

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

(Clint Gardner: This is a test at 15/16ths inches per second. This is a test of 15/16th inches per second. This is a test of the recorder. This is a test of the recorder. Microphone volume is -- the microphone volume is set at the highest possible now. It's set at the highest possible setting.)

(We have with us tonight Eugen Huessy, who spoke at our arrival banquet. And since that time, we haven't had much philosophical meat in the program. There's been a little bit of other meat, but we hope that as he talks you'll think of questions, because some of these points should be raised constantly during your Peace Corps service, and perhaps even during training. Training in service should certainly not all be technical knowledge, factual knowledge and experienced only { } few tangible reactions. The box is yours.)

(Gardner: Oh well, no, that won't work because of this.)

(Oh yeah, you have to be over here.)

When Dick Wright phoned me that I should come over here, I asked for three nights to speak to you, because if it is to be worthwhile, you must have some opportunity of pondering over this. I want to take you into a frame of reference that holds good for a century backward and forward as well, because the fashions of the Peace Corps are its real dangers. I've seen six fashions from -- since 1912, when I first began to feel that something of this kind has to happen. And we aren't through with fashion. But your Peace Corps is more serious than any fashion and any party system of government in any state, including the United States. It is too serious -- a man has said in France when the Second World War was about to be lost, "War is too serious to leave it to the generals." The Peace Corps is too serious to leave it to anybody official. You would have to restore the Peace Corps even if the government of the United States would abolish it.

Well, that sounds very serious. So let -- me inject a more harmless fact. When we telephoned -- Dick Wright and myself -- it was the same day in which a man died, who can be considered the last and very noble scion of an -- the era which went on before the Peace Corps. The man was Arthur Waley. Very few of you will have heard the name. He is the greatest expert in England on Chinese literature. And the importance of the man, however, will appear to you if I say that one of his last books was called *The Opium War through Chinese Eyes*. This book was published in 1958, just a year before the Peace Corps was established.

It is perhaps the last moment then in human history in which countries went to war for trade, and tried to force the Chinese to buy the Hindu opium. The Opium War was waged between -- between England and China, because the only income in poor India was to sell the opium at high prices to the people who now use -- how do you call it? LST -- or what is this wonderful drug? Wie? What is it?

(LSD.)

Wie? Ja. It's the s- -- played the same role then, opium. Thousands and thousands of Chinese perished from its use, and the Chinese government took very energetic steps to combat this, and asked the English to comply, and to forbid the import. But Lord Palmerston, the prime minister of England, said, "Then India will starve. They live on the income of the opium trade for the Hindu population."

I think you, who are on the way to India may like to be reminded that every one country, in the last 200 years has been amiss, has overstepped the duties between nations. There is no exception. And it is good, I think, to know -- and I recommend this book to you. It should be bought by the library here. I do not get any percent -- royalties from it.

But we are very blind and deaf and think that these things do not -- do not concern, for example, Asiatic countries. That isn't true. Any one country -- India, as well as England, as the United States, as Germany, as France, what have you -- have always prospered in the last centuries on trade and asking no questions on where the trade went to and what was done with it. It was not the responsibility of a statesman. And you must understand that the Peace Corps is breaking with this. And I will use the rest of my words to eme- -- emphasize how we could clearly see what the difference is, what the distinction is. The superstitions in this -- the Opium War took place in 1840 and '41, and it ended with the English getting Hong Kong, you see, where you now order your cheap dresses from. And Hong Kong was the price paid for the impertinence of the Chinese to fight off -- off the imports on opium. They not only were forced to accept the opium ever since, but they also had to cede the island of Hong Kong to the British.

To tell you -- to show you the degree of mutual ignorance, I may quote Mr. Waley's very fine book, *The Opium War through Chinese Eyes*, in which he says the Chinese were convinced that the English only brought the opium in because they needed the {roopha}. Otherwise they would have died from constipation. So on this level of mutual ignorance, you see, were -- was the trade of the world

directed and established.

Kindly keep this example in mind, that the real, thorough knowledge of another country's conditions was not demanded from any politician, any statesman, that in no election -- be it in the United States, or in England, or in Sweden, or in Guatemala -- was any statesman even allowed to say, "But these are people like we ourselves. I am responsible for this, too." The only statesman who, to my knowledge, before the world wars, has pronounced the principle that a damage to another country does not sit well with the statesman of one country is President Theodore Roosevelt. He was asked to mediate the peace between Japan and Russia in 1905. And you may know -- some of you, at least -- that the peace actually was, under his intervention, concluded in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, our sister state here. And -- Vermont of course has no harbor. Otherwise I would have taken place in Vermont.

Do you know what the president then wrote? His ambassador in St. Petersburg had suggested this mediation, and said the Japanese are completely financially broke -- the Russians always were financially broke, so that didn't matter -- but he said that they were exhausted. They had a mutiny on the Potemkin. Who has still seen the Potemkin movie? Very few. That was the most important movie shot in my days. And so the president said, "It would not be in the interest of the United States to allow Russia and Japan to come to terms. It is to our interest as United States that these two great powers should weaken each other, because we then would be the laughing third. However," he goes on, "the office of the president of the United States is too high an office to be corrupted by the self-interest just of the United States. I must act in the interest of mankind."

This was a lonely wolf. This was a very extreme voice. And it was never published. You don't find it in the Roosevelt dictionary published by the Roosevelt Society in this country. It's too good even today for these people, for these Yankees, to be published. They are all imperialists. They are all power politicians. They all want not to be blamed by the Birch Society.

But it is true, gentlemen. The world is too small. You fly in 89 minutes around the globe and for this simple reason -- any other country's harm is our own harm. And -- however, this has not been formulated. The Peace Corps is the first attempt to formulate this experience, you see, on a -- on a worldwide level. And there are many implications which I think even leaders in this movement haven't thought through. It will be a -- some hundred years before we are functioning well.

I say all this only to make you see that there is a break, a decided break. After the two world wars, and after the bomb has been -- fallen, and after we shoot to the moon, the self-interest of a government never suffices for justifying any international measure. Why that is so, it is so. And it was not the same way in 1840, when Palmerston could declare war on the Chinese, because they wouldn't allow the Chinese to be ruined by the buying of opium. That was the only reason for this -- for this opium war, that the English said, "You cannot forbid our tradesmen, our businessmen to import opium into China."

We don't do these things so crudely now, with opium. But I think there are other damages -- going on. It hasn't even been investigated how much harm we do by exporting the New York Times.

This new epoch, the new period of which I am -- try -- shall try to speak, will not be just fair to the Chinese, as this very beautiful book by Mr. Waley, who was the greatest expert on the Chinese in the whole of England, through his life. He lived from 1889 to 1966. W-a-l-e-y. And I think he deserves even your memory, because he stands out as a man of great gentleness, and great sympathy. And he can show the two sides of the coin. In this book, you understand why the English acted as they acted and why the Chinese acted as they acted. Now if -- it is already quite something if an educated person can see two sides of an issue. You people cannot be satisfied with this. As long as China is China, England is England, America is America, no Peace Corps effective. The condition of your existence is that there is something third possible. And what this could be is -- will be my task now to find out with you -- or for you.

It has been my concern to put it into such blunt and such simple terms that even children can understand it, because only if the children -- your age group -- of course you are already senior citizens -- if you don't grasp this, your elders will not grasp it. They have been educated in such a clear-cut map-reading that here are the United States and there is China, that they even believe that God created these frontiers. You know very well that He didn't, that by this terrible mischief that the Pilgrim Fathers la- -- landed in the United States, you see, we now have this -- these separate United States. They didn't have to be separated. In 1608, it was just a part of -- of a general { }. The -- our -- your map is so dogmatic that you actually believe that China is China and the United States is the United States. I challenge you on this. It's just an invention of the devil. God created the globe. It's a very round world, and you have established all these custom duties between them, the parts of it. But wouldn't it be interesting to look what is common at this very moment, without treaties, without laws, without

any fuss about our principles, our constitutions, our religions. How can the fact that here are Christians, and there are -- there are ancestor-worshippers, how can this be enough to say that there is China and there is the United States for good, for opium, or for tea? It isn't so simple. God does -- doesn't let us -- get away with murder so easily.

We have introduced something divine into our existence in the last hundreds of years which I think makes Mr. Waley look obsolete, and even the president of the United States of 1905, Mr. Theodore Roosevelt, only a pioneer. And you -- we all have to adopt what he reasoned out, that it was not in the interests of the United States if any other country, you see, came to harm and was weakened.

We have learned to invent inventions. That is to say, down to my youth, into my middle age, when an invention was made, we all believed that the invention was to stay with us. To give you an example: in Vermont, on Sunday the last train carrying persons stops running through Vermont. The train between New York and Montreal. Now in 1890, 10 miles from here, there was a meeting of 3,000 people trying to persuade each other that -- should build a new railroad which has never been built, between Vershire and Tunbridge, on Brockle Bank Hill. Well, you can say fortunately it wasn't built. Probably you wouldn't be here if it had been built. But this was the plan, and these 3,000 people marched up this mountain, had a picnic there, and decided to put out shares to build this railroad. They meant that if the railroad was built, it would go on forever.

The great inventions of the 19th century had all the character of finality.

Everybody believed this was, like an automatic razor, going to stay with us, you see. Where would we be? We can't go back to knives, you see, to -- to razor blades. So, this is no longer so. While I -- when I was young, believed that the -- an electric tramway in the streets of my hometown, in Berlin in Germany, was the latest invention and would go on forever -- and my parents moved from this terrible street where now an electric car was commuting, because you couldn't live with this new monster, you see -- today we drive cars. The electric -- you see, the electric train was given up. And the same is true, this -- this train between Montreal and New York ceases to exist. We are waiting for the next invention, when we all have our own helicopter, you see. And nobody will drive a car on the highway, because that's too -- that's too many accidents, you see. I still wait for my own helicopter. It's still a little too expensive. But it will come.

In other words, we have invented to invent. And this is changing the whole picture, because in any community, in any town, in any country, any such new inventions -- invention re-arrange the people. If you have to pump the water

from your well, or if you have to draw the -- the water from the town water supply, it makes quite a difference. First of all, the second is chlorine, and it tastes very poorly. And then it may be closed for hours. And you have to ta- -- pay regards to your neighbors with whom you have to arrange things, as they do in the South. If you have ever been in Arizona, there are days and hours where one man can draw the water and the other cannot.

So you suddenly belong to this community of Arizona, and instead of having only to care for your family. But if it goes further, and you pump up the whole Colorado River, as they try to do now, it's {a great} -- will even be more so that you depend on the legislature in Washington, and on the council who takes care of this interzonal, interstate organization. And what the town can do, or your own -- can do in your own family is nons- -- is -- is of no value whatsoever. All of a sudden, all your familiar ties with people who work with you cease to be important and you suddenly depend on others. When we founded this Camp William James here in the neighborhood, we had to set up a council of nine townships, because the interests of nine townships seemed to be involved. And there was not one town who either cared or would have understood what we were trying to do, establish a Peace Corps, you see, for Vermont. And therefore we were driven to re-organize the po- -- people in this town. We have here two witnesses of this fortunately tonight, Mr. O'Brien from Tunbridge, and -- (Clint Gardner.)

-- Mr. Clint Gardner from Nor- -- from Norwich. It is a great pleasure for me to have two witnesses of our doings 25 -- -6 years ago, 25 years ago. And they know that already at that time there was a leak in our self-government. It didn't function. The village of Tunbridge, or the village of Sharon, you see, could not carry the brunt of this whole enterprise. They didn't understand. And the antagonistic interests were, of course, as they all are in a small town, couldn't be won over except by bringing in fresh blood. People -- the best men in every town will understand something new, you see, but not the majority.

Now every minute today, where something new is invented, we need a new administration for it. If you have electricity in your house, instead of an oil lamp, or a candle, obviously you suddenly depend on the electric power company. And therefore you have to pay regard to the problem of: who is this electric power company? How will they treat me? Thirty years ago, they treated Vermont very badly. The power company situated in Vermont took the liberty of charging higher prices for electricity to the farmers in Vermont than to the block in Boston. And when we talked to them, the power company -- committee of the Legis-

lature -- I had some talks with them on this -- they said, "Well, we sell to one block in Boston more electricity than to the whole village of Vershire together. So why should we not ask less money from the block in -- in -- in Boston, you see, than we charge here?"

Now, I told them that in Sweden they had solved this problem long ago. And that the whole country of Sweden was just one electric block, and you couldn't charge any difference in rates in Haparanda than you did charge in Malmö or -- or Stockholm.

Well, these blockheads didn't see it that way. Well, they made the president of this -- who resisted us, they have made him in s- -- in -- in the meantime president of a university. There he can't do any harm, you see. There is so much electricity anyway.

But this is very important. May I ask you to -- to see one great law of technical progress, which is revolutionizing the universe at this moment, and in whose wake what you are doing suddenly is vested with great importance, great urgency, and great dignity. And unfortunately the do-gooders don't know this, the charitable people, that this is not a charity, this Peace Corps business. It's not a -- just a beneficiary. It is inevitable. It is indispensable, because any technical innovation expands the space in which we move, shortens the time in which we can achieve the change, and destroys a familiar group -- a family, or a village, or a town, or a country. This simple rule, which I have preached for the last 20 years, is quite inaccessible it seems to philosophers, who don't see the forest for the trees, but it is also inaccessible it seems to so-called -- well, I won't give names. You can observe it, however, yourself and then you will understand what you are up against: why you have to go to India, why it is not a charity that we go there, because we destroy. Technical progress destroys cardels of life, structures of togetherness, of solidarity. It must, because any technical progress allows you here to put on the lights, you see, without much ado, whereas before you had to -- perhaps to -- to use a stone, you see, and -- and go to great lengths before the -- the spark would occur. This is no longer true. We have in- -- we are inventing all the time things. You call this press-button civilization. I think it's not dignified enough. The term is -- it is a much deeper achievement which technical mankind is looking for and seeking for. It's the unity of all the forces of the universe which we are trying to bring about, which is a tremendous task for which we are speaking, for which we are living, for which we are breathing. That's why we are on this earth, to unify the creation.

Now, would you kindly take down these three sentences? Every invention, or

every technical progress, or every technicality -- or you can call it as you please -- every gadget enlarges the space which we dominate; it shortens the time which it takes to dominate this; and it destroys the old group in which this before was achieved. You needed the community to have the water, perhaps, you see. Now you don't know it -- need this community any more, because the company, the water company -- that's the whole Colorado River. It's the whole Mississippi River. So what do you care for the man in the village there? He's a little cog on the wheel, only. But it is true of any other invention. Take the telephone. Obviously, as long as you have to send a messenger -- to the next village, you see, these people are very important. You have to have trustworthy messengers. Even -- even the mail still is a very human thing. But as soon as you get the telephone, or you get radio, you -- it is impossible for you to know to whom you are talking. We telephoned the other day to Australia. You just ring up and San Francisco answers, you see, and said, "Yes, I'll go and connect you." And there was Australia, you see, in two minutes' time. It's a good example, you see, of the foreshortening of the time element, you see. It would take two months to go by ship there, and bring the -- ship there by surface mail -- the letter there by surface mail. And it widens the space in which we can act, because within two hours, the answer was there from Australia, and so you dominate this whole space. This is one. But the last thing is the people with whom you used to correspond and to talk, to converse in the village -- they are very little interest to you, because you can have a conversation with your best friend in Australia. And you prefer this, because he is more interesting to you, and he has more to say to you. He shares your interest. He's another, you see, frustrated poet.

This is very astonishing that a very -- such a simple law has -- is never mentioned. I'll tell you why. All our viewpoints in school, and paper -- newspapers and radio, and Parliament, and Congress of course are restricted to the national boundaries and -- or the local boundaries, or the county boundaries, or the constituency in which we elect our senators. Now all these people are every day diminishing -- give us diminishing returns because our more important acts are always some connection with -- with the universe, with the five continents, you see. Not just this one. And for this, the senator of Vermont can hardly help us. He is in the same predicament as we. He also wants to telephone to Australia, and he has no more influence in Australia than we have. And therefore we both look in the same direction and ask ourselves, "What can we do to live with these -- with these people so that where we really see our tomorrow, we can have some influence, we make -- can make ourselves heard?"



May I repeat quite pedantically this one rule, because I think a new era really will dawn as soon as people -- legislators and educators begin to understand what is happening. When I was young and when Brockle Bank Hill was planned as a railroad, everybody believed that inventions were going to stay. This is no longer true. If you organize the school district of Vershire today, you must be ready to admit that 10 years from now, it may have to be re-organized. It will be all wrong. And every town in this state at this moment faces this fact that you may do something for the next 10 years. You may still go by railroad, or you may not go by railroad. But you cannot be sure that 10 years from now you will not completely -- be completely obsolete.

That is, the future of our own inventions today is in jeopardy, whereas in the 19th century, in the days of the first great inventions of the exhibitions in Paris, when the Eiffel Tower was, you see, disc- -- was built, people thought this exhibition, it's the dernier cri. That's the famous French word, you see. That's the last thing in the world. And you still can see in the French movies that the Eiffel Tower is still treated as the white elephant, you see, of the future, pointing to the great time of economic progress. Today, when I see René Claire movie, you see, with all the Eiffel Towers in the world together, I begin to yawn. That's not my fault. It's not René Claire's fault, who is the great -- a great man with his movies on Paris. But it is true that we no longer can rest on laurels and say, "This is the dernier cri." There is no -- no dernier cri. And this is quite upsetting to most people.

We all would like to go from here to there. But then the there, that must be final, you see. And you know how it is in your own life. I mean, now you say you want to reach a certain income, but once you have it, you say then you will have 12 -- children and 20 grandchildren and have a house in Florida. There is no such end, now. I mean, Florida will be obsolete by that time. I don't know where we go from there.

But the very strange thing is, and I think you will bear me out -- you're -- another generation I know, and perhaps this is not so explicit to you. But I have learned in my own life -- is that all my dreams of the future are now dreams of the past. That is, I have to admit that people now have to dream other dreams and they are very much clashing with the technical innovations, you see, which I admired.

They are now -- when I was -- came to this country I studied with great -- with great enthusiasm the romantic story of the Canadian Pacific. That's a great story. You see, the Scotch people have an -- first have the -- they have conquered the

British, you see, and now then they conquered Canada. They all call it the "British Empire," but it is of course the Scotch Empire. And so they invented the Canadian Pacific to bring their goods from London or Edinburgh to -- to Yokohama in Japan. And at this moment, you read in the papers that they actually are discussing to abandon the personal -- you see, the personal traffic on the Canadian Pacific. So one of the greatest features of this coun- -- this century, the building of the Canadian Pacific, it's really a tremendous achievement. And I still recommend to you the reading one of the many books written on this. It's like a novel. It's already about to disappear again.

So we live hyperbolically. I don't know much mathematics, but this much I have learned, that a hyperbole enters space from somewhere and leaves it somewhere. Isn't that true? Who knows what a hyperbole is? No mathematics left? Isn't it true? He doubts it. So I will give it up. It's better not to pose as an expert where I don't know enough.

But the inventions today do not last. And this puts us for the first time in a position where change is not a step from A to B, but which -- where it is a constant, even for our political organization, even for our schools, even for our thoughts, even for our church buildings. That is, in the future I would bring -- have to bring up children in such a manner that they do not feel that tomorrow is final achievement, which has been the ideology of the last 900 or 1,000 years; before, there was no change, no progress. Then there came change, but always with the feeling: that's the ultimate, that's the dernier cri. Now I think we have to bring up our children -- and you already live in this manner, of course -- knowing that this is not the next -- or only the next, perhaps. But it is not the ultimate. And that the very invention which you today prize highly will have to go again.

So the story of the railroads in this country has taught me this, to think it out more clearly. And my law therefore is that the human group on which we have relied for the new invention, which we have established -- like a railroad company, you see -- and all the vocations going with it -- the conductor and -- that they will again disappear.

When I came up to this part of the world, it was the 5th of May. I took the train from Boston to -- to Hanover, and I went back again. And I looked out of the window, and there was not a leaf on this -- on any tree. And the conductor sat down next to me. He saw -- he saw that I was very melancholic, and he said, "Yes, Sir," he said. "You can live here now another 50 years, and you won't see a leaf on a tree by -- on May 5th."

He was right. I am now living here 35 years. There hasn't been a leaf on the trees. If you could invent this, that there are leaves on the tree in Vermont on May 5th, then I would think this is the dernier cri.

Thank you.

(Are there any questions or corrections?)

[unintelligible]

(Well, thank you very much. Later this ev- -- you now have probably an hour to study for the three hours that you need -- figure it out somehow. I hope some of you can come back for the program later this evening. This week is going to be pretty rough on your -- adapting your schedule. But we'll be flexible, too.)

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

[Chopin]

(Clint Gardner: This is a test. This is a test. You see, if that thing is going there, you can tell that it's recording. See, every time you talk. It -- it -- it mustn't go into the red.)

(It's not going into the red.)

(No.)

[tape interruption]

(Gardner: This whole thing is relatively new up here. I mean, to be out in the country.)

(You mean to us? Or do you mean --)

(Gardner: No, no. To any trainees.)

(Oh yes, yes.)

(Gardner: They've all been on college -- on college campuses.)

(The last four years.)

(Gardner: Well, this is sort of like old home week for me, because we had a camp building like this about 15 miles away from here in 1940. And this was the -- this was Camp William James, to which he was referring.)

(Well, it's new for us. I don't know, it's -- it's new for me, anyway. I haven't been to camp for { }.)

(Gardner: Oh, I think I never had any quite as gay as that.)

(That's a { }.)

(Gardner: Possibly I did in the army. I mean, I slept in a pup tent of course in the army. But in civilian life, you don't often have a chance to do something like

that.)

(It's great. Well, we're pretty much in the army here. The rules and regulations -- but there are lots of -- things that we don't have. If we don't really want to do something, we say "no," and then if you've got a good reason for it, why { } come and talk to you about it, and if you still don't want to, you may get booted out but --. But it's...)

(Gardner: Well, it's amazing how -- how -- how little at least one hears of major problems of personnel in the Peace Corps. I -- I have no idea how it's worked out as well as it has, because in a camp like ours, we had -- at least 30 percent of the people were thoroughly disaffected or -- or were in the process of leaving or -- it was just because they were -- well, young, and changing, and idealistic, and full of problems.)

(They select you pretty carefully here, though. I think that the selection ratio is 1 to 6 or 1 to 7. And so to begin with, it's a select group. Then when we get up here, the first five days, or the first week, four people left immediately. I mean, no one's left since then, but of -- )

(Gardner: It's pretty good, considering that you're this radically out in the open.)

(No, well. We didn't expect to be. We expected to be at Dartmouth.)

(Gardner: I know it. That was a bit -- as a -- as a --)

(Shock. Yes.)

(Gardner: That was a bit of a surprise. You didn't know you were going to be an experimental group.)

(We didn't know what we were going to be doing. We thought we were going to be at Dartmouth College.)

(The thing is they never -- they never -- didn't say so. They did say so, but nobody { } to figure it out.)

(Well, they said we should bring along ...)

(No, they didn't say that. They just said your mailing address would be Ver-

shire, Vermont.)

(... pocket knives, work clothes, and -- right. And this was --)

(It was perfectly in line with a -- with a five-day, you know, overnight hike that we were supposed to take { }. { } because we live in an overnight { }.)

(Right. No kidding. But here -- we get to Dartmouth and they -- "Well, tomorrow we're leaving for Vershire." Oh, great. What are we going to do? Start off hiking the first day. We get out here and the boy that had been out the night before -- some people came in early and they went out the night before and started working on this thing. And some of them said, "When we saw what we were going to have to live in, we just figured that the next day, when the girls came up, we were going to put their luggage in the car that night and drive them right back home and ship them off, you know, to their respective homes, because it was such a mess. It was such a mess that first couple of days. I { })

(Gardner: Must have been. It must have been.)

(Oh, God! it was an unbelievably { }. We're getting spaghetti in our face, so that it's { }. Dick Wright has decided he's going to pull out a few of our little installations and make { } of one.)

(When is it? I've got to study.)

(I have to study, too, but I'm going to { }).

(Gardner: What are you studying? Indian, or?)

{{ }, the language, technical studies -- there's our poultry king right there.)

(Gardner: M-hmm. I spent { }.)

There was somebody yesterday who asked me to ask a question. So I said, "Ask the question." Where is the man? Here, he agreed that he should. Wie? Yes?

(Well, I just asked Dr. Huessy last night if -- if he wasn't overrating the -- the singleness of technology that went back to work { } on bringing about some kind of...)

Speak a little louder. You see, I can't hear you.

(The { } of { } unity among mankind {cutting} across national differences. I thought that technology was something which reinforced the divisiveness of the world by giving some kind of backbone to such { } as ideology, as economic { }, the historical { } of countries just breaking out of well, the newly emerging nations.)

Well, what is the question? What -- I still haven't gotten the question. We are talking here about a peace corps. Wie?

(Aren't you overrating technology as working toward some kind of peace, whereas I think I would contend that technology is one thing which is keeping the world divided and which unless -- unless it would explode in some kind of a -- some kind of a war...)

Well, I have -- pass no judgment in quantity or quality on any of your theses. I have only -- found, for example here in Vershire, that this town has been destroyed by technology, and still is a dead corpse, despite your presence. And so I haven't measured this in quantity. But one of the biggest issues which faces us is that you come to a town, the municipality doesn't function. The church doesn't function. You ask why. A hundred years ago, it has functioned. Officially there are still selectmen. There are still ministers. There is still Sunday service. But it's all dead. And you ask why, because they cannot function because they have electric light. And the electric light comes from an electric power company, whereas before, the candles were made in the village. So the people who made the candles and who bought the candles knew each other, and now you don't know each other. This is a -- simply a fact, Sir. If you haven't observed it, because you probably live in a big city, you see, you are the victim of your own blindness and deafness. And you think that nationalism -- anything. I have yet to find a nationalist who is not the best friend of every other nationalist. You take a French nationalist, a German nationalist, Italian nationalist -- they got on beautifully. They only despise the people who are not nationalists, you see. In every country that's the state. They will kill the non-nationalists, as the Goldwater people would like to kill some other people here, you see.

This is all so primitive, I wouldn't think that a man like you could -- could be so without experience, between the words that -- people intoxicate them, and the things that as strangers -- you must draw a line. What these people have in their minds, that's the result of the emptiness of their souls and of their opportunity. If you lived in Vershire, you would also go crazy from inop- -- lack of opportunity.

And then you would become a Goldwater man, of course.

I mean, we -- we are talking about daily -- daily processes that eat the marrow out of our daily life, out of our work, out of our friendship. This has nothing to do with what's going on in your head, Sir. And -- I mean, nationalism is -- is -- is bubbles, soap bubbles. Of course, if you have no blood in your brain, you have instead air -- hot air.

(Well, perhaps I misinterpreted the -- the universality of some of your statements in -- in going from -- referring to very wide historical periods and very...)

But I haven't. I haven't. I haven't. I'm speaking of electricity. That's not a very far period, Sir. And of the fact that the trains have ceased to go on Sunday. Last Sunday the last train went through Vermont. Where are my large periods? You are living in dreams. I am not.

(Well, I...)

You don't mention -- you see, in your political thinking the fact that there are no trains now running through Vermont doesn't exist. You have never given it a thought. I tried to show you that is one of the most important political events of the last four weeks. And since I cannot convince you, I have to shout at you and say, "Wake up! And look where the real events today take place." They don't take place in nationalistic heads. Mr. de Gaulle is quite unimportant. Absolutely unimportant. He's a holdover. The -- leave this to the poor French. They want a -- some sem- -- semblance of power. But the fact that you have to fly now, and don't go by boat to France, that's a very important fact. The -- all the -- all the pi- -- the -- the sea- -- sailors in the harbor of New York, and the sailors in Maine, and the sailors in New- -- Nova Scotia have lost their jobs. There are 7,000 farms to be had in New- -- Newfoundland -- or no, Nova Scotia -- at this moment, because they were all shipbuilders, and they no longer can build ships to go to -- to Europe, you see. And all of a sudden, this -- absolutely empty country. You can buy one of these 7,000 farms at -- at preferential rates.

(Well, to give me a chance to rebut -- I think that we're...)

That's -- is --

(...talking about two different frames of reference. I was under the impression that you were making -- making -- making some of these statements as some kind of universal law.)



Of course. Of course.

(I think -- I think...)

Since -- since Prometheus stole the fire, you see, we live in this -- under this great inconvenience, that every new invention dislocates men. And this -- has not been taken into account. I do speak in historical terms, Sir. But I just defend myself against your saying that the other things are more important, because the destruction which you yourself, by raising chickens here, are going to work on -- on poor India will be quite enormous. And that's very serious. You have to find out tonight and tomorrow night -- or -- well, as long as you are here -- where you will be -- a destructive force or a productive -- and constructive force. That hasn't been decided, yet. The next war can well be started by the Peace Corps. Well-meaning people are always the most dangerous people in the world, you see.

(Well, I think that...)

Pardon me, I have to speak so roughly in order to wake you up to see what I'm really trying to say. I haven't said any of these things yesterday which you have insinuated to me.

(Yes, well I was under the impression that you were formulating some kind of a theory of universal history, or some such thing as that, by which -- where the world is inevitably moving toward some kind of unity of mankind. And I think that this idea about technological progress breaking down boundaries -- family boundaries, clan boundaries, racial boundaries possibly also. I think this is -- this is perhaps very true in a -- a homogeneous culture like America. But I'm not so sure it works that same way in something like the -- like the world. You're talking...)

In which town are you at home, Sir? In which town are you living -- do you live?

(Pardon me?)

What's your hometown?

(My hometown? Wellesley, Massachusetts.)

Wie?

(Wellesley, Massachusetts.)

With all the girls there? Well. Of course, that has turned his head.

Let me say once more. I have formulated a universal law of which I am very proud, because I have formulated it as a first, 15 years ago. And you can observe it in -- in action every day. And it is not yet decided whether the Peace Corps, as it is established in the United States, will function on any one side of this law, or will counteract it, which it should be -- should probably. And therefore, your aversion against universal truth is -- is -- I don't know where it comes from.

Perhaps it's a Freudian complex. I don't know why you are -- why should I teach you -- and attain you with lies or with not-truths? I have not come here to speak of something that is not true. No. I want to say something that is true. Wh- -- what's the objection against some fact you can observe every day yourself, Sir? (Well, in Massachusetts, there are universal truths with -- such as this...)

Well, I have exposed myself to your criticism. Refute that it is true, that's {served}. But to say because I have tried to formulate a universal truth, it must be false -- that's funny.

(This isn't what I'm saying. This is- -- this wasn't my objection, you know, { } opinions and formulations. I'm just -- just arguing with your thesis.)

Ja, but give me -- give me some counter-thesis. How -- how do all these dislocations -- how are they brought -- about? In which way are they bro- -- are they brought about? Why does -- doesn't -- our villages not function, our schools, our churches? Why are they empty and void of spirit? Why do we have to have now Washington interfering, when we -- in Hanover now want to have a bridge?

There is a law in 1962 passed in Washington to protect the local people who no longer have the means to protect themselves against the state highway department. There sits a man in -- an ombudsman in Washington already. You have heard of the ombudsman in Sweden, perhaps, who has to righten the wrongs of the bureaucracy, you see. And now there is in Washington, of all cities, somebody to righten the wrongs of the bureaucracy. And if they had -- this Vermont state highway department makes a plan, we can go to Washington to complain. That would never have happened 50 years ago, because 50 years ago, the citizens of Norwich would have been sufficiently virile and articulate to fight anything that goes on in Montpelier. And this is no longer true.

(Well, Mr. Huessy, on this -- on this front, do you think that life is further unified by the fact that you now need a man in Washington to -- to work out your grief between here and...)

I'm only describing. I have -- the scene is so desperate. The schools are run from -- from Washington, as you know, because our tax system is impossible. I have to pay 11 times as many taxes as I paid when I built my house in my town 30 years ago. And that's quite something, 11 times as much.

(Now -- now it seems to me...)

How shall I pay it? So if the United States government isn't kind enough to support one-third of the tax -- of the school bill, we cannot have the school. Very simple.

(It seems -- it seems to me that these have been very divisive influences.)

Wie?

(It seems to me that these have been very divisive and dividing influences brought about by an increase in -- in technology, an increase in communication, and a further centralization of power in -- away from -- where, you know, away from the grassroots. And I don't see why you think the technology...)

Well, look at grassroots here. Grassroots -- this road here up and no grass grows here. I mean, what are grassroots? That's a sentimental term. I don't accept this, with the grassroots, you see. Who is grassroots here? Not one of us -- you. Don't talk grassroots when we have lost our grassroots.

(All -- I -- I would agree. I think we have lost our grassroots and I think this is why technology...)

Ja, but that's -- you are too young to be so sentimental about it. We have to draw -- learn to draw -- to live without grassroots. The -- this is all sentimentality or romanticism just to complain. I don't. I have said soberly we all are responsible to make up for the destruction brought by the technological pro- -- change.

That's all.

({ } still think {we're} beginning an answer to {my} question. What, if anything, do you see as an antidote to the...)

Pardon me?

(What, if anything, do you see as an antidote to the relentless operation of the { }?)

Well.

(Awareness of it, for one thing?)

The answer is that your Peace -- you Peace Corps people will have to decide in your work and in your service whether you are on the side of the destructive process or whether you are already an antidote. I hope you are an antidote, because for my -- during my whole life, I have tried to think up this antidote, this means of filling the gap between the old order and the new -- how would you say? -- void that is being created. And it isn't yet -- we mustn't be too optimistic. Mere charity and mere good will doesn't always alter the facts of life.

And therefore I've tried to put you a little bit on -- make you curious the last time. I tried to say that there is something to be done of which nobody ever speaks. Nobody says that technological problem -- progress destroys groupings, you see. And this is very important. You don't find it in any textbooks, Sir. This is not admitted. The old-timers say it isn't necessary. So they form societies to protect the grassroots. They'll be -- they will -- buy magnifying glasses to see the last grassroots, you see. And they think that's a counter-action of the development. I say, if you see that the grassroots disappear, you have to plant elsewhere. And this is what the Peace Corps should stand for, might stand for, but I'm not so sure that you will stand for with your ideas. It's not yet -- it is not yet decided. In 10 years perhaps, we may know whether this has been very harmful and led to the next war between India and the United States, or whether it has really made for peace. It isn't -- absolutely not -- not safe to say. You are a dangerous people. That's what I try to say. And I tried to wake you up to this de- -- great -- your own dangerous position.

And there- -- why don't you then talk of nationalism? I don't understand it.

(No, I think you're -- you're imputing something which I think is true, to be -- some -- to be a goal. I mean, I think -- I think you're translating my view of what objectively exists into something which I'm trying to bring about, or trying to perpetuate. In other words, because I -- I think that technology does not unify the world, you seem to -- you seem to feel that my goal is to keep the world disunited, as if it were possible that I could do this by myself. I -- I don't think it's

possible, yet.)

When I went home yesterday, I felt, of course, because of your question, quite puzzled. And then I comforted myself with the sentence, by Napoleon -- he was asked how one wins battles. And he said -- to the great amazement of the generals, he said, "On s'engage et { } en voir." One gets going, you see, one gets involved, as the people say nowadays in existentialism, and then one s- -- looks around and sees how to do best, you see. A very simple answer, a very modest answer. And so I also hope for something, you see, to get engaged. Now you have s- -- offered this wonderful possibility, you see, of getting angry. That's always the first thing for a good plan of strategy. It is better to get angry -- I think more comes to one's mind -- than if one is very sweet.

(Well, possibly, but it also blocks out the possibility of open-mindedness about something. It's very hard to {be able} to see the possibility the other person might { } and being angry tends to narrow your -- your scope of your viewpoint, very often.)

Well, you have a point. Let me tell you that I decided on the -- on making today peace the topic. And so as late as possible, let us make peace. Postpone this a little bit.

I received, and that was what I tried to -- what I would like to say -- this morning a pamphlet, which comes out every -- every three months. It appeared since 20 -- for 20 years now. It's a fr- -- written by a friend of mine in Germany. It's called Reconciliation and Peace. And it's filled with articles on war and peace, and the -- the alliance of -- for reconciliation on the civil -- service in -- in Switzerland, which works in Al- -- Algeria, just as you're going to work in India. It's an old establishment. A very fine man, Pierre {Cerezolle} founded this in reaction to the World War I in Switzerland, 1919. Have ev- -- ever- -- anybody heard of the -- they call it Zivildienst, which is strange way of calling an international enterprise: "civil service." You wouldn't think with the word "civil service" that it was an attempt to coloni- -- or to help in Algeria and Morocco. And they have done very well.

The whole -- this whole pamphlet is filled with oc- -- with narratives about peace. There are exclamations and proclamations by physicists and by churchmen and -- against Siam, of co- -- of course, and Eirene, international Christian service for peace, the campaign for disarmament. And I think it's a good way of showing you that belonging to the era that has passed -- to the -- I would call it the ideological era -- there is a deep feeling that today peace has to be manufac-

tured, proclaimed, shouted -- talked about in all forms. All these are people who you would rate with the conscientious objectors, perhaps, and with the pacifists, with the protesters against S- -- Vietnam. And I have tried and this perhaps explains your difficulty of understanding me, Sir, I have tried to take your attention away yesterday from this style of effort for peace and anti-Vietnamese proclamations. I am not interested in these. They have never done anything in my estimation, achieved anything. Whether they are 50 physicists who suddenly write, "We shouldn't throw the bomb," or something like that.

I have tried to tell you that we enter a -- a new era in which not the living side-by-side of the countries and then provoking misunderstandings and opium wars, as between India and China in 1841, will play the havoc, or will play -- will be the provocateur, the -- the spur for action -- but that simply your daily progress in having a television set will force you to join a peace corps, to -- to reconcile the rest of the world to this infamy of yours to have a television set. That's what I have tried to say, that the consumers of the technological progress -- you, Sir -- that you are guilty of making war. This has nothing to do with nationalism. It has nothing to do with ideology. It's a fact that we, by using all these new produc- -- means of production, you see, we are making for war against the -- former groupings. We destroy them. You and I do. We are aggressive, Sir. This you haven't gotten from my statement. I only formulated this law -- an emphatic word for something very simple -- to bring it to your senses and to say, "You cannot improve your gadgets every day without changing the order of life." That's very serious. We are responsible for all these tensions in the world, for all the coffee riots in Brazil, because we drink this coffee.

And there -- well, you see, I cannot follow your argumentation at all, because I wanted only to arouse in you and my -- me the self-consciousness that we, by participating in this technological civilization, are guilty. That's -- are -- what the Bible used to call original sin. That is, we inherit a guilt by using the things invented, done -- all the time. And there is therefore no argument of an ideological nature that -- I have not to judge -- sit in judgment whether nationalism is worse, or this is worse, or this worse. I have only come to my senses to see what I'm doing, without thought, of course. Perfectly thoughtless. Perfectly unideologically.

Yes?

(It follows then that { } {have} introduced {simply} { }, with very little touch {in} technology, is not so guilty?)

Not for this; he's guilty probably in other respects. He may beat his wife, you see.

(...we may bring this guilt to him. We may involve him in our guilt by -- by spreading it through...)

Oh yes. That's just the -- our danger. We don't know, yet. Quite. Don't you feel that this may be true?

(Yes, {we saw that today}. The -- the question that arises also is: we are -- all right, we're breaking up the old order. Can we get back to the old order? Do we want to get back to the old order?)

No. This is of course why we are here together, and what -- why we have to -- to think out loud: how can, you see, instead of only making a mess of things and how leading -- lending us in the lurch, how -- what can we do?

(Technology won't stop.)

No. Exactly. That's what I try to say.

(Perhaps the {quality} of it is {changed}.)

Ja. Ja. But it isn't yet decided whether you, as Peace Corps, you see -- the name will not protect you. So let me speak today about peace.

It is unknown what peace is. You must think that the United States have not made peace in 1865. They have not made peace in 1921. They have not made peace in 1945. We live in a country in which the three greatest wars have ended without peace. It's only a semblance of peace. The fate of Korea, the fate of Germany has not been settled in a peace treaty. You forget this. And the tr- -- state of -- of the Union, as you well know, they still told you in the South a year ago, "After all we -- we have not lost the Civil War."

It's very strange. We live in a country which has no relation to peace. And it is very funny that this corps should be called not the Corps of Vengeance, but the Corps of Peace. Now that's more than a joke, because peace is a -- impossible to understand in the mentality of the 19th century. In the mentality of the 19th century, a man had feelings, reason, and will. And if you asked him what love was, he would say, "Oh, it's just a form of will." Well, then you get a divorce. If I-

-- if love is a form of will, in this whole picture of you -- the humanity, of the idealism of the 19th century -- in the Constitution of the United States, by the way, too -- peace and love have no room, because there is a wrong psychology at work, as though man could will peace.

And let me say this today more definitely. Perhaps you then will see why I am not interested in ideology, Sir, in -- in -- in reasons, you see. Because peace has been omitted from the thought of mankind as a task or as a problem for the last 200 years. It has been replaced by will. Peace will not be brought about by your will. Perhaps by your not willing, by dismissing your own will, you may make peace to your sweetheart -- with your sweetheart and your lover. But the condition is that your will is not law, that you dismiss your will as very incomplete and very defectious, and that you try to find what will take its place.

The greatest German poet was asked to write the play at the end of the Napoleonic wars. There had been wars from 1792 to 1815. All Europe had been ravaged. Finally, you know, Napoleon even went into Russia. And on the way back, the whole German and French troops were destroyed -- bled white by the cold -- by the freezing out. So then came battles at Leipzig, the famous battle of -- at Leipzig when 700,000 people fought. It was the biggest battle ever fought up to that time. And finally Waterloo came and Napoleon was defeated a second time. And so people breathed freely and said "This is now peace," from exhaustion. It's -- they made peace. And the Peace of Vienna, miraculously enough, holds good for 60 years. That's a long time in the history of the world. It was the longest period of peace that had ever existed in the Occident, which was brought about in the year 1815.

When the German poet Goethe was asked to write a festival, to write -- how would you call it? -- yes, a play to celebrate the peace treaty, he did. And the people were disappointed because it was not a nationalistic play. And he didn't glorify the deeds of the Germans at all, not even of these innumerable German princes. And the people began to joke over this play. And then he added a prologue. And the first line of this prologue is the topic today from what I have tried -- shall try to say to you. It says, "Will cannot make the peace." *Der Wille kann den Frieden nicht bereiten*, if anybody of you happens to know German. That's a very strange sentence. And I tried to dig it up to remind you that good will is very nice, you see, but peace has to come from elsewhere, as it does in the Gospel. Peace to all men of good will. In the Greek text, it says, "Peace to all men of His grace." It doesn't say "of -- of good will."

So on peace, people have stumbled for the last 2,000 years. They don't know



quite where it is situated. But I invite you to consider that it is perhaps not consi- -- consi- -- situated in you. There are always, in the ancient world, vain attempts to have the word -- a word for peace. There is no Indo-European word for "war" and no Indo-European word for "peace." So difficult was it even to nominate the things. You would hardly believe this that we cannot find a common root for the word -- for the term "war." If you look at guerre in French, that's a Germanic word, very late. La guerre, you see, the cov- -- has to do with war, you see. The German Krieg is quite different. And so it -- on it goes. I followed it -- this morning through my dictionaries, through the -- the various words. People have great trouble to define whether peace is the absence of war, or war is the absence of peace.

Since the day comes nearer where we probably w- -- won't be able to afford war, it is not a luxury to give this one moment a thought -- our thoughts. In German, the word Friede means the right order inside an undisturbed home, or village, or province, you see. In English -- or in French, paix -- la paix means something established by contract. Pactum -- that's "peace," you see. That is, it is something that has gone through the human mind, and has been rationally then, you see, put over and decreed so that looks as though it could be done; it could be made; it could be manufactured.

The history of the word "peace" in the Anglo-Saxon world and in the Roman -- Romance languages has been coined, I would say, through the experience of the Pax Romana. The Romans, you see, were able to impose for many, many centuries their peace. And it was of course a peace of the victor over the defeated and enslaved. It was a polite word. A peace treaty was signed, but it was very one-sided. It was the peace of the Romans imposed, as in Vir- -- if you read Virgil, which was the poem for a thousand years of Ro- -- Roman grandeur. It says, you see, "We make war against the haughty ones, and then they have to obey." So peace in the Lat- -- in your tradition of the word "peace" is a peace imposed by the victor, and obeyed by the vanquished. You will admit that this is too narrow a term for peace. If -- that would be the peace in a house, in a family; and it would be a very outrageous peace, and it would have to lead to divorce, which it does in this country, usually -- after the wife has imposed her will too long. The word "pactum" which is the pact, which is peace, you see, seems to me to -- to obscure the mysterious character of peace, because it cannot mean what we write into a peace treaty. And it is not an accident that the South and the North have not written this peace treaty here in the United States, that Mr. Byrd has to die before the old victors of the Civil War, you see, go away. It's a very strange

story that you have to wait till one man is 83 and the other is 79 before he -- the most important committee in the Senate can be occupied by the vanquished -- not occupied by the -- by the vanquished of the Civil War. It's the strangest country in the world which -- in which we live, in which a -- in which a racist can be the -- the chairman of the judiciary committee in the Senate. That's very serious, Sir, because it means just what I say, that the United States have not been able to conclude a peace after the -- the -- the -- winning the Civil War, allegedly.

This country is unable to make peace with outsiders. And yet in the -- in your village and so, it's the most peaceful and friendly life together. The old word in German for Friede would express this good spirit in a village, which has not to go through reason, which has not to be put into so many paragraphs, which just consists in hospitality and friendliness.

When my wife died, for six weeks there was a luncheon on my pla- -- ta- -- table in the kitchen by neighbors. And I never knew who had cooked the meal. They wanted to provide for me because I was a widower. Now, that's -- isn't that peace? The whole town was at peace, but there was no contract, there was no stipulation, there was not Chapter 1 and Chapter 2, you see, which the word "peace" unfortunately in this country implies, as though there was a pact concluded. There can be peace without this.

So there is a peace right from the start, originating like a plant from the earth. And then there is a high-brow peace concluded by Mr. Rusk, you see, and the Dale Carnegie Foundation.

There are two kinds of peace today in most people's heads. And that's why psychoanalysts, and psychologists, and historians cannot agree on hu- -- the nature of mankind. One thinks everything can be done by contract and by stipulation, and by chambers of commerce, and by computers; and the other thinks that everything rationally formulated, you see, destroys the peace, endangers the peace, is already narrowing our life to channels which cannot bear any pressure, any danger.

Well, from your own experiences, wouldn't you say that this is the best peace which cannot be formulated, but inside which we find ourselves, you see, unquestionably, because we see that other people -- do not exaggerate their own will over us. It is the absence of a strong will which enables man to live in peace. If one of them is a monster in willpower, in energy, he will upset the peace. Certainly there will be no successor. You can recognize -- peaces made by writ-

ing, or formulation, or by law by the simple fact that they do not bind the successor. When the people who have stipulated this die, there is then -- usually the upheaval follows. Tyrants can very well formulate their will, but they have no successors. The -- that -- the real seriousness of life consists in this fact that we are all mortals and that the order of life has to exist regardless of the strong man in the White House, or wherever it is.

This peace has no -- can go on and has gone on in this country in its settlements for many, many generations. And nothing was stimulated. You find in no book on New England a real understanding of the deep peace that prevailed in any village, because all people built their farm, and their roads, and their churches, and their meeting-houses together. This togetherness, this communism, you see, is not mentioned, and so everybody here gets the impression that this was a -- a country of rugged individualism. It's the only communist country in the world, America -- New England, you see. Everything was here done in common and together. And it's never mentioned, because it is unspoken; it's inarticulate. There was such a deep peace that you didn't have to -- to say, to distribute chores by so many paragraphs and laws. They did it. In my -- on my own land, the stone walls that go there have been not established by the owner of this land, Bob, but by the -- all the people who went into harness and pulled it, instead of horses, which they hardly had.

So peace is something where we do something without getting something for it. You -- peace can only exist where people do something for nothing. We have an order -- official order of society in which -- this was 25 years ago and I think you were present, Bob -- the commissioner of education of the the city of Washington -- that is, of the United States government, who still has his seat in the department of the welfare, health, and education, pro- -- proclaimed in Hanover, New Hampshire, in my presence that a citizen was a -- was a man who was profitably employed.

I said to him, "You make for civil war. If this is a citizen, then there are no citizens," you see. But we have a -- reached such an all-time low in our public thinking, that this could -- could have passed if I hadn't protested. He came home to me and he sat down. I gave him something good to drink. And he said, "Now, you are absolutely right with your protest."

You know what I told him? I said that a citizen is a man who, when the city tumbles and falls down, can refound it. That's a citizen. And -- well, if you think about it, it's so natural. Who else c- -- what else can a ci- - has a citizen to do, but to refound his city?

And he said, "I -- you are absolutely right. You are absolutely right. I'm sorry I said this nonsense. But if you quote me on this, I shall deny it." At that time, a commissioner of education in Washington had to pretend that everything was economic. And -- he would have made himself ridiculous if he hadn't said that a citizen is a man who is profitably employed.

Now you are in the same boat with your Peace Corps, you see. Do you make for peace because it's profitable what you're teaching these people? If it is, you are making for civil war, or the next general strike. Economic laws don't make for peace. That's an error in judgment. It's widely spread, but it is simply true, that the machinists of the airlines are economically absolutely correct in striking. Only they are not correct with regard to the peace of the land.

No, peace is too serious to leave it to the religionists. Every man born from woman, and every woman have the duty to be involved, to be a part of the peace process. This they can only do if they admit that peace is neither of their will, nor of their reason, nor of their feelings, nor of any of these strange psychological errors in -- into which you have been wrapped.

There is an order of things surrounding us, as the lions know, and the -- the snakes know, and the stars seem to know. There's a course of events which engulfs us, which embraces us, which contains us, which leads us, which goes far beyond you and me, Sir. Although our -- and we only can -- can correct our errors in -- of judgment, so to speak, our own ideas about this, our rationalizations, our philosophies so-called, our theories, our party tickets, our candidacies for the Senate and so. They must all step aside before the simple problem of peace.

A fascist went down to a Southern city 20 years ago. Was very -- he was a good Nazi. {Casper} was his name. You may have heard the n- -- he is still around. And in this Virginia city, there was a great upheaval. All the listeners sat on their seat's edge, because he -- he pounded down the doctrine of Mr. Hitler that the black had to go, and the Jews had to go, and the Catholics had to go. And he would make order here, and he -- he summoned them to -- finally to see to it that white superiority would win.

And there was an old man in the audience, over 80, and the whole -- he felt that the whole city was on fire. The -- the talk took, of Mr. {Casper}. And he got up and said, "Gentlemen, I -- we -- I have lived here all my life. And that's a good town in which the Catholics, and the Jews, and the colored people have gotten

along beautifully in peace. But he doesn't seem to understand. So let's all go and accompany our friend to the railroad station."

And so they did. And that was as good as cooking my -- me the meal, you see, and put it on the kitchen table. That meant that this community was at peace. And that's not -- nothing rational. That's nothing you can talk to this man, you see, as an answer. He didn't get an answer. He was only treated royally. He was accompanied to the railroad station.

Peace always invents moves that are not prescribed. According to the -- to the order of parliamentary procedure, somebody had to answer this man with his arguments. This is the wrong way for a peace-loving people. "Don't argue" is the first answer if you have a dispu- -- disputatious fellow in front of you. But do something to him.

And so he was expedited. And I have always loved this story, this -- which really happened in 1946, because it shows how peace is very realistic. It is inventive -- invents something nobody has every mentioned before and probably never mention or formulate after. I tell this story to show you that the one thing that is a -- is -- constitutes peace in any family, for example, is an unforeseen inventiveness. Something must happen that is not on the order of the day. Your going to India is under the same stars, gentlemen. You will only make peace there if you can do something -- something that is not prescribed by your instructors here. They cannot. They can tell you all about chickens. They can tell you all about Indian dances. But the real problem is: will you find the inventive step that may -- constitutes your experience of peace with these people? How shall I express it? The main point is that peace is not found in us. It befalls us. We may -- we may support it. We may help that it can unfold. But I -- you can't even call it your own plant. It is not like a seed, where we put a seed into the ground, you see, because it takes so many other people's peaceful endowment.

It is an act of faith that we know that beyond everybody's so-called personality, a very superfluous term -- I hope I have no personality -- and all these witches' sabbaths of modern psychology, you see, where a man is always described in his own terms, there is something much bigger already around. The peace that transcends all reasoning is waiting for you and me to fit in. And it is not made by us.

And this is all I have to say tonight. Please think in terms of our inability to make peace. We cannot make peace, but it is around us. It is waiting for us. It has

to be invented, or it has to be affirmed. All the terms we use from human will, from human reason, from human feelings are already -- what's happened there?

Do they shoot?

(Some angels just went by.)

What?

(An angel of peace.)

Good.

The Greek word of peace -- for "peace" is a very strange word. You may have heard it in some applications as irenic. A man is irenic, he's full of peace. And it has nothing to do with our root of peace, as in "pact," and -- and Latin peace, or French, paix. It has nothing to do with the German Friede either. The Greeks formulated the word eirene, and it's also a girl's name, of course -- Irene, you see. An empress -- famous empress was called Irene. Played a great part in the history of the Church. The word for "peace" in -- in Greek has to do with aristocracy, and with fitting. It means simply -- eirene is there when everything fits together with everything else. I think that's quite a good description of what peace might be. So the Greeks avoided our error of judgment that peace can be made by fiat, by the head. It cannot. As you see, the good will was not lacking in the Americans to write a peace treaty in 1918 and to write a peace treaty in 1945. But they have been unable to do it. Will will not do it.

Perhaps I can then say more about this -- tomorrow. I think for -- after our quarrel tonight, it is enough that we have come to peace at this moment. And peace cannot be brought about by will. If you hold this together with yesterday's thesis, that every technological proce- -- pro- -- progress, every progress of technological invention, every technological change widens the space, narrows the time -- or shortens the time, abbreviates the time -- and destroys some former groupings -- I think we have together the elements out of which the -- it can be explained why a Peace Corps is indispensable, and why even its abuse by its members will not stop its -- the desire for having it.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

I think we were quite lucky about yesterday. Without this misunderstanding yesterday -- and I think it was total -- you would not understand why I always insist to speak at least three times. I think it's a curse of modern man to think that in one lecture anything can be conveyed to anybody except misunderstanding. So I presented my friend {Coleman} tonight with a little book in which I had written ca- -- "The promotion of further misunderstandings."

For this is a very deep reason. Since we live in a technological era in which we try to do things quickly, on -- on a vast scale, in which we think that a television set that is nationwide must be better than a local television's performance, in which everything is measured on planetary or lunacy terms -- the ancients thought that lune- -- to me- -- to have to do with the moon meant to be mad, you see. We think to be -- to go to the moon means wisdom. But in this strange situation in which size is adored, and brevity and shortness, also -- any important thing has to be -- explicitly be brought back to its own time measure. And you cannot experience time in one lecture, because your dealing with one hour is that it is the smallest possible unit for any intellectual process, and that if you can compress something in one hour, then you have the best form of intellectual understanding. Of course you have the worst form, because nothing is understood before it is misunderstood. And if you do not expose yourself to misunderstanding, you will never understand. Nobody does. I mean, therefore an examination at the end of your course won't help. What you know at the end of the course is only the very beginning of what the course should mean to you later. I must under- -- I understand now what I learned when I was 18. And I hope that some of you will have the courage to confess that they are still waiting for understanding anything.

This is also true with the newest event. The Peace Corps in this form, in which it is at this moment presented to you, and offered to you, and expects from you your services, is a very embryonic form. And we who have been in this now for a whole life foresee that it will not be the last form. And you of course think I am obsolete and you are very young, and therefore you must know better and do better. I'm sorry to say that isn't -- it may be, but it isn't sure. It is possible that somebody who foresaw the necessity of the Peace Corps could avoid certain downfalls in which -- which will not be spared you. And perhaps it is very disappointing what you go through with the Peace Corps. Nobody knows yet. You can become a nationalistic humbug. You can spread the word around in India that Americans are so ego-centric that they only think America's hamburg-

ers are good. I don't think they eat hamburgers there.

Time is of the essence for our living and understanding. And if you look at this technological, strange law that every invention widens the space, shortens the time, and destroys an old grouping, you can very well ask yourself which is the measure of time which you have to go -- to give to any real peaceful endeavor among human beings. Our life is 70. The Bible thinks the maximum is 80. It has been prolonged now to 90 and 100. They speak of "old as Methuselem," as you know, in Bernard Shaw. And it's quite terrifying to see that on one-hand side we can speak to each other in one minute ac- -- around the globe, and on the other hand, people are put away at 60 or 65 as obsolete and then they have to live another 30 years. It will all have to happen to you, too.

And so the meaning of time is at this moment threatened as -- I think as it has never been threatened before. If time is shortened, can then any human change really be brought about by this -- in this haste? It is already a tremendous step forward in acknowledging of this contradiction that we have to live longer and can do everything in shorter time. You see the contradiction. That you are asked to serve two years. When the thing began, when the Quakers had their first camps, they thought six weeks was already a tremendous thing. And they put it a vacation time, which is play time, so that the Quaker camps have always suffered from this lack of seriousness, you see. Anything shorter than three months is not serious, you see. And -- and nothing that is shorter than a year lasts in your life. That's an old saying, which I recommend to you as a solace for your discomforts. Nothing that is -- lasts shorter than a life is important in a -- in a -- for the formation of a human character, the formation of a human relation.

All this is unknown today. People insist that you can be serious, and become friends and become also enemies in much shorter seasons. You cannot. God has created man in generations. And only when three generations agree on anything is there peace. Peace is conditioned by lasting out your own death, your own disappearance, your own giving-up your position in life and being replaced by another president of the United States, or by another delegate, you see, to the United Nations, or by another man as the director of -- of some big factory, or whatever it is. Replacement of us mortals is a condition for a peaceful order, because if at the removal of you as head of the household, there's rebellion, there's bloodshed, obviously there's -- the thing has not been successful.

Peace, however, is the form in which these transitions can take place without shaking the order. This country has been able to shift -- change peacefully presidents now for -- how long? 180 years. And that makes it a real country, a real



democracy. If, as in Mexico, with a change of president you always have a revolution, you would have to admit that this was not a peaceful order, you see, because the decisive point of peace is that the transition from one human being to another in the various functions, you see, takes place without bloodshed, without enmity, without hostility, without hatred, without disruption. You will go to countries where this is, as you well know, absolutely not that safe. I mean, Mrs. Gandhi had to become, as I see it, I may be wrong, I -- you know more about this -- but she had to become president in order to avoid bloodshed, to avoid disruption. The authority of her relationships to Nehru made this possible. It's not a question of personal fitness. I don't doubt this. I have no i- -- judgment in this matter. But that's not the true story of her being the successor, you see. The true story is that it was because of her propinquity to the -- to the throne, it was possible to compel all others to take it quietly. With anybody else, they might not have done so. These are really the important forms of -- in government to be -- to be considered, that the others do not begin to shoot, and not to pay taxes, or not to emigrate, or what have you.

Now since time is of the essence, you can say that the Peace Corps is faced not with this great problem that the world has become one, that the space has been -- become gigantically big, that all inventions are immediately usable in all countries. This first form of technological progress, that space becomes wider and wider, is not what makes your existence in this -- in this service indispensable. This the nations of the whole globe now know, accept in some form or other, at least the governments; and for this reason, there would be no Peace Corps necessary if the gain of space was the only thing to be put through. For the unification of space, it is only necessary that -- technician goes everywhere, and builds a telephone, or a cable, or a television station, or some satellites in the air. You can see that the technol- -- -ologists, the engineer, is needed for certifying that space shall be one for all people.

With the shortening of time, however, there is this tremendous question: how can the seconds in which we flash signals through the air, and send you -- I mean, a -- a play in a quarter of an hour, or a drama in three-quarters of an hour or an hour -- how can this time enter a human heart in such a way that after two generations, the vestiges will still be felt? If you consider your own memory and just enumerate the movies you have seen in the last 10 years, how they have been photographed one upon the other, and how little there is left of the individual movie, you will understand that my question is quite useful, because the more you have seen at various evenings, or afternoons, or mornings on television, and in movies, or in theaters for that matter, the less has one of them been able -- allowed to bear fruit. The more is just a -- a sum of photographs. And the

funny thing, if you photograph one picture upon the other, you know how it looks afterwards. It is worthless. It's fruitless. And the fruitlessness of our mental processes has reached a remarkable degree.

Nothing what you see in these last 10 years you will probably deem worthy to communicate to your grandchildren, or to your children even. You will say, "Oh, they go to the next movies." But if this was so, if you allow them to go to their movies and treat you as obsolete, and say, "Well, my parents of course -- they went to French movies. We only go now to Abyssinian movies," which you -- they probably will -- for a change, that would mean that your children would be barbarians, and would upset everything you have created or you have done. And this danger is very large. It looms. In all these new countries -- go to the African countries. I won't mention India. The danger is that all the good there is discarded, you see, in favor for the latest news.

How then do we enlarge our time horizon? Never mentioned. If you read psychology books, they really think that a minute beget -- 60 minutes beget an hour, and 24 hours beget a day, and 365 days beget a year. In other words, time is treated as built up aus -- of time bricks, or time seconds. And if this was so, there would be no hope for us. The Tower of Babel would be what we call "time." It would be the compound of moments. And the moments would make no sense together. And most people live in this daydream that this is so. And they hasten from one leisure to another, from one cocktail party to another cocktail party. And the very word "cocktail" of course is the best definition of the treatment of time, you see. You mix some ingredients and this you call then time, or you call it cocktail. It's the same thing. That is, your time consists of absolutely discontinuous units. And you swallow it. You get drunk on it, as you do at cocktail parties; embrace your worst enemy and go home and forget. Most people live this way, in the big cities. And they are quite proud of it, of their -- faculty to stand all their enemies. At cocktail parties, you know, you would even embrace your future murderer.

Time treated as a cocktail is the -- is the curse of all of us. It offers itself to this, and the physicist says, you see, time is just an addition of moments. That's what it is: 60 seconds, one minute, and so on and so forth. I don't -- you can do this yourself. Everyone who is alive knows that he wants to live the other way around. His whole life is more important than any one year in his life. Any one year in his life is more important than an hour of toothache. You can stand the toothache if you know that after an hour you can go to the dentist.

That is, time has interruptions. Time has moments. But your and my time is

first consistent and one. So is the history of mankind. The history of mankind does not consist of 5,000 years B.C. and 2,000 years A.D. But it

consists of one big breath of God who creates -- is in process of creating us at this moment. And it appears to us very short-lived, but in fact, you are in the palm of His hands, and you are not the thing He wants to create. But He wants to create more than you and me. And we are inside of this.

And what I tried to say yesterday of peace is conditioned on this fact that peace is around us, above us, before us, after us, and if it isn't, then there would be -- just the end of the world. There would be destruction. And it would be perfectly meaningless for me certainly to stand here and to talk to you about peace and service. You could be entertained in going to India, which some of you probably will hope -- are hoping for. But it has nothing to do with peace or with service if what you do is nothing but an addition of moments, of minutes, if it doesn't play a part in the destination of the race. We hope to do something which is indispensable, which we cannot afford not to do.

Don't -- and if -- as -- as old President Calvin Coolidge, who -- who tried to say nothing at all, as you know, was the most silent citizen of Vermont; he's at home here in Plymouth, you see, only 50 miles from here -- he used to say when a law was before Congress and they asked him if he would sign it, or if he should veto it, he always said, "Is it necessary?" And if it wasn't necessary, he would veto it, because we are on this earth to do the necessary things without which the world cannot go on. And the other things are very pleasant for the moment, of -- but of no importance. It is necessary that children are born, you see, and that's there for -- has been marriage. It is not necessary that you amuse yourself at 14 in -- with sex. That's perfectly unnecessary. You can do it. You do it. But it is not necessary. Therefore it is not very important what happens there. Everything you do before you get married will be forgiven you if you don't do it too -- too badly. Therefore the -- the Kinsey Report is uninteresting, utterly unimportant. It doesn't deal with the necessary. It deals with the wanton. And the word "wanton" is a very good word to describe the superfluous.

For your own life, that is important which is necessary, in which you fulfill an indispensable task in the community. And it is all the more important the fewer people know that it is necessary ahead of time. And I hope you all know have ahead of time grasped the fact that your acts are necessary, although many in the community don't understand it. And the more this is so, the less applause you at this moment receive from -- people at home, perhaps the more necessary it is, and the more illustrious. He who does the one thing necessary all alone, against an -- an army of enemies, he's of course the greatest. That's why the Crucifixion

ranks as the one greatest act in humanity, because He was the only one who grasped that it was necessary, to show that in defeat we can be victorious. Nobody had ever dared to say this, or to do this. And that is -- remains the one necessary act and the one not recognized by anybody else, except the doer. To a certain extent, gentlemen, a doctor who for the first time does an operation does the same thing. He risks his whole reputation. If the operation miscarries, you see, he can be through with his job forever. And so everyone -- once to every man and nation comes the hour to decide -- that's the famous old hymn. And that hasn't changed. But the condition for your believing me at all is that you must see that in human time, it is very different as it -- we tre- -- treat astronomical time, or mathematical time, or physical time. Your lifetime has nothing to do with the stopwatch. Absolutely nothing. It is, as any organic process, you see, a phase in bearing fruit.

Now you will admit that a flower that goes then to seed and brings forward its -- its fruit in season, cannot be judged for its momentary time, for that little moment. It has a curve to go through. And that's predestined. And from the very beginning the end is in sight, although you don't see anything in the -- in the budding flower, how the apple or the pear will look at the end. Yet it's all one process. Now believe me, we Americans here -- and the Indians, the Hindus, too, and the Africans -- we are all as much in the palm of our creator's hand as His apple is on the tree, while he's budding in spring. There's no difference between us and them. And His purpose, first to create this strange world of separate nations where everybody found his way into some niche; in South America, the {Bo- -- Otoes}, Mongolians coming from Asia over the Bering Strait, marching through the whole of the American continent and finally now being found in the midst of Brazil -- in this same manner, all of us have been dispersed. This great diaspora, this great dispersion of the nations is the first act of this spectacle. And if you go to India, you will first be struck by the distinction, by the fact that these people are dispersed as compared with you. Then this dispersal had to go on until the man of men was found who could set an example for all these nations, all their dialects, their black and their white colors.

You find the dispersal, by the way, if I may hark back for one minute, because it's such a miraculous story. They now have found in Kam- -- in Kambotscha an Eskimo race. Eski- -- a group of Eskimos fearing the blood feuds, the vendetta, you see, by some other group, marched on -- marched on to evade the vendetta, the vengeance of their neighbors, and is now -- has now been found out by anthropologists as living in Kambotscha. Only to show you that flight, fleeing, fu- -- being fugitive from law, as it is in the Bible, in the chapter on Cain, you see,

is a true story. The first act of mankind was dispersal, because the hatred between stepmother and father-in-law, et cetera, is still mentioned today in jokes, but mostly sons-in-law now get along with their mother-in-law. Formerly they didn't. They went off. They went off very far, and the dispersal is the instinctive friction between family -- members of a family. It is not true that members of a family get on together well. It's not natural. We go -- get on together well, because we have so many ways out in school and colleges, so that to see your parents occasionally is a very nice idea, you see. But when I was young, there always appeared a column in the Z- -- in my newspaper: "My Family Cramps My Style."

And as we read the history of mankind, the first -- the first oc- -- occurrence has been that the -- the families cramped their style, and Cain always migrated. And that's how the earth -- the first act of -- of creation, of mankind then consisted of dispersal.

There have been perhaps 100,000 different languages spoken. They all have been created by human beings who broke away from the language spoken hitherto. Now 100,000 -- it's an arbitrary number -- but there are 10,000 African languages known to us, so it is not an exaggeration if I say 100,000. These languages all mean historical acts. They all mean a -- setting aside a special time for the people who spoke this language, because speaking a language means to get out of one part of history, one epoch, one century and entering in your own. So language and time has very much to do with each other. The fact that you now have to learn a little of Hindu is already a peacemaking endeavor, because you cancel out thousands of years in which these languages dispersed, you see. Went out.

I say this because you must not think that anything in human history is natural. Everything is supernatural. The languages also. There are no natural languages. To call your mother your mother, and to have the mother call you "my son" is always an act of divinity, always a religious act. To name each other, you see, and recognize that you can't sleep with your mother, and the mother recognizing -- or the father -- that he must not marry his daughter, that is always faith. And that's the oldest story of mankind. Mankind would have perished if incest had been permitted. So chastity is the first law of the tribe.

This is not natural. And what I've tried to do is to show you that history, from the very beginning and all the time in which you move, has nothing to do with nature. You are under the protection of the Holy Spirit, because the Holy Spirit has created mankind. And as long as there will be a mankind at all, it can only

move under this strange spirit that knows the ends, that knows your destination, and that spares you in -- in many ways for all your own follies, and all our own shortcomings, and has very great patience with us. Every one of us can make a thousand mistakes, and still at the thousand-and-first time, he's pardoned, and somebody comes to his rescue -- perhaps a nice policeman -- and says, "Don't do it."

How -- how come -- isn't that a very strange world in which we are forgiven all the time? I mean, if you figure out how many mistakes -- deadly mistakes from babyhood you have tried to make and to commit, and how very rarely you have been allowed to -- to commit them really, you see how lucky we are, h- -- what -- how much providence is already around in the form of all the offices which have been appointed from time immemorial to spare you these -- these innumerable -- the consequences of your innumerable mistakes. So man is this strange being that is allowed to make mistakes under the protection of a mild providence that allows man to come to your rescue and say, "Yes, you have made this mistake, but it can be forgiven you." There is a doctor, and there is a policeman, and there is a schoolteacher, and there is a kindergarten nurse, and there are all kinds of people who will straighten this out, and the consequences will not be as bad as you really would deserve it.

That is, mankind from the very beginning has tried to outlast the individual human life. Always have three generations at least try to cooperate. Always have there been grandparents, and parents, and children, and children's children together. And only in this way do we exist. Not one of us could live on the idiocy of your contemporaries. Any group of contemporaries is idiotic. If they meet, as in Rotary clubs, go to sleep. I mean, the -- the hell today is that only contemporaries meet. And they have nothing to say to each other. All wisdom, all -- everything important is where the young man says -- and an old man are together, the young man says, "You are too old," the old man says, "You are too young" -- that's the beginning of wisdom.

Well, really, everything interesting is only -- and everything true is only there if age makes no difference. As soon as you are a teenager, Sir, that is good for -- what is this infamous magazine which now sells 4 million teenagers? What is it called? It has a special teenagers' magazine, isn't it?

(Playboy.)

Wie?

(Playboy.)

No. I didn't mean this. This is for 21.

(Mad?)

Well, I only see it in the ads, you see, where they boast that they -- all the teenagers read them.

But you understand very well that all the instincts of a commercial character of mankind try to tear down this architecture of generations. Everything what we call commercial means to disrupt the flow of time of history and appeal to your momentary instinct. And that's why it is disruptive, why a commercial society is contemptible. Why it is the devil. It is the devil incarnate, the people who make you buy unnecessary things, because you don't have this money then for the decisive act, for example, of getting married.

Everything important must be measured -- by its degree of importance for all generations. And that's most interesting. And every one of you, I hope, has some ancestor in the family to whom you can speak business much better than to your contemporaries. There may be only one. And if you have none, then try to find one outside the family. But these talks with one such person are more important than 50 football games. Because -- why? Because the line of the future, from the past in the future, can only be determined, as in mathematics, if you have three points. You can only determine by -- by three data a triangle. Well, in the same sense, the direction of your life can only be pinpointed if there are some older, your age group, and some younger. If you don't have this in your mind and in your heart, you are a beast of the field, but not a human being. It may be a rich man who wants to endow a college, and that may be his -- his pipe dream, you see. He still thinks when he wants to endow and leave a name, like the Rockefeller Foundation, the man is still connected with future generations.

He was 90 when he did this. You know why he did it? His -- a newspaperman went to Mr. Rockefeller -- I think he was 89 -- and said, "Do you know that you are the -- most hated man in America?"

Mr. Rockefeller was shocked and said, "What can I do?"

And this gentleman, this newspaperman, said, "I will help you to erase this and to leave behind for future generations a different name of Rockefeller." And that's why we have the Rockefeller Foundation.

So he came to his senses in the last minute, really. He repented. That is, he reconnected himself with the future of his country and of mankind. And today the name "Rockefeller," you see, is so good that you can even become governor of New York.

It is very strange that this connection between three generations -- this pin-pointing -- who is your ancestor mentally, spiritually; on whom do you draw to prove that you are worth being elected, for example, you see, and your promise to leave something behind of which your grandchildren will -- still will be proud -- that this is not in the foreground of our education? Obviously, you can't elect a man who doesn't say I -- he's a Jeffersonian, or he's an Adams man, or he -- he is a -- a Lincoln man. They all do. They all quote ancestors, don't they? That's why you elect them, unfortunately. And they always betray you. They -- they may quote Lincoln, but that doesn't prove yet that they are Lincolnians. But they live by this. And there is no Democratic Party and no Republican Party without the quot- -- this quotation of these grandparents of their party. You can't have a party as of today. Only candy manufacturers can.

And that's their shortcoming, I mean. All the things you -- today in the political movement is so flat. It has no roots in the past, and therefore has also no promise for the future. Nothing immediate is worth your political interest. If you go two years to India, that's only worth an investment if it bears fruit -- ja, now comes my ending question -- bears fruit in which time?

When the Russians began their Communism, they began with 5-year plans. And we have now the idea of lengthening the Congress -- duration of Congress members for -- to four years, haven't we? Don't know if it will come about. And the president of the United States is elected for four, and the infini- -- infinitely more wise senators are elected for six years. And this strikes me all as exceedingly short-lived. I said that nothing is important that doesn't outlast one year. But by this, I do not mean that it is long enough to foresee the future for four or six years. Your life is certainly too precious to be wasted in four or six years. And if you go to India and serve two years, it would be foolish to think that the fruits of what you are doing can be seen after two years. It cannot be seen after four years.

You know when it could be seen? If the people with whom you have lived will tell their grandchild that one day this grandchild should go to the United States, and look it over what this queer country was from which such a plant had arrived, then you would be successful. Your own two years you can measure by



the yardstick of twice 365 days, altogether 730 days. And you can build it up from scratch, from the unit: one day, two days, three days, four days. Or you can look at it in terms of a century, or as I prefer, in terms of three generations and if your two years for- -- make a dent inside this century, then you have made a place for the Peace Corps, because then it affects people where it matters, in their species, in their belonging to the whole of India.

The -- the English have recognized this. They are very wise people. They are an aristocracy; and therefore they have always figured that three generations are needed before a Churchill is a Churchill. And that's why it is important that -- he is a Churchill, you see, because his ancestor fought at Malplaquet. And he has written the history of his -- of his ancestor, as you know, who was a very wicked man. But that doesn't matter. He was also a very important man.

Well, the English, knowing this, have always spoken of unrecognized service. In the civil service, they say the most important part of the service is that there are people who have -- are undersecretaries of something, I mean -- have a white-collar job in -- in the -- or on the board of trade, or the board of education, and do their work; and it is not recognized. And the English think that this is the most important work, and that's the work by which the British Commonwealth alone has been built up. Recognized service -- that ranks with Madison Avenue, with image-making, you know. You can pay people for giving you -- making you -- praising you. But unrecognized service is quite clear, as a woman, that the best things she does will not be labeled loudly. Her lipstick and her dress may be, but what a mother really does, or a sister, or a daughter in the home of man is unrecognizable. It just brushes aside certain cobwebs, and certain hindrances; and the life can go on, and wouldn't be able to go on otherwise.

Now the males in this room may protest, but I have to tell them that in the third millennium in which we -- entering so soon -- in 30 years, it's already ahead of -- before us -- will be in many ways a filial, a daughterly, sisterly affair. That's why women must be in this service, and why you -- we men must not act as brutes, and as soldiers, and as knights, but very much as male nurses, and deacons, and servants. The reason for this is that time has been destroyed by our technology, that we are preponderantly inclined to think that we can count the minutes, and the hours, and the days and then add them up and have a result. The unrecognized service consists in being the -- the cement between those hours and those unconnected dates. I would -- call the unrecognized service the connecting service, the service which ties together different activities in one spirit, and in one peace.

In German, I had occasion to comfort my coun- -- fellow countrymen after the First World War, that this would be all that was left of Germany: this power of the soul to go through dark ages, and con- -- have a continuity without the lime-light of images on Madison Avenue, and the town crier, in one form or other, called "advertising." The slow flow of time today is imperiled. Gentlemen, we put it in your hands to restore it.

[tape interruption]

...America { }. It may be very difficult. But don't call it a problem, because then you will make a wrong decision, because then it isn't necessary. Problems can be solved one way or the other. You can always wait for a new inventor who finds a new solution. You are -- life's task however, can only be fulfilled by you. Therefore you are not helped by calling it a problem. You are only helped by investigating whether you can live without it, or you have to go through with it. All important decisions consist in this simple question: is it your business? If it is your business, you have to solve it. As my friend Richard Cabot in Cambridge once said, "Anything that deserves to be done -- doing, deserves to be done badly."

This is very surprising, {Sir}. Most people would say the opposite. But he meant, if a man is musi- -- musical when he plays the piano poorly, for Heaven's sake, let him play the piano, because it deserves to be done. Somebody must play the piano. Many people must play the piano. One badly, one well. This is unheard-of. Today you always have a maximum of technical perfection, because you think piano playing is something there, and I'm something here. I can do it or leave it. If {you're really} musical, you must play the piano. Or must sing. There's no question that you can leave it. And then it's forgiven you if you do it poorly, because it is better that somebody follows his heart's desire poorly, you see, than that he doesn't -- do it at all.

This is all against all your psychological standards, I know, all against all your efficiency tests and so on. But that's how it is. Real life has nothing to do with -- anything of problem. And anything of plan. I have never planned my life. There are duties. There are challenges. Something has to be done, that's all. In every one case, I mean, I can only wish you that you get into a real quandary, the real difficulties, you see, because that will arouse your -- your energies to the pitch, and then you will -- will {do a righteous thing}. Any act of faith in a man's life will always bear fruit. And anything accommodating the convenient will always ruin you. And that will always happen when you see the problem and go to the expert here and to the expert there and ask, "What shall I do?" You think they

ever know? It's your life, you see. I can only live one. Nobody else can interfere with a { }. { } ask for counsel { } what would happen if I do this. And then he may tell you. But more he cannot. He can never say "Do this or that." Therefore, all plans mean that you can provide bliss and happiness for others. Impossible.

(I'm not asking you to plan my life. I was just...)

But that's the only plan that would be important. The real, live { }, they constitute then the direction life has -- your whole life has to take. I mean, you can plan -- you can plan {when you're old}. I mean, what can we plan is of a technical nature. You can plan the world, Sir. But mankind, you cannot. And you see, the -- the worst that has befallen you all is that you treat yourself as a part of the world. You aren't. You are the children of the -- your creator, and you are in yourselves creators. Are you parts of the world? The world is there to be used. It's the offal, I mean, there's the -- the -- the -- the town dump. That's the world. You are not the dump, yet. Don't treat yourself as worldlings, as pieces of the world. You aren't. By the way, nobody does. And you all figure that you find one girl who doesn't treat you as world, but as the one and only.

If you avoid problem and plan, you will go to Heaven.

(I'd just like one more turn. I -- I've got a quotation from another 19th-century man. Thomas Carlyle in the French Revolution said, "No nation conscious of doing great -- conscious of doing something great was in fact doing that.")

What?

(Thomas Carlyle, in the -- in the French Revolution said that no nation conscious of -- conscious of doing something great was doing that. I was wondering whether you would apply this to the Peace Corps { } its own awareness of historical destiny is what is going to bring about its downfall.)

Oh, it's too loose, Sir. { } you are not in danger, yet.

(Do you not -- do you not think the Peace Corps is perhaps overplanned, and over-schematized and overstructured?)

(How can you say that after three weeks { }?)

{ }.)

(How can you say that after { }?)

(Well, I would say that Dr. Huessy is { } very much.)

(After the last three weeks, if he could say that, he's a true { }.)

(At least in so far as it has aims, you know, subconscious aims, I think it is perhaps too aware of its own -- coming role.)

It isn't { } to say anything in this matter. Why should I? I don't know it. And my own -- you know, we tried all this 25 years ago here. And my only sorrow is that the -- domestic and the -- the worldwide services are separate. I think that Shriver should be the head of both. I mean, that he had to give up one and go to the other, I'm very sorry. That's -- to be a blemish on the service, because it obscures the fact that our whole globe is in need of this, and not just the Hindus, and -- or the sick. And I -- there are -- more criticisms I have, but they are not in { }, because I think you are very lucky that you have as the head of the Corps somebody who hates bureaucracy more than you do.

(You had a question? Well, thank you very, very much. And I hope you'll visit again.)