

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

{{ } Dr. Rosenstock-Huessy and his companion, Frau von Moltke attended our somewhat unusual community Mass, Father Rivers { }. And at that time, or rather right afterwards, he was shown what we have here { }. And in the meantime, some of the clerics spoke with Doctor, and conned him into coming over to -- { } to worship in the community. So -- as I mentioned to Doctor before {has tried} this, we don't know what we're talk about tonight, but it should will be very interesting. I give you Dr. Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy.) Well, it's just a gra- -- act of gratitude for this wonderful day with Father Rivers, that I'm very glad to be here. And since I am at the university trying to tell the people something about the religious and the political significance of the word "economics" and "economy," I may perhaps be allowed to bring this in tonight here, to this room, too.

And since you are Franciscans, I may perhaps explain what I am trying to do at the university by pointing out to you the story of the 13th century when the Order of St. Francis was founded. There is, to a degree of course only, a similarity today in our predicament as it existed in the 13th century. I have there announced in my -- for my last -- next lecture at the university, the two depic-tors, Marx and Adam Smith. I should turn it around: Adam Smith went before. He was the -- great advocate of free trade and world economy. And Marx was the great critic of this world economy and said it is atrocious. It neglects all the needs of humanity and it has to be overthrown by the marching battalions of the proletariat. And in this fight between so-called capitalism and so-called Com-munism--as it's called today; it was "socialism" in the 19th century--the two hos-tile brothers seemed to divide the whole world between themselves. You either had to be one thing or the other. And no -- {tertium non dato}, no third solution seemed to exist anymore.

Very strange, because after all, before the year of the Lord 1776, nobody had spoken of capitalism ever, and nobody had ever spoken of socialism. So what a -- kind of a world is this, that for 6- -- or 8,000 years has gone on without the two terms. And now we are told that: one or the other. Very strange.

And I have been puzzled by this all my life. And so I have been setting out to prove--to my own satisfaction, of course, as you always speak for your own satisfaction--that the two were twins. fighting twins, and negative as compared to -- compared to their antiquity, to their -- to their past. They had one common

enemy called "feudalism," whatever this meant. They wasn- -- weren't quite sure. Everything before 1700 was -- is called "feudalism" in their writing, and in the writings of all the writers of political science ever since.

It so happens--this may be accidental--that I wrote a huge volume praising feudalism in the 13th, and 12th, and 11th, and 10th centuries 50 years ago. And now the book has been reprinted all of a sudden, without my doing. So it cannot be quite so obsolete. And -- I discovered that feudalism was a very good thing. And so I was from the very first rather immune to this orthodoxy that you either have to be a Communist, you see, and proletar- -- a member of the proletariat; or you had to belong to the capitalist class. Even to this day, most people belong to neither.

And it came to me tonight, as I was searching for some connection between your experience and this strange situation between the left and the right in our modern, daily life--both lacking any perspective about anything man needs for more than the day -- the working day--that something similar has existed, and given birth to the Franciscan order. Now don't -- understand me right: the comparison is very limited. The comparison which I try to offer tonight is between the dualism of Franciscan and Dominican in the 13th century, and this -- and the dualism between Adam Smith's thought and Marx's thinking.

A -- very great writer on the 13th century--{Alfred Dole}, the man's name--wrote, on the side of his historical research, also a very nice novel called {Caracosa}. In this very sweet novel, which ends in 1260, with the great debate, you know, in the Franciscan order about the succession to St. Francis, he said, "At that time it was not a question whether you should become a begging monk or not. The only question was: should you become a Dominican or a Franciscan?" So you see, it seems that in the world in -- where we live, the living generation is always tempted to only have, you see, a choice between two alternatives, and doesn't look behind the fact that after all both the Dominican order and the Franciscan order still belong to the Roman Catholic Church, and were a part of a much wider system of pope, and emperor, and mission, et -- et cetera, and so on. And the universe didn't consist of Franciscan and Dominican, although it seemed so.

Well, the point I have -- will -- shall try to make in my -- in my speeches at the university then is this: there seems to be a deep secret of our maker in asking the contemporaries of such great movements not to choose between one of the two, but to divine, to sense--to believe perhaps is a better meta- -- word--that

both are necessary, that both are ingredients. You couldn't do without Dominicans; you couldn't do without Franciscans, although they'll never admit it. The Franciscans will of course have to say that you are sufficient. Gentlemen, you aren't. Nobody is. No -- we mortals are all limited in what we -- in our intended universals. The soul of man is really in Heaven, but our realization isn't. It's very limited. And you have to choose.

All creation of anything, a--take a flower, an animal as God created it--is strictly, you see, limited. All birth, incarnation, realization has the pain of limitation. And it's the mor- -- that is the greatness of our -- the founder of our faith, that He took upon Himself this slavery--as the Letter to the Philippians call it, you see--and He became a slave. That is, a very limited being, being divine. And that's a deep secret, that the divinity at that moment has -- had to be -- represented in a passing, in a limited form, you see, of a life--we don't know how long; 30, 40 years long--and yet containing the whole divinity. You have there the same paradox, you see, that our faith must understand that as soon as anything enters our sensuous world -- world, it diminishes in totality.

And you may say that our -- the -- Christ has made room for all other men by this humiliation, you see. The divine, if it was outside of us, you see, we would never amount to anything. But He has made room for all of us to share it. And so what I say is very -- I think, genuine Christian truth, and a very mysterious one, that the variety of these -- appearances, of these forms, of these shapes, must always be understood to be mutually explanatory. And I do think it is not so difficult to find how the Dominicans and Franciscans, for example, explain each other, now, in retrospect, and outside the order. -- There have been, by the way, Franciscans who have tried this -- to admit that even Dominicans can come -- go to Heaven, and vice versa.

Whoever is a -- is a -- is an -- convinced member of one group has great difficulties to understand this, you see. That he has to go full heart and full blast in one direction, you see, and yet hope and confide that others will stress something else. It isn't too easy. I mean, all my -- our life, we are in this quandary, that our head can think universally, but our heart is of course attached to what we have to do, to -- what we have to suffer for, what we have to stand -- stand for in -- in the eyes of the world. We have to say "yes" or "no" about your own task. And that's very restrictive indeed. And if you think of all the martyrs, it is at one point where they have to stand upright, for one thing they are reproached with, you see, and have to believe that this in some way will transfigure or illuminate the whole.

This is I think for -- today for -- in -- in such a distance from the 13th century --. You may -- you may criticize me. I only wish to make a -- vague attempt to sh- -- tell you what I think the -- the necessity for the two -- the two orders was at that time, that the new cities--as you know, there were -- 5,000 cities by and large founded in Europe in the -- around 1150 to 1250. All new, you see. All the peasants moving into the city. And they needed an armament industry just as you have now the Rand Corporation here, and -- and all the satellite building. It was exactly the same. The new knights, you see, the Crusaders needed armaments. And it took 156 different crafts to equip one knight and his horse with a full armament. The saddle-maker, you see, and the blacksmith as only the beginning, you see, and from the -- shirt he took on his body, you see, the knight, to the stirrup, everything had to be manufactured in these new towns. Because where else should they get it? And the old manors had not produced these artificial, complicated things. A horseman in the -- in the 11th -- in the -- 800 or in the days of the Romans or Charlemagne, usually had no stirrups; that was unknown. And since he had no stirrups, he couldn't bear -- could bear very little armor, because if you have no stirrups, you fall off. So the practical, new inventions were just as startling at that time as our navigation to the moon. Imagine! Hundred and fifty-six--or -- that's not my own reckoning; I take this on good authority; it may 150, I don't know--still it must make -- set you thinking, you see, that as you see now all this new urbanization, these tremendous factories going up for the satellites, and for all the things, at that moment as -- when St. -- St. Francis appeared as a banker's son in a -- in a -- this town, he saw the -- this sprawling humanity without guidance, you see, without leadership, without Christianity really, because they suddenly were set free and emancipated from their villages, and their -- at the foot of a castle perhaps living there in a -- in a -- in a hut of clay or bricks. And now they -- they had to disappear behind stone walls in cities. And as you know, I don't have to tell you this, but just think it for a moment what it meant, that St. Francis said, "I, as a banker's son, now have to admit this new economy. I have to give up real estate," which for an American is unthinkable, and --. Because I think the -- the -- between you and me, we may talk religion, but the religion of America is in real estate.

That's man's real estate in this country. Well --.

So the -- as you know, the begging monks were called "begging" because they had no land to go back. Therefore they were proletarians. They were deprived of the one certainty man had at that time, you see, that he had his own land. This is the whole reason why this is a revolution. Franciscans and Domini-

cans agreed that they shared the uncertainties of the guilds and crafts in -- of the town. These people, too, depended on the import of their foodstuff from the countryside. They didn't claim that they had a -- a legal property right to these fruits of the fields, you see, but they had to buy it. And the -- the begging monks are monks who have no other budget but the gen- -- jan- -- the hope that somebody will sustain them. This was not begging just in -- for alms, you see, but it was the new reliance of a second-degree economy. Second degree -- one -- one grade removed from the original source, from the soil. And that was the courage of the two orders. And they shared. And they both saw the same need. And in this sense, you see that I'm not so wrong when I say that Adam Smith and Marx both relied on the factory system, you see, as the real problem of the age, of industry- -- what we call "industry." And the medieval two orders said to the Benedictines and to the -- to the monks of -- Bernard of Clairvaux, who are the { }, you see, and the Cistercians, you see. "That's all very nice about you. You have done fine work, Cluny, et cetera. But you haven't gone into the insecurity of the modern masses." And your -- your priests in France, I mean, have sensed this again, in the same sense you have heard of the working -- the worker priests, you see. All men in any generation have to share the frontline of insecurity, of uncertainty. And this was done in the -- 13th century by your order and by the Dominican order. And of course, first people -- the old order said, "Can't be." The bishops and the Benedictines, of course said, "It's impossible." That's why your OFM has its translation to this day.

But that's serious, I mean. It's an eternal lesson. This, both orders shared: their response to the situation, to the emergency--to the calamity, you may say, of these--to the homeless masses, who had to be herded into these new Inns, and guilds, and crafts, you see, differed. Of course you can always--our doctors unfortunately don't seem to know it sufficiently--cure an illness by different medicines. And probably must. It is not true that every illness has to be cured by one and the same panacea, you see, but you have to go several ways. Especially in -- of such an epidemic as this -- when a whole nation go- -- goes proletarian. What is -- what is the difference? You -- you all know it just as well as -- I. One is called: put the preaching in front, you see, and the other: the light. It is -- you are indifferent, so to speak, to the differences of temperament, or -- or personal sentiment, because the feeling is the main thing. If you read the -- what St. Francis has left us, it is the Gospel truth, that every day has its burden, you see. { } means, as you know, the -- the days of life. And therefore the flowering of life happens, so to speak, new. When- -- whenever the sun rises, our heart must go out and seek its answer freshly.

If you do this, you emancipate every human being to its own language. Every monk has the right to respond, you see. The Dominicans, of course, not only saw that in Florence or in Assisi there were people starving for spiritual bread, but there -- that there were 5,000 cities. And where would you go if everybody, you see, was left to his own devices? They stressed, as you know, the teaching, the -- the unity.

Now I think without one and the other order, the solution couldn't have been found. One order had to start from the fact that everybody had to be told the same thing. And the Franciscans start with the fact that the -- every day has its own revelation. The -- whole Hymn of St. Francis -- everything you read of him, it has this wonderful freshness, you see, as though it never happened before.

Pardon me for bringing up a -- a reminiscence. You have heard perhaps of the fairy tales of the Brothers Grimm. When Jakob Grimm and Wilhelm Grimm, the two brothers, published this book first--in 1812, I suppose it was--they dedicated it to a woman friend, Bettina von Arnim, quite famous in literary history. That wasn't very important; she was a very good friend and the wife of a nobleman, Herr -- Mr. von Arnim, who had helped the brothers in their search. And so they dedicated it to her, because she was, so to speak, the -- both were at that time bachelors. She gave them a home; she -- she received them with her husband on their -- on their -- in their manor. And the dedication is very nice, but it is just pretty.

But in the year of the Lord 1870, the surviving brother was privileged to publish a new edition of the fairy tales. And he dedicated again to the lady. By that time she was a great-grandmother. And he said, "I may bring this again to you, because through all your life you have kept the capacity, the power--the spirit, you can say--to look into the chalice of a flower as though you saw it for the first time."

I think that's a very good Franciscan remark. You have to keep -- retain the freshness, the -- the power to see every day as never -- as it never happened before, you see, as unheard-of. And the -- on the other hand, it's obviously necessary to retain the Dominican first sentence of teaching, that there is something to be taught, you see, that -- which is very doubtful today, I mean.

Well, it is { } question. Since everybody assures me that allegedly everything is changed, you see, since we have jets, how can we teach? Well we can.

It's very unimportant, these jets, I assure you. That you -- that may change, you see. But the -- the great truth has to be preached, and -- as the Dominicans said. And that's why they are called the preaching monks, you see. It has to go into all the earth, with one sound and one language.

Now obviously the two orders have not split so far that this is not agreed by both. It is only the accent, the emphasis. What comes first, and what comes second? What is the thing that strikes the world first when you think of a Dominican, you see? It's a -- it's the preaching monk, you see. And what strikes the man first, or what is when he thinks of a Franciscan? It is this man's understanding for the situation, his indulgence in a -- the man's plight who is set before him. Perhaps however his own plight, or his own {blessed place}.

But the order then of our experience can be looked upon from the general to the specific, or from the specific to the general.

[tape interruption]

Both is absolutely correct, both is indispensable, you see. But it has certain consequences, when you -- where you start. And you see that Dominicus starts with this terrible anarchy in France: dissolution, so to speak, of the heretics -- heretics. And St. Francis has no time to think of the others, of their mistakes, you see. He sees his own mistakes. And therefore he's much more concerned with his own orthodoxy than Dominic with these Crusades. Francis is not a Crusader in this sense. And the difficulties of the Franciscan order, therefore, have always been the personalities of the individuals in the order. I don't think I say too much in this. And with the Dominicans, it's -- there are other problems, first.

The story of -- as you know, the story of the two orders -- are a very painful story. For the first 150 years, the suffering of the orders, you see, of these 100,000 people in Europe, who followed the call of the two faiths is indescribable. It is not an hilarious story. And the sufferings of -- of many of these pe- -- groups of monks on both camps is -- is really, even today, very difficult reading, because you suffer with these men. And they were made to suffer, as you know, by the established powers.

But I think in retrospect, forgetting these individual cases of suffering, we may now admire God's wisdom that He created both orders. And I think in retrospect you will have to say--or we may say, I invite you to say, even--that the hardest thing to formulate is why the two had to supplement each other. Because you can understand one order, you see, rationally, and the other. But this -- their

togetherness is a mystery, and remains so. It's the same as -- between men and women. Why have the two to coexist, you see?

I have tried to show you one point that in the -- in -- it's not the whole story, of course, of their distinctions. But I think it is the first, you see, the -- the -- Dominicus sees the a- -- danger of anarchy for the whole Church, you see, and St. Francis sees the need of the individual soul as of this day, and forgets everything else. Or says it is not important. -- Other things will come, in -- in order, if this heart is res- -- responded to, is answered to by a -- by a feeling soul. Or if you give this soul itself the jubilation, you see, that the sun, and the moon, and the stars are her brother and sisters. I mean, the sun in the Hymn of St. Francis is of course the most sublime expression of this power of one soul to be in line with the whole universe, you see -- subs- -- as a vicar for the whole of humanity. I think we today -- this is my -- my problem in -- in -- in the university is to make people see that we would be the poorer if the -- Marx and Adam Smith hadn't both come up with very small distinction in time. In 1776, Adam Smith has written his Wealth of Nations, and in 1818 or -19--or is it -18? I think--Karl Marx was born, and published his Communist Manifesto, as an answer -- against Adam Smith, so to speak, in 1847. It's a very short time indeed.

And one saw the achievements of the industrial machinery, and the other saw the shortcomings. I think I shouldn't give away my secrets which I have to -- you see, divulge in my lectures. Otherwise you wouldn't come.

There is a difference between the 13th century and the 19th century, of the surf- -- on the surface, that these people tried to do without the old, religious traditions throughout, and said something utterly new, technological progress, machinery has entered the world, and thereby the conquest of new markets, the conquest of the worldwide system of production is in -- on their minds foremost. And therefore you don't find -- find any mentioning from them -- in them of the old powers.

On the other hand, these--that's why I have called them in my -- in my title of this next lecture, "The Two Defectors," Adam Smith and Marx. And in this title, I, so to speak, have criticize them, and even attacked them. They have omitted a tradition of mankind over thousands of years, which did not know of this -- of this industrial system. But between you and me, we would be unfair if now, you see, before I call them "defectors," I must also call them Siamese twins. I also must invite you to admit that both of them belong to each other, as is -- necessary. And we, as third parties, so to speak, do them an injustice if we think

we can criticize one by the other. We have to look for the secret, why two opposite solutions, you see, outside the total former framework of -- of economic, legal, political, moral thought, you see, had -- awakened these people. And I warn you: you will not deal with them successfully if you don't give them this credit, that both have hit on something unheard-of, something that has never existed before: a world market, you see, a world society.

There is this great secret; how much of it is between the two, so to speak, without their knowledge, while we must try to spell out, you see, the togetherness of the two, deny- -- declining that one is enough, and trying to find what is correct in both, together. It's the same as with -- you will allow me also to -- as you will have done it of course over the centuries by itself. You have already made your peace with the Dominicans, although it seemed quite impossible in the 13th century. And you admit that there are various ways to -- to salvation. And one spark of the Franciscan spirit, and one spark of the Dominican is of course for a long time embodied in the teaching of the Church, in the tradition; also in the discipline you give every young priest, whether he is a monk or not, you see --. Today all teaching I think that -- in the -- are in your seminars, is either Franciscan or Dominican. Of course, we must be quiet; the Jesuits mustn't hear that.

But you know, they are very clever; they know it. They know it, just obvious. They know that they have, so to speak, they came really, as a matter of fact, in a time when these distinctions between the two--Franciscan and Dominican--no longer were tolerable, as absolute distinctions. And the order has really { } the very first. I've talked to many in this order, you see. They know simply that they have to try a synthesis between the two.

Well, is that enough, for the time being? Wie? You don't think so? Any questions on this? Yes.

(You mentioned the fact that the revolutionary insight of the two --)

I can't understand you.

(You mentioned the revolutionary -- spirit engendered by these two founders of the orders --. Could it be possibly maybe linked { } their position in regard to their society with our position of -- say -- modern religious position to our -- our own modern society? Especially as spelled out by Cox in *The Secular City*? Well, he thinks it's a fact -- there might be a need now to forget, or to lay aside our former teachings about divinity, or he speaks { } the metaphysics of

divinity are two of our tribal conceptions of God to wait until there is a kind of a { } political events of our time.)

Ja, this has to be subdivided, Sir, your question. We --.

(Well, would you say, for example, we have to approach a Christian --.)

We distinguish -- {Benadote}. Your question, you see, mixes very many questions. All ages are direct to God. That is, the Franciscan 13th century is just as present as the so-called 20th century, in my mind, in my heart; and the -- age of Christ, too. And we don't believe -- if we don't think the 12 Apostles are here today, just as they were in their own days, there are no 12 Apostles then, you see. Therefore, I don't believe that we live in a modern society, and the -- Francis lived in another society. Yes, we live in a society, but -- and we have certainly to learn very much from what's going on now. But this replacing of the 12th century or the 13th century by the 20th century, that moves me not -- except to tears. It is -- don't fall for these slogans. It is a slogan. Modern society will be the real society if it is the heir of the previous ages and its own, you see. At every moment, the Devil stalks around and say -- breaks off the continuity and says, "Immediately: the panacea, the new medicine, the new drug -- here it is." Then after -- this -- is in medicine, it is in politics, you see. The newest is the best, you see. If anybody who believes that something--because it is new--is the best, is mistaken. If anybody says, "Because it is old, it is the best," is mistaken, you see. Neither new nor old is a criterion for -- for the -- rightness. And the -- the newspapers try to persuade you that new is better, Sir. That is the meaning of the word "modern."

And therefore I have not -- never been impressed. I think I'm quite willing to change. -- Misunder- -- don't misunderstand me. But the recommendation, because it is new it is better, I cannot -- accept. And in the word "modern," there is a kind of praise of something new for the sake of its newness. And this I simply have to fight in -- my own breast, of course. I also think if I wake up to -- tomorrow, and I have a new idea that the new idea is better than the old; but sometimes I find it's just wrong.

So the new is not a criterion of history. Believe me, you see. How much blood, and heart, and faith you give to the new, that will testify to the value of the new, you see. No sacrifice done by an honest heart is in vain. Even our errors are forgiven us. Many, many sacrifices have been -- have given, so to speak, a blessing to the act. But the idea itself is -- is worthless in itself. It is not true

because it is new.

You can now admit that Marx and Smith res- -- deserve and demand our greatest respect, because they saw something and spoke of something, which for 200 years the old powers--the kings of this earth--declined to -- even to speak about, I mean, to mention. This is part of my -- of course, I -- I will not say this tonight, because -- I mean, the -- the specific elements of this confusion--obviously the powers that be, the old -- the old teaching class, Protestant and Catholic alike--I mean, there's no difference--have at first the Romantic school said that industry was -- could be, so to speak, be blessed by some -- some simple adaptations, you see. And the more radical way was pooh-poohed. But obviously, if a -- if a child of 6 has to go into a factory --. I mean, I just -- give you one example how little the Church in the 19th century understood the newness. I give you two things.

In 1816, in the House of Parliament in England, in the House of Lords, there was a commission trying to investigate the state of affairs in -- in the factory -- in the factories of England. And a doctor was called as a witness. And he was so blinded by the prevailing wind of the factory system that when the pres- -- the presiding officer, the presiding Lord said, "Doctor, we are told that children are asked to work 23 hours, till they fall dead, or go to sleep in a factory. What do you have to say to this?"

He said, "I see no reason why they shouldn't."

This is in print. So I mean, novelty blinds people, you see. The -- the magic sha- -- charm of the factory system was such that a doctor, a physician, had the effrontery to say in the House of Lords that he didn't see any reason why a child shouldn't work 23 hours, if this was good for industry.

And the second thing is, which is even more serious--I have to come back to this in -- over at the university--in 1866--this is 50 years later, after all--a commission of the House in England again, in the English Parliament, had to write a report on child labor again. And they said, "It is very painful for us to remark, but it can't be helped, that we have to say that the worst enemies of the children in the factory are their parents, because they sell them there."

Now this is unheard-of. You have never heard of this. But that's only 100 years ago. And this could be done with an archbishop of Canterbury and archbishop of York presiding. They are all members of the House of Lords. And it took a long time, You know, the -- Cardinal Manning was the first who went

over to the side of the Irish workers in England, because they were all Catholics, of course, the Irish, working there. And he intervened in the dock strike in 1890, I think it was, one year before his death in London. Does anybody know the story? I mean, it's a great story. Was the first time that a prelate of the Church, you see, intervened in a strike, in an industrial strike. And said, "This is unheard-of. I have to. These are my children." Before, this was taboo. It was -- a very short time ago, after all.

So the two stories, you see, show you how -- who we are. We are blind and deaf if it is against our -- in our interest to be blind and deaf. Every one of us is. Nobody is better than the {exception}. It is only when he confesses his hurt, his sin. The word "sin" isn't very strong today, you see. It is the sin of this doctor, of course, you see, but it's original sin.

And we don't listen -- today original sin is pooh-poohed. I see it everywhere. Original sin is much stronger than private sin. It is. I assure you. Just by being the son of somebody, and the grandson of somebody, that's original sin, you see. We are already marooned in some partial way of life, which we think is the absolute way of life. So I'm all for the restoration of the doctrine of original sin, you see. That's quite anti-modern. If you ask the moderns, they say, "There is no sin, and there is no original sin; certainly not." They laugh at it. It's the most serious thing I know of to be restored today. That's why I cannot go with the moderns. You see, I cannot talk to people who say that tomorrow there are -- is no original sin.

I mean it -- is no end to it, you see. Most people live on the thought, the mentality of their grandparents. Even in California. And -- and that is what the Bible means by "original sin." You see, the -- the -- the Bible says in the Ten Commandments very simply that the sins of the fathers will be visited on the grandchildren on -- in the fourth -- third and fourth generation. Now we always -- you always think this is an outer punishment. It is just enough to be -- it's not enough to be the grandson of somebody. That's what it says. You see, each -- as soon as you allow the great impressions of your grandfather, that your grandfather was president of the United States, you see, then you get Ted Kennedy, you see. This is original sin. Because his older brother was president, he goes around and -- and wants votes. I think that's terrible. It destroys the democracy. Pardon me for being so outspoken in this case. I think it's scandalous, absolutely damnable. He has no right to this. Thirty years, this man is. It's just laughable. I hope he'll be -- he'll be - he'll be beaten up. Not just beaten.

Well, he just hasn't got -- enough spanking in his youth, obviously, you

see. The spoiled, unregenerate, I mean -- son of rich people. That's what he is. We all live in this danger, you see. Hereditary faith is not to be had, you see. And the whole problem of Christianity -- you see, when it came into the Old World, where everything was hereditary, when it came into the Jews where, you see, the -- the chosen people had their pedigree back to Moses and Abraham, it was unheard-of to -- proclaim the Holy Spirit, you see. And the more we know of our past, the more history is written, the more people study, the -- the -- the gen -- the more museums of history are opened here and historical societies, the -- the lazier of course the heart of man grows, because you say, "My grandfather already did it." If you ever hear this, you see, the man has -- is becoming dangerous, I tell you. Because he is not longer exposed to the immediacy of something, you see. He entrenches himself behind something. It's very nice to think of your fathers and grandfathers. But only if you know you have to do better. And that this is no rel- -- no reason.

I mean, the whole problem today is again in jeopardy between blood and spirit. And -- perhaps I may end then on -- on this point, I -- I thought I should make -- it was really my main theme, when I came, and I only -- only felt the other was equally important.

If you think of the Hymn of St. Francis to the sun and the moon, written for -- in -- in midst of a citified generation, in which suddenly the walls of these cities, you see, took away much of the life and nature for the average citizen of Florence, or Arezzo, or -- Assisi, or { }, then you must feel that he discovered the dimension of our inner life which was in danger of being forgotten. The communion with nature, with the created creation, you see, was not the first stress of the Christian Church that freed men from demons, and devils, and false gods. The second stage of the mission is to make sure that even in an urbanized country, the redwoods, and the birds, you see, and the sea, and the fishes in it, are honored. And from St. Francis to the zoo, and to the Marino--no, what is it called? Marino -- in Santa -- Los Angeles? -- Marineland--there is a straight line. I mean, the whole world has inherited from St. Francis this -- respect for the creature, you see. That hasn't to wait for -- for teaching and writing. It's -- the heart speaks immediately, creature to creature, you see, loves it. And this affection, this sentiment for the -- the creatures around us, of course re-built our own creature-like existence, too. We ourselves have to become aware that we are not just {head} and orthodox, but we are also feeling, enthusiastic.

So my own -- from my own -- from my own comfort, it has always appeared to me that the first thousand years of mission--where people had to be

told that there was Christ, and there was a new life of the spirit--had to hear first of Christ. And that the second person of the divinity, of our -- the deity, was then the bridge that led from the missionary to the human heart. He was touched by this pie, you see, of the Lord, who for us went to the Cross. In the second thousand years, when you think of the -- of the times of the Crusades to the modern -- the times of the satellites, and to the second Vatican, it is the universe of nature, the created world. And the world of the Father who, in the fir- -- according to the first article created Heaven and earth, who came first in human interest. And what you call "science" is the -- all this is the consequence of this emphasis on the first article.

Now the mystery of this is that when we say "one, two, three" of the three articles of the Trinity, we say, "God the Father, God the Son, and God the Spirit." I advise you in our historical existence, you see, to take the second article first, and to say that the way, the bridge we know of to any newborn child's heart, or to any unbaptized, unbelieving heart is Christ. You can only talk what God is via Him. And this is your great problem with the East today. Can the Japanese, can the Chinese, can the Hindus, you see, can the Negroes in Africa, can they become Christians? And you will not achieve it by preaching science. And you will not achieve it by preaching cooperatives, which would be the Holy Spirit. But you have to speak of Christ.

And therefore the missions are still in the situation of the first thousand years of our church history. You understand. You -- will perhaps now begin to understand why I am not interested in the variety of the ages, but I'm much more in the identity. This part of our Christian existence is unchanged. We have to begin with Christ. With the modern masses in Santa Barbara--or let alone Santa Barbara, I speak of Los Angeles or Chicago--you have to speak not of the Holy Spirit, but you have to testify to the Holy Spirit. Because you have to show that people of different language, and different age, and different character can cooperate, you see. And the Holy Spirit demands in the next thousand years tremendous sacrifices of all of us, you see, because this is new.

People of all races, of all colors -- you -- only have to open the paper. This is our problem today. And it isn't enough that they are all Christians. But they must believe that the other fellow is a Christian, which is very difficult. It is very easy -- simple to say that all the Japanese are human beings, and we must make them Christians. But it is terrible difficult to believe that a Christian of a different denomination is a Christian. It's very { }.

Now there is a great -- we are surrounded by this mystery, you see, of the

co-existence of the three articles of our faith. At any one time, the Trinity is very demanding. Where we have to do with the earth, and Heaven and earth, you see, and the created universe, we have to speak of God as the Father. Where we have, however, to reconcile crimes, and offenses, and insults, and pain, you see, which we have, you see, in our own selves, you see, in our arrogance, our shame, our anxiety, our cowardice--whatever the reasons are--committed, you see, all were -- just from laziness, usually, what I call "original sin" --. Because after all, if I am a Ted Kennedy -- why, I am a Kennedy, you see. So I have to learn that this isn't enough to be a Kennedy. You have to be baptized. And he may be 10 times baptized, it's all -- doesn't help. If he's still says he's baptized because he's a Kennedy -- he's -- of course -- baptized despite the fact that he's a Kennedy. Now if you see then: history is not so very complicated. Since the world is discovered--even the Second Vatican has acknowledged this--the -- the third article of our faith becomes prominent, pre-eminent, you see, or in addition to the others. But the others remain. I give you -- let me close you -- close with a rather stunning fact.

Two thousand five hundred bishops, as far as I -- know, are -- were present in Rome. You may think that is unheard-of, only because you have -- fly, { } and aeroplanes can this be done. The human spirit has moved quite differently. In the year 1053 of our era--when there were no roads, there was not one stone bridge crossing the Danube, or the Rhine River, or the Po anywhere in Europe -- America was not discovered--a -- a monk wrote in -- in Lorraine to his colleagues, "The pope can no longer be elected by the citizens of Rome. The plight is too great. These local powers denaturalize, I mean, ruin the Church. The pope must be elected by the bishops of the whole globe."

So this prophecy, or this demand, this political request, in 1053 has taken all this time to 1965 to come true, which I think is a great story, you see. And -- you understand why modernity is not good enough.

Now, {friar}, are you satisfied? So any -- any questions, please, or any remarks?

(Doctor, do you -- do you think that the churches are going to have to -- learn to change their language to -- to be able to speak to -- to modern man? To -- to have him understand the Christian message today, do you think it's -- the language that we -- our traditional language is good enough for this task?)
No, you see, you are quite right. It's a central question. You see, we -- the

danger is much closer. You -- in 20 years, people will know it. In -- in your lifetime. I will -- may not see the day when it -- people will understand that people are going to lose their language in this modern world of cars. That to speak at all is miraculous. You will have tribes again, where the leader will make speeches, and the others will listen, and -- and -- applaud.

I'm very -- if you go to a primitive tribe, you see that the senior citizens speak, you see, and the others listen. I don't see how peo- -- children who sit before a television set can keep their language. I think it's quite impossible. They become indif- -- they will become indifferent to the { } spirit, and they will not think it is creative in the sense that you say it, and I go. I mean, you know the how -- the {Captain of Cabernau}, I mean, when I say to my man, "Go," he goes. That's language. All the rest is bunk, I mean, the newspapers. That's not language. Language is where an order is carried out. And I assure you that the war in Vietnam is only a -- by the mercy of God an attempt in a moment when the Americans unders- -- lose their language with the help of all these television sets, you see, to remind them that there is a real language, where what has been said has to be done immediately. -- This is the way in which the most primitive contributions of the -- human genius -- you can call it "human genius," or you can call it the "history of creation" in man, you see, our language has to be preserved. I think that these terrors in Vietnam, and I share the -- the sympathy with -- these poor boys who are -- dying there, but there is a good reason for this. The society at home is quite incapable of keeping language in its important light. Do you think that in -- in Barbara here, in -- at the university of -- of the -- the words have still their meaning? It's all analyzed away, you see. That's why your order is necessary, because the liturgy is still going on there, and has to be performed every day. You may -- must think there is a relation between the sacredness of the Word, you see, in your services and the looseness in which people usually today throw away all these words -- these verbs -- these sentences. Who can speak today with power, and with the conviction that what is said is done, and what is done is said? They say what is not done; that's the best description of modern man.

So we are in great danger, you see. At this moment, the third millennium after 2000, it's really -- I won't quote Revelation, but I tremble very often, you see, about this realm of the anti-Christ. The anti-Christ is the man who says, "It doesn't matter." And Christ is always on the side of those who say, "It does matter." Now what does matter? What we say, you see. And -- seriousness is -- is replaced by sports. Or -- and the -- as long as this country has the -- the -- the sports, even a -- a Floyd Paterson as a hero, this is in a bad way. And any sacrifice

is -- is justifiable -- justified in our lives to combat this, this destruction of -- of meaning. Play is not serious. And -- who -- who --?

We visited yesterday a very nice man. And he gave us a turkey to eat, which I have every reason to be grateful. It was very nice. But he's -- he's 40. And he said to me, "I've played all my life. I've only done what I like to do." And -- and now, he's 40. There's no fruit. Terrible. The most miserable man in { }. I mean, I -- I pity the man. I don't know if he can be saved, because he has not learned the distinction between serious and play -- seriousness and play. He had money, and he has done not -- it's not an evil man at all, but an unreal man. He never knew the distinction between seriousness and play. He said so. Now, for man to say this at the age of 40 is quite something. It makes you shudder.

And one thing you must -- have to produce, if you speak of modern times: the word "sin" and "original sin," you see, they must be replaced, restored. Their -- sense is unforgettable. It's most important today to say that original sin is around us. All the heirs of a fortune, all the heirs of deg- -- of Ph.D. degrees and so, they are all heirs to efforts made before. They must -- I have -- mentioned Ted Kennedy. Don't mistake me. It's very serious, you see. A country cannot live on quotations. It is not enough to -- to said, My," you see, "{ }." The question is how -- what is tod- -- has to be said today, obviously. In other countries, this -- this danger is much greater than here, I think, where there is still great innocence, and there are new- -- newcomers, and the country is growing. And here is much less danger.

That's why I was -- got so wrought up by this one case in -- in Boston.

Because it is a symptom, you see, which I had met with in the old Europe. I had grown up -- the first half of my life, I have lived over there. And these people have not been able to understand what was happening to them, because they were satisfied with quotation from the Gettysburg Address--from their Gettysburg Address.

And even in this country, I mean, I don't have to tell you that we have not made peace in this country after the Civil War. We quote the Gettysburg Address given in 186- -- which year?

(-5.)

Wrong!

(-3.)

Wie?

(1863.)

Wie? Scandalous!

You know why you have to know the dates of these things? To say that they are bygone. If you don't know the year, you see, they fly around in you, and you cannot bury them. You have to say "1863" to know that in 1965 finally the peace between the Confederacy and the North has to be made. And -- we -- we bask in this Gettysburg Address, and have allowed something -- you see, a state of affairs in which 11 states with their seniority in the commissions of the Senate rule this country, although they are the conquered ones. Isn't that interesting? You could look at the chairmans of the commissions who rule this country in the Senate, and they all are from the South, from the vanquished states, and they all are racist, and they all -- make it impossible to make peace. It's not North and South, gentlemen, but it is the representation of the South in the Senate which is the continuation of the Civil War. I won't say names, but I could give them.

Well, only to show -- what I -- would like to leave behind you is: the next, if there is a new approach--or an additional approach, I would call it--from the Holy Spirit --. You see, the Holy Spirit is the avant-garde of the next authentic law, or movement, always. First, you have to invite people, unbelievers, where you -- who will not recite the Creed, you see, and have to live with them in some form or other. Look at the Peace Corps. It's an attempt to make people move in a still -- not-named spirit, not-labeled spirit, you see, so that then they will believe that it might be named one day, you see. The -- the fore-field -- how would you call it? the -- the -- how would you call the --?

(Advance guard?)

No, that's all Montmartre. I mean, if you have a fortress, or a fort, there is a fore-field, a field in -- around the walls, which is un- -- not covered, you see, by any building, entrenchments, but which is left open, left free. This is today the -- danger line. May I close with a story of Pope John XXIII, which has impressed us all very much?

We -- I knew a doctor. He -- he drowned in the Caribbean a very short time ago. He was a Scotchman, and he was -- happened to be exposed to the -- he was the first or second man to enter some of the camps of the Germans where the

Germans murdered their prisoners, and their -- the Jews. Belsen and -- the other, I do not know which it was. And he was so up-wrought that his whole life was changed. He devoted himself ever since this year, 1945, to the -- to problems arising from these cruelties, from the war. And he went near to Paris and built there a camp for all the victims--or not all, of course--but for victims of the -- of the German concentration camps. And with his great imagination, he established them in such a form that they made these people again into living beings. No rules. No Creed, of course, you see. No denomination. Everything, however, arranged to make them forget the concentration camp. There was money to be taken out at random by the inmate, you see. They could go out and come back at 3 o'clock in the morning if they wanted to. Everyth- -- way it was stressed that this was not a concentration camp, and they learned to live again. And this was an attempt to cure these poor people from their im- -- you see, incapacity to live. They had, of course, become completely hipped to this question of: What's forbidden? Who will kill me? And who is behind me?

Now Cardinal Roncalli was the nuncio in Paris at that time. And he heard, like all others, that this was a great thing. And he came to see it. Now you understand what I'm trying say is, how the Holy Spirit is -- differs from the second millennium and the first millennium because of this incognito that he needs. Because the cardinal had to -- Dr. {Westphal-Thompson}--that's my doctor-friend's name--"Doctor, isn't it strange that nowadays all the important things must be done by laymen?"

Fortunately I -- had read in the meantime an article in which it is proven that the word "laity" in the Bible comprises clergy and non-clergy. We are all laymen, including the cardinal, and including his sanctity, the pope, you see, because we are all people of God. As far as these are people, in the plural, you see, we are all still unlabeled. And we all have, as St. Francis one day, you see, to rediscover what should be said. This is what we call the life of the spirit. And that has to be found in innumerable forms. If you think of the Peace Corps, or of this anti- -- Job Corps, this Job Corps business, now, the anti-poverty program, the whole problem to meet this man in such a way that he doesn't -- be labeled. . It isn't -- you can't call him poor, you can't call him down-and-out, you can't call him a rioter, you see. The main thing is that he suddenly forgets that he's colored, you see, that he's one thing or the other. You see, you must talk to him in such a way that he becomes a human being. And a human being is somebody who hears from tomorrow, and not from yesterday. If we can make him hear from tomorrow, you see, he's -- can become a child of the spirit.

Thank you.

[applause]

(Doctor. Doctor has gracious consented to put in another appearance, and -- probably next week. Is that -- toward the end of the week?)

It's -- up to you. I told you. I mean, you -- you know how these -- people are.

(Oh, I know.)

They are all scheduled, you see. I'm not.

(Well, we can -- I can let you know { }. We can work out a date. { }.)

Well, I told you. You can dispose of me, and let me know -- tell you.

(Okay. We'll dispose of you. I said, we'll dispose of you.)

But don't dispense with me.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

(...creates between the religious community and the world at large, and the -- and the involvements that -- that are incumbent on us because of this.

Would you want to take off from there?)

I'm glad you asked. Answers are always more reasonable than a free speech out of the air. So I'm glad to -- to speak to your question.

You see, the miracle of our human existence is -- must be true in a certain sense of every man, and of all men. When our Lord appeared, He set the standard for mankind; and yet it was one life, one single life; not to be repeated, even, unique. Now all our problems, just like this of hospitality, then is that all man- -- mankind must be willing to open up to a newcomer, and welcome the child into the world. And nothing more terrible for -- than for a human being to -- to feel that he is not made welcome. That can happen in a family. That can be -- the woman can be just so tired that she feels it shouldn't have come, this baby. This is a very serious thing in us, in a proletarian family. The children are burn -- .

I just read -- happened to read two days ago a book written by an English noblewoman, who married a German landowner. They were happily married. However, she only had daughters. And the husband could not suppress his desire to have an heir, a male heir to the estate and to his rank. And she began to dread this. And she said, "I'm just good for bearing this heir, obviously. And I don't want to go on and have babies all the time, because they are all daughters," you see, "and he's not satisfied. He thinks this daughter, that's just, you see, preparatory to the real thing." She felt that wasn't true.

And so there was a tragedy in this marriage, because the woman felt abused. The -- the daughter was not as -- as much honored by -- the father, you see. And -- well, the Old Testament is full of such stories, that the heir has to come, the male, you see.

And -- so you see, to be made welcome is nothing natural in a society. This ask -- saying that the next comer -- the newcomer is not ill-received, is not unwelcome, but is in a -- some way or other the expected one, is quite an imposition on our imagination. And as you know, in China and in India, this just isn't solved. The people there are -- the children crowd in, and they are a burden. And they are a pain in the neck, for the society, for the government, and for the indi-

vidual group.

And seeing this -- this strange conflict or dualism--that everything in the Bible, everything in a revelation, everything important is valid for the individual and for all mankind, or it isn't important--puts me on the track on the -- of hospitality in the old days. And for other reasons, I have been given to much studies on anthropology and archaeology. I began as a constitutional lawyer. And the history of the law, of course, is very much the history of the mores of society. That's what it is. And so I simply had to read many old texts. And you everywhere find this great problem, that the smallest group already, the tent of an Arab sheik is not complete, it is not leading in its own eyes, in its own judgment, a good life if they aren't able to open up to a -- to a guest.

This is a great mystery. I mean, it's as great a mystery as that in a little village church the whole Mass can be celebrated, you see, which is more mysterious than you probably come to think of it, you see. It is incredible that the -- what I said, what is true of all mankind must be true of this one priest and his -- how do you call the man who turns the page? The deacon. Wie? How do you call him?

(The server, acolyte.)

Yes, that's probably the right -- yes. The lowest grade. This is more serious than you think. Much of the dogma, you see, is built around this paradox that what is true of this one priest and his -- Mass, you see, must be true of the whole Church. And what is true of the Vatican council must be true of one lesson between one student and his -- teacher.

In a way, it is impenetrable. In a way, you will find that scientists are absolutely unable to -- to grasp this--natural scientists, I mean, mathematicians, physicists. They think 10 people and one people -- person, that's not the same. Now our wisdom begins with the fact that all the mil- -- billions of people on this earth, and one man and his wife, or his friend--probably two must at -- be it, because man begins at two, so to speak--have the same problems. There's no -- no difference. And you have to formulate -- you have always to think always in terms of this strange duplicity. If you have a statistician, he will only think of numbers.

I had the great privilege that a statistician on Madison Avenue in New York, where they have all the advertising firms, you see, came to visit us. And he -- explained to me--I hope I -- have I told you this story before? It's a -- one

shouldn't repeat one's story. But it's a good story, and an important story, because at the end, he dec- -- explained how he found out about the popularity of his breakfast food.

And -- and I said, "But I never read the ads. I cannot be influenced by them."

He said, "Well, all right. You are statistically unimportant."

Now your humanity begins at the point where you are statistically unimportant. Ja, you understand, you see. Then you are able to incorporate in your single personality the whole problem of mankind. Before, you are only one in a -- in a host of -- of people, you see. You may be an angel or a devil. They have no names, the angels and the devils. They are a crowd. We are persons, which is -- you see, is both. I mean, it's a burden, but it's our privilege. God's sons and God's daughters are more than the angels, as the Bible says, you see. Which is very hard to understand. The deepest reason is that the host of angels, the statistically important people whom you can count, you see, are innumerable, like the sand of the sea. But they have reached the point of being irreplaceable. You can -- replace them by others.

Now the hospitality is an attempt then to represent this universal principle that all men are brothers, and owe each other a living, that they are to be found already in the smallest possible unit. One man on his camel or in his tent, and one stranger already found the Church. I mean, when the Bible says "Where one and two are gathered in -- in my name, I am in the midst of them," you see, this is of course -- this is already the institution in anticipation. Because if the chief--the -- the sheik I would say, the Arab sheik--and the man who comes strolling in--obviously a British man, because only { }--comes and asks for a -- drink of water, if this sheik can surpass his Arab- -- Arabism, his character as a Moslem, his character as a man, his character as speaking only Arabic, you see, his right -- fear that somebody encroaches upon his property, upon his territory, all these shackles which limit his humanity, he has to shed in order to give this fool of an Englishman something to drink.

Now don't laugh on this. It's quite serious. You must -- you must see how many walls, how many stone walls, you see, around his human heart he has to tear down before he can recognize that this man from the British Isles is his brother, and that he owes him a living. And it is much rarer than you think. In every moment, people today begin to build--just by terminology, by saying, "You are statistically unimportant"--walls around themselves.

Mr. Pierpont Morgan, as you know, was the rich- -- one of the richest men of this country. And when a big crisis arose in the first decade of the 20th century, the people said to him, "But Mr. Morgan, the public has been frightened off by you," he said, "I know -- owe nothing to the public."

A chief justice -- not the chief justice. A justice of the Supreme Court wrote a book to the same -- in the same way. He wrote a book. It's called, *The Public and Its Government*. Now Pierpont Morgan and this Justice Frankfurter, by simply choosing the term "public" instead of "people" made themselves irresponsible, so to speak. "To the public, we don't owe anything," you see. Public is curious. And woe to the curious. I mean, curiosity doesn't deserve any respect. If a man is curious, you just close your window and don't let him in. You don't have to be -- hospitable to the public. They can buy a ticket to a concert, where you wish to admit the public. But otherwise you shut up and say, "I'm -- this is my private house. My house is my castle."

If he -- Mr. Pierpont Morgan had not known this hateful word "public," and had been forced to say "the people," he could never have formulated the sentence, "I owe the people nothing," because it would be obvious that he was one of the people. The public, you understand, is already a means of not belonging to the people. And the word -- if -- wherever you today read the papers, distinguish between "people" and "public," and you will see: the public is a way of dividing you from the rest of the world. They sit there, I mean. Of course, you don't want their gaze, their stare. So you are of course compelled to let down your shutters and stay in your privacy. If you say "people," you are one of them. You can't help it.

I mean to say this, that hospitality is a spiritual act. It is a disarmament conference, because it means that you do not use terms that estrange you from that what happens to you, from the foreigner who comes in. And you and I, we are sovereigns by our terminology, to name this fellow, you see, as being either outside or inside. Hospitality today is so cheap, and is so common that you forget that any minute the same person, the same stranger, the same foreigner, you see, can be admitted to you as a brother, and can be estranged from you as public, as curiosity-seeker, as an intruder.

And there is no end to this liberty of the -- the human soul, by naming, to create foreigners and brothers, you see. The brotherhood of man is not a fact; it's an act of faith. And it's very strange that language has become obviously so cheap that people think that when you speak, you just use the right terms as you

have learned in school. Beware of this. It's not true. You -- every minute --. Well, what's "ernennen"? { }. Ernennen -- you name, you appoint the -- the person to the role you are giving him at this moment. The brotherhood of man is not a fact. Don't be talked into such naturalism, you see. It's an act, and a very difficult act at times to perform.

And we live today, as you know, in a tradition of mere nature, that all the things in the world are as they are just -- we have to find out what they are. Now human beings are not whats. They are not things, they are not objects. They are not what they are. They are what you believe them to be. Then you help them to become what they are meant to be. But without your support, they can't. Hospitality therefore is always a creative act of beginning to create the una sancta.

In -- without this connection of your naming this foreigner, your guest, you see, and the great goal of humanity on this earth, to become one, you do not justice to this earliest period of man. That is not -- it would be too cruel if God had waited till the coming of Christ, until you have your monastery here in -- as a mission in -- in Santa Barbara, if -- if nothing before had happened.

Now every host in antiquity, when Abraham {faced} the three -- the angels of the Lord--you know -- you know this story, you see--he doesn't know who they are, you see, but he treats them royally. That is the great example of how -- it has always been interpreted in theology, you see, as the first revelation, as the first act of the new covenant, this hospitality given by Abraham to the -- to the strangers. You should read it up, really, in your Bible.

And what has -- driven me to -- to stress this here and in former days is the -- when we read of the mores of the ancient nations, the tribes, the Boc- -- Bor- --what is their name?--the {Boroccos} in Amazônas, or the Sioux, or the Apaches, or what have you --. We are apt to think that's all very easy, very cheap. They had as dif- -- great difficulties as we have today, and perhaps greater. And their achievements are just as great as ours. The human soul has not been created 1900 years ago, but from the very beginning, when God gave us a living {breath}. And you can study in hospitality the amount of generosity and of courage that it has taken in all times to be human.

Now it is a very great thing, I -- I feel, that we do not find any nation where there is not hospitality--that is, where there is not some rule that a stranger must be made your blood brother, and must be treated, you see, as though he was on equal terms with the heir of the house, or the he- -- of the -- the community. This is incredible. And there is then the first layer of revelation

in every human heart, which is expecting something. Something more than what is.

Today people talk of eschatology, and they talk of such difficult Greek terms. In hospitality, I feel, the whole tension between Revelation and the -- the book -- first book of Genesis is already there, it's already contained in this. Because here is the first man, you see, primitive; and yet, on the other hand, there is the expectation, the desire, the longing for more. And there you have the whole wavelength of beginning and end, already, in this one step that says -- this chieftain says, "You're welcome," and doesn't slaughter him, and doesn't rob him. Think of what -- this man had to sleep at night, and what happens at night? Anything can happen, obviously. We live such a protected life that very few of you will -- will ever had to -- have had to give thought to this fact that while you are sleeping, you are unaware of the dangers around you. Anything can happen to you. We have a police force. But there is no police force in the Arabian desert. Obviously this hospitality was made in many groups the mainstay of their constitution. We have the old tradition of Tantalus in Greece, where the -- Tantalus was a king who feasted the gods--he invited the gods and -- in his -- in -- how is the story? They -- he slaughtered his own son--Pelops, isn't it?--and served him. And they found out about it. Well, that's only -- it seems only a gruesome story. However, it seems to be a fact that in the tribes, there have been systems of economy, of living together that a whole group of pe- -- one tribe came to the other, regularly, lived one-quarter of a year with one tribe, and then one-quarter of a year with the other, and so in four quarters, had a common budget, you see, eating out each other's provisions, one after the other.

Sir? You want to join us?

(I want to listen. I understand it's on community life, is it?)

Who are you, Sir?

(Oh, I'm a teacher here.)

(This is Mr. {Peter Schneider}. He's an instructor in speech in the seminary here.)

Ja. So. Welcome, stranger. We're just talking about hospitality.

And so I think the -- the most primitive mores of such a -- such a group as

these people who take turns, you see, visiting each other, are to be taken quite seriously. It's a very catholic theology which they follow. They want to show each other and to assure each other of the peace that governs between them. Not more can be shown than the community of goods between them. And no economic consideration enters this picture of generous -- generosity and hospitality. It isn't -- there is no accounting. There is no bank account overdrawn or filled up.

In these -- in these processes of hospitality, the whole mentality of accounting is completely left out. As soon as a hostess and a host reckon -- begin to reckon how much they have spent on their guests, the rule of hospitality is broken.

To give you a very modern example how important that is, that there is a realm where there is no accounting, there is no bank account, there is no overdrawn -- and overdrawing, where figures are not admitted, where the -- arithmetic of "2 and 2 is 4" does not pertain.

I'll tell you a story of my own experience, which has really become very decisive in my own life -- has changed the course of my own actions and my own existence in my -- in this col- -- in this country. I came to this country after I had introduced the Peace Corps in -- in Germany first. And in imitation of this Peace Corps, the American government, as you know, introduced the Civilian Conservation Corps. And when I came to this country, I was made very welcome, because Mrs. Roosevelt invited me immediately to dinner to celebrate the -- my alleged merits in the case.

So I was of course very much aware of what was going on in this country, and beginning to live in a -- in the backwoods of Vermont, in a very lonely place without water. I had to -- it was December, and I had to cut open the -- the ice in the brook in order to get some water. Very primitive circumstances I lived. I saddled my horse one day, and rode out into the next wood--they are very beautiful. And I came to a Civil Conservation Corps camp. It was a so-called side camp; it had not 200 people, but only 50, which was smaller than the normal. And I greeted these people. And there was a man in command, a reserve officer. It was a time of economic crisis. It was -- it was the year '38, and economic -- the economy of that time was still suffering. And there were the unemployed boys from Revere, which is a -- quite a famous suburb of Boston -- famous because of Paul Revere; it's called after him.

And the man, the officer, and I were talking. I got off my horse. We sat down, and he began to complain. And what was he -- that he was complaining of? He said that the boys were such a horror to him--they were all between 17 and 22--because they grabbed the food that came on the table, from each other. And they -- they're so jealous, that they wouldn't allow the other men to get any better bite, you see, from the bowl which was served.

And I said, "You are right. That's the most serious thing I've ever heard in human society. The society begins with this spiritual unity, you see, that everybody is glad that the other fellow also has something to eat. Where you don't have this, the society is broken. You have ana- -- not only anarchy, but you have war."

This is very serious. The gold-diggers, and the people -- who went west had to suffer from this lack of solidarity. That's the opposite of hospitality. And you can see the miracle of hospitality from this contrast. Here are boys thrown together in one camp, meant to form one family. Not being strangers, you see, suddenly appearing at the horizon from a -- far away. Coming even from the same town of Revere, in Massachusetts, and yet being unable to forget for one moment that everyone was somebody separate, and trying to steal, to get the best bite out of the bowl for themselves. Animals. Wolves.

And I -- quite seriously, I was then appointed by the government to reorganize these camps. And this was the basis of my willingness to interfere. Because I said, "There is nothing now to -- to destroy. It is destroyed. The Civilian Conservation Corps is over with. On this basis, you can't run it anymore." There is no -- this is quite important for you to hear. We are very optimistic in this country. We -- you think everything can be healed. Now I assure you, a camp in which this has happened, the only thing you -- can do is close it. It can never rem- -- be remedied. And perhaps this is -- strikes you--because you are young, and are Americans--as very cruel on my part and very pessimistic, I assure you, it's like cancer. It leads to death. There is no way of healing a community in which this first law of identity is broken. And the first law of identity -- is, between human beings, that they want to be one body that is allowed to live, quite materially.

I don't like today -- nowadays to begin with the spirit, or with the mind of people, or with their convictions, you see. This is much more telling, their stomach. If you cannot abdicate your stomach, and the other fellow's stomach and form one stomach, you are not fit for the incorporation which we call

"humanity." The word "incorporation," as you know, is a very sacred word, that we form one body. But it is not an abstract term. It is not a play word. It's just -- not true that it only happens at Mass on Sunday. The Mass sets the example of that which must happen all day long, and the whole week, and the whole year. And there I found it, you see, so to speak, in -- in -- in its nakedness, as destroyed, and as denied, and -- as having become impossible.

The second feature, by the way, of this camp, which perhaps bears out my contention equally was that the -- the officer who was -- a man of 30, I would say--so he was not much older than these fellows--paid them money, in cash -- money, if they would be good enough to -- to play together sports -- games, on Saturday and Sunday, because he said otherwise they won't do it. They were real rowdies, you see. They -- they -- they sat on him, so to speak, blackmailed him. I think the study of a non-society as this, you see, is quite a good introduction to the simple facts of life, that we all rely already on this power of self-forgetfulness, in -- in a close by -- which we usually forget. We are who- -- far too highfalutin when we are invited to love the Siamese cat. I don't care for Siamese cats. It is much more difficult to love your neighbor, you see. It's obviously very easy to love Siamese cats, because I know so many awful people who love Siamese cats.

Heavens! I said something dangerous.

(Excuse me.)

You're welcome.

So what I have found in my dealings in the last -- in my life, is that the educated people are thinking too -- in too-high terms of all these spiritual processes, you see. They look to the stars, and they look to the -- to the organized Church, and in the sacraments only, and don't see that every day these things, these processes in some form take place -- must take place. And on the other side, the poor people, I mean, have no time to think at all. They do not -- they do these things. There is not -- no more hospitality than in poor homes. Quite naturally, I mean. The family can come in, and the brothers and the sisters are taken care of if they fall -- become a burden. And they are not put into an old-age asylum immediately, as the wealthy people can do. And -- and they can't divorce, and they don't have all these exits, you see, into an easier life through money. So I think the simple virtues are much more represented. Also the break of these virtues, I mean, the trespassing, among the poor than among the rich.

But what I have learned is that the -- our -- the Gospel, our -- our -- our faith is so indestructible, so to speak, or so central, because it begins with really us, with everyday man, in -- in our situation here. And it is not made for kings and philosophers. And this battle between the Greek mind and the Christian mind is -- is always with us, you see, that you -- you try to figure out a -- a world in which the philosopher can take satisfaction, and find comforting. That wouldn't help, you see. And the simplicity of the hospitality is that it is the greatest sacrament between men, because it is everybody's everyday affair. If you get two people, it exists in its full wake--whether they are old or young, whether they are men or women--because it is this side of the division. It is simply our bodily existence, which has to be incorporated into oneness, because -- before this man ceases to be an animal, or ceases to be treated as an animal. You have your choice, I mean. You yourself can act as an animal, and as soon as you treat the other fellow as an animal--as these boys did in the camp, you see--you yourself become an animal.

So this degradation of the people is quite serious. And I would say there are two terms today by which you have to cope with, and have to fight off as the real devils. One is the word "public." That's usually for the -- the entertainer who wants to sell you a ticket. He invites the public. He's rid of any obligation. You pay him; he delivers the goods. And I always have great pity with all these artists who think they only have to do with the public. They must be empty in their heart, I mean. It's terrible. The relation then is just the ticket office. That's why then I feel the -- the problem of the arts today in this country is to take them out of the commercialism of this relation. The art is not performed for the public, you see. It's performed for you. But the condition has to be that the artist is hospitable to you. But now he isn't. He just says, "Five dollars." And that isn't enough. That's why the amateur art today is the great problem in this country, you see. If you can make the music a house music, you have won the game, you see. As soon as it only consists in -- in selling tickets, I think you can never give it the dignity it deserves. It -- in this country it's the opposite. If you say, "The man earned \$10,000 by his concert," you think he's a great artist. He may be a great artist, but you also have killed the man's soul. The one concert in which he plays for nothing, you see, is the important event, of course. In his own life, too. And they know it, by the way. Any generous artist will give so many concerts, you see, for charity and so, because that gives him the satisfaction that he's hospitable. And the other is a very poor relation, after all, where you just -- in -- earn \$100,000. Burn it. What are \$100,000?

In all these human relations of the -- of the -- where man is sanctified, money is no consideration. It can -- you can -- and as soon as you try to buy indulgences, you get the Reformation.

It's a very -- it's as simple as that, gentlemen. It is true of the artist today in the same -- sense. He has genius; he has spirit; he is inspiring. But how can he inspire if the relation between you and him is his -- your ticket?

Sacrifice something for the artist, and he will sacrifice his genius for you.

But this is, I mean -- it's -- instinctively, we all know it. That's why you want to celebrate the artist. We want -- I mean, the girls throw flowers at him, and so on. Because it is a deep desire to establish a real relation bet- -- between a man who inspires us and ourselves, you see. And we want to get beyond the ticket office. Isn't that true, I mean? You may make -- poke fun at these -- at these -- how do you call these people who -- who beleaguer a star? The fans, you see. But this is not -- not despicable at all. It is very human to replace the relation of a public to an actor, you see, by the relation of a member to his people.

Hunt down this term "public," and try everywhere, if you can, to replace it by "people," and you can never go wrong. You see, if you live in the Greek heathen world of "civilization," or "culture," now they call all these heathen things, whenever people are treated as a public, and whenever they are treated as a people, you have been honest enough to say that you are one of them. The public is always something to be -- manipulated.

There was an article in the Los Angeles Times on November 29th--that's three days ago--I cut it out. I have preser- -- shall preserve it. And it said -- the man was running for office in Los Angeles. And he went to a public relation man. And the man said, "Now, Sir; I understand you want to be councilman. All right. But just take it easy. Go hunting, or go on a journey. I'll do it for you. For Heaven's sake, don't say a word. Not necessary. It's much easier to be elected if you don't say one word."

And he proved it to his own satisfaction, this -- this public relation man.

And -- it's quite a story about democracy. and you shudder, because the -- the public is treated there as a gullible public, you see, absolutely idiotic, sleepy, indifferent, you see; and can be bribed by anything. And the less the man appears and give offense, the safer the public relation man feels. I -- if you can get hold of the paper, it's -- it deserves your interest, because it makes your -- your hair stand on end.

At this moment all over the world, by the way--it's the same with Mr. Brezhnev in Moscow, and it's the same with Mr. Wilson in London, and it is the same with Mr. Mao in China, by the way, it's absolutely no difference--the poor, so-called -- the governing people, you see, must all the time deal with the public. And the public is what they see. And faith is only that which cannot be seen. And today people want to -- to bring down our faith in each other to the level of visibility. Now God is invisible. And He remains invisible; with all your pictures you cannot paint God. You can only, so to speak, direct your thoughts towards Him. But He still is always inscrutable. And the same is true of any sacrament performed under His eyes, like the hospitality. It is the most primitive sacrament, you see, the most primeval one. And will be the last one, because it takes again your power to strip this man who -- whom you -- whom you meet from all that which you think you know of him. You cannot be hospitable to a man of whom you care, of whose you rank you care, of whose enmity you care, of whose moods you care, you see. It is the same with your friend as with your -- the foreigner. Even to the friend you can only do right if he has -- is not, so to speak--how would you say it?--is not denied the truth about him. If you have a good friend, you may spare his sentiments and not say what you really think of him. You would break the law of hospitality in this respect, too. If you -- his friend -- your friend, he can -- must rely on the fact that you treat him right. So the -- I mean to say, hospitality even has the opposite front of veracity towards the man who is already inside your admitted friendship. That would balance, your -- your charity towards the man who -- you see here for the first time. The obligations of hospitality are, so to speak, infinite. All the secrets of the human heart are involved: when to speak the truth; what to say to each other, you see; how to name each other: what rank to give to the stranger, and to the old-timer, and the newcomer, and to the ever -- always-have-been-there. And this is what -- what made me always come back to this -- to this simple thing. It's outside theology. They don't treat -- of it; it's so wonderful, you see; we are on safe ground. You cannot be -- be accused of saying anything heretic -- there is no heresy about it. And it's common to all men. You can talk to Buddhists, and you can talk to -- to Chinese, you see. And your mission begins this way. A missionary who is not hospitable, I think, will not ma- -- make any converts.

And so I feel we have got -- one of the reasons why, at this moment, the whole of mankind in its emissaries is following the line of anthropology and prehistorical research is -- the reason, that there we find this one primeval feature of hospitality in its -- nudity, nakedness, but also in its efficacy and its serious-

ness represented. It's not an accident, you see, that at this moment -- you can't win fame by publishing a book on Homer. You can't -- earn fame by publishing a book on Julius Caesar. They have all been written. You can repeat these books. And you can improve on them. But anybody will listen to you if you suddenly come out of the bush in New Guinea and tell the people how -- how come that these aborigines, you see, in New Guinea, keep peace among each other. There's a very wonderful new book by Harvard -- some Harvard scholars, who went to New Guinea, which is north of Australia, you may know; and which we abandoned to this terrible Indonesian gentleman, for no reason, for -- just for cowardice. It's one of the blames of this country that we -- we sacrifice these people in New Guinea to this Mr. Sukarno, because we want it. I mean, we took it away from the Dutch.

I say this, because these people have -- left humanity, obviously -- perhaps 8,000 years before now. They don't know the dates. But it is a fact that they have still the mores of the oldest people on earth, as we have to assume that Adam and Eve are described in the -- in Genesis. There are several tribes. They have peace among each other, because they honor their dead. In the name of the ancestor of the tribe they keep their peace. And every 50 or a hundred years, they have a religious war, because they have to renew the faith in their ancestors, they say. And one man is slain. And as soon as honor has been done, and one man is slain, they can make peace again. Because they can then remember this one slain; in the name of this one man slain, they keep the peace again, which I think is sublime. It's lim- -- if you think of our human catastrophes, how many thousands of people we slay, it's very profound that these people obviously have lived there many thousand years now in an order. They speak to each other; they live together; they don't kill each other. The only refresher course they have to take is that there has to be actually one man dying from violence, so that they shudder again that there has been violence, you see, and they say, "It mustn't happen again." And of course, that fades into the background after a certain while, so they renew this ritual.

Perhaps it makes you in contrast see what hospitality does, you see.

Where hospitality is at work, you can avoid the warfare with the foreign -- group, you see. Where you have this power to nominate, to -- to acclaim a foreigner as your brother, the tribes don't have to go to war against each other. It's a very serious business.

And if I could -- I have -- I mean, I -- I think you will find that in the next 50 years that the writings on anthropology, the writings on prehistory will have

to play the same role as the reading of Greek tragedy, or of Pindar, or of Virgil, has played in the last 200 or 300 years. The nourishment, you see, to make us believe that life on this earth is very difficult, and very important, and very worthwhile, will be renewed by such stories more readily than by complicated stories about Louis XIV or -- some rascal in the 17th century. And history changes its -- so to speak, its aspects. And this is why this country, as you know, one expedition after another, goes into the bush, or into the Amazônas Valley -- that has deeply -- deep religious reasons. Because in this -- very simple forms of hospitality, every one of us is practically challenged. Every one of us can do something about this.

And what more can we want as -- that the -- the books that surround us, the stories that are told to us, gain the meaning of summons, and tell us that we are expected to do likewise. Is that enough?

(Does anybody have -- { } question { }?)

Please.

(I was wondering if you could elaborate a little bit on the difference between work and -- and play. You mentioned this last time when you were here, that people can't tell the difference between work and play. { }.)

Well, it's the most important question we have in this society. You see, Americans do everything to obliterate the frontier between seriousness and play. They -- they -- they feign as though everything was play, you see, and they also feign as though play was serious. I mean, baseball seems very serious in this country.

And I -- did I tell you the story of my Dutch friend? Is this what brought it up? I have a friend who works on a computer in Holland. Please tell me if I repeat myself. And he brought up this question, you see. He visited us in -- in May, in -- here in -- in America. And I had to give some lectures there on the spirit of the third millennium. And he listened. And I had tried to make this point that we -- we would have to distinguish what was really serious in the future. Obviously flying with the jet plane was not very serious, you see, but there were more serious issues indeed.

And he went back. And -- and when he started his work again in Holland, I received this letter: "Dear Eugen"--that's my first name--"You will hardly understand my protest against all your proposals for reforming industry. You have

only, so far"--that was against me--"written on the worker, and on his toil, and that he needed some compensation for this, and his -- and social -- life or so. What I am experiencing is something quite different. We, the employees in the offices of the firm, we are not overburdened. We are not sweating. We are not exp- -- prone to accident, as the man who works on the hundred- -- hundred-story building. Our great pain is that we cannot take our work seriously. It's routine work," like accounting, you see, you have to figure, or -- take all these words. "Our problem is how to remain serious." And certainly the work, so-called, our attendance for eight hours at the office is not very serious. It is boring. It isn't sacrifice. We want to earn money for my -- our family. But I don't call this serious. My soul is not involved. My body is not in danger. So I come home with the soul empty, and the body not tired, really, not used up. And what I need in the evening is seriousness. And then I read your books."

I -- wrote back, "Very complimentary." But this gives you to think. The -- you see, services, so-called, and employees' standards are grappling -- I mean, are extended. Work through automation of manual character is diminishing. The problem of the employee and the office worker, his situation will become more and more the standard problem of society. He has a television. He may -- he's not -- he's not poor. But if he has to work on an -- on a typewriter or a Xerox machine in the daytime, and has to listen to television -- or to look at television in the evening, he certainly has not one minute of serious life. It's all fake. Or it's all second-rate, if it isn't fake. It is unimportant. Nothing really depends -- think of all these -- .

The -- when the Navy sends out a letter today, the American Navy, 16 copies are made. These 16 copies are not serious. You see, that's just -- frivol- -- frivolous. I mean, they have the machinery, so why not the -- make 16 copies? Well, but that's the story. With the computer the same. We have the computer; why not figure out, you see, the end of the world?

In -- in my college--which is not the worst of all, Dartmouth College in the East--every boy's edu- -- trained in computer work. And so they have to think up problems that don't exist, because they have paid the money for this expensive machine, you see, and thousands of problems which should never be solved are solved every day.

We have an old proverb in German, you see: one fool can ask more questions than hundred wise men can answer.

Well --. But this is the future. I knew this man who invented this devil of a

computer. And pardon me for being quite personal in this respect. I told his father that he was a criminal. He sent his boy to Harvard at 14 -- age 14. And the boy was a doctor and graduated from Harvard when he was 17. The result is the computer. It's the lower faculties of man and -- which have been made independent in the computer, and now gallop through the universe. I'm quite serious. Something terrible has happened. This gentleman who invented the computer is Exhibit A for a wrong education, you see. At 17, the mind is developed up to here. But all the real problem of wisdom, of concern, you see, of creativity are not developed yet. He remained childish all his life. When his -- he had a son born, unfortunately to him, at 24. And then he was standing at MIT--that's the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in Boston--and saying to every man who marched into the building, "Congratulate me. I have a son."

He was, so to speak, collecting for this immensity, you see, that he didn't know what a -- to be a father is. And he thought it was -- consisting in this act to tell everybody that he was. Now I think a real father would have kept it a secret, and would have been quite shy of mentioning it to any newcomer.

I'm perhaps unjust to this man. I had this argument with his father. I said, "You are guilty for a whole new phase in the existence of mankind, because you have not given your son the time to mature. It is not right to send a boy at 14 to -- to the university, and have him graduate at 17. He will overdevelop -- you know tho- -- these faculties. From 14 to 17, we are clever, we are quick, we are -- have presence of mind. You can make him solve "2 and 2 is 4," you see; one faster than the other, I mean. You can run a class on this, you see. Hee, hee, 2 and 2 is 4 -- no, it's 5 and 6, and on and on it goes. But of what value is this? You develop a machine, a clever machine. No important question can be asked, and no important answer can be received. And the world is now under the yoke of this computer system.

The -- there is a group of meteorologists in Holland. And this friend of mine told me the following story, this friend who -- who had this argument with me, said -- saying that it's all play now, you see. He said this group of meteorologists forecast the weather with the help of the computer. All the probabilities, you see. And they had one young student among them, as a kind of apprentice; a rather fresh boy. And whenever they said how the weather would be, the man said, "No, it will be this way."

And then they wrote it down finally, and they found out that he had many more right answers than the scientific group to which he, so to speak, was an appendix.

And they said, "How do you do it? How do you do it? You never care for the computer."

"No," I said -- he said. "I don't."

"But how do you know it?"

"I look out of the window."

So. Let this be our { }.

(At the risk of being accused of inhospitality, I can tell you that it's 4:30. I'd love to continue, but --.)

No, no. We -- I have to go to { }.

(So thank you once again, Doctor. Whenever you're in Santa Barbara, stop by your -- this is your home.)

(Very Spanish).