you ever tell what is good? Nobody knows. Nothing is ever good or evil, you see, as Shakespeare said. But -- it's -- of the moment. You have to be very crude, very rude sometimes in order to help such a man.

So, I -- think I have to stop now. Thank you very much. And I hope you have understood why it is a -- quite a great story that the geom- -- geometry of the 17th century and the grammar of the 20th century, 300 years apart, in 1662, Spinoza wrote his book, we have -- are writing now 1962, that is of the same urgency and import to save us from geometry as it was at that time, you see, to {plan} for the geometry.

May I say -- say one more sentence? It's for the ministers who are present. I don't have them here always. And -- Mr. {Thorvaldson}, I have one objection against the language of the Church. And that is that God is an object of praise. And I hope that even the Book of Common Prayer will eliminate this pagan phrase. God is not an object of prayer. I have here -- several sentences. Of course, John Dewey uses it all the time. He says, "Morality is the formation of the voluntary self in which the love of the objects will make this transformation possible." Now, to Hell with the love of the object. You -- don't you understand that you can only love somebody who can talk back? And he has ceased to be an object. The word "object" makes it impossible to assume that the listener or the recipient of your praise, you see, listens in. And it makes for atheism. Now the Church, of course, is more or less an atheistic institution. To cover that up, you use these routine prayers. But you shouldn't give away the secret and say that God is an object of praise.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...to give it its serious connotation, I have to say that it is certainly obedience, because it is patience. You can -- the expression in German came into usage after the Reformation because -- the princes who took over from the Papacy the responsibility for the -- protecting the orthodox faith on the continent -- every prince had his own establishment -- these princes were responsible for the cultivation of the land. They were the first conservationists. Long before any conservationist ever reached these shores, and before Mr. Muir created the California parks, the German princes saw to it that the woodland in Eur- -- in Germany was preserved. Over 800 years, the percentage of forests has not changed in Germany. And that's a great achievement. And this was called "Kultur," culture. Die Landeskultur, the -- Kultur of the country was -- had from the very beginning something to do with the length of time needed to create, construct anything worthwhile.

And I'm afraid this word in this country and your translation has to be brought back to this meaning if it shall not destroy you. Culture has nothing to do with china, or with ceramics, or with painting, or with poetry. But it has to do with obedience to the laws of the earth, and of the Heaven, too. No child prodigy comes under the expression, "Cultura," because it is not given time to develop. All the sins of the 19th century and the 20th century, of your speed-up program -- what I said last time, that if a child is allowed to be a freshman -- at 13 and-a-half years in the university -- these people should be beaten up who allow this. That's uncultured.

So -- in the translation into the English, which only has occurred really in the last 30 years, you must know -- the word is of -- is quite recent an intruder in the American jargon -- has lost its solemnity, its religious values of going slow, you see -- of letting grow, of not being able to do things by your will -- but observe the laws of growth as they are, and as we cannot change them. So you see immediately there is -- obedience is at the beginning, this hearkening, you see, to the -- slow and low whisper that is just the opposite from the Devil's whisper. The Devil tells you you can have all your pleasures immediately and patience says you cannot.

And -- I had a friend in -- in Alberta who wrote me very ki- -- no, it was in Saskatoon: "We have much civilization, but of course we have no culture." Well, what did he mean? He had lived in my house in Germany years before, and now he felt that things at the frontier in Canada had to -- done very quickly,

everything improvised, you see. So he felt deeply, you see, that this slow growth wasn't there. You can have -- culture, I think -- if you need this word at all. Only when you feel that something has already been going on for a long time, you enter upon it and you don't wish to destroy it. You don't want to mechanize it. You don't want to exploit it. You don't want to take advantage of it, you see. So the Kultur is older than the living generation. And for this reason, the generation feels obliged to wait and see so that it may reach the grandchildren. This country, as you know, since the 17th century has been threatened by the opposite situation. In 1675, a synod of Westminster in, I think, in Massachusetts, gathered and the Divines decided that this country was in great danger -- to become the matter of one age -- {Res unius etatis} was the Latin expression. And that I think has remained the symptom of this country to this day; that even if you do things for the long run, like conservation, you have to persuade the living generation that it is for their benefit, for their pleasure. I don't think that the conserv- -- the parks in this country are for the pleasure of the living generation, but they are our responsibility to the year 3000 or 2500. We cannot -- kill the soil, which must bear fruits later.

Now all the tactics that are needed to bring pressure on Congress so that we allot some money for these parks, you see, today have to be clothed in some propaganda for the benefit of all these recreationists during summertime. They should know that they are absolutely unimportant! And the -- conservation is needed whether 10 million people go into these parks or not. And as soon as these 10 million people understand how unimportant they are in the face of the responsibility for the long-range future, the better it would be. I think this is just advertising tactics to tell the people that they will enjoy it. Enjoyment is not a reason for conservation alone. It's a byproduct. This would be again obedience, you see, because there's always somebody third present, the future. And what are we? These -- these few little mice we are, running around there in these parks.

This language has not been spoken. Here -- therefore the word "culture" has made an impression in the last 30 years. But since I'm deeply concerned with the abuse of these words, that it really means the Ph.D. and some such ridiculous things, that -- I would like to -- you -- to -- tell you when for the first time the word became a slogan, because it is perhaps of some interest to go back into this history.

At first, for 300 years from Luther's days in the 16th century -- also the days of Henry VIII -- to the French Revolution, it just meant the obedience to the

very poor and scanty soil of the little principalities in Europe, in Central Europe. Then the French Revolution came, and many Germans traveled to Paris to see the new miracle of freedom and brother- -- fraternity, and equality. Of course, they found -- not one of the three -- none of them -- but they found a guillotine. And they were frightened. And so there was a violent reaction. And one of the deepest German thinkers, Wilhelm von Humboldt, wrote home to his wife and to his friends that Germans had to reconsider their values, that what the French proclaimed as civilisation, as civilization, seemed to him a haphazard and short-lived thing. And so he -- played up, so to speak, the German patience and slow -- slow -- going-slow principle, as Kultur. And at that moment, in 1795, this change-ling, Kultur -- culture then entered its second verse, you see, a new career. Now it didn't mean just the cultivation of the soil in its proper way. But it also meant the human behavior as -- through creative arts, and the patience, you see, with regard to results that you couldn't do by willpower in -- a fortnight, but only the slow growth of centuries might -- produce.

So, is this sufficient? Anything else, please?

(Does that apply also, though, to the Church?)

Pardon me?

(Does that explanation also apply to the Church?)

To the -- church?

(Yes.)

Well, the byword of the Church since antiquity has been {Patiens quia æterna} patient because eternal. You see, what we -- what the Church is -- Father {Russack} again will forgive me, that I try to know something beside what he knows -- that all churches, you see, are criticized by this epit- -- epithet. Any church has, of course, some elements of passing interest. The language of the Church is our modern English, but that is not the eternal language of the Church. What is eternal in the Church needs this patience toward the sensations of the day. You see, the Church has to survive any fashion. And a fashionable church is not a church, even if it is on Broadway, or Fifth Avenue, or Park Avenue. I mean, it doesn't help to be fashionable. And if you only show your hat and your new dress on Easter Sunday, it just isn't Easter. It is your new dress, then -- prevails. So {Patiens quia æterna} -- patient because eternal -- is the slogan with which the Church fights its -- her own temptations, you see, to be

modern, to be up to date. It's all unimportant, because the Church must live through all the fashions of all the times, or there isn't a church. And most people hate to hear this, because they think we have to be progressive, and we have to march forward with the times, and yesterday is not today. Yes, but today is just yesterday, you see. That is, in the eyes of the Church, this day which we live here is already yesterday. In the eyes of God, it is just one whim, one wink, one moment, you see. And so this is -- is it -- does it satisfy you?

(Not quite. Because you said the people that were running around through this generation like mice, we think -- I think it's tremendously important what this generation does in this church, which is part of the great tradition of -- of 19 centuries, and so I wonder if the Church and culture aren't somewhat welded together as being more important than...)

Dead culture.

(...fleeting mice or -- or just patience. I mean, it's just terribly important what we do today. And if -- as far as style goes, I don't understand that. I mean, the hat on the head. I'm thinking of the great stream of catholic philosophy that's come down. I -- I -- by catholic, I mean the great meaning of "catholic.")

I -- I am not quite sure that we understand each other.

(No, I'm sorry.)

Every generation ex- -- must expect to be judged by the dross it produces, and the wastepaper, and the -- the -- the destruction, and by the plantation that goes on. That you will agree with, I mean. Rhode Island is called "Providence and plantations," because you plant it for the future, and every generation has so much membership in the Church as it sacrifices the present for the future. So any parent -- father who is -- decides to marry and forgoes the pleasures of the moment for this continence and for this self-discipline, sacrifices for his children. That's why it is difficult to get married, because you forgo, of course, very many pleasant things. In the moment in which he enters this -- into the sacrament of marriage, which is for the husband much more difficult than for the woman, he is willing to say that his life takes second seat in the respects of having children, and providing for them, and feeling responsible for their upbringing, their education. In this moment, he is a member -- active member of the eternal in our lives, you see, because he forgoes the complete fulfillment of his own personality, you see. He's indulging in -- in -- in the -- what has been the sermon in the valley in the last hundred years, "Be yourself," you see, "and develop all your --

faculties," and so. Nobody who does this can be a good father, I mean. The beginning of fatherhood is that you cannot develop all your faculties. Is this -- isn't this quite eloquent?

We are so secularized today, of course, that people do not believe that there is anything that can stand outside the year 1962 and can shine into this year -- 1962. But all sacraments mean -- try to do this, make you and me aware that our present, own life, you see, is only a link in a chain and cannot be this link in the chain if we -- think of our own time as the only time. The other times must be present. And this representation is the duty of the Church, you see. To represent from Adam to the -- through the last judgment day the whole of time, while we are in a -- divine service. The meaning is, you see, that what happens to us in our own lifetime is very small, compared to the importance that the whole creative process must go on.

Ja?

This is my last meeting with you and I must try to pull together what -- I have done in the previous five meetings. I have tried to prepare you for what is the content of today, for acknowledging the real place of speech in biology, in the life-and-death struggle of -- this earth, which is always in the throes of death, destruction, annihilation, extinction, drying-up, sterility, and decay. Death is upon us. And every generation has to create a larger humanity, because the way in which the spirit, or the word, the speech, keeps us going -- despite our own mortality -- is that we have to move in ever larger circles. Today we have to face the whole of mankind for this very reason because if not, we perish. But this has been the case when the first cities got together and founded a country. The -- the power of peace between men is the power of conservation of the human race. And speech is -- the method by which this is constantly achieved. The program of -- of humanity is not in the hands of parties or politicians, but it is in this first fact that man has received this power of speech so that he may make peace. Peace is the paradoxical experience; it can exist between a woman and a man against all appearances. They pursue each other. They want each other. They torment each other. They divorce each other. And yet you all know that there are words, spoken with -- spoken with conviction, who hold this couple together. And the first peace made on earth, therefore, was the peace between Adam and Eve. I always am so sorry that the ministry and the people who poke fun at the Bible only mention the fall of man and never mention the fact that Adam and Eve, after all, stayed married, and had a very nice son called Seth. And, this is a true story, of course, that when God in the fifth chapter of



Genesis calls man "Adam," he includes Eve into the story, so that from the very -- the -- first experience of mankind is the experience of the worst warfare that exists in the world, the battle between the sexes. And it is very silly -- as we educate children to think it is difficult to have peace between Russia and America. That's very easy. Both have a wrong system.

But it is very miraculous that the worst fever that we have -- usually spring fever -- that this can be pacified, that there can be peace between the sexes. And you think the other way around, I know. I am quite alone with my admiration for marriage and my little esteem for politics. It is very easy to have -- hold peace between Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Kennedy. But it is terribly difficult to have peace between husband and wife. And you don't -- are not astonished where you should be astonished, and therefore you read all these newspaper -- this is newspaper stuff. But the difficulty is to pacify the sexes. There is nothing more cruel, nothing mehr devastating than the war between those sexes. If you think of the victims from venereal disease, from brothels, from prostitution -- from perversion -- all the men who from fear of the other sex go pervert, you -- you know -- look at -- all -- all just around how many, how much life is there destroyed. That's very serious. And we haven't found -- a cure-all for this. In politics, we have all kinds of ways of threatening each other so that we keep -- keep reasonable. I always suspect the people who talk too big in politics, that there's something wrong in their household.

The rank and file of mankind has plenty to do to keep peace at home; and if they do this, they also know how to make peace in the world at large. But the professional politicians have some reason to stay away from home.

The -- the famous story of a minister of justice in Prussia -- he was a very great jurist, Mr. von Beseler, a very famous name -- and he was intolerable in his office. But one day he began to be very sweet. His wife had died.

If you would for one moment believe me -- I know it is difficult -- that the war between the sexes is the original warfare between man and man, and that this is the seat of the problem of our lives, and of our union, and of our United Nations -- that in any -- every marriage on the one-hand side, a new nation begins, and two nations may make peace among each other -- you would really look at history, I think, with a better understanding, because the whole problem -- program of human history is then in the fact that already the oldest tribes have monogamy. You also would understand that Islam is the great desertion of this, abandonment of this knowledge because Islam, as you know, has polygamy and that's why Islam has no future and why today, against all the news from these

scoundrels in Ibn Saud's Arabia, the -- Islam is in the birth throes of a great reformation. It cannot last, because it has not this peace between man and woman. That's the real warfare, as I told you before, and that's -- don't be frightened when these people speak of pan-Arabic movements. That doesn't exist. There exist, unfortunately, American dollars -- which we feed these tyrants and make for war there. But that's America's policy and not -- not the policy of the Arabian raiders.

And on the other hand, in -- all over North Africa, all over India, Pakistan, Arabia, Iraq, Iran, the problem is: where do the women of these people stand? And that's real politics. And nobody -- ever -- in our newspapers ever mentions this, you see -- Mr. Nasser knows this very well indeed. His predecessor, King Furt- -- you see, King -- what was his name? wie? Farouk, yes -- was divorced by his wife. And that was the great revolution of Egypt, not Mr. Nasser. She sent the letter of divorce to the King of Egypt. And she made -- she had been educated in Paris and she made use of her new rights as a woman.

And these are -- these are the interesting facts that go on in this world today, not what you read in the papers. Because all issues are religious, and the relation between man and wife is -- men and women is of course the central issue of our faith.

It is this very reason that magazines and newspapers are no food for you today, because as soon as these news are just secular, they can never touch on the important, you see. Because the marriage is a religious question, you see. Your religion is in your marriage. And therefore the newspapers don't touch it. But that's why -- they have become so uninteresting. I've tried to read -- The Los Angeles Times, but I found it unpalatable. The newspapers have let us down. They no longer speak of important things.

Now, in order to draw together these five lectures, I have put this strange word, "individuus," here on the blackboard. Nobody knows what it means. And I have added "can" and "may." I have talked here, in the understanding of what we do when we speak to each other or when we fall silent, of something that goes against the grain of the 19th century. That's the word "individual." Everybody has boasted that every man is a parcel, is a country to himself, is his own world, and his own will governs in this -- inside this individual. That is one meaning of the Latin word, "individuus," which means "it's the smallest unit -- that which is indivisible," you see. "Individuus" is the adjective which means "that which cannot be divided." This is one -- only one aspect, it is the use of the word, used in Greece, in antiquity. The "atomos," you see, that -- the atom is -- the -- Latin

version of "atom" is "individual," and I have not to point out to you that this has been refuted. We do divide the atom. It can be divided, and the assumption therefore that you and I cannot be divided is probably also wrong. We can go schizophrenic, and we do. And we break down under the burden of this lie that you and I are individuals. It's the one thing we are not. We are very divisible. And just as the nuclear physicist tells you that the atom is divisible, you and I are also divisible and we are therefore found in -- in larger proportions than ever in lunatic asylums.

This is quite serious. The blunder of the 19th century is to declare that man is not divisible. Man is divisible. He can break apart. And he does it more and more, and if you con- -- go on with your -- ridiculous philosophy that man is not divisible, he will prove it to you. The majority of people will go insane.

There is quite another use of the word "individuus." And there you see that the Church or the religious way of mankind has always run -- to run parallel with the secular one. For the secular thinker, for the zoologist, the philosopher, the biologist, it was understood that here, everybody had a skin to himself, therefore he couldn't be divided without destroying him, and also man was his own highest unit. Here, I can see: you sit here, I sit here, what do we have in common? We are divided.

The Church has always said that's just nonsense. You only live because I am here and you are here. We are together. And this therefore, they coined therefore this phrase, "individuus" with the new meaning, "that which may not be divided." And they climax it with the -- to you, unknown, but rather sacred term -- "individua trinitas." The trinity between Father, Son, and Holy Spirit cannot be subdivided. It is indivisible. Also peace is indivisible. You may remember that there has been a slogan in the last 50 years, and between the two world wars, that all peace was indivisible, that it wouldn't do that two countries had peace. All had to, you see. Peace could not be divided. The divine presence cannot be divided. And all the peace treaties, down to the peace treaty of 1815, including the Peace of Versailles between America and England, began with the great word, "In the name of the indivisible Trinity."

What's the practical importance of this phrase? It meant that when -- the 13 colonies and England made peace, that it made no -- difference -- it should make no difference that George III hated the independence of America, that the divine spirit now hovered over both countries, despite the lack of any understanding between the two earthly powers. George III, as you know, said at one time -- had to pronounce the independence of the United States. I've learned this

from Mr. Page Smith, again.

And man can only make peace if your and my conviction is not the last and highest court of justice. The individual character of the Trinity means that we have, as Americans, at this moment to grant Mr. Khrushchev life. And -- and although the bishops of -- this country have gone to -- Mr. Truman in 1948 or '47, and told him that they had nothing against the preventive throwing-down of the atomic bomb on Moscow -- that's not a religious act to -- to say so -- you have to tolerate your enemy. The essence of Christianity is that, believe it or not, we like it or not, God has a greater patience and a greater understanding than we have and the -- since the Trinity is indivisible, God is at home in Russia as much as He is here, because the official denial of the divinity is not what God cares for. You just have to read the New Testament on this. Those who will say, "Lord, Lord," are not, you see, sure of the kingdom of Heaven.

The greatness of the peace that we have to follow, that we have to maintain, that we have to aspire at, is beyond our ideology, beyond our philosophy, beyond our consciousness. Peace is beyond our reasoning. This is expressed in this expression, "Individua trinitas," and it means that Trinity may not be divided. That this is very important you can see from the fact that Mr. Eichmann went to his death allegedly believing in God. It cost nothing. That's philosophy. The Stoic says, "I believe in God." Nobody knows what he means. He means "nature." I told you yesterday -- the last time, about Spinoza, who was a pantheist. And he said, "Nature and God -- that's just the same." It isn't, you see. The Trinity of our -- living God is quite different. It's a -- trinity which we testify to when we speak. For example, when an American speaks to a Russian, he acknowledges that although there's misunderstanding, there's a craving for understanding, and there is a duty to try to understand, and there is a hope that we may understand, and there is a deep faith that God cannot have created this round earth just for nothing, and just for our private pleasure.

The individua trinitas then is in the 20th century, I think, as important as the doctrine of individualism in the 19th century. It is totally forgotten that the peace treaties were only possible for a thousand years of mankind, because people had to bury the -- the axe, you see, of dissent, and had to come to terms, because they recognized that they weren't alone in the world, that God had created the other beings just as well as us. And as you have to make peace with the redwood in conservation, so we have to make peace with people who speak another language. And it's no reason to kill them, because they do not speak with the nasal twang as in Chicago.

If you see it, it is quite exciting that the secular always takes precedence before -- we discover the religious content. It is not an accident that the word "individua" -- "individuus" -- "individual" has triumphed in the 19th century on purely natural grounds. Because you and I have two different pairs of pants and coats, we were called, you see, separated, and the smallest unit that can be formed. But if you think of your natural atomic physicists, they, of course, only think under the neurotic compulsion to keep up with our faith. And the natural sciences always -- march in the rear guard of political experience. You think the opposite. You think they are the avant-garde. Not at all. They are delegates from our experience of World War I and II. Since we have to form now a unity, you see, they have to -- discover that all these electrons are not just part of one atom, but belong to a much larger universe into which this atom, you see, is lodged. And I assure you, if you want to learn how to behave from the atomic physicist, you will throw the bomb. If you say they are just reflecting on the needs of mankind in their little fields of physics and chemistry, you will understand them better. And you will control them, and you will check them, and you will not admire them so much. I think that's all today the golden calf, this admiration of physics. It's exactly the same what the Egyptians did, and it did the Egyptians no good, and it won't do you any good to believe that physics is the divinity which you have to worship.

Physics can be subdivided in biophysics and chemical physics. And it's already completely on the way out, as a unity. It has -- forms no unity. The place in the individual trinity is more difficult, but it's much more fruitful and it's much more reliable.

I try to show you that every human being that participates in this great concert of the universe in which the electrons swing, and in which you and I dance, trying to keep the peace of -- to establish the peace and spread it all over this globe, that in this tremendous cosmic dance, speech is the power that enlarges, controls, revises what we are doing. We are told what to do; we say we are doing it; we check, have we done it; then we die and others come and take stock and say they have done it. And I told you that man moves, therefore, from the imperative of when he hears his name called out over him -- be it in the cradle or be it later; marches under orders -- that's your obedience; and while he is -- carrying out his -- his task in -- for the little time he is on this earth, he makes -- tries to encourage himself by this emotional attitude of the subjective mood. And then he looks back and takes stock with whom he had to join. And you remember that I told you that the sequence in grammar is -- where's my chalk? -- I -- the -- the vocative, with which I am called -- the "Poor Me," you may call it. Then the "I." Then the "we." And then the "it."

I have to come back. This was the beginning of our wisdom here. You and I, when we are born, we enter this world as "Poor Me," as "Thee." Then we -- may become "I's." But the right to become "I's" depends on our obedience, that we have listened. I think I have somewhere here even a stupid verse, but it is just as good as any memorial verse in grammar:

The listener, "Poor Me,"  
Has formed all my beginnings.  
He as speaker, my proud "I,"  
may come into his innings.

It is very important that you should see that man begins as a listener, as somebody to whom the voices of God or his parents speak. And the parents are no good if the child cannot understand that they speak in the name of God and not in their own ridiculous name. There would be less matriarchy and less analysis needed if the parents would make it clear, as obviously Mother Freud did not make it clear to poor Mr. Freudli, that she did not speak in her own name. But she -- that she called on him in -- in somebody-bigger's name. Parents are in God's stead, but only as long as it is clear that they don't speak in their -- from their own women-mood, but that they are representative.

There is a universal priesthood of men, but it is only in existence if it is -- can be made clear that the child knows, "my parents govern me in a higher name." Your whole problem in this country is only that the parents have always acted as I's, as characters, as individuals. Then they have no right to claim any authority over their children. Why should anybody, why -- because he's older or has indulged in marriage, why should he have any right to educate his child? No reason to see this. Take the -- take it away from these parents. They are just individuals.

And I tried to show you that the only thing that must hold together is the indivisibility of human peace. And if the parents are able to let this peace shine into the heart of the child, they have the authority to bring the child into the fold. Under- -- otherwise, they abuse it. All your problems in education vanish from the very moment when the parents make sure that they find means and ways to show the child that it is not they who give the orders, but that they are, just as much as Mr. Kennedy, officers of some higher order.

If you don't do it, the result will be that the -- your children, as they already do, call you by their first -- your first name. And then you have to obey

them, which I -- also have seen in American families. This is very simple. We all are either priests of the word, or we are nobodies. Out we go.

"The listener, Poor Me, has formed all my beginnings. He as speaker, my proud I, may come into his innings." It may help you then, to see also that there is a famous book, which is very misleading, by my friend Martin Buber, who wrote this book 40 years ago and couldn't know that it would be so misinterpreted. The book is called, *The I and the Thou*. And since he put the "I" first, people have not understood there is not -- are not two people, only, but that you begin as a "Thou," and then grow up to be the -- an "I," and then later a "we." It's terribly important that you should see that you yourself have to run through the stages of grammar in every one act. When you are -- integrated into a society, you begin with understanding the command. In this moment, an imperative -- I -- like to always -- to express it, seeks his executor, you see. There is in the air dangling fire, you see. Somebody has to extinguish the fire, so we all shout, "Fire, fire, fire!" Somebody who is obedient to this call, runs out, and brings the water hose, and begins to extinguish the fire. Others -- remain indifferent, and this act does not touch them, and they remain outside history, so to speak, because they do not feel that they should respond. Responses make people. Anybody who hears the vocative, "John," and who follows the vocative is in the state of being born as a person. But he has to take upon himself this humiliating experience, that somebody else creates him into what he has to do. We are not self -- makers of ourself. Again, one of the wonderful lies of the 19th century is that man makes himself. It doesn't exist. Nobody makes himself.

We are made by -- under -- even the man who hears the word "Gold," from California and he rushes out and is slain -- he has not been made by himself, but by this vocative, "Gold." And the -- his answer is, "I shall try to get it." But this is a second situation. This is a response, you see, to somebody -- something that is called out. How can one overlook it? I -- it's hard to believe how these people in the 19th century cheated themselves out of their salvation, and out of their bliss by saying, "We begin {the earth}." Well, any man who came to this country listened to -- you may say, something very seductive, some sounds of the siren, but he came certainly because there was a rumor in the world that you could live in this country. And they obeyed this challenge and they came. And then they respond by their becoming somebody in their own right, and ending up as "I's," and finally as "we's," with some tremendous trust.

We ourselves, then, pass through the various forms of grammar. If you would bear this in mind, you would understand that history, for example, a field which is today very much in -- under debate, is not a science, but is a narrative of

what has gone on before. Now to narrate, and to tell a tale has nothing to do with science. And as long as the historians on -- in this university and others believe that they are scientists, history must, of course, disintegrate, as it does today. It ends in biography. That is, that's the last individual unity which cannot be debated, and so the good historians today are biographers.

But history is not biography. Sorry to say, dear Page. And it's the -- it is the tale that's -- has to be told so that the young- -- next generation is -- is -- allowed to continue the tale. And therefore it has to be told because the future already got started in 1776. And how can any man live in America if he doesn't take to his bosom the history of -- beginning in 1776 or before, or later, and becomes willing to continue it? That's history. History is your introduction into that which already has begun to dictate to your acts because the future began already, long before you were born.

No Christian can doubt this, because -- what do we believe? We believe that Christ is ahead of us. Jesus died certainly a long time ago. That's a very short time for you and me to catch up with Him and to follow suit. And He is va- -- very much ahead of you and me at this moment. He lived already tasks, and duties, and possibilities which you and I still have to discover. So we are much later than Jesus, or there is no Christianity. If you don't believe this, you cannot be a Christian. The consequences are easily understood.

I have here -- copied for you a strange tormented { } of a man who has written a very good book. It's called The Yorkist Age. It came out a few weeks ago and it tells the story of the 15th century. But you only see the sickness of our age -- and that's why I read it, not because you are interested in the 15th century -- but any one of you reads historical novels today. Any one of you occasionally knows that there are four gospels written who began to write history as it should be written and have no- -- never been excelled. And this man writes -- every word is ill and sick in this preface -- "The object of this book" -- he means, the aim of this book -- "The object of this book is not to analyze, but to recapture a part of the past. I have aimed" -- now comes the right word -- "at recreating the Yorkist age." Now he has to a- -- apologize. Otherwise his career, you see, is destroyed. "Isolating a segment of time from the mesh of history is admittedly to deal in metaphor, not truth." So the poor man destroys, you see, his own, whole -- standing by saying, "What I am doing is not -- is not truth, but metaphor. Because truth, you see, that would be scientific."

So: "Yet I believe that this figure of speech, the Yorkist age, is more than a pale paper existence. I have tried to -- demonstrate that the metata -- Metapher" --



how do you pronounce it? Metaphor -- "is apt and useful." I have to say on this something right away. And "...the historian will come up with partly qualified generalizations. Facts are brute, are recalcitrant matter. Must -- they must be rubbed together in the mind before they will assume the shape of meaning." I feel terribly hurt. "On the other hand, one -- once touched upon, they become artifacts. I have inver- -- -vented no scene, no conversation, no details of action ..." and yet this poor man felt he is writing metaphor, not truth.

This poor historian, you see, who -- who says he will only speak the truth, you see, is in -- in such a self-defense that he has to deny what he is doing and is willing to be called a metaphorical speaker. I mention this because this man is definitely very ill. He is -- fallen prey to the superstitions of the age, of this scientific age. And therefore, it is quite important that I now prove this to you.

He has on another page -- ja: "The values of life," he says, and that's perhaps the best beginning for helping him out, and helping you out of this quagmire -- "the values of life were still emblemized in the 15th century, rather than analyzed." Rather than analyzed. So he said, we today in 1962, of course, we only analyze, you see. That's why we are so boring. And in the 15th century, they still emblemized. Whatever that may mean. Something nice, obviously. Now, no historian analyzes. The historian tells a story. And then you know how it ha- -- all happened. And you can enter this sequence, you see, and act as they did, your -- the founding fathers. It is utterly ridiculous. Modern scientists, you see, have destroyed human speech because they only speak objectively. And I have tried to tell you -- show you -- that to speak objectively is the last act in a whole process of poetical, imperatival, religious, and historical speech. At the end, you can take it and say, "it," "they." What -- George Washington was only a small man, or he was a fat man, or he was a big man, all the interesting questions of analysis. Or he loved his mother, or he didn't love his mother. After all, what he really did was that he was the first president of the United States.

So all the things that the analysts then add, you see, are looking behind the scenes, so to speak. But that's not the story itself. If you look behind the scenes on a theater, you know what you see. That doesn't explain Hamlet, that you can go behind the scene and look at the -- at the stagecraft there. But all what modern man wants to do is to get behind the stage; and then he's very astonished that he sees absolutely nothing.

This man is sick, because the -- the beauty of his work -- The Yorkist Age,

I've read it -- is that he makes these people speak. He quotes their letters, he quotes their documents, and that's -- first of all, it's the truth, and second -- and now comes perhaps the surprise, which I like to add today and which I would -- would like you to take home, because it's the beginning of -- of discovering the life of speech -- all speech is metaphorical. There is no other speech than metaphor. Whatever we say, we use metaphor. The prose we use is just frozen-out poetry of yesterday. If you analyze what -- when you write a letter to somebody, it's the poetry of the 18th century which you have now -- have now been reduced to prose.

The "eye of God" or the "hand of God" is a much older expression than "your hand" and "my hand." Anatomy, how you describe now your human body, has only been invented as a vocabulary in the 16th century, when anatomy became a science, you see. But long before, have people spoken of "Zeus nodded -- nods approval," you see. That is, all the things in space -- the rose, and the -- the tempest, and the flowers, forget-me-not -- were used to express things absent in time, of the future or in the past. Metaphor is the source -- the first means of speech. How could -- you see, the first people had -- in the Bible, in the Old Testament, you find the eye of God; and in Egypt, you find the eye of Horus. Of course, how else could they express that God also sees, but not with my eye, you see, but with some bigger thing, the divine eye? This is, I -- I mean -- e-y-e. Ear, hand, eye -- all these were metaphorically used. The visible had to serve the -- hint, you see, at the invisible -- at that what has gone before. How could a man who had to conjure up the founding of the tribe, how -- what else could he do but bind a mask before his face and say, "I am the dead man, once more," you see. And all the words he spoke were metaphorical, because they were meant to make alive something that happened 500 years back. Well, all our theater makes still use of it and -- of this metaphorical way. If you analyze any one page in any -- in any history book of today or law book of today, it is all metaphor. It is -- only it is thinned out. You don't realize how thin now your understanding has become.

I tried to show you that the word "object" and "subject" themselves are metaphors. Of course they are. Therefore they meant in the 18th century the very opposite from what they mean today. An "object" is something -- was originally, you see, the subject, and the subject was the object. Because to object and to subject, you can see that something was thrown against you and that's why I said we today must see that we are prejects into the future and trajects from the past, because that is the...

[tape interruption]

...we want to speak. You have to uphold the Constitution, otherwise the -- John Birch is behind you and you also have to change. And so you are traject, by using the words of the Constitution, but you are the preject by adapting it to the needs of the future.

But this very word, "preject" and -- and "traject," is of course a metaphor. Because anything that our five senses in this room here cannot reach, you see -- by -- by touch, smell, eye, or ear -- we still have to bring into our ken. We have to speak of 2,000 years back and 200 years in the future, have we not? Otherwise our children cannot understand why we are teaching them.

And therefore all our language is metaphorical and the "eye of God" has to be used. It's -- of course, the atheists are very proud that they discover this metaphor. Don't you think Moses knew this just as well as Professor X in the University of California, that he used metaphor? It's his duty to use metaphor. And you now have limited to one poem that the boy at 14 is allowed to write to his sweetheart -- as one poor boy told me at Dartmouth, "I stopped writing poetry at 14." Poor boy.

But I think the man here, Mr. -- what's his name? -- Paul Murray {Kendall} -- do you know him? You should. It's an historical book. You are scientists. Paul Murray {Kendall} has written this book, *The Yorkist Age*, and as I said, he said that his -- historian will come up with craftily qualified generalizations. He must not come up with any generalizations.

But there we come to something quite important, which is not understood today by most scientists: that a family, consisting of four or five people, or six or seven, is not a generalization. It's just this one family, the Smith family. Yet this man thinks that when he speaks of more than one man, he generalizes. That's not true. There is a difference between humanity and humankind. Humanity is an abstraction. And I gave you this paper, "Death by Abstraction," to show to you what it -- that it doesn't convey any -- any life. But the humankind -- that are all the real people in their interaction, with nothing abstract about it at all. A family is not an abstraction; it is not a generalization. But it is an existing group which you can, so to speak, member and arti- -- articulate. And that is what language, concrete language, specific language does: it articulates groups. But this group, which I call the Smith family, is not a generalization. But poor Mr. {Kendall} thinks it is.

The historian has no right to generalize at all. But he has to call a spade a spade. Now there are many spiritual spades. There are powers and beliefs that go through the ages. So he has to speak of the Church, and he has to speak of socialism. That's not a generalization. Of course, all words with -ism are suspect. Try to avoid them. One can live without -isms. But human groups are not -- are not such abstractions. The Quakers are not a generalization. Or the Catholic Church. Just all nonsense. And of course, because Christianity has fought the abstract mind of the philosopher and the scientist through the ages, it had, therefore, preferred even to have a pope in Rome than to have just a philosophy, you see, because that would be a real abstraction and that would be the death of any living creed. It's an -- was an emergency in which the pope received this authority, because it is a -- still better to hear a living person speak than just to have -- to -- define your terms.

I was scolded last time, I understand, because I have not defined my terms. Well, then I would have betrayed you. At the end of these six lectures, you -- we may understand each other, but I have just to begin to speak until we understand each other. Any defining of terms means that the thing that I speak of is not in my heart. It is not in me and I do not represent it, but somewhere lying on the table of an- -- the anatomist and is dissected, and bisected, and resected, and analyzed. You can only define terms about dead things. How can you define the United States of America except by saying, "I love them"? Then they begin to live and then people begin to know what you mean by this. But if you say, "I an- -- define my term. I mean by the United States," ja, what do you mean? It is indefinable. It is much more when you could define. If I could define it, it would be outside of me. It would have ceased to be important to me. You can only define unimportant things. God is not to be defined. That's just His power. That's why we call Him "infinite" and "almighty." And all the people in the 19th century who have tr- -- defined God in their insolence and impertinence have killed Him. And that's why at the end of the 19th century, a philosopher said, "God is dead," successfully executed.

"Define" means "to kill" -- to presume that the -- the thing defined, you see, is under your power. Who can speak of God Almighty in His absence? It's impossible. I can only blush with -- by the idea that you could think that I am speaking of God. Nobody can do this. That's why -- but who understands that this word, "under God" which is in the Constitution and in our -- all our talk, means something very real, that He is present. Otherwise it's a hollow term, "under God." "Under God" means that although I am speaking at this moment as an American, the individual trinity, you see, is above me and watches that my word hasn't too much significance. Because there must other words be heard,

too, and other people have the right to speak, besides me.

It's very strange, all these things have -- you are all schizophrenic because on the one-hand side, you quote all these wonderful insights, and on the other, you forbid yourself ever to believe in them. I have not understood this, this -- this paralysis to break through into a real unity of thinking out of the strange dream that we define our terms. Could you speak English, if you had to -- first had to define your terms? We are groping. -- These are difficult things I try to tell you. If I tried to define my terms, I couldn't say -- reach first base. I'm stammering, sure. But the better the truth, the more you have to stammer. And the more we are superstitious, and say, "I can define all this," the less I would care. The more unimportant is what such a man has to say. You can only define things that -- to which you are indifferent, or as you say, "objective."

But God is in us. He is not above us in the sense of a physical universe. It seems that most people do not dare to think this out, that we are part of all these powers between God and us which I've called "the gods." A scientist speaks in the name of science. A -- a soldier speaks in the name of strategy.

I just read this -- this speech by MacArthur. Funny enough as an advertisement. We all speak in the name -- parents speak in the name of the family dignity, or of God Almighty. But everybody speaks in a higher name, but usually not in the highest. In church, you sing this strange -- these strange four verses -- "Bless him -- praise God from whom all blessings flow. Praise Him, ye pow- -- ye -- creatures here below." And then comes the third verse which is very -- not understood by any one of you. Pardon me for saying this, "Praise Him above ye heavenly host." That sounds like a very untestable, undemonstrable something. How can we speak to the -- the powers that are between God and us? This is a great riddle. It's -- most mysterious verse in the whole liturgy, you see, that we ask the powers between God and us to -- to obey Him.

And yet, that's the whole story of the speaking human being. Our speech makes you and me free to know that I'm only -- have spo- -- only spoken in the name of science. That's one of these powers there above. Other people speak in the name of good government, of patriotism. Other people speak in the name of art. Again, others speak in the name of art critique, whatever that may be, or in the name of -- of phy- -- your -- your own science, your own field of -- or they speak in the name of the future of California.

Innumerable powers are between God and you. If you understand this process of coming to life and dying, which I've tried to show you is the process of

"Thee," "I," "we" and "it," then you know that all these powers are transient. There is a time for science, and there is a time for war, and there is a time for sleep. And there is -- all these angels and archangels, dominions, and principalities, as St. Paul called them much more drastically -- all these powers of finance, of the stock exchange, of speculation, of the -- Dow Jones averages -- they are powers and they are gods, in the old language, you see.

If you are an idolater, you will rest your case in the lingo that you have to speak at the stock exchange. And most know -- people I know who have to do with the stock exchange think this is an independent something which has its own laws, and all your vocabulary is limited when you talk to another businessman to this ridiculously narrow circle of expressions. Today we cannot afford this. The living God has even to enter the realm of business, and the gods of business. Even the Dow -- Dow Jones averages have to fall to the ground, just as the walls of Jericho. And God is power -- more powerful than the stock exchange. This seems to me the lesson of the last 10 days. That is, the economy doesn't give a damn for the Dow Jones averages. It goes on, despite all the losses of the speculators at the stock exchange. That's a great experience for me. I know that God is more powerful than the stock exchange. This hasn't brought home -- been brought home, so far. And now it is beginning to dawn on people that there are other powers that keep us going, and not just the stock exchange. This has to be proven. These are the powers that we invoke in this prayer, you see. "Praise Him," you see, the powers above -- because they stand between me -- nobody can live directly under God's eye constantly. He's too far away, He's too powerful. He has created the United States. He has created economies. He has created business. There's no doubt that they are bigger than you and me in -- in isolation. But there comes a moment where any one of these powers has to show that it is responsible to a higher, you see, power. And we weak men in our feebleness, in our idiocy, are sometimes called up to speak in the name of these -- this highest power and to call these -- these middle -- medium powers, so to speak, you see, in between -- to justify their existence. To mend their ways. There would be no politics, otherwise. There would be no history. There would be no marriage. If your -- if your parents knew already all your relations to the human race, a daughter could never marry a man who -- of whom the parents disapprove. Yet all marriage consists just -- in this very interesting experience. That -- I feel so deeply that the most vivid, and most dangerous and most risky terms of the liturgy are no longer heard or understood. I haven't found one minister -- pardon me, Father {Russack} -- with whom I've tried to debate, you see, this "Praise Him a -- above ye heavenly hosts," who had ever given it a

thought. There is something about Gabriel, and Raphael, Michael -- you don't know very much about them, and they think these are angels. Well, let them alone. We can't let them alone. These powers that are between the living God and us wait to be called to attention in the -- in our -- in our words, which we speak over them. They have limits. And we have to discover their limitations. And if we don't, we perish under the shadow of these powers, just as the Egyptians perished under the dominion of the very benevolent tyranny of the golden calf. As you well know, the Egyptian religion went on till Emperor Constantine's successor closed the temple in Alexandria, of the big bull, of the golden calf. I shall never forget, I once came to the Rhine -- to the city of Trier on the Mosel River in Germany. It must have been 20 years ago, I'm not sure now. Longer -- longer, in the '20s. It was -- is a beautiful river and was a great experience to me. And I came to an excavation where an old Roman temple was excavated. And the excavator, an archaeologist -- of course a professor -- said to me, "Yes, we have just found that this is the temple of the Egyptian goddess Isis. And here is the -- Serapis, the golden -- the bull," and I -- was quite exciting to find in Germany such an Egyptian temple, out of the 4th century of our era. And then there was a farmer standing by and he said, "Oh, we knew it all the time that the golden calf here had a temple." He had only, you see, the tradition of the Church and of the Bible. And he didn't need an archaeologist, you see. He just -- and he gave it the right name. He knew that this was the -- what Moses had called the "golden calf," you see. The archaeologist -- had never dawned on him that this was the temple of the golden calf. He called it the temple of Isis and Serapis. -- You see, it's a -- that's the method of modern science to make sure that nobody understands. It is -- this is the way. This archaeologist had never thought that perhaps the Christian people of the Mosel River, who once had become -- worshiped this -- this goddess, you see, and this bull, had then become Christians and kept the memory of it. And yet, in Trier, for ex- -- to show you how -- how vivid these traditions there can be, at the church next door to these excavation, there was standing at the entrance door a Venus naked. And when the Christians entered the service, they took a whip and lashed out at her to show that they had given up the worship of Venus, you see, and now entered into the true faith inside the nave of the cathedral. This I -- I have seen with my own eyes, still standing there, this poor wretched sculpture. But it is more important that such a tradition should be called {alive} than that we should have archaeology. It takes a hundred years before you can

persuade the archaeologists to understand that this was ever of vital importance to the people, you see, and is not just for Guggenheim.

That's the -- the charm here, I think, with the -- with our Indian dance -- I have friends here, their dances are still real. I mean, their -- they still acknowledge powers of death and diseases, you see. And they are powers. As I learn in June and with dismay in California -- I didn't know you could complain here about the weather.

Since we are transformed into these various stages, with every act that is important in our lives and has to be carried out, that we move from a "Poor Me" into a "Proud I" and into a communal "we" and then are dismissed as "they did it," or "they have passed away," or "they are now gone," you may begin to see that with speech, we integrate the globe, the earth. We join with other men when we say, "we." We take our tasks towards the earth when we conserve, when we dig, when we harvest, and we try to distinguish how much we owe to our fellow man and how much we owe to the furtherance of the elements around us -- be it oil, coal, woodland, soil, what have you. This constant partition between our interest in things and our interest in our fellow man is really the religious task that we have to solve. How much do we give to the love and affection of the -- you see, of our mem- -- the members of society? How much do we have to honor the gifts outside our human society?

And now at the end, I would like to prove to you that you all know this long ago despite your wrong -- teaching in lang- -- the languages. Although you had to learn "La rose est une fleur," or "The water is cold," or "Das Wasser ist kalt," you also know better that one sentence is not language, but the relation of past and future times means to speak, to participate in the life of the race. You all know this, because there is one thing of which the grammarian doesn't know anything so far, and that's the basis of the future grammar, I think. It will begin where the platitudinous, the fortuitous grammarian, and grammar school never tried -- dared to begin. The one thing that is lacking when you play with things, and when they are not seriously meant, you see, is that you can start them and end them arbitrarily. What distinguishes a war from sport. You say, "I play from two to four." With a war, you cannot do this, you see. It breaks out and it ends. And you are the slave of this time -- length of time, and you have no power over its duration. So you say, "for the duration," because you cannot determine the duration.

Most people have forgotten in this country that there is this definite difference between seriousness and play. And you always mistake talk for speech:



for example -- for this reason -- or play for seriousness. People would like to play politics; they would like to play marriage; they play with everything. And they are very unhappy. Anybody who doesn't know the distinction between play and seriousness of course is the -- is the -- how you would say it -- preisgegeben ist -- given, you see, to -- to accident. Play is something that you c- -- that -- isn't worth your -- your effort, really. And so it just runs away from you. I know -- you know how -- how many students perish because they cannot distinguish between play and seriousness. They think that examinations are serious. It would be serious, you see, if they learned something. But examinations are just play. Nobody should think that an examination is -- is serious. It's an exercise. Exercises are not serious.

I mean to this very seriously, because this country now seems to fall for the idea that the examinations are the goal of life. And parents should know that they are just nothing.

Since this frontier between seriousness and -- and play is really gone, my topic today was formulated in this rather insolent fashion that speech is a life-and-death struggle, and I try -- only try to say it is very serious.

How can I prove this? There's one thing that the dying, and the sick, and the tortured people know -- the healthy have forgotten it. In a -- in a -- I read a few weeks ago in a paper from British Columbia -- a newspaper from Vancouver { } -- the following report: The Salvation Army makes known that it has a suicide service to try to persuade people not to commit suicide. And they have a telephone going day and night -- this also exists in other communities -- and that they have found out that from the tone of the voice of the man or the woman who telephones, they can say whether it is serious or whether it is not serious. The tone of a human voice is such that it defies all the grammar books and the dictionaries. This tone testifies to the relation of this articulated speech to your own life. And you know very well when you turn on the radio, you know whether a minister begins to speak, or an advertiser begins to speak, or a politician begins to speak -- you can judge by the tone of their voices, you see. If you have to think of the grave, then it is a sermon. And they have this -- this grave voice, haven't they? Or they -- or they imitate somebody else, because they are afraid you shouldn't find out too early, you see, only { }.

What is this tone, the tone of the voice, the tonality? Some Italians in the Academy of Science in Rome, have published very interesting investigations about the tone of the voice. In the Anglo-Saxon countries, nobody has done this -- they have too long been anti-musical, probably. Now they should. They

should discover. The modern linguists, the modern grammarian has paid no attention to the tone. And yet you all know that if you observe tonality, you well know that an imperative is quite of a different urgency, you see, than something lyrical, or something epical, something just narrative, or something analytical. The worst thing I object -- to, you see, I -- is -- the reproach I have against the scientist is the tonelessness of his statements, you see. We all -- I go to sleep. And others, of course, worship this and say, "This is objective." But what have I to do with objectivity? It leaves me out of the game. I want to be in it and not outside of it. This objective -- these words that drop here from somewhere, I don't know -- I think they are ridiculous, utterly ridiculous. And whenever a man tries to speak objectively, his eloquence is certainly gone. Why people should listen -- him -- probably because he has a Nobel Prize -- Nobel Prize. But he gets the Nobel Prize for killing his soul first. Then he gets the Nobel Prize. Let him have the Nobel Prize. But he's not interesting to me. Poor Mr. Kennedy has to dine with him.

They are not interesting. A mathematician is just usually the funniest creature on earth. He's not a human being, he's just a mathematician. I -- have some friends who are really great mathematicians. They are very nice, but they smash every automobile and you have to watch over them like little children. They haven't grown up.

Now, the tone is "me." And you know whether I am in danger or whether I am in love, or whether I am indifferent. The tone says it all. You don't have to understand what I say, that comes second. And it is this which I would like to recommend you for reflection. The logicians, the philosophers, the scientists, but even now also the religionists, prefer thought to speech. And they say, "We use speech as instruments, as a tool to express our deep and profound thoughts." The man who gives in to the tone knows that to speak is a physical process in life, that is just like breathing. I've written a book therefore with the title, *The Breath of the Spirit*. And I mean every bit of it. I mean to say that to be inspired is nothing but breathing to the second power. To such a power that others have to breathe with me.

This is what we desire when we speak. And you just watch a bird or watch anybody -- any animal proposing in his oestrus to his mate, they try to get the other in -- into co-breathing, into sharing this inspiration. The spirit tries to conspire. The conspiracy is the attempt to -- to breathe together. And it is the greatness of the New Testament that they gave up the idea of wisdom -- of the Old Testament of the Greeks -- and replaced {sophia} by pneuma, by the word that just means breathing. It's great modesty, and great reality, and great truth-

fulness in this, you see. Pneuma is a neuter and was for the Greek philosopher something utterly, you see, undistinguished. It was low. It's just physical breathing, but the Christians of course had to emphasize that man is embedded in this really -- real, one creation. There is no beyond. Christianity has never believed in -- in what the -- what the children now are made to believe, and beyond outside this. God has created one Heaven and one earth, and not a second heaven and a third earth. And we are His children when we extend our power to breathe to our brethren and sisters. And then we are filled with the spirit and we can make peace in His name.

The physical character of the tone I would like to emphasize, because it's the one element which the pagan, Alexandrian philologists so far have not been able to touch and to destroy. And in this breath, you have the unity of the Christian tradition of the pneuma, of the spirit, you see, and the fact that God is the word, and became flesh so that we may understand what we do when we speak. We kill or we make -- alive. As I -- tried to tell you; if you say, "I had a father," it is very different from your saying, "I have a father."

And this poor man gives a wonderful example of his right, of his power to kill and to make -- alive -- I read this -- this damnable sentence -- now where is it? Here, listen to these terrible words: "Facts are brute, recalcitrant matter. They must be rubbed together in the mind before they will assume the shape of meaning," when this poor man is just asked to tell us a story. No, -- I didn't mean this. I meant -- other sentence -- { } I put this? You remember he said that he -- he -- oh, "The values of life in the 15th century were still emblemized, rather than analyzed." In this word "still," he drives me to despair, because it means that the people in the 15th century were alive, and that we are dead. You see, even if it is true -- that in -- the values of life in the 15th century were still emblemized, whatever that may mean, rather than analyzed -- it means that all, everything we do today is just analysis. Then we are dead. I don't see that there is any increase in analysis. These people had the wrong philosophies then, just as much as we have today, and they also ran to their witchcraft doctors, as we go to the analyst, and it's exactly the same. The -- the sorcerer of pharaoh, they ca- -- they are always with us.

And -- but I, for once, think that all life at all times has to be emblemized, what -- as I said -- as this man calls it, and not to be analyzed. It -- I think it is incredible that a man offers us a book in which he tells stories -- tries to tell a story -- tells it quite well -- and takes this for granted that he is an -- an exception, and uses metaphor, and not -- doesn't tell the truth and, so to speak, apologizes for his being admitted to the bar of public opinion with doing something

that is utterly obsolete. Accepting the -- this strange German today, that if you do not analyze, you don't -- deserve a hearing.

[tape interruption]

Now is it true that you propose today to your lady by analyzing her charms? I thought you praise them. Or you write a poem about it. But do you have to analyze your sweetheart? Is it really ev- -- inevitable?

If I have succeeded in making you pause and see what you are doing when you speak and when you listen, which is one and the same -- it's one act -- you will understand in what a sick state we are. The best books on language which I've consulted are the books by {Sorceur} and {Bermeille}, who are a Frenchman and a Swiss, they are by Bernard Shaw and Wilson, on language in the English language. And they have indices. Even the French book has an index. You know most French books have no indices, and this book has. The French are too logical, you see. They don't care for indices, for this reason. They say it's illogical to have an alphabetical index. And -- but this has. The -- the pupils of Mr. {Meille} have added to his beautiful book on language an index. Now you look up this index and the word "listener" doesn't exist. They speak of a language, you see, that comes from the brain and enters the paper in the form of a book. That's Mr. {Meille's} language. But of course language is a bridge between people. And to hear, and to hearken, and to obey, you see, is the meaning of speaking. If there is no obedience -- there is no listening -- I couldn't speak here if you weren't kind enough to listen to me, and if this bond between us wasn't more real at this moment, than that I am I and you are you. You must forget this.

You can see this very clearly if you not -- do not -- if you stare at the speaker, you can't listen to him. You must forget that there is this dividing line between your skin and mine. You cannot listen as individuals. Anybody who speaks well or listens well must for this moment, although he sees the other person, only concentrate on his face. We speak face to face because my face and your listening face are just widen- -- widening circles around mouth and ear. The face of a person is something quite different from the face of an animal, or from a -- the -- the surface of a picture. It speaks and it listens. And this -- it's very unfortunate -- in German we have the two words, Antlitz und Gesicht. And the Antlitz of our lov- -- beloved is something quite different from her face. It is that which we lift up towards each other. That's called Antlitz in German. And the Gesicht is just wha- -- that what you can define in physiology, in -- or in anatomy. It is -- I don't know that there is in English such a distinction possible,

but yet you all know that it exists in reality. While I'm talking to you, you see, we are in one. And I can explain what no scholar in philology can explain, why the Psalms are written as responsories, because the speaker and the listener grow so much together that out of my word, your word responds. This is speaking face to face, you see, that it elicits this. And many people today talk about dialogue. But they have no idea what it is, because they think in a dialogue you say what you think. No. You don't say what you think, but y- -- what you are made to say in answer to what your beloved or your hated says on the -- in the first place. This is the -- magnetism that is created by our facing each other.

Therefore, in full speech, more is involved than just the sound of my voice and the ear of your body, of your -- . We are transformed into conductors of this speech. And a good speaker, of course, trembles in his whole body when he speaks, and the listener can be made to tremble. You only have these sensations, it seems now, when you go to a good play. But of course it should be this way when a father talks to his son, or to his daughter, preferably.

That is, we can be transformed into receptacles or into cables of speech much more than you think when you consider speech as just the sound, you see, that comes out of your mouth, and forget that you yourself, in order to listen well, have to become ready to be nothing but an { } -- be it of speech or be it of listening. And this -- this is so -- that's my end- -- ending remark -- I can prove to you by something that most people do not understand. The difference between the shout, and the cry, and the meowing of a -- of animals, and your speech and mine is something that also goes unheeded and unnoticed, and yet it is the great miracle. When a bird sings and persuades his "she" to join him, the dove closes his eyes and thereby gives us to understand that he is without consciousness, that he is just in -- in a trance. If you and I say something in seriousness and earnest, I hear myself what I have said and I am bound by it.

The human being who speaks has to stand under his own word -- it returns to him -- and binds him to the future. That's why every human being is not the one who has been, but the one who has been, plus the thing he says at this moment. Because this, what I am telling you, is an obligation which -- burdens me, which takes me into the future. We speak to get rid of our old self, whatever that may be. By "yes" and "no," by "thank you," or "please," every one of you, and I too, here, in speaking to you -- that's why I have used no manuscript, no rhetoric, that you might perhaps believe me that I'm speaking. Most people only read lectures. That's not speaking. They have thought it out yesterday. I have had to be -- it's a rather risky business, I know -- I had to try to speak to you as it comes, so that you might understand the re- -- the last and highest

miracle of human speech, that it binds the speaker. People, you see, the advertiser is not bound. And you must draw this line between lying and truth.

Anybody who speaks sincerely and truthfully, allows the other fellow to quote him. And he who doesn't, says, "Don't quote me." And of course, that's the usual no- -- connotation, I understand. Most people, when they speak from -- openly and frankly always will add, "But don't quote me on that." Now, I'm not interested in people who add this remark, you will understand. I -- in history, only those people count who say, "You can quote me."

In this very moment, my word tells against me. Full speech then is nothing you can sell and nothing you can pay for. It is that word which you are willing to be seen made a part of your own existence. Only those words count. Only those are matters of life and death. And when a Quaker came with his hat on into the Puritan Church in Massachusetts, he knew that he had his hands -- life in his hands, you see. He could be quoted on that. And -- how many people are willing to be quoted, as you know? It's a -- small minority that make history. The others don't coun