

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

Joseph Botond-Blazek [probably]: (Ladies and gentlemen: welcome to the 9th annual Tippett lectureship. I would like first to give you a few announcements. On your green sheet, there are certain changes. Tomorrow the faculty meeting -- or the faculty luncheon is not going to be in the president's dining room, but in the {Callison} minstrel gallery, in {Callison} College. It's this thing about the dining room.

(Also tomorrow evening, the second lecture is not going to be in the {Albert Cavel} Hall--or dining hall, but in the north quad {Callison} College dining hall. And -- and finally, those who would like to get in touch with Professor Rosenstock-Huessy either individually or in groups, you can call up the secretary of the dean of the chapel, and make arrangements there of where you can find him. The phone number is 218, extension 218.

(I'm not going to give any normal annou- -- normal introduction to Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy. I don't -- I'm -- I'm not going to talk about how he is a great expert in theology, philosophy, law, history, sociology, grammar, and of how many Ph.D.s he accumulated. If you would like to find out about these things, you can get a copy, a 10-page introduction to his new book, which will come out this summer, called -- Judaism despite of Christianity. And you can read here and receive a deal of information. And if you still want more, you have a book available, called The Christian Future, or The Modern Mind Outrun, which we have some 30 copies here. And you are able to purchase that for two th- -- \$2.35 now or -- I mean, after the lecture and during the -- the reception, which is going to be in that door. We have to go through, and we have a reception there.

(I would like though to mention three things which I consider very important about Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy. One is that Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy started out after the First World War what became here in United States Camp William James--you know William James' remark, "the moral equivalent to war"--a -- a camp, a labor camp you might call it. And that out of this came the idea of the Job Corps and the Peace Corps. Sargent Shriver and J. F. Kennedy were roommates at Harvard at a time when Rosenstock-Huessy was professor at Dartmouth, and had a great impact on -- young people.

(Secondly, I would like to mention to you of how many students of Rosenstock-Huessy became resistance fighters in Germany against Hitler. And in a -- in a memory of them, I would like to ask you in a moment to have a moment

of silence, because many of them gave up their lives, following their teacher's command, which was that you cannot ever say something without meaning it, and living it. You cannot have theories and then not practice them. One of them was Helmuth Graf von Moltke, whose widow, Mrs. Moltke, is now here with us, and who is a steady companion of Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy. He -- he was killed by the Nazis after July 20th attempt to assassinate Hitler, and his was discovered. (And thirdly, I would like to talk a bit in a -- more personal terms of what it means to me to have known and to know Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy. This is the reason why I was really chosen to be the introductory speaker -- or introductory -- introductory introducer to the first Tippet lecture today -- tonight. Twelve years ago, a few years after I arrived to this country--having lived in four different countries before, throughout the whole Second World War, and after-war period in Germany, I was a very confused young man. I didn't know whether I was coming or going. I didn't know what -- why it was worthwhile living.

(And then I went to UCLA, and took up a totally new field, which I never had before--namely history--just on a whim, I would say, because it seemed to be the only field available where you were able to specialize in diversity, and to really find out of -- who you are, what you are, et cetera, the burning questions which every sensitive human being has. When I went in 1955 to UCLA, I found a big factory there, with a great deal of faculty running around and doing their publish-or-perish game. And I discovered one human being there who was what the -- what the Yiddish would say, a Mensch. Somebody who was a real human being, who was not harassed, always {doubted} things, but for whom another person was more important than anything else. And that man was Page Smith, who is now the provost of Calif- -- of Cowell College in the -- Santa Cruz, University of Ver- -- Santa Cruz.

(It was not so much what Page Smith told me, or gave me to read, but it was rather what he was, a man of a certain quality which I didn't find very often. As a matter of fact, I didn't find at all, especially in those difficult years of my life. I could never understand about Page, of how he could have so much patience with me, and have so much compassion, and not looking at me as a student, or some other "it," but as a rather -- rather as a {dao}, somebody who really counts, or -- somebody who really deserves all the time that he has.

(Well, Page Smith literally saved my life, and I am openly acknowledging that. But I didn't know, that -- except two year -- two years later, when I left this college, University -- University of -- University of California, that only after I left

it, I found out that the same story happened once ago -- before, around 20 years ago, in 1935, -36, when a very young, confused undergraduate student by the name of Page Smith, disillusioned as many other sensitive people were in 1935, with Christianity, capitalism, democracy, and everything else, threw himself into the arm of Marxism, and wanted to change the world as a Marxist. And then he went to Dartmouth College, and there he encountered a man--a Mensch, as the Yiddish say--Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy. And what Page Smith became was largely the result of Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy.

(When I began to understand that, I began to really experience what it means, what is called the "bond between the generations," what it means to be able to live in generations and not in an isolated hell of -- only -- only of one's own generation.

(So I would like now to stop, and offer to you this wonderful man, my intellectual and spiritual grandfather, Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy.)

\* \* \*

Ladies and gentlemen, this morning we drove to Sacramento. Being here in California, I felt I had to find something that could connect us, you and me--I am coming from the East--but something Californian I thought might interest you. We drove to the railroad station, and there in front of the railroad station on the one-hand side stands the last Southern Pacific steam engine, banked there in 1957; and on the left-hand side, there is a very inconspicuous monument. And this monument, because it is so inconspicuous, is the best introduction to our theme of the next four meetings. It's a monument in honor of Theodore Dehone Judah, the man who inspired the Californians to build the Californ- -- the railroad, the Southern Pacific--the Central Pacific at that time--and connect by rail the East and the West, and thereby make California the first state of the Union, which it is at this moment.

The man paid with his life for this venture. He was born in 1826 in the East, took his wife out West in -- 1856, developed this plan of a railroad, managed to convince four hard-headed dry-good merchants in Sacramento that this was feasible, and these four men and he laid down the first rail on January 3rd, 1863. Six months la- -- seventh months later he was dead of yellow fever in the Canal Zone.

His widow could write with great pride 20 years later to the railroad queens that she was not a railroad queen, that she hadn't -- inherited any of the

riches of this world. But she had enabled the railroad queens to become railroad queens. Who were these railroad queens? There was Mrs. Crocker, and Mrs. Huntington, and Mrs. Leland Stanford, and Mrs. Mark Hopkins. Now all four of them are quite well known to you. They have left their mark. They have built these fantastic mansions on Nob Hill in San Francisco. One has founded Stanford University in memory of his son who died at 16 years of age, in 1886. Mr. Huntington is immortal because his nephew bought all the libraries in the world between 1910 and 1925 and assembled them in Pasadena. And Mr. Crocker is not very well known for anything immortal, but his money is immortal.

Now this is a parable of very serious content, because that is history.

That's how real, secular history, as it is taught today in our schools, looks. There is a man who has an idea, who sacrifices his life for it; others get rich on them, and get the fame. The -- this little tablet in honor of the real man, this Theodore Judah, was -- erected--and I still blush when I think of it--in 1930, nearly 70 years after his death. Not by the railroad kings or railroad queens who made the money, but by the employees of the railroad, who were tithed -- on this, you see, by collection. So they had to make him immortal. That's how justice is done in this world. That's how our Lord was paid. And --.

I'm reminded of drawing a comparison between the four evangelists and these four railroad kings. After all, it's a similar story. A very short dawn of a morning, a bright light for a few months; then this light is extinguished. And then gradually, the people come to the fore and become famous, who build on this man's seed. We take this all for granted. Note, Mrs. -- Mrs. Judah never--as I told you--got any compensation or any acknowledgment. She is not even mentioned on this monument. She is not mentioned; neither is the birthday of Mr. Judah mentioned on this monument. He just had existed between 1863 January, and November 196- -- 1863, when he died. That's all.

Perhaps genius is always of this type. Certainly the story of Christianity should be revised in the light of this very true story of California's immer- -- immortals. Mr. Stanford is immortal. Many students go to Stanford University, and praise -- some even praise Mrs. Stanford. It's very strange, I think. I'm quite upset by the fact that no protest is { }. They -- they dominate the scene. Everybody goes and glories in -- in Huntington -- the Huntington collection in Pasadena. Some- -- there's something ironical about a worldly history which needs sacrifices; then forgets the sa- -- the -- the victims, and praises the sacrificers. No letter, and no -- no -- summoni- -- summons ever moved these four railroad kings

to do anything for the memory of Mr. Judah. He was wiped out. And it was -- obviously, it was disagreeable to mention that they didn't have the ideas, because they were dry-good merchants. And you can't be dry if you do something so intoxicating.

What's the doc- -- lesson? We have at this moment in this world receded into a pre-Christian scheme of history. This is literally true. When the First World War broke down, in the last days of 1918, I managed to be -- the army was dis- -- German Army was dismissed. I was an officer, and I went to Munich, where at that moment a man who became very famous later had published his great book, The Decline of the West. His name was Oswald Spengler. And some older people among you may rem- -- know that he had great fame in his time. A little bit like Toynbee nowadays. We have quite a similar prophet.

Now compared to these four railroad kings, Mr. Spengler held the same philosophy. He said, "Cultures come and go; civilizations rise and fall; there's nothing you can do about it. It's like the morning and the evening, of a sun -- sunrise, and sunset. So the West had its sun rise, and now it's setting. The East will follow. Then there will be another civilization; probably at the southern Pole, and the next on the North Pole."

Then we got Mr. Toynbee, of whom more of you younger people will know. He figured out that there might be 500, or 600, or 700 -- civilizations all -- all following each other in a cycle. And so with a gesture in the 19th century, in the second half, after the American Civil War, and after various other tragedies, the Christian era was abolished. People were back to paganism. And if you read any course of lectures in the American university, you are just back to normalcy, because paganism seems to be normal. The ordinary human mind is pagan. I have a friend in Stanford who told me that we -- of course we had to throw the bomb on China right away, and had to have -- to wipe out these 700 million Chinese. I was a little a- -- frightened, and I said, "How come? What's your authority for this?"

"Well, they can't live with us. They can't live --."

I thought -- I told him that I thought God had created a very varied world, and obviously the problem was to live with the Chinese. He didn't understand this. And his wife was even more energetic that the Chinese should disappear. That is paganism. If any part of the universe is declared to be satisfactory

and sufficient, and the other part is not accepted, we are back to paganism. And I move among pagans today. Most people are in some chapter of their -- judgments, pagans. They aren't brutally -- dogs are treated very well. Horses even better. But Chinese? No. Nor the Vietnamese, no. I mean, napalm is good for the Vietnamese, and sugar is good for cats.

Nobody says anything. The historians do not take issue. There is no Christian history. If you read a -- a book on -- on antiquity and -- and Middle Ages, the transition is made without a word about the Crucifixion. There is Augustus, and there is Tiberius, and there is Nero, and then comes Constantine. Nothing has happened. And they can't explain why there should be a difference, a distinction.

So when I call the topic of this lecture, "The Chaos of Pagan History," I unfortunately meant business. I meant that we are the pagans, not the pagans of antiquity, who were very pious and religious people, and searched certainly for an order, and to get out of the cycle of the cycles. Today, nine-tenths of the people who teach history proclaim cycles, the eternal return of some nonsense. And they call this "science." And we -- our children, and we ourselves live in midst -- in the midst of this chaos, because if we move in cycles, then we don't move at all.

The Indian chieftain in 1820, who was met by the Christian missionary from Yale University, said, "My people move in cycles. That's why I have to get into Christianity. It's the only religion which doesn't move in circles." It's true. But you have to be a Christian for this. And if you are just an historian who calls himself a Christian, that doesn't prove that you have moved out of the cycles. Today the cyclical -- doctrine is taught in nine-tenths of our schools. However, I'm still very old-fashioned, and hope we -- {new fashions} tomorrow. And I believe that in this Christian era, we have -- made a jump out of the cycles, of the Egyptian, or the Syrian, or Babylonian -- darkness and obscurity. But of course, we have to make an effort today to prove it to the unbelievers, to the learned ones, who believe that cycle is the last thing that the human mind can worship, or can perceive.

It comes of course from our paralysis through physics, and natural -- the natural sciences. You and I observe facts in the natural world, outside ours -- our own family life, outside our own love affairs, outside our own bankruptcies, and our own sicknesses, and breakdowns. And if you look into nature, you find geological layers. You find yesterday, and today, and tomorrow; you find what

they call the past, and the present, and the future. And now by a strange ruin of language, of our expressions, most people understand that history is the contamination in some way of past, present, and future. But that's only true of pre-Christian history. And it will be now my topic for the next three times to convince you of the fact that this cheap allo- -- allegation--that history is the knowledge of the past, to take it into the future, given you at the present--is utter nonsense, and that no human being has ever lived in this manner. You all can test this.

One of the greatest -- that's why I have called this lecture series, "The Cruciform Character"--or "Structure"--"of History." I want to wake you up to the fact that the word "history" has been stolen by the pagans, by the natural scientists from -- people -- from the believing Christian world. It is the cowardice of the theologians, the cowardice of the Christians which has allowed this { } of course. We are at fault. Christians are always at fault themselves, you see. It's very bad. We have no alibi. It's always our fault, because we are too timid, or too -- too silent, or too -- too --. We adapt ourselves to -- to the domination of the world, and in the last centuries, the domination has been with the railroad kings, and people back of the railroad kings, you see, with the natural scientists. So it is no wonder that poor Judah, you see, never got his due from these railroad kings. We did the same. Or we do the same. We also say that causes produce results, and that the future--as Mr. Laplace, the great physicist, in 1800 framed this foolish sentence, that the -- past and the present produce the future. This is believed in all schools of the country -- not only here, but in Europe too. Only the Russians know better. That's why they are partial Christians. They say the future produces the present and destroys the past. And that's true. That's simply true. That's what our Lord did. But you don't know it. And you all live in this Egyptian darkness in which you say that the past and the present produce the future. What is the present, ladies and gentlemen?

Before I answer this--you can answer it, yourself, too--let me give you some examples of how inveterate today--the 19th century and the 20th century--this heresy, this superstition, this nonsense has spread.

I was intrigued when I -- after I had formulated my theme for you, Sir, that I remin- -- remembered that Benedetto Croce, the Italian philosopher so-called, has in his name "the cross." And he was very strong in pretending that history moved as a spiral. You know what a spiral is: up, up, up, up. Now -- nothing ever more nonsensical has been proclaimed. I have analyzed this in a whol- -- in this Christian Future book at some length. I don't want to bore you

now, except that I have to say -- mention it as an example of human folly. Nobody quite knows what -- why a spiral is the model of human history, you see. It's very hopeful, you see. I go up, and I go down, and I don't know quite where I am, which is probably true of most human beings. You see, "I know not if I sink or swim." You know this famous English folk song. "But not as deep as the love I am in; I know not if I sink or swim." Now from this lover, I will accept this sentence, you see. He doesn't have to know. But from a philosopher, to be told that history moves in spirals, I just have nothing to say to such utter nonsense. What is a spiral? Nobody has ever seen it as a natural building. And you and I -- I see you a little higher than me, and I a little lower. No, Sir; next moment I am higher. Does it make any sense? Has -- anybody ever seen human beings move in a spiral? Perhaps you still go -- staircases, but even they are not in a spiral.

It's a pure invention of the imagination, because of course, since the poor man was called "Croce," he wanted to avoid the Cross. There are people who suffer from their name. And Benedetto Croce all his life suffered from this closeness to Christianity. So he had to prove that he was a secular philosopher, you see. A new Hegel.

The spiral is just one example of the attempts to avoid this one very disturbing part of history: that we are in the midst of it. Mr. Croce could call history mov- -- as a spiral, because he looked at it. He was a philosopher. And philosophers, as you know, have to be -- have the privilege to stand outside, unmoved, unshaken, you see. {Si fractos illa { } orbis im parvidum ferient ruine} -- Horace has described the Stoic philosophy, you see: "If the earth breaks down in fragments, he, the thinker, will remain unmoved." Where he stands, he doesn't tell you. But he is quite sure that he is outside -- outside the disturbance, you see. He looks at it.

I don't look at things, gentlemen. I am looked on by my creator. He looks at me and says, "What a fool are -- you are." That's all we know of ourselves. And to believe that we look at the world is very funny indeed. Do you think Mr. Judah had time to look at the world? He built the railroad, and he died over this, and that's a real man. And he had no idea of formulating history as a -- as a spiral. And who is more in history, Mr. Croce or Mr. Judah?

This is fantastic. Today these people who write articles in the newspapers and the magazines, they dis- -- determine what history is, instead of the people who -- experiences, and -- create it. And they are the great victims of this. But don't be -- I don't understand the world anymore, when I see that you are will-



ing to listen to these apes. And they are apes because they pretend that they are not inside the suffering cauldron, but they are outside, and they look at something, like all --.

I visited Mr. Spengler in -- at Easter, 1919. For you, that makes not -- is not important, the younger one of you don't know how Oswald Spengler at one time dominated the imagination of the Europeans. He was the man who had something to offer about the order of the universe. In this book, *The Decline of the West*, he describes how now Europe was declining, and then the next -- third millennium, another part of the world would decline. And he was very eloquent. He was very clever. And he was totally unmarried. And he was totally without any love or affection for anything. And so he had really an attitude which you only find with scales or instruments. He was a natural scientist, pure { }. That's not good for history, because it is untrue that anybody can be without sympathy, without hope, without wishes. He was. He was a bachelor. He was his mother's son. He had never been--how do you say this?--the umbilical cord had never been cut. And as such introverts go, he didn't care. It's quite interesting. He died in the '30s, when the Nazis came to domination. And -- not from a broken heart. He for- -- declined to say -- admit that he had a heart. But he was in the -- is the only man whom I've ever met who was in every sense of the word an atheist. He thought that mechanical reasons produced mechanical results, that the universe consisted of spouts, to so speak, of -- which spat out civilizations. And just as later, Toynbee.

It was quite remarkable, this conversation between him and me. I was hurt by the end of the war, by the decline of Europe, and by the terrible degeneration of -- and the { }. All my friends had been killed. I myself had been in the war for six years. And to talk to Mr. Spengler was a revelation, because he was without any sympathy for anybody. He was indifferent. And he was very proud of his indifference. He said, "That's my -- you see, my business, to be indifferent. Otherwise I wouldn't recognize anything."

So I said to him, "You can't recognize anything because you are indifferent," you see.

Now that's an eternal decision, or division. One group says you can only know because you are indifferent. And the other part says you can only know because you are not indifferent. This decision will have -- always be fought out in politics, and in battlefields. And it is the real, religious decision of all times. And that's why religious wars are unalterable, and unavoidable. The world can never become tolerant. That's all silly. And what we have to reproach the liberals

with is this idiotic idea that -- that indifference is better than fanaticism. It isn't. Only you have to know the true fanaticism. The fanaticism of indifference is more cruel than the fanaticism of taking sides.

The doctrine of the cycles, the doctrine of the spiral, all this is as hopeless and as unwarranted as anything that results from a look at things. Because you and I, we are not things, and we cannot be looked at. We cannot. If you try, your wife will very much re- -- resent it. You have to talk to her. And you even have to -- allow her to answer, which is much more bitter.

That is, man is not defined by himself, by his self, by his brain, by his mind, by his insight. He is not determined by any of these things. He is only determined by the passions that -- allow him to rule. He can be ruled by love. He can be ruled by envy. He can be ruled by hatred. But it -- are his passions who rule him. And that is then -- the result is the world which is created by these passions. And it is a very mixed world, half diabolical, and half divine.

And the whole problem is: will the divine part in us be one inch stronger, wider, farrer-reaching than the diabolical? Every moment--in this moment, here too, my dear friends--it is not yet certain who wins. It is a very uncertain battle between these two aspects of our creation, whether the powers that form this into a unity, and figure that California should remain a part of the United States, and the United -- should remain a part of humanity; or the other party who says, "The other parts of humanity are there to serve the United States, and the other states of the United States are there to serve California." That's -- you have to decide. And every day some part of this decision is made one way or the other. And life is very risky. Don't think that your Constitution, because happens to be 177 years old, is so -- or how long -- old is it now? Much more. Hundred--what's the lates- -- cal- -- calculus? How old is this -- Constitution? I always -- hear people boast that it is so very old. I do not think that's a recommendation. Pardon me for saying this, being not an American. You think old things, you see, are recommendable, because you have too few of them. But when I hear a constitution praised for being very old, I'm a little skeptical, you see. I think that this in itself is no recommendation. It can be, but then you have to look at what it produces.

So old age is one of the historian's bugaboos, in both ways. One recommended, and one de- -- deprecated. I think that in history, and -- as in life, and as in your own love story with other peoples, age alone doesn't justify anything. Age can be abused, age can be glorious, age can be -- to be venerated and

worshiped; but in itself, without any qualification, history is not based on old age. I don't see why a great event, completed to- -- accomplished today should rank less than the Exodus. The Jews thought that the Exodus was so much more recommendable than the Crucifixion, because it had happened so long ago. Now you see very clearly that this is not a good reason, because the result is the Crucifixion.

And that's with all our life. Every day you are tempted to say, "These are old ways; therefore they are honorable ways and good ways." I don't think that we know anything in this direction. Old and new are no qualities of life, which is very disagreeable. It would be so convenient. For fraternities, it may be possible, because they are not important.

But where are we left? How can I open a path that leads us a little beyond this dilemma? Here are the unbelievers, the people of fact, the scientists. They say, "I look at history, and I see that something has been in the past, and then something has come about in the present, and then the future must be its result." What are they do- -- where are they going wrong? If I can tonight say that much, why I think that they are going wrong, that they have overlooked the main thing, the main question of history, then I would -- you would perhaps be prepared to listen to me and to accept the answers that have been given since the Revelation came into this world, and has asked people to jump out of this morass of physical causes and physical effects.

They tell you that every cause has its effect, or every effect had its cause--it amounts to the same thing--and that we look at these causes, and then we study them, then we know ahead of time the effects. For all dead things, for all things under man's domination for the creatures who are only creatures, that's true. We, however, figure time in quite a different way. If you look how you experience time yourself, the best way you are sure that you know what has happened is that you say, "At one time, I expected this to happen." A mother expects a child to be born. Then the child is born. And then she can begin to name the child and to {found its days}. But the great thing about historical experience of humanity is that the same event at one time was in the future, and only then entered the past. That is history. And that's overlooked today in all our textbooks. History is not that what has happened either to your grandfather, or to your father, or once to yourself when you went to school. But history is only that event which you have dreaded, expected, hoped for, which you then have seen -- helped to bring about, and which at the end is there, and you have to cope with it, because it is your own doing.

Whenever your grandfather has done something meritorious, whenever the railroad was built by the Leland Stanfords, then of course, the heirs, the students at Stanford University now say, "Thank you, Mr. Stanford. You did a great thing." And they repeat his performance as still not done, as undone, as future. And because they have an inkling that it was an heroic courage that made these four men build the railroad, it is quite right that they now should have some grate- -- gratitude for these people, because they -- you enjoy the fruits of this founding. But it isn't the -- the brick of Stanford University, but it is their ability to share the hopes, the expectation, and the courage of the founders which allow them now to say, "That's history. That's past. Now it exists, it goes on forever" perhaps, you see, or for centuries.

So the heresy of the modern historian consists in this very strange alienation--you know, "alienation" is now a very much bandied-around term for the -- for the mental -- the--no, how do you call them?--psychiatrists. We are all under psychiatric treatment and there is no field of human endeavor which is not -- has not fallen into the hands of some Freudian psychiatrist. And -- but the terrible thing with -- history is that the psychiatrists haven't yet found out, that the people who deal with the his- -- with the past by itself have no idea of what history is. History is the power of you and me to add to something in the future the predication that now it is -- exists, and has passed into -- into being. A person who cannot fathom that this thing is in the future has no understanding of what it is now.

Nobody who -- can understand the Church who cannot understand how the Lord went to the Cross. That's obvious, that without Easter, you cannot understand Pentecost. Now what does it mean? In -- at Easter, the event hasn't happened, yet. Nothing looks like the Savior. Nothing looks like the Church. Nothing looks like redemption. Everything looks like despair. If you cannot delve into this event at the moment in which it hadn't yet happened, you will never understand Christianity. And that's why most people don't understand Christianity. Christianity is either accessible to you as well in the future as in the present or -- and in the past, or it doesn't exist. It's a dream -- as our pagan historians today treat Christianity. It's an event on the -- on the margin, you see, in a footnote.

In the days of the Emperor Augustus, there was a strange man, you see, who pretended that he was the son of God, but -- Augustus knew better and said he was the son of God. Well, there you are.

Future and past cannot be separated in our speech, in our thought, in our sentiment, in our judgment. Only that of which you can understand that it was in the future have you any idea what it was and is now in the past, and how you treat it. You have otherwise no way of knowing when to abolish it, when to enlarge on it, when to preach it, when to condemn it, when to ameliorate it, when to embellish it. The only way in which you become an integrated person in your own mind is that -- when you know that you yourself one day change the phrase, "It shall be" into the phrase, "It has been." Or "It has become." That's the man's great power -- that's what we call grammar. And this despised grammar today is the only mental -- mental faculty which you still can cultivate with fruitful results. Philosophy, sociology, economy me- -- all means bankruptcy. But if you -- but if you would know what a power is in this fact that you can say, "This despised man is the -- to become the savior of the world," you can become a Christian. It is difficult, but it is possible.

In other words, the very simple grammatical tenses--future, present, and past--are not organized as Mr. Laplace has held, that the -- past and the present produce the future. That's utter nonsense. That's good for lead, and iron, and water. Then you can find heavy water. But heavy living is quite different. The heav- -- heaviness of life consists in the fact that you are born into a world which expects your contribution, and at -- in fir- -- at first it looks very easy. And you dream, and you dance, and you get engaged, and you get divorced, and after the divorce, you begin to weep. And you see it's all different. It's very different, and you have to pay the penalty of the first half of life wasted and sacrificed. And then you understand that the three tenses--future, present, and past--are your way of orienting yourself in life, under one condition: that the future governs. As soon as the past governs, that you become--because you are your grandmother's granddaughter, you have to marry some member of the Morgan family--you are -- out of luck, just out of luck. She must not know, your grandmother, whom you are going to marry. Then you can perhaps become happy. That's very strange. But the future is not to be -- derived from the past. And no foundation can help, you see. That's why foundations are such a -- such a terrible thing for schools. This is what stands on its head today in this country, that you really believe that the past precedes the future. It is not true. Only this has become past which at one time beckoned the people as future. And only that deserves to exist as long as it still enlivens and enthuses people as a dream of the future. Because something is there, that's no justification. That's what the Jews said against the Lord: "Of course. Very simple. We have no better things to say than the high priest in Jerusalem."

If this is your justification as a professor of history, that things have been, let them have been. Their justification of course that at one time, they redeemed people, they made their eyes big, and their breath vivid, and that, when you had to follow the -- the oracle, so to speak, and build, for example, the transatlantic railroad -- the transcontinental railroad.

The spirit of Mr. Judah, therefore, cannot be omitted from the story of Mr. Crocker, of Mr. Hopkins, of Mr. Stanford, and of Mr. Huntington. And there is something very wrong in the way the history of the Southern Pacific is written. And I resent very much that the life dates of Mr. Judah -- Judah are not on the monument. And they are nowhere. This monument, as I said, was set by the employees. And the employees, of course, as all modern factory workers, had an inkling of being treated as cogs on the wheel: nameless, and hopeless, and without a future. So they had sympathy with the first man who was treated in this way by these millionaires on Nob Hill.

And we have not solved this problem today. And it will never be solved forever. Every one of you has to solve it in his own life. The future becomes past. And anybody who has -- has lived a good life knows that that is the proof, that -- he, the things he worships belatedly are not the things that made him rich, or famous, even. But they are things, nobody else may ever know that he has done them, you see. But at one time they made his breath wide and his heart big; and he did them, and he's proud of them, and he will remain proud of them, and he will remain -- be a different person for this reason. And everybody has this. I don't -- I -- I think man is much better than he today poses in -- in -- in mental -- in mental statistics, and psychiatrists, and --. I think most people have very great memories of the great acts in their life where they believe, where they helped do something unexpected, unforeseen, which seemed impossible.

Some contribution every one of us has made in this respect. But these are the historical acts. That is the real history. What are these four people, these dry-good merchants who built the railroad, I mean? For -- if you promise me \$20 million or--they made \$30 million, you know--it's very easy then to -- to go out and -- and do this, you see.

So we have a very strange scale of values. Every one of us has an anonymous life in which he dreams, hopes, says, "This should be." And he's -- at least will not stand in the way when this comes about, because in his better -- self he will know that this is due, and it should be done. And even this not standing in the way is already a right to be counted in, into the great galaxy of the people who have done it, who later can say they are a part of the whole story. And we

become part of the story only when we take part at a time when the story hasn't yet become history.

So I plead for you tonight -- with you tonight for a reform of the term "history." And I give you the gr- -- the secret by which you will be able to recognize it against all the scientific historians: these cooks and these chemists. The people who speak of time in this observant sense that they look at the time process: "Oh, that's 7,000 years ago"; "These people had 6 million years before this -- this ape, and this gorilla." That's not how human beings speak. Our speech is a little different. If you feel that something should be done, should have happened, you say, "It began in this manner, it was continued in this manner, and now God has allowed us to put the final touch to it." Jesus is not the en- -- the middle of an -- of a past, between a past and a future. He is the middle of a beginning and an end. The religious terminology is that our Father has created the universe, and has allowed us to participate in it, and that He is going to finish it, whether you like it or not.

Now the beginning and the end are something totally different from the past and the future. The suffering of the physicists and the chemists--these very poor people, I always pity them for their vocation--is that they have no beginning and no end. They only have past and future, you see. Something was there; now they do this. They cook it, and then later it stinks. No, I -- I'm not -- this is the world. This is the earthly part of us. We are, of course, ourselves in this process of just being things that are changed. But God is not changing the world all the time. He is creating the world, is He not? If He is creating the world, and we are participating in His creature -- creative acts, then it leads to a certain end, as it had a certain beginning. And in the beginning was the Word, and God spoke, and there was light. And there it was -- and still is. That is, the his- -- real history of humanity has a beginning, a middle, and an end. The history of the sciences, the history of nature has no beginning and no end. It goes from cause to effect. And it goes on and on and on and -- to something. But just to something. But fortunately your and my history does not go on to something. It doesn't even go to somebody. It goes forward to that person whom you love, or whom you hope will love you.

Thank you.

Joseph Botond-Blazek: (Eugen Rosenstock-Huussy prefers not to answer questions here, but rather during the reception, or tomorrow. After tomorrow, he likes to meet people on a different grounds than the lecturing ground. Thank you very much.)

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

[Unidentified speaker]: (Good evening, and welcome to the second evening session of the Tippet Lecture Series. We're glad that you're here. We're happy this evening to have the president of the University of the Pacific, Dr. Robert {Burns}, to say a few words. Dr. {Burns}?)

[Robert {Burns}]: (Last evening, after the lecture, I called Bishop Tippet long distance, and found that he had just been elected the president of the Council of Bishops for the Methodist Church. He is in an eastern clime, but quite elated--and I'm sure we are, too--that the man after whom these lectures are named is now at this exalted position. And he expects to be here tomorrow noon, so that I'm sure he's going to be very pleased to know not only the choice of the speaker that we had this year, but also the great response that we have had. I'm greatly pleased to see the turnout last night, and also the turnout -- turnout this evening.

(One of the great stimulating things about what happens on this campus is the fact that we can have people of the stature that we have here in these lectures. And I'm sure that students are beginning to appreciate this. But don't just leave it entirely to the students, because the faculty appreciate this, for it gets the cobwebs off the sky. And we pick up by accretion a great many things which we normally wouldn't get.

(So I think, speaking on behalf of the university, we are extremely pleased that we can have a man of the stature of our lecturer tonight here. And I'm representing Bishop Tippet in saying that he couldn't be here these two nights, but he will be here tomorrow night.

(Thank you very much.)

[First unidentified speaker]: (I'd like to call to your attention that at the exit here, and the exit behind me, you'll find copies of Dr. Rosenstock-Huessy's book, *The Christian Future*, and you will find mimeographed introductions to his forthcoming book, *Judaism in spite of Christianity*. And I hope that you will avail yourself of the opportunity to pick up these two items. The book sells for \$2.35.

(I call to your attention that tomorrow, Dr. Rosenstock-Huessy will be speaking at 11 o'clock a.m. in the chapel, on the topic, "Faith, Love, and Hope, as



Three Generations." And tomorrow evening, in the final lecture of the series, in the Great Hall at Raymond College, his topic is, "From Halloween to Labor Day." (Last night, after a very stimulating encounter with Dr. Rosenstock-Huessy, several of us--and I trust that many of your were included--went home, and with *The Christian Future* and other material that was available to us, tried to enrich our understanding of the kinds of things that he was introducing us to last night. We are happy that you are back here this evening. As Prof. Rosenstock-Huessy, after having spent a day engaging students in conversation and stimulating a classroom on the campus, is here with the second in a series of his major lectures entitled, "The Creation of Progress." And I know you join me in giving a warm welcome once again to Prof. Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy.)

\* \* \*

Ladies and gentlemen, "The Creation of Progress" sounds to myself a little dry. Creation is something rather vital, and rheumy, and sappy; but progress today is -- rather has something to do with bigger and better automobiles, greater highways, and -- more taxes, probably. So the word "progress" has declined. When I wrote the book 25 years ago, *The Christian Future*, and had a chapter on progress, it had not reached this all-time low it has today. I don't think that people at this moment can realize the religious awe that this term "progress" once carried for our ancestors. In the middle of the 19th century, the word was used to translate the greatest desires of the Christian community into secular problems and ways. And the great progressive -- man in progressive education, John Dewey, made it very popular and said, "We progress in spirals." Those of you who were present last time know that I reject this whole notion of spiral as an intriguing hypocrisy. The spiral doesn't offer anything visible or tenable in form of movement. It goes up and down, no direction given, no aim, no goal; it is one of these cure-all words which promise you immortality, and next day you are dead. "Spiral" is one of the obsessions of the last 50 years, I warn you against the word. You can analyze this as you like; it has no meaning. Absolutely no meaning. But the leading spirits of the last century took flight into the spiral, and I think I have found out why.

You see, for the last 200 years since Benjamin Franklin and the French Revolution, the "fall of man" and the Crucifixion ceased to be mentioned in good society. You -- dealt with human problems outside any religious context. And so the fact that men fell or had fallen, that was very energetically sup- -- repressed,

and many other Christian notions or biblical notions. Instead, the word "spiral" had this wonderful notion that the part of the Christian message seemed to be retained. Yes, men move upward, but in the next moment, he fell downward. And so it's a wonderful merry-go-round, like an American -- like the merry-go-rounds, up and down, and up and down, meistens -- mostly down. It is quite serious, this loss in our vocabulary, of a decent term to explain man's handicap in history. The Bible said -- called it the "fall of man" and said that something had happened which cured this fall and had re-established our proper level of behavior. And my task tonight is at first to state that if you talk of the fall -- of the spiral as the wonderful way in which we circumvent the tragedy of humanity--as in two world wars, or as at this moment in Vietnam, or as anywhere where you look, in Mao's China--if you want to circumvent or to lie--which is the -- the proper term--about reality, this word "spiral" is a wonderful, mechanical translation of the serpent in the Old Testament. Look at the spiral. It nearly is -- looks like a taxidermic snake. And the serpent of the Jews in the Old Testament served exactly the same goal to express what ordinary men thought about their earthly state. The serpent recoiling, recoiling, got them down. The fall of man is not so far away as you think, I think you know very well that "fall" and "man" is at this moment with us; otherwise we wouldn't be in Vietnam, and several other things wouldn't go on at this moment.

So, I feel that the word "spiral" can draw attention to the fact that your vocabulary and my way of speaking has been emaciated into a mechanical way of speaking from the organic way of speaking, of the Old Testament. We speak of spirals; the ancients spoke of the snake, of the serpent. That's long forgotten. Who reads the first chapters of Genesis? I mean, that's -- for the museum. Unfortunately, the spiral is not for the museum, but for the so-called philosophers of today. The greatest man of -- of a -- in regard to the -- to the spiral in this country was John Dewey, born in 1859, the great hero of progressive education. And since he wanted to rescue education from any suspicion that it could go backward, or fall down on the job, he said that the movement of education is the spiral. That guaranteed, you see, all the downfalls and all the progresses.

Now I'm quite serious. Modern man, in the last 200 years, in this period called the Enlightenment, has replaced the organic terms of the Old Testament, like "serpent," by mechanical terms, like "spiral." If you want to understand what has happened to your own vocabulary about reality, just look into this term "spiral" as a replacer, as a substitute for "serpent," and you find -- will find many others, you see. We say "trends" when we mean "wicked angels." And so we have wonderful vocabulary everywhere replacing the old terms by mechani-

cal terms. The old were organic, they were taken from the bot- -- botany and zoology, from living beings. But we have, of course, by our mastery of mechan- -- mechanisms and machinery, much easier access to mechanical terms. If you look at -- carefully at the word "spiral," it corresponds in its use, in its adaptability, in its practicality, exactly to the word "serpent" in the first chapters of Genesis. And I would say, "Beware of the serpent." That is, there is something very cheap about com- -- taking comfort in the fact that yes, man is constantly led astray by the serpent, or by the spiral -- no difference.

The Christians, of course, have never fallen for -- for spirals because they rose above the fall of man. And that is the content of the religious message of Christianity: that there are ways in which man is not required, so to speak, to fall. Our psychologists say we are required to fall; our Freudians say we are all analytically involved, you see; the death of God has occurred, exactly what the serpent said to Eve; and so we live today very happily in the first chapters of Genesis without the Redemption, without any power to escape from it. Especially the -- the progressive educators, you see, have tried to tell us that children are never wicked, never naughty, never lazy, never lie. I have found that they lie all the time.

The innocence of man is a great dream of mankind, the "golden age." And if you construe the serpent as a spiral, you can get away from original sin. You can get away from the fact that we are very weak and every day we are -- something is missing to our completion. We can't do all the things we would have to do to live in a decent world. Every one of us neglects a li- -- tiny little bit. And if you take the sum of it all, it's quite considerable and you have to establish a police department. And a police department certainly is the simplest expression not of the spiral, but of original sin.

But it is very remarkable that this country especially has escaped any quotation from the Old Testament, with the help of these mechanical terms. I think the word "spiral" is highly instructive for the way in which the devil cheats us. If you speak of the spiral, you cannot recognize that this is a nonsensical notion. If you look at it carefully, you say, "What's this?" "Where do I go?" Nobody knows. Spiral leads nowhere. But it's a wonderful consolation. John Dewey has literally printed that progress has the form of a spiral. Now, I invite everybody for a prize of \$100 to tell me what this means. It doesn't mean anything. And that's so wonderful, if you look educational books -- read educational books, as I have to do sometimes, you find out that they mean absolutely nothing. Good educators don't read books on education. They may write them; that's

something different.

But it is a serious situation, because the very word "progress" at this moment has lost its momentum. You think, and most people do think, that progress is secured. And the funny thing is that it has been made secure by a second trip -- trick, similar to the snake which has been replaced by the mechanical spiral, the dead, the organic, by the mechanic. In a similar manner, a second theft has been performed on our vocabulary. The word "progress" today is understood about progress in the building of automobiles, in the building of aircraft, in the building of auditoriums like this one; they are very progressive. You can't find a better place to speak in, as this one here. It's the newest architecture. So you say, "Aren't we progressive?" Unfortunately these individual progresses would have never led to the invention or the coining of the phrase "progress." That's an error. The word "progress" in this sense of progress in chemistry, progress in physics, progress in mechanics, you see, progress in special fields, is all derivative and second-rate compared to the great idea that mankind progresses, that mankind can get out of its hole, out of its fall, by progress.

And I want to devote tonight my time to this--after all, rather important--story, that man has conceived of his own march through time as a progress. The word "progress" is a contradiction, which you will not -- expect, to "regress." All the ancient peoples, outside the Revelation of the Bible, believed in circular movements and therefore they believed in the regressus, in the regress of the Great Year on -- in the sky. That one day every 1460 years, the same constellation would occur -- that's what Pharaoh and the Assyrian kings believed they knew. The Jews came and laughed at this, and said, "We are satisfied with a year of 365 days' duration, and all this Big Year business is superstition." That's -- and the progress of the Jews was the abolition of all the big mechanisms, of all the big calculations, and computations, and -- and calendar lore.

So progress was opposed to the regressus, in- -- ad infinitum, in which only now our bankers and our analysts believe, you see; I mean the -- financial wizards, the financial -- they analyze cycles all the time, you see. They are never right, but they sell their ware very successfully. Regress is forbidden among Christians: the belief in cycles. We are not on this earth to move in cycles. That's quite serious and I -- I can't mince words. And I tried to -- tell you last time that Mr. Spengler, the -- greatest atheist I have ever met, proclaimed the cycles in history in order to abolish Christianity. This book, *The Decline of the West*, is so interesting; and that's why I visited the author af- -- just after it was written, because he had managed to omit Christianity from his world history. It didn't exist.

In a history of cycles, the Christian Church doesn't occur, you see. He had an Arabian millennium, that was from 0 to 1000, and then he had a Faustian millennium, that included even California. And there was no bridge. And the 2- -- last 2,000 years were not held together by the Christian faith, you see. He ignored it. He said, "That doesn't exist, had no influence, you see. We shouldn't count the years in this manner" of our Christian era, you see. "We should count from 0 to 1000 and from 1001 to 2000." All our other historians, like Mr. Arnold Toynbee, do exactly the same.

In this moment, then, the use of--the "avoidance" perhaps is better--of the word "progress" -- in the singular, is a mark of a decent atheist. Anybody who wants to deny God says that the Christian era doesn't exist, that it makes no sense to count through -- that in the year 1000 everything changed so totally that it makes no sense to connect the era. And your children will have to read textbooks in school in which the Christian era is denied and omitted. It's all brewing; it's all coming. And it's very hard to fight. They have of course "the facts" on their side. Anybody has the facts on his side, you know. That's called the legal profession.

The progress of Mr. John Dewey, the -- this educational wizard--founder of the University of Chicago in 1895, and the most influential man in education in all of America, of -- of anybody I know--this man is alive in innumerable teachers' colleges, in innumerable superintendent of schools. And he has managed to implant in you the idea that the little fields, like football, can make progress. The general question of a foot- -- or a progress of mankind doesn't touch him; he doesn't know anything about it, and he doesn't pretend to know anything about it. But you can make innumerable progresses, you see: bigger -- bigger and better elephants, bigger and better bridge players, bigger and better cars, and everything bigger and better. "Improvement," you should call these things. They can, of course, be partial. But "progress," I'm afraid, is a sacred word. Because it came when our Lord entered the world to heal fallen man from his constant regressus, from his constant cycles, from his constant superstitions that something had to be done tomorrow, because it was yesterday; that the South -- the South cannot give up segregation, because it was the remnant of their defeat in the Civil War in 1865 and they do not want to be reminded of their defeat in -- 1865. So for more than a hundred years, the South has carried in front of -- themselves segregation as a token that they were not defeated. That's why it is so important for them; it's a victory -- emblem, you see, against all visible signs. They say, "We -- we never lost the Civil War." That's why it cannot be fought in the ordinary way by -- legislation. It's a profound, religious and -- issue that the conquered South to this day holds up this as a shibboleth, you see, as this talis-

man, by their right of -- the right of Mr. Maddox not to serve the Negro in his -- in his -- in his restaurant, he becomes governor of Georgia. That's the only reason why he is governor, because he has hoisted the flag of victory, which otherwise was denied the South.

People in--I don't understand it--in this country, people ask -- argue morally about the South -- Southern question, the Negro question. They love the Negro and --. This is not the issue. The issue is: how do you cure a whole conquered nation from its talisman, from this one token by which it denies that it has been defeated?

You could go to the South five years ago and hear the people say, "After all, we have not lost the Civil War."

Now come back to my world of progress. The emancipation of the black people in this country is not considered then a token of progress. Well, what is progress? I think it's a very legitimate question. It cannot be that a car of hundred horsepowers is progressive, compared to a car of 10. The miracle of a 10-horsepower car is in a way greater than the big car, you see. It's not only more economical, but it's more desirable that everybody can have a small car and -- and not only the big shots have the big car. I don't know how you would decide, but the biggest cars are not the most progressive cars. The same with other things. The most numerous school probably is not the best school, the most progressive school.

Well, what is then the Christian notion of progress? For this I would have to tell you first that the word "progress" occurs first in the year of the Lord 434 of our era. It was spoken by a monk in the south of France, Vincenz of Lerinum, who was a pupil of St. Augustine's, the bishop of Hippo, who had died two years earlier. And it was in the downfall of the Roman Empire a tremendously courageous act to speak of the progress of man in the face of the destruction of all power and all order around the Mediterranean Sea. Progress can be, among defeated nations, inside defeat. That's why it is such an important notion. It has nothing to do with success; it has nothing to do with the bank account; it has not even to do with a good wife. You can be unhappily married, and yet speak of your spiritual progress. Probably Socres- -- Socrates made all his progress, thanks to Xanthippe.

It's a very strange notion. Is this -- is this a dream? Is there such progress?

If you compare the word "progress" with the word of "the fall of man" in the Old Testament, which today is pooh-poohed: "Who speaks of the fall of man? That

has never happened; and that's an illusion, you see. I go to a psychoanalyst, he asks \$10,000 and so no fall." It isn't that simple. We all know that what is demanded from us we can't do completely. There is always something lacking. And the fall of man is an expression used by Vincenz of Lerinum and his followers, this -- this abbot in -- near Marseilles on the Mediterranean, to say that man in the Christian era, following his master's example, and fortified by His example, is able to fall less profoundly, less deep as -- than before. What we call "progress" is the bold belief that there is a God in Heaven who holds His arms open and is willing to help us when we fall less profoundly into the -- into the -- dirt, and the quagmire of our despair, of our cowardice, of our weakness. "To fall less" is the correct translation of the word "progress." Never have the Christians pretended that progress means that you can fly to the moon. Such strange ideas were quite foreign from them. And they did, however, want to remain in the arms of their Father a little closer, a little better than they had before.

And so "progress" means that the fall of man can be mitigated, can be even avoided. The perfect man remains in the order to which we are created. The fallen man knows that he has, in one way or the other, stepped outside the bounds of the divine law. It is very difficult to find any book today, especially these so-called theological books, Sir, the -- who have any idea that progress has to do with the fall of man, and is nothing but a -- the -- the enthusiasm, spread by the coming of Jesus into the world, that man, by taking upon him the gallow beams of the Cross, can thereby avoid his fall. Jesus stumbled when He had to carry the Cross, as you know. He was too weak to carry it in the -- in wood, in nature, in -- physically. He was not too weak to carry His Cross which led Him -- which were the gallows of His undoing.

Ever since man fell, in the garden of Eden, the -- his problem was to hide this fall; to say, "I'm perfect." So they all -- we all geh- -- go in very elegant dress on the Sunday parade and there we seem to be perfect. And all our deficiencies are hidden on weekdays. The church parade is a very dangerous appearance, because you put on an appearance. Jesus didn't. He didn't go to the temple, but He carried His gallow beams visibly. And everybody said, "Look at this sinner. Look at this criminal. Look at this adjudicated {stellerate}. And for this reason, we call Him our Savior. For this only reason, because He fell deliberately where He didn't have to. He fell for us.

The fall of man and the progress of Christ are one and the same thing from two different sides. -- You know, probably--many of you--the books by Dr. {Dodd}, the biblical critic. He said we should not call the Cross "the Cross." We should call it the "gallow beams." The reason perhaps is now obvious. By calling

the Cross the "gallow beams," man says, "I can only be understood with that part of mine by which I am obligated and rooted in the awful errors of my existence, of our society. The -- if I do not carry this -- these gallow -- gallow beams visibly with me, I pretend to be virtuous."

The Cross of Jesus is very much used in songs, but I doubt that it is understood in most cases. People do not understand that what they try to say in these -- in this old verse is that you are never alone; you are never a single person. You are always a part of the whole of humanity, since the days of Adam and Eve. And that this inheritance maroons you, confines you to a very imperfect appearance of your real -- of the -- in real life. Man plus the gallow beams, that's real man.

Now Vincent -- when Vincent of Lerinum, when this dawned on him, and he wrote on progress, he was quite sure that the progress could only have to do with our relation to the divinity. Before, man had regress to cycles. He knew that the sun would rise next morning, and he felt very elated that he could know this. He knew something about the secrets of the universe. And when the moon came, he could predict that in four weeks there would be a new moon, you see. So all the satisfaction of man at first came from his knowledge the external universe. The great step into a different kind of knowledge, into a kind of knowledge of our own life story came when Jesus said, "If we all knew that we are carrying the gallow beams of our collective guilt in every step, in every word, in every appearance which we put into this world, then men would recognize each other as brothers, and then they would be able gradually to diminish this load."

Looking at the gallow beams in somebody else, you know, is much easier than -- look at the gallow beams on your own back. You can't see it. It's like the princess in the fairy tale, you see, who tried to -- to see the prince who was nestling in her own hair.

It is that simple, with the idea of progress. Progress has been created down to the French Revolution as a constant effort to show the gallow beams in back of the real man and woman. That is, to show that he was indebted to the law that prescribed to him certain things that he couldn't alter--like going to war, or like acting as a juror, or like doing any -- any other duty in the -- in our society, which is not angelic, which is very earthly. We all are participating in a common order, and that is -- are our gallow beams. We all carry this cross. And this cross is not tooth-aches, and not being heroic about going to the doctor, as many people today abuse the word "cross." It is their wrong appearance, that we



are -- appear as powerful, as wise, as superior, as good, when we are very wicked indeed. The appearance of goodness is the real -- are the real gallow beams of the Christian in any era. We all want to appear a little better. And I can't -- can't blame us, I mean. It is intolerable to appear as who we are.

There is a church in Philadelphia where the people were -- a year ago were hit quite hard by the fact that they were not perfect. So they asked from their minister to throw himself at every service straight -- prostrate to the floor. They remained seated, and they thought that was the cross-beam, you see, the gallow beams that would cure their ills. A funny idea of a congregation to say that the minister could expiate for them, you see, by falling prostrate. But I know many con- -- congregations which really believe this, you see. The funny thing is -- and the minister himself seems to believe it, too. His wife wouldn't.

This is quite serious, because the word "cross," the word "gallow beams," which I use from -- from Dr. {Dodd's} example--which I think is a good one--is today by the overdose of progresses made in all fields, you see, really useless, nearly useless. I have to -- try to explain it to you again from -- from scratch, as something in- -- unavoidable, something that we cannot skip. People -- look at all these people who teach you who you are, you see. They teach you involvement, devolvment, revolvment. I think it's pretty funny, these -- these specialists in involvement, or these specialists in existentialism, and so on. We know all this long ago, only we don't make use of what we know, that's all. You all know that man falls and that certain people fall less profoundly than others. Everybody does this, knows it, lives it, and the example is there that he who took the gallow beams and carried them in front of mankind and said, "That's me!" is the greatest of us all, because He volunteered to accept the Cross as His definition. And we don't like this at all. And we don't want to be defined by our gallow beams at all. We want to have a title; and we want to have a salary; and we hand to -- want to have security. Progress means to forego these securities, to fall less deeply into the morass of all these nice, worldly securities, including the financial securities on the stock exchange.

When I look back at the 19th century and the 20th as far as I have lived it, it seems a pipe dream to hope that the full meaning of the word "fall of man" and "progress" can be restored among people who have now learned to see progress in every little invention of a new match. That they call "progress." We may -- will have to do it. It may not be the word "progress" which will cure us. But the thing is the same. The greatness of the Revelation of the last 2,000 years cannot be altered. The fact is that man is not lifting himself up on his own -- at his own bootstraps. That fact is that we don't move in circles; at least we don't have to

move in circles. The great fact is that we have to fall less out of the hands of our maker than we think we must.

This discovery, that we are closer to our Father in Heaven than we assume we can be, that is the strange message which seems to be forgotten in every generation. And when I listen to the Christian gospel as it is preached today, I always adm- -- admire the ministers that they omit this. They have a very special technique of omitting this very fact of redemption: that to be redeemed means to fall less out of the Father's hands. After all, He created us. Adam first was with God; Jesus was with God; you were with God, before you entered this valley of tears. So how can otherwise it be that we exist if we weren't perfect first, and then imperfect later? This is the meaning of progress in the Christian era, the meaning that progress is the reconstitution of our original, virginal state.

[applause]

We can stay here.

[Unidentified speaker]: (Prof. Rosenstock-Huessy would entertain a few questions if you have them at this point.)

(Over here.)

(Would you trace the beginning use of the word to a -- contemporary or a student of St. Augustine. {Furey}, in his history of the idea of progress, finds quite different roots for it. Almost a progressive development, running through {Beaudin}, and Condorcet, and Bacon, and many others. I wondered why we must of necessity take this initial use of the term as the -- the meaning that has had most significance for western civilization?

Well, I am delighted that you bring this up. You see, if one speaks without a manuscript, one is apt to forget one's best points. The -- the word "progress" in a singular has dominated western thought, and that means the thought really of all energetic thinkers in 1500 years, from 400 to 1792. It is true that in 1792, Monsieur Condorcet, as a good Frenchman and a good member of the Revolutionary Party in France, wrote a book, Les Progress -- Progrès de l'Humanité. And thereby shifted the truth of the matter from the singular of "progress" of man to "progresses" in civilization, as you also would do. So after this it -- came the progress in -- in automation, and the progress in dautomation, and cautomation, and mautomation. And we are full of progresses, you see. And that is just the calamity.

So the great in- -- catastrophe of the human mind occurred by this translating a singular, The -- *Le Progrès de l'Esprit Humaine*, you see, with the belief in the Holy Spirit, in one power permeating all mankind into this book of Condorcet, which I own, my dear--I'm sorry I do, but I did pay for it when I was a student--and I learned the idiocy of people who wanted to replace the Holy Spirit by the arts and sciences, and by technology. And that's what Condorcet does in this book. He says there are innumerable progresses -- possible, you see. Here and there a new button, and a new pattern for -- for solving all ills of a woman's dress, et cetera. That's all for progress. But it is not a very exalted progress. It is the application of the term "progress" to a multifarious civilization, you see. That's why I feel -- you see, that's why it happened to me, that I didn't mention it. But if you read my book, *The Christian Future*, Monsieur Condorcet is -- is well taken care of.

(Um, Dr. Rosenstock-Huussy, you said -- you were talking earlier today about -- you said that mankind knows what -- that incest is self-destruction. But you said there was a growing obsession of the present society with incest. Would you think that is a death-wish for our society?)

Now it's hard on these people who were not present this morning, that I should answer a question which makes no sense to them at all. You think I should answer it, just the same? Wie? Well, I think it's very impolite to the other people.

The question that -- our friend here brings up was asked in some other context. I said, strangely enough, from the abyss of fallen man, from the abyss of prehistory, rises today a phenomenon which people in my youth had thought would never even be mentioned. That's incest, the love between brother and sister. There are many novels which treat this, and plays. And people today, since they want to understand everything, they even want to understand this phenomenon. Now I have never felt that it is a serious phenomenon, but I -- beca- -- for the simple reason that mankind in two generations would destroy itself by incest. The result of incest is such a dwarfed race that it wouldn't survive. It would just go out of business -- physically. If brother and sister mate, the result is that they -- they are 30 inches shorter, the children, you see. And in the -- in the -- fight for survival, mankind has of course understood this. You go to the Eskimos, or you go to the islands in the Pacific and you find that the incest rules are strictly observed, because they are the salvation of the group. Without the incest, you see, taboos, the group would just be wiped out. So we don't have to moralize, you see, because we just -- the facts of life forbid it.

On the other hand, of course, you may use this example of why incest is out, and cannot return, despite Mr. Proust, and despite Mr. Mann, and despite all these gentlemen, who are no gentlemen.

In a positive sense, of course, the taboo of incest teaches us what marriage is, that mankind was created as one man, and that marriage has to restore this unity of the human race, in the most practical way by forbidding the old -- these simple strands to stay put, to stay separate. And the next thousand years will of course see this problem in aggrandized million- -- -wise, because all these groups on the univer- -- on the globe will demand some way of coping with intermarriage. And obviously the solution is not that everybody intermarries everybody else, but that intermarriage is left open, and that in any decisive moment, the -- Queen of {Saba} who was a Negress, can marry Queen Solo- -- King Solomon. In the Old Testament, this example is very eloquent.

I have a friend. His father is a senator of the United States Senate. And he married -- he's a doctor and he married a Negro nurse. And for a senator of the United States, that's -- was quite an imposition. It went very well. The parents are fine people, and the couple are vell -- well-matched. But it is something still extraordinary. And it has to be extraordinary. Nobody -- can say that it is something simple, and -- without any -- any discussion, or without any difficulty. It has difficulty. And so it is with all intermarriages.

I hope you all have experiences -- in this matter, because the only way in which man can remain -- an understander of politics is through his marriage and engagement experiences. This is never mentioned. When I read these American textbooks on politi- -- on political science, I yawn, and I throw them into the wastepaper basket, because they never, never know that the -- greatest politics that has to be learned is marriage. How to cope with your in-laws -- heavens! When -- if this isn't politics, what's politics? And why don't people -- include this in their doctrine, in their indoctrination? But it is -- a man becomes a man -- if he learns to cope with the relatives of his wife. And a woman even more so, you see. Her husband's mother -- that's some obstacle for bliss.

This is serious. Why -- it is nothing to laugh. Our situation in this lit- -- puny world -- world of three, four, five, six people is just as complicated as our relations to Vietnam, and Mr. Mao, and China. I feel they are more complicated, because I have to cope with this problem daily. And with Mao, I only wait till my -- the ambassador from America sends a new dispatch. So there is always a little rest, you see, for a week or so.

We have no sense for the important. The importance of mating is greater than all frontiers of countries and territories, and all export licenses and all import licenses, taken together.

(I'll accept one more, and then Prof. Rosenstock-Huessy has had a long day, { }.)

(I wondered: if progress is really a small departure from our creator, and the lack of progress is a great departure, is it logical, or is it necessary that a longer life is more likely to be destructive to our future, because we've got more time to get further away from our creator? In other words, what I'm asking, really, is the old story about whether or not the infants who die very, very young might be the most blessed?)

Fortunately, you can answer this question yourself much better than I. I won't.

(I have an answer. I didn't know how you --.)

Exactly. Well, you have. So I'm quite sure you have. Everybody knows these things, you see. Not to speak of, but the people who are silent know much more about it, because they probably had to suffer. And suffer -- suffering is the only source of wisdom, and not my brain here. So if I would answer this on the spur of the moment, it would be an intellectual answer. It would be worth nothing, you see. But if I had a child in this category, you see, I would probably know something, of some wisdom. So forgive me for not answering. It is a serious question, and I will not answer it on the spur of the moment, just from here. I don't believe that is the source of insight, the so- -- brain, you see. It's nothing but a -- an attic, where the old luggage is put. That's what the brain is.

(Thank you very much, Prof. Rosenstock-Huessy. Let me remind you of the two sessions tomorrow, and we're adjourned this evening.)

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

[Unidentified speaker]: (... S. Eliot, our age is an age of moderate virtue and of moderate vice, when men will not lay down the cross, because they will never assume it. Those of us who know anything about Dr. Rosenstock-Huessy know that his followers, his intellectual disciples, have been willing to become passionately involved in the struggles of their times. Many of his students were involved in the fight against Nazism in Germany, and many of them gave their life, because through him they had seen a vision of how the Church and the university should be prophetic and not merely married to their culture.

(The first time I heard about Dr. Rosenstock-Huessy was when I was a student at Union Theological Seminary in New York. And one of my professors asked if we had ever read his book, Out of Revolution. And he said that we could not consider ourselves educated men until we had done this.

(We are privileged to have Dr. Rosenstock-Huessy giving the 9th Annual Tippet Lectures of which this is the third.)

\* \* \*

Ladies and gentlemen, when the Lord hung on His cross, He still had the power to whisper, "It is finished." T- -- {tellustae} consummatum est." What was finished? There was no Resurrection at that moment. Pentecost hadn't occurred. And yet He said, "It is finished." If we try to understand what was finished, we may understand that since He hung on the gallows beams in Palestine, you and I are enabled to be -- or to live our true nature. And this true nature comprises in us the child; the man; and the ancestor, the parent. Most of us today have unlearned to live all three generations. Most of us are either hippies or politicians. That's no good, either way. Man is condemned and privileged to live in every moment all three generations. If he doesn't, he'd better surround himself--the older with children, the younger with teachers--in order to represent the whole of mankind. Man perishes as long, or as soon as he believes that he is of the moment.

In these three words, "love," "hope," and "faith"--which I put as a title to this lecture--are no other expressions than the coverleaf -- the clo- -- for these three generations in every man's life. It is lost on us today, because in a strange manner--and that's what's provoked me to speak on this topic today here--in a

strange manner in America, faith is obliterated by hope.

When I came to this country, a very great American, Dr. Richard Cabot--he was a professor at Harvard for Christian ethics, and for cardiology, for the heart diseases; so he knew something about the human heart, physically and spiritually--and he said to me, "Eugen, now you will -- become an American; you must learn that this country is visited by an exaggerated belief in hope. Hope is the religion of America."

In -- some years later, the older ones of you will remember it, the Council of Churches gathered--I think it was in Chicago or in Toronto; this I do not know anymore--on -- under the topic that Jesus was our only hope: -- Jesus {spes unica}. That's a medieval term. You will find that in {spes unica}--in the hope--then, faith seems to be omitted, or unnecessary. Against this, I wish to state today very bluntly and very energetically that in the four Gospels, the term "hope" does not occur. The four Gospels which describe the message, the meaning, the heritage which we owe Jesus of Nazareth, could be conveyed then to posterity without the use of the word "hope." Therefore, I think it is necessary--that's my task this morning--to convey to you the importance first to know what faith is, before you dabble in hope. Children can be hopeful. A grownup who takes up his cross must have faith, and cannot be hopeful. Jesus' situation was totally hopeless, and He knew it; and that's why we worship Him. He's the only man who lived without any hope, only on faith. "What is faith?" and "What is hope?" we'd therefore better ask. On love, everybody seems to be very well an expert. I doubt it, but I am glad you think so. It makes things a little easier for me. If I could succeed in implanting in you the notion that faith is as much needed as hope and love, we might begin again to Christianize America.

The man of hope knows what it -- is worth hoping for. You cannot hope without believing in bigger and better elephants. So you know the elephant. And you hope that one day, you see, you will have bigger elephants. Or with your store, you sell so many things a year, so you hope next year the balance sheet will -- will offer you larger figures on the black side. Hope knows what it is talking about, and projects it into the future. And therefore hope is a secular, Greek virtue. The Greeks were full of hope.

As you know, the Gospel is a blend between Hebrew and Greek faith and tradition. Now you could not learn faith from the Greeks, but you could -- can

learn from the Greeks, hope. This is a hopeful country. It is a Greek country. You are in an academic institution, therefore it is easy to teach you, if you base everything on hope. And the teachers do, of course, and they hope against better insights that you will be good students.

What is faith? Why is it not possible to speak of faith in the four Gospels?

Because Jesus has planted faith into our hearts beyond anything that seemed possible and feasible at that time. He is the carrier of a new faith, a faith out of despair, a faith where there was nothing to hope. What does "despair" mean? Despair means there is nothing to be hoped for. You have here a rather silly phrase, very popular now. You say that people want something "desperately." Don't use the word "desperately." It's for 17-year-old girls. And you are all already, as I understand, 18. So don't hope desperately for something. And don't believe desperately in somebody. The word "desperately" I think could very well leave our vocabulary. It is one of the -- I think it has to do with the dismissal of the word "faith," that we all speak of "desperately," you see. "I need desperately seeing you." You don't need desperately seeing me at all.

This exaggeration of the words connected with "hope" is obviously no accident. You all talk in your letters of desperately wanting to see me, you, anybody, because you have no faith. Pardon me for being so blunt. But it is a -- very terrible situation that these three great cardinal virtues are out of kilter, out of harmony today.

Faith is that amount of expectation, of coming to know things we have not known, of being led ways we have never been -- trodden, of expecting the article of our faith fulfilled, that God is still creating the world. By faith, we submit to the fact that we have very little knowledge of how and when God is creating, and that we are open to being told, to being informed, to being led into His real world. Don't think that you and I know what the world is like -- God has created. You know a little ounce of this. The full pound hasn't been yet come -- given you.

So faith is our connection with the creative process of the future. And therefore, a man of faith is so remarkable when he is old. The old -- older statesmen in this country, they are the only people I can see who have faith. And this country, time and again, has been saved by these older statesmen. Being already beyond 70, being of course pensioned off at 65, as you now do, they were available in an emergency, unshaken by the outer events of which the hopefuls live. Faith is the greatest gift of the hoary head, of the senators, of the old women in any nation. It is unexpected, I'm sure, that I say that faith is their quality. Well,



it's the most difficult quality for old people. Most old people grow suspicious. Most old people have no faith. They say, you see, "I'm from Missouri. I have to be shown." If you should be from Missouri, emigrate. It is not enough to be shown. The future is embedded in our hearts by faith. And therefore, we -- participate in the creation of God's world tomorrow. Hope connects us with all the good things we have experienced, or we have heard of, or we have seen, and says -- it says, "They may endure." "They may return." "They may recur." And we will cultivate them. We love them. Ice cream, for example. "Give me more ice cream." Hope always wants additional things.

Only to mention in -- in passing how important this is. In Germany, where the Nazis, as you know, worked havoc among all religious traditions, there was a man my age. He was a professor. And he was a socialist, a Marxist, and he went to Russia and thought he could live there. And he became famous by a book called, *The Principle of Hope*. And he, quite radically, insisted that we didn't need the Trinity; that it was enough to hope. He omitted faith. This man's name is Bloch, and he's quite famous in Germany. He fled Russia, disappointed. It was just not quite that much hope as he had hoped. And -- he lives now in Tübingen, and has a great, great crowd of listeners. He's very influential. And as you see from the title, *The Principle Hope -- of Hope*, he tries to be a monist, a unitarian. But not like the Unitarians of 150 years ago, who only said the Father was the -- only god to be worshiped, and we didn't need the Son and the Holy Spirit -- the modern principle is: among the three cardinal virtues, we only need hope; the two others are superfluous, or at least they are purely additional spices. It's quite nice, and quite peppery to be in love, but it isn't necessary.

Because of this fact that today hope is bandied around by all the socialists, all the Marxians, all the Communists--and of course in this country, by all the people who want to sell cars--it is quite difficult to explain to you that hope and faith are located in different parts of our abdomen. Faith is stretching out to generations to come. Hope gathers into the -- into your -- into your farmhouse all the treasures of old, all the provisions you can appreciate. And now you can say, "Oh, if only I had this, too: a golden chain, and a silken dress, and glory, and power, and obedience, and loyalty," and so on. You can list all the good things of life which man has experienced, or have mentioned in poetry, in Shakespeare, or in the Hymnal, and then list them all and say, "I hope for them." It's a very impotent and very popular gesture. And I think the impotence of modern man has to do with his exaggerated faith in hope. The faith is misplaced, because faith has to do with the things unseen, unknown to us, undesired, dreaded. Do you

think the Lord hoped to go to the Cross? He geh- -- went, and that is His achievement, that He overcame the nostalgia for hopeful things. He was not a Mr. Hopeful.

I'm quite serious that I -- I get quite angry when I see that this fact that the four Gospels could do without the word "hope" is nowhere mentioned in any modern theological book. How can we then be Christians? It's impossible. But once we open the real book of faith, love, and hope, we understand that Christianity is not invention -- an invention on Galilee in a corner. It isn't obsolete. It is nothing that is something special. Christianity is not the Judeo-Christian traditions. It's the only truth. When I read this word "Judeo-Christian traditions," I always get angry, because it minimizes the fact that Lord of creation has been in- -- has incarnated. And how did He? By distributing the times of man as they must distribute -- be distributed into the three ages: the future, the present, and the beginnings. Hope holds onto all the beginnings, to the first sunrise, and the first rainbow, and we won't forget it, how beautiful they all are. That's hope. Hope for the return of the good things.

If you -- it is not done in this country at this moment. We are heretics, because we think that we can hope for things we don't know. That's to me a contradiction in terms. It's idiotic. How can I hope for something I don't know? The future cannot be hoped for. It -- in -- of the future you can hope the repetition of all the silver, and the gold, and the good food, and the good friends, and your parents, and your sisters, and your brothers, and your sweethearts whom you already have known. "Let them return," you say. That's your hope. If you do not know what's going to happen, it is a self-betrayal if you say you hope for them. You can believe in them. You may have faith that God's finger will point out to you the next corner where you have to turn and go an unknown path in the night, perhaps to Calvary, perhaps to suffering.

But the wisdom of love, hope, and faith is in this: that the man and the woman who have the three rise to their true stature. The true stature of man -- is that he belongs to three generations, that he belongs to the oldest past, to the latest future, and to the full present of all men alive at this moment. He grows into a giant who covers the whole of this little man-pool in a way quite unexpected to the man who talks of hope only. The hopeful thinks of his own interest. Well, that's not interesting, not even to himself, tomorrow. I mean, if you grow up, you will be surprised how indifferent you become to your own hopes of 10 years ago. You may smile at them and say, "I was silly and I hoped for cigarettes."

This isn't good enough for you and me, to be an -- a butterfly of one day duration. This you would if you followed hope in separation, and faith--try to do without faith. Faith, hope, and love, however, connect you, connect you with the day of creation and the Judgment Day, because faith brings in all that has still to be created; and hope holds on to anything you have already appreciated, and you would like to see repeated and renewed. The balance between the three -- the two is charity, is love. And this love enables the person inside yourself to do justice to your own past, as well as to the future. The greatest wisdom is the love that the bride has when she asks her parents to agree to her marrying this scoundrel.

I always feel that the world is created not when a boy runs away -- elopes with his girl, but when the girl prevails on this man to go to his -- her parents, and ask for his -- her hand. At this moment, there is this great reconciliation between the generations. It has to happen. If you elope, you have to come back later. The -- the -- the great act of victory over yourself is not the act of falling in love. That's very easy. And certainly not in eloping. That's easy, too. You see, there are so many motels. The real scene of humanity only opens when the parents are made to agree to the choice of this wild boar.

The reconciliation of the beginning of creation and its end, in this middle part of our existence on earth, is the eternal problem -- or the eternal task, I should say--I try to avoid the word "problem," because it reminds me always too much of physics or mathematics, and I'm against it. You and I are -- if you are problem children, that's too bad. I'm not a problem child. I'm not even a pra- -- problem grandfather. Human beings have no problems, and are no problems, but they are creatures, unfinished creatures. And that's much nicer than to be a problem, I assure you. Because this unfinished creature is now responsible for the harmony of these three great branches of the outstretched cross over our heads, of the divine. This cross is stretched out backward by our hopes, by which we retain the memory of things past. It is stretched forward by our faith. It allows the Creator to enter quite a new page in His book of His creation. And the love holds the two together, as in the case where the parents are asked to agree to the innovation that this girl now has a right to call this wicked man her husband. It's very hard on a mother to do this, to agree to this.

So this is why I took the liberty of asking you to understand that we all outgrow our childish, ephemeral, butterfly state if we dedicate our lives to this balance between faith, love, and hope. As soon as we enter into this secret, that the creative process surrounds us as much from behind as from the future, we understand that faith, love, and hope are one trinitarian stream. We believe in

the tri- -- triune God for this very reason. In every one moment, a new passion befalls the heart. And that's the son or the daughter in us, as children of God. In every moment, God must be -- free to change things we have not known, we don't know, we don't expect. And in every moment, the spirit tells -- is in harmony and in peace with the congregation that has already lived these truths. So faith, love, and hope, it seems to me, express the great miracle that you and I are not as small, as passing, as a 24-hour insect. This is very popular today to treat man as so ephemeral that he's worth nothing. I think we are pretty big. We are giants. We cover the whole story from Adam and Eve to Judgment Day. That's why the Bible can contain the revelation of St. John and the Book of Genesis. What else would this mean? You all participate in the tol- -- whole story. But the condition is that we wisely distribute faith, love, and hope. Faith, into the -- in the future; hope, gratitude for the past; and love, reconciliation of all things living.

Thank you.

[Hymn is sung.]

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

[Unidentified speaker]: (In his initial lecture on the chaos of pagan history, Prof. Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy argued that the historical present cannot be grasped in terms of the past alone, but -- lives out of the future, which beckons towards us. But at that time, I -- he hadn't told us the difference between faith and hope. And I don't believe I was the only one who went -- away with the feeling that what he's talking about is the way in which history involved our anticipations and aspirations toward the future.

(As we saw in this morning's chapel talk, the dimension of the future which beckons to us can be grasped only in faith, in which we lay ourselves open to the possibilities of being transformed by -- in terms of our own expectations and hopes. Likewise in his second lecture, he spoke to us concerning the -- great contrast between progress and the regressus. But it didn't come clear--to me, at least--that the progress we generally think of is really a form of regression, because it is a way of building up our hopes and aspirations, which after all are simply a reflection of what has gone before, which we hope will be bigger and better.

(In his talk this morning, Prof. Rosenstock-Huessy argued the character of faith over -- against hope, faith being that which transforms and shatters our hopes. And so in his talk tonight, I hope we might approach it in the spirit of faith. That is, open to the possibility that what he has to say for us tonight will deepen, enrich, and transform the understanding we have had of what he has been saying in the last three lectures.

(Tonight I give you Prof. Rosenstock-Huessy for his fourth and final Tippet Lecture, "From Halloween to Labor Day.")

\* \* \*

So { } {spiranza}. You see, my introducer has very kindly said that I have warned you against your hopes. It's a hopeless situation.

But I tried in these lectures--which have gone before--to furnish you with the instruments for coping with the step which we all are required to take into an era which will be very different from the last thousand years. I have called the lecture, "Between Halloween and Labor Day," because Halloween was introduced in 864 by the whole Church, at that time still undivided Russian, Eastern,

Greek, and Roman. And it was the day for All Saints, as it is still celebrated in remnants by your children every 1st of November.

At the end of this era, in 1889, and the next decades, there was a big movement on foot to celebrate Labor Day. The Russians celebrate Labor Day on the day first proposed by the Americans in Paris in 1889. Then the Americans were defeated with their plan, and so we celebrate Labor Day on the first Monday after September 1st. But you must know that this is a second choice. The American labor movement is the originator of the idea of the May celebration, on May 1st, as it is now celebrated in Moscow, and in all socialist countries. It's important that you do not allow the divisions of this so-called western world--which it is a very small world indeed--to be too important between you and them. America and Russia are twins. They are not divided by Marxism, because Russia is not a Marxian country anymore. If there is a Marxian country, it's America.

Pardon me for saying this, but I want to warn you against your slogans, and I want to emphasize that we live in one continuum of the last thousand years, which is defined by the day of All Saints--at which the march of the saints, into the world as the Church, came to an end because the day of All Saints ends the necessity of celebrating every saint on a special day--and Labor Day, in which our vile bodies, our sweat, our toil are celebrated. On Labor Day, we are not celebrated because we are saints, but because we are animals. We are donkeys. We suffer under the load of work, which we have to perform. We sweat. There is a great tension in these, between All Saints--Halloween--and Labor Day. If we got -- would get stuck in these thousand years--or -- nearly -- ja, a thousand years would be right, I think; 864 to 1889--we would not live up to the demands of our own time. And most people decline to live in their own time. Most people live in their grandparents' time.

So my attempt tonight must be to show you that the Cross is a very practical thing to escape from the last thousand years, not because they were not good thousand years, but because they have come to an end. Why have they come -- to come -- have come to an end? Why is it not enough to celebrate--as the Catholics do, or the Greek Orthodox--All Saints on the one-hand side, and then plunge for Labor Day?

There is a day in between, called All Souls, which was introduced in 996 of our era by a very wise man who said, "We must comfort the people. They have pagan ancestors. They think their ancestors may be in Hell. So we will celebrate

a day for All Souls, and not a day for All Saints, only." So on the 2nd of November, there is a day by which the old nations of the western world -- all the Christian nations who had accepted Christianity, got the comfort that their ancestors--Christian or no Christian, you see--were also well taken care of, that the world had been created by God before the Lord came, and redeemed the world; and that therefore on All Souls, there was universal peace.

So if you would add a word to my theme, "Between Halloween and Labor Day," you may add "The Time of All Souls." Because for a thousand years this interested the nations of Europe--and of America, by the way--the day of All Souls.

Today I think that the days are very blurred. I wo- -- do not wish to examine you, what you know still. But I think it's very mediocre. People today are very doubtful whether men have souls. The psychologists say, "No." William James used to say that he could be a good psychologist without the notion of a soul. I admire the man, but I pity him. I can't. I'm very old-fashioned. And I think that if we want to celebrate the third millennium--with its Labor Day, with its unity of all toiling, sweating, and -- in- -- unfinished humanity--we will not be able to forget that our soul has certain ambitions and demands beyond our labor. I'm going to -- at this by stating dogmatically first--you see, I love dogma, and I always admire the people who think this is a -- is a vituperation, this is a criticism, if you say, "He's" -- "I'm dogmatic." I don't see how any reasonable man can be anything but dogmatic, because "dogmatic" means that I think it is true. And I can only honor you by telling the things I hold to be very true, dogmatically true. And all other things -- all other statements I suppress, because I think it was -- would be an impertinence if I would talk to you undogmatically.

This I have to say, because the fashion today is to -- to boast that you are undogmatic. I don't understand what that means.

The soul of man--I tried to tell you this, this morning--stretches out between the past and the future in the present. In every one of us, there is this gallow beam represented by which we are fixed to the day of our birth, to the environment of our government, and to the aspirations of our future. And that is a crucial situation. And therefore all souls are nailed to a cross.

Winston Churchill's -- has in his memoirs a very nice sentence, where he said, "Every man is nailed either to a cross of action or to a cross of thought."

What I have in mind tonight, however, is the admission that it is impossible for the individual to -- carry -- bear his cross alone. Mankind it -- himself--themselves, I should say--is the bearer of the cross, the Christophorus. Our Lord bear -- bore the Cross. It is not -- not possible that every one of us just bears his cross in privacy. What we call "the Church" will be in the future the union of the people who get together to bear the cross of this century, or of this age, or of the human race. By which I mean quite concretely something which I hope now to be able to explain.

You see, history in our textbooks is American history, history of California, history of Stockton, history of the University of Pacific -- of the Pacific, your own life story. Perhaps the story of your family. This to me is not history. That -- are stories, because they have no end, and no aim. They begin somewhere, and they end somewhere. And therefore they have no arrondissement. They have no rotundity. They have no style. They are little spots on the easel of the painter. History is only there where we -- the Creed in one God unites all these many facts. Here are over a hundred people. If we should have a common history, it is not by your or my intent. But it is given above us, you see. And we may believe this. And we may help it -- to do it. But neither you nor I know this story or make this story intentionally. And we believe it. We have faith in it. And I think there is such a history. Perhaps there is even a history of this college. And the history of -- of this college may be determined by this evening. But it is not your or my doing, but it's only our faithful service in this moment by which we may take part in this process.

So let me lay down most dogmatically that history presupposes the brotherhood of all men; and the Creed in one God, maker of Heaven and earth; and the Maker of all future and past history. That's quite important, I think.

And therefore, all history presupposes something rather queer. That all the history, that to us is past, at one time was future history by other people -- by our brothers. There is no history unless you admit that this, what you call now "past," was at one time future for people who had the same human heart, the same humanity in themselves as you pretend to have today. Therefore history is lived in this brotherhood of man by a -- partially by people to whom the history is still ahead of time, and by others who harvest it and look backward.

This is very comforting, I think. Any family lives by this hope, that the -- the parents give life to the children, and the children know that they were expected and wanted. And later they look back to their parents and admit that they knew better. The children today, you see, prevent themselves from having child-



ren too often.

History has a totally different aspect as soon as you be kind enough to admit that we only can call history something that at one time was future for real human beings--trembling, expecting, hopeful human beings. Our history books deny this. They are pagan history books, because they omit the expectations of the people before it was done. Too often, not all. There are good history books I would divide the history books according to this amount of respect that the historian pays to the people who did it, who dreaded it, who expected it. So I think we have taken one step forward. And this is why my previous lectures were out to prepare this, that history is a unity from beginning to end. It is -- begins only there where it is expected, dreaded, hoped for, started; it ends only where this unity is accepted, and sanctified, and ratified by the heirs, by the grandchildren. All other history is good for the zoo. You can of course write the history of the lion. And you can also write the history of the elephant. You can write the history of the Stone Age Indians. And all this is not history. It doesn't deserve this honorable title of "history," because the human heart is involved in real history. And it's one heart which has -- we ha- -- has been -- has been put in every one of us, one and the same heart. As to the heart, we are equal. Otherwise we are not, as you know.

We have a -- strange democracy in which the assumption is that everything is equal. We overlook the skin, we overlook the religion, we -- "regardless of race -- color, creed," et cetera, you see. But the only thing we have in common is -- is the human heart. And if we would admit this, we would be related to the people thousands of years ago, and thousands of years in -- in the future. It's the only unity we have, the heart, you see, because we may assume that the -- the heart of tomorrow and the heart of yesterday { } is of the same caliber.

If the people who looked forward and the people who look backward form a unity, it is well to ask which shape this unity could have. We formerly, very courageously, down to the Reformation, spoke of the Church, the visible Church as containing future and past saints. Faithful, fideles, as the Latin word was.

All this is today -- has been interrupted in the last 200 years. And I don't think that we may be able to unite mankind in the -- in a visible Church. It doesn't look like it. That's why I've made an attempt in these lectures to show you that man is in a crucial situation, that the Cross of Jesus is not a sentimental something--taught now for the last 200 years, because people didn't want to shed

tears over Him--but that the cross of mankind is a real situation for every one of us, and for the whole of mankind. If you under- -- allow me to investigate the beams of the Cross, the crucial situation in which we all are suspended, then perhaps you will understand why perhaps after an eclipse of 200 or 300 years, the Cross of Christ is a way of explaining what we have to expect, what we have to do, and how we can live.

The Cross, as you see, is denied by the historians. They only have straight lines, or spirals, or cycles, or curves. And I have spent much time to prepare you to reject these notions of Mr. Spengler, or Mr. Toynbee, or Mr. Moynbee. All these wonderful circle -- vicious circles. Twenty-three civilizations, and 72. This is utter nonsense. And I'm ashamed of the academic world who takes this nonsense seriously. It is just nonsense. Nobody has ever seen a spiral working in human society. Yet they say that history moves in cy- -- in spirals. I have still to find a man who -- who can find one word of sense in this idea. And yet the books are -- go through many editions, and our schoolchildren learn such nonsense.

Certainly history is not a straight line. I mean, in 1864, the South was vanquished, and it says it hasn't lost the Civil War today. So what happened in these hundred years is a very interesting question. Something was stopped. It did not run off, run on. No evolution took place, you see. It was blocked. That's a very interesting phenomenon. How can we explain this? Time is of -- goes -- time runs, isn't it? -- at great speed. Better and bigger cars, better and bigger airport -- -planes. But the South is the same as in 1864.

So human beings obviously do not enter the physics -- realm of stop-watches. You cannot count human history by years, by decades, by seconds, or minutes. That's all wrong. That's a convey- -- that's very good for -- for the steam, and -- and coal, and all metals, and all things of this earth. For the human heart, it isn't true. If you know the wickedness of the human heart, or the stubbornness of a human heart, and the obstinacy, you see -- there are girls who -- consider themselves engaged for 20 years. The man comes never back, but they still think you -- they are engaged to marry.

How can you prove it, that they are not engaged to marry? They will not believe you if you tell them that they should look for another husband.

Our clockwork has nothing to do with physics. You can find people on this earth who still believe as in the days of the Exodus. The -- all orthodox Israels do this.

I had a friend in Israel, a young woman, who always said to me -- if I teased her, she said, "We have been present at the Sinai, we ourselves." Quite courageous. But you can't defy it, and you can't deny it. There is a great power in this. "We have been present at the Sinai ourselves." The -- medieval Christian would have been told you the same. He would have said, "We are present at Easter on Golgotha." And there is some truth in it. You can't deny that this word can be said with good sense.

But this means that the astronomical chronology of so-called history is -- has very little to do with the history of the human heart, and our history. And this country in America cannot cure -- heal his wounds, as long as you believe that automatically, because the Civil War is now 102 years old, it must be over. Obviously it isn't. How do you explain this? Time is not of the essence, if you treat it as physicists' time, as natural time, as cosmic time. It's something very different.

For many, many years I have been puzzled and suffered under this. It began in the First World War, that I recognized -- I had been an historian by profession. And when you are in the war, it doesn't help you -- you are a professional historian, because you are in history itself. And you learn a little more than in history courses. Even in advanced history cur- -- courses.

What does one learn in a war? That the dead, who are sacrificed, the heroes of the battlefield, go with us, and must not be forgotten. That although seemingly they have died--you remember the -- my story of Judah, and the four directors of the railroad. Mr. Judah is alive, and these four millionaires are dead. At least that's what should be. If it isn't, we are wrong. Then we have made a mistake. Probably we may have made the mistake. But I assure you that Mr. Judah built this Central -- Railroad Pacific, and not the four people who built the mansions on Nob Hill.

So where is the man? Where is he? All the people who died for a cause, these victims, which the Veterans of -- of Foreign Wars, for example, will celebrate in their -- in their celebration with some sympathetic memory -- all the dead are in this sense as present as you and I here. If you really understand history, you know that the shape of their courage, the shape of their actions cannot be missed the -- as the mortar which keeps up the building in which we here celebrate, and sit. They are the mortar at this moment, thanks to whom we exist. And because this is so, it is not true simply to say, "They are dead." If you say this, you are one of the modern barbarians who say there are 10 hundred different civilizations. I'm satisfied with my own civilization for whose upkeep

I'm responsible. And my responsibility is to keep the memory of these dead very much alive, and to say by -- at every opportunity to the unknow- -- ignorant children that they are the makers of our good fortune, and not you and I. This is the whole story of Christianity: an attempt to make the man at Easter, who disappeared in a perfectly shameful and abominable situation, to make Him more important than the disciples. Those of you who were -- who was present at the first lecture? Well, it is a majority, so you will allow me, the others, to point out that I spoke there of these four first directors of the Central Railroad, and the man who had suggested it to them, insinuated with them, put down the tra- -- trac- -- first track, and threw the thir- -- first shovel of earth down for the rail. This man in our secular society is dismissed. Too bad. The four directors are hoisted up as big men. Christianity has made a very successful -- effort to turn around and say, "The real story is that Jesus enabled the four evangelists to write the four evan- -- Gospels. And although they lived and He died, it is more important to remember Him than the four evangelists." So we know that -- Him, from Matthew, and from John, and from Mark, and from Luke, we know very little, and we are not even very interested in the four Gospel writers. They just did what is expected from all of us. We -- they kept alive the memory of the sacrifice by which our world has been made possible.

If this should be so, then we are quite superior to the natural course of events. The fact that Mr. Stan- -- Leland Stanford only died in 1900, and the fact that Mr. Theodore Judah, the engineer of the Central Railroad, died in 1863 is not important. Mr. Theodore Judah is important, because he died so early from the cause on -- of yellow fever, and Mr. Leland Stanford is not important. Anybody who can read history in this way saves it from oblivion not only, but he saves it from decay. The more you and I are willing to celebrate the sacrifices, the more the successful gentlemen can be tolerated.

In 1919, President Eliot of the -- Harvard University was 90 years of age. He was retired. He was still the great citizen of the Bostonian area. And Boston, you know, is as famous a town as San Francisco. And the Chamber of Commerce and the unions in Boston decided that they would celebrate the contributions of capital and labor to the winning of the First World War. It was 1919. So they got their men together; and in the largest hall of Boston, they investigated this great question: who had done more, capital or labor, for winning World War I? At the end of the evening, 10 o'clock, the chairman said, "Gentlemen, we have here the honor of having Preside- -- the president of Harvard University,

President Eliot. He has taken the trouble, despite his old age, to come here. And so I think we should ask him what he has to say about the contributions of labor and capital for the winning of World War I."

And Mr. Eliot did something very simple. He erected himself. The old man, he had a massive scar from a -- a burn in his face--grew by this effort, and said, "I don't care for the contributions made by capital. I don't care for the contribution made by labor. But I do care for the losses incurred by the brides and mothers of the people who were killed in this war." And sat down. And nobody had anything more to say.

So it's an old story. I have not invented this idea, you see, that you and I, we are responsible for keeping the victims alive, and not the people who -- the benefit- -- the profiteers. That's quite serious, because all our history at this moment is strangled, because this is not done. What you call "success" is not success in the kingdom of Heaven.

If you -- however undertake this, you suddenly are stymied by the gigantic magnitude of this task, because it means that the lines of history are not just going forward from 1864 to 1967, for example; but that the line of your heart must stretch backward to 1864 to find these victims, and give life to them. And this perhaps enables you to understand that the only form of this unnatural character, which lifts history over -- above physics, and above nat- -- the natural sciences so high, is the crucial form. Only in the Cross has man found a -- a form in which the directions -- changes, in which one thing is true, although the opposite is true, too.

I've written a whole book on this question, that we are forced to respond to tasks in life--you and I--every day, although we have prejudices against them, although we didn't expect it. Wherever you find the -- syllable, "although" --. It would have been much simpler for Mr. Eliot not to speak at 90, you know, at this meeting and make new enemies--he had enough before. But he couldn't. He couldn't remain silent. And he had to say, "Although you celebrate labor and capital, be ashamed of yourself." This "although" is always a crucial act, which people just hate. And if you read the psychology of the modern heroes of -- of success, they will never allow you any measure that contains the syllable, "although."

Thirty years ago, I wrote a whole book on this topic, and said, "For the last hundreds of years, you have learned this sentence, 'I think, therefore I am,' 'Cogito, ergo sum,' you see. I advise you, if you want to live in society a good life,

you must turn around and say something quite different: 'I respond, although this will bring about a change of me. I will change, but I have to respond to the stimulus that forces me to acknowledge something I hadn't expected. For example, that somebody else has the merit, and not myself.'

The syllable -- the two syllables, "although," are supernatural. And although this country is -- are excelling at this moment in trying to prove that Jesus was natural, that everything is natural, the president of the United States is natural -- since you live in this pipe dream, that we are all just horses and animals, and things, and we can be measured, and we can be catalogued, and we can be treated statistically, please understand that any human being is statistically unimportant. That as long as you are found in the statistic, you are not known. You are not. Anything that the statistics contain is not of any historical value or importance. It's good for the statistician. It's good for the plumbers. It's good for the railroads. They must know this. But it is only your shell which they count. Man begins where he says, "Just the same, I won't do it. Although the temptation is great to lose myself in statistics, I shall know that the real person will never be called a statistic."

This syllable -- these two syllables, "although," is funny. They are the reduction of the Christian tradition at this moment in our human language. That is still vital. It is still possible, I think, to con- -- to ask a daughter not to run away from home, although she wants to, because her parents are invalids. She may stay. And -- such other sacrifices are made every day. Wherever you find them, they are founded in the human heart's strange power to erect a crucial situation. They cross out the tendency, the trend, the statistically probable, the recommendable, the reasonable, the -- sober. And you do -- although reason tells you, you shouldn't, you do it. That's worth doing. Nothing in life is live -- is alive, or is human, that is not able to defy some natural causes, some natural reasons. Because by gravity, you see, all dead things live. And if you follow by gravity the -- the next best incentive, you see, you are just a thing -- a thing or a stone. You throw a stone into the water, it falls; and it even makes very nice circles. You can do the same. You can jump into the water of temptation, and into the water of fashion, and the water of success; but you are nothing but a stone, a lodestone, and a very superfluous being. And people have a strange tendency today to make themselves superfluous.

Man is necessary, indispensable, was created on this globe obviously for one purpose: that he could change trends, that he could resist gravity, that he could go uphill. Man is the uphill animal of creation. All water runs down the hill. Do you? You climb the mountain. This is unnatural. But fortunately we are

meant to be unnatural. We are meant to cla- -- climb mountains, and not to roll them down { }.

Everybody of course lives quite right. I mean, the people are much better than their philosophies. But what you have in your brain, that amounts to shavings. What is taught in our official schools today is an attempt to transform us back into donkeys, not to say monkeys. It is an attempt to tame us, to tell us that there is no "although." But this is not a good -- nothing is reasoned out when you say, "Because I will make \$10,000," "Because I can retire at 50." I have heard students in my college say this terrible phrase, "Because I can retire with this firm at 50, I must take their offer." No. Such a man should be burned at stake. He's not a human being. He can be an omelet, but not a human being. Because he can retire at 50, "I must accept at 20 the job."

I asked him, "And what will the work be like?"

"Oh," he said. "Terrible."

So he was willing to -- waste his life, you see, these 30 years for this wonderful idea that he could live at 50 in Florida, and die -- go on dying. This is how modern youth today allows itself to be treated.

The human heart is always in this crucial situation. And if you have here the line that goes forward on the highway of life in a straight line--Route 19--you have to listen in to your heart, at which point you have to deviate. You have to cross this out and say, "Although this big, high road leads in this direction, although I must look around the corner and see what's there," whatever that is. If -- unless you have this power to resist all the highways of the world, wide as they are, convenient as they are, stocked as they are, made you -- making you as welcome as they do, as long as you don't have this, you are not borne by the spirit. You are not a second-born human being. And this old rule that man has to be born twice is unfortunately simply true, although the churches have forgotten it.

So let me speak outside the Church that this is still true. Man has to be born a second time. And he is it, at the very moment, when all the luxuries and all the temptations from the outside world cannot prevail against this one syllable, "although." Unfortunately here is no blackboard. Otherwise I would like to develop before your eyes the power of the cross. It's the only form or shape which is not found in nature. A cross, you see, is only possible to humans, because we can leave off one trend and start at another end. And that's tremen-

dous, you see. All other things have to follow by gravity, by instinct, by custom, by habit in the direction in which they are -- have started. You and I, however, can break off and say, "I take another tack." And all life which you have here in this building--your dress, your clothes, the fact that you sit here, that you can understand me--is based on events in which people took another tack. We are the sum of the other tacks. And we are the fruit of crucial living, of this cross of which our Lord was the first who proclaimed it as the inevitable. Of course, He only proclaimed--became vocal--for all the victims that have gone on before. You must not think that Christianity began with Christ. But the hope, the expectation, the willingness to sacrifice was in all the pagan tribes, also. Only they had no -- way of telling why they did it. But sacrifices, of course, of the first order have been brought in all -- all over the globe. Otherwise there would be no mankind alive today.

So it is very hard to stay within the Christian achievement which made -- revealed the Cross, which revealed this power of the "although," you see, and not -- and -- not to forget that of course life on this earth would have never come even to the point in -- in Jerusalem, and in -- on -- Golgotha unless people, mothers, babies, men, soldiers had this power of going against their interest. When I came to this country--this was before the Second World War, it could happen in a classroom, in the college at which I -- in which I taught; that was Harvard University--that the death of a soldier in -- in the battlefield was labeled "enlightened self-interest." The people were so ashamed of sacrifice, they were so ashamed of the power to act against your own interest, you see, that they called the -- death of the hero, "enlightened self-interest." I think that may be {going on} still; you look at me as though I was mad. I think the people were mad who said -- called this "enlightened self-interest." To die as a soldier on the battlefield is the opposite of enlightened self-interest. But it's a light which says, "Self-interest is not enough." It cancels out the self-interest. Otherwise there is no death on the battlefield. But this country had managed to -- to--how would I say?--to pack into the self even those acts which overcame the self. Don't do it. You betray yourself of the most important category of reality, that man can go against his own interest. And he may be enlightened, or may -- he may follow his self-interest. But it isn't one and the same thing. And any -- all attempts to reduce the action of mankind to this ki- -- little of -- game of psychology, which tries to hypnotize the rat, so that it surrenders, isn't worth the {candle}. It may be good for the -- for -- for professors, but it isn't good for their victims. A -- a soldier -- on the battlefield does not act from enlightened self-interest, because he has dumped his self. He has overcome his great fears. He is



afraid, trembling. But if he obeys orders and is killed, that's not from enlightened self-interest, but from his decision that his self-interest does not count. That's the opposite.

But the -- in the last 50 years in this country, this whole jargon of no soul, and "enlightened self-interest," you see -- enabled--I don't know whom enabled--I think it enabled the people on Madison Avenue to write such wonderful -- wonderful advertising; so we have to read all the nonsense that they publish in their journals, you see, all for enlightened self-interest. And it was all put in -- into one big casserole. And anything you enjoy, anything you name -- and you -- imbibe, anything you read, anything you said came under this one, single category of enlightened self-interest. If you have only one line, you see, and everything must be in the same line, then this is the result. But if you admit that you and I live in a crucial situation, that at any minute down from Heaven the thunderbolt can stop your nonsense and tell you that you are here for better things--not for your enlightened self or your unenlightened self--that's very different. If you keep this open to you, that there is a communication which is not derived from your years in grammar school, your years in high school, and your years in college, and your years in this -- in graduate school, and your years -- years in the Chamber of Commerce, and your years with reading the Saturday Evening Post, this is not the logic of your biography. The logic of any man's biography is that he has an ear and a heart into which suddenly sounds fall, which he has never heard before, which has never had any authority over him, which have been defied by his teachers and his parents as nonsense; and he suddenly discovers that they make very much sense, and that if he doesn't heed them, the world will perish.

Great truth is always connected with your and my insight that without my taking sides, something -- a catastrophe must happen. You can only volunteer in a war when you know that without you, the war will be lost. You can only save a child in -- from the water, from a -- from a -- a rapid stream as long as you know -- believe that without you, the child would -- would drown. You may drown in the process. That doesn't alter the fact that you have to jump in and try to -- to save the child. It is so simple. Everybody, by the way -- does these things. But we have developed a theory of monism in which a man's mind is closed to all outside surprising voices, to all crucial issues, and which he is this logical line of development--you call it "evolution," is equally silly term. I've never seen anybody evolve. A decent person jumps, dances, writes, jubilees, curses; but he certainly doesn't develop. That's all taken from -- from geese, from animals. I'm not an animal. I decline to follow Mr. Darwin. I'm underdeveloped. And that's my honor. They cannot develop me. I hope they cannot develop you. What you

are going to be, that is your business, Sir, and no one -- no developers'. That's good for real estate. Develop. Onions. I'm not an onion.

However, it is -- it takes some strength in this modern world, and in this modern world of -- of magazines, Colliers, and Dollier's, and Wollier's to keep one's mind. And therefore, believe me; we are not alone in this fight. The Cross, this power to say, "Although I won't," waits to be joined by all of us. My dream is that in the third millennium, when the Great Society of Mr. Johnson makes headway, we recognize that we are not just joined on a globe by airlines--United, and -- and Disunited, and Qantas--but that we are united in our hearts, which has nothing to do with geography; it has nothing to do with race and color; it has nothing to do with political power; it has not even to do with money, which is saying quite a bit.

The cross to which we are united, and whose head is -- the first Easter hero, enables everyone to draw on this tremendous treasure of conviction that no act of a human heart ever is lost. That's called faith.

In the last -- in the last 200 years, we have tried--as I said at the beginning--to escape from the old, more or less Catholic or Orthodox iconography. You find today Christianity rarely expressed just in paintings of saints, or in paintings of ritual. But allow me to suggest that there are certain symbols which we may pick up without being scolded as superstitious. I -- let me begin -- there the Cross comes in. The Cross has been treated through the Crucifix, as you know, very much as an ecclesiastical item, and a gem. Then the Protestants abolished the -- the Crucifix-Savior, and left the Cross. I don't know if here is one. No, there's an eagle. Return to nature. And -- yes, that's what it is.

Now as a simile, as a -- as a story, allow me to tell the story of the four evangelists, in the -- last 1800 years of iconography, that is, of picture writing. The four evangelists who wrote the story of the Lord were, of course, not writers -- professional writers. They never had written a book in their life, before. And they were not professors. And they didn't expect that their book writing would be mentioned as a reason for promotion. This shall happen today, I'm told. But it shouldn't. You should only write books when you must, and for no other reason. Well, I'm now serious for a moment. That is, these four evangelists were given already in the days of St. Augustine, in the year 400, by four symbols. They were taken from the Old Testament. And the four symbols was: the eagle for John; and the lion for Mark, and an angel for Matthew, and an ox for Luke.

When I was young, I admired these symbols, but I was dissatisfied. I said

they were not eloquent. And lo and behold, in the -- around 1800, they were given up.

A young friend of mine who built a church in 1900, in the south of Germany, omitted the symbols of the four evangelists. The -- the -- the priest was quite taken aback, but he said, "That's obsolete. What -- why should John be given an eagle? Eagles are no longer of any lang- -- linguistic power." And I had to admit this. But I was sorry, because there was some nakedness in this.

And so around 1914, I discovered that some painters and sculptors gave heed to this problem, and I myself dabbled with this. And I felt that if we could understand the four evangelists as representing four definite mental attitudes -- spiritual attitudes of man, that we could very well regain some power to design them. And so I felt that Luke was the -- the first sitting teacher of the Church; and Matthew was the fighter who went -- left Judah, and went to -- into Ethiopia--you know, he converted the Ethiopians, and so he is always given as standing. So I said: one standing, one sitting; that makes sense. And of Mark it is said that he was -- of John it is said that he was lying on the island of Patmos, receiving the Apocalypse, the Revelation into his heart, like one dead. So he was given horizontal. And Number 4, Mark, was kneeling at the lectern in Rome when Peter preached, and got his -- as a deacon got from -- from his bishop the news. So you have sitting man, kneeling man, lying man, and standing man.

And this in -- is in a way, the complete register of -- man's spiritual life. We do, according to your -- your experiences, kneel; lie prostrate; sit--teaching, for example, you see, or learning; and fighting as a lawyer in court, you see, standing upright and defending his cause. Now I was very much taken by this idea that perhaps man is not just an individual, but is the receptacle of spiritual processes, and that in these four ways, he is expressing something eternally true, that unless you and I can lie prostrate in despair, or in -- in intuition; can stand in fighting, in disputing, in denying some -- some injustice; if you cannot kneel in reverence for some higher authority; and if you cannot sit in imparting your acquired knowledge to the younger set, for example, or to the listeners, you aren't a complete human being.

So I feel there is hope that our four Gospels regain one time the colorful character they had in the old Church, you see, that -- people felt that oh, these are not just people, but these are people coined, and stamped out into a certain spiritual attitude, an attitude which we receive by reading their Gospel. They make us kneel; they make us sit; they make us adore; they make us -- debate.

Of course, I cannot follow this through. But I'm convinced that the Protestant world will either go atheistic, as it well -- may be, or it will overcome its anti-Catholic bias against forms and shapes, and will conquer man's physical expression of his spiritual life. God made us into receptacles of the Spirit, and He did not make us just into bigger and better elephants.

And therefore my plea has to mention these things, so that you may believe that man has in himself reserves of spiritual protest, of spiritual "although." Any of these four attitudes mean that the man is superior to the stimuli of the advertising agency on Madison Avenue, that he is superior to images, to these idols which these people dare to offer you, decent people, and say -- "The president must have an image." And nobody kills these people. Nobody burns their houses at stake. That's just a return to the worst idolatry that ever visited Egypt. Nobody protests this. These people make money on this idea that they can sell images. This is forbidden.

Therefore, what I say--you may -- sound very exalted to you, and very strange, but believe me, it's like a fire extinguisher. The house is burning, your house, the house of America. It has allowed the money makers to intrude the sanctuary. This is quite serious. You have to be told that you must not listen to these tempters. You must not. You must -- this boy who said to me, "Because I can retire at 50, I must accept this -- this -- this position," you see, he must be shamed to death. You must drive this out of him, or out of yourself.

If we did this, we would discover that around this kneeling, this lying, this standing, and this sitting spirit of man: the teacher, and the prophet, and the -- and the fighter, there is -- then this cross, which in this strange way as I tried to show it to you this morning, allows you to in every minute to be your father's child, to be your children's ancestor, and to be your neighbor's friend. That is a crucial situation. We are as much crucified as the Lord was. In His -- the garden of Gethsemane, it wasn't his free choice. He knew that he was from Israel; He was an Israelite, of the Israelites, but He was the founder of the Church, of His children in the Spirit, too. And He was alone with a few people--Mary Magdalene, His mother, and St. John--who at this moment even identified Him with the highest that mankind had. I think the figure of the Cross means that you and I can identify ourselves not in a house of God, not in this hall, but in this fact that we belong to the ages.

What was said of Lincoln, "Now he belongs to the ages," has been quoted time and again. But wouldn't it be nice if it could be said of -- by -- of -- all of us? Don't we belong to the ages? Do we only belong to the ages because somebody

murders us? Perhaps we just cease to murder ourselves. That's all that can mean. And in this moment, man would outgrow his lifetime. He would outgrow his classroom. He would outgrow his geographical belonging. There would be no California and no Connecticut. The soul of man is straight, given from Heaven. Anybody who can say to the tempter, "although," belongs to this crucial, gigantic cross that waits to be established all over this globe.

Thank you.

EDITORS' NOTE: The box of the original tape of this lecture is labeled "Cruciform Character of History" number 5. There seem to have been three formal "Tippett Lectures" at the University of the Pacific. Between the second and third, there also appears to have been a talk in a chapel. In our numbering, the third formal Tippett Lecture is Number 4. In its introduction, it is clearly described as the last lecture. However, the content of lecture number 5, as well as the labeling on its box (in Rosenstock-Huessy's handwriting), make it obvious that he viewed it as a fifth lecture in the series. The audio quality, as well as the delivery, suggest that it was not recorded as part of the original series, but done later at home or in a studio.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

You'll recall we began between Halloween and Labor Day, and that I fixed the time at which we were speaking at this millennium or these thousand years between 856, the day on which Halloween was instituted, for All Saints--by the Church--and Labor Day, which was started by an American group ca- -- who came to Paris in 1889 and tried to prevail on the European working man's movement that there should be a universal day for labor.

Why is this important, that we are quite clear about our own limitation in time that we speak in a certain moment of history ourselves? Inside history, we are dated. Most people think that when they talk about history they themselves are not in history. But at this point it will pay dividend that we already have spoken not of the Cross in general, but of gallows-beams, and no- -- therefore not in the pale manner in which the Enlightenment has talked down the Cross as a symbol, perhaps, as an abstraction.

Behind the spiral, already we discovered the organic serpent of the paradise story, lurking. Now, could it be that just as little as the spiral gives away the hollowness of her secret in her- -- itself--because we have to -- rediscover the organic model from which spiral is an abstraction, the serpent--could it be that behind the abstract term of the "cross" we find lurking the errors of western philosophy? This philosophy's idea of the cross is as unfounded as the spiral, and this I have now to explain.

About time and space, the last centuries have philosophized. There has been the great Kantian statement that time and space were the fundamental concepts of any thought--the shape, the form, the clothes, the dress--inside which all our thoughts had to appear. However, this philosopher, Kant, as well

as all the others, chose to -- to talk of space and time in a singular. Now, our debunking of this abstraction is very similar to the debunking of the spiral, behind which we found the serpent lurking. Space and time never occur in the singular. It's a pretty stark lie to speak of space and to speak of time. When I describe a space, I'm myself not in it. There is always somebody, some mind, some thought outside looking at this space from the outside, objectifying it. Therefore, there must be two spaces. The singular space just does not exist. It is even worse with time -- time. To pretend that time can ever be known in the singular is one of these nice philosophical fictions by which the philosopher pretends that he is outside time himself, superior to all the events in time. But is he? Is his time not just as measured, and just as constituted as a limitation of his own existence as the time outside? Are we ever in one time without looking into another time? When I am speaking of the Middle Ages, does this not mean that I myself am im- -- at this very moment in the modern times, and look into the Middle Ages? Or I look into the future? Or I listen to the voices of the past? Whatever I do, time cannot be had without duplicity, without plural. The same, space.

And this is why the gallow-beams, the Cross of the genuine Christian tradition, have a tremendous value for reminding us of the inability of man to abstract from a crucial situation, from an ambiguous situation. I appear; and nobody at the first moment can tell--and I don't know myself--whether I'm to be treated as a member of the present society, as a member of the past society, as a member of the future society. If I am treated educationally, then I will be looked upon as somebody who may become somebody, but whose acts at this moment are not taken seriously. You may listen to me and say, "That's a study; that's an attempt of this young man--or this old man--to speak. He'd better learn a little better before he comes up again in public. He should have remained in his private brown study to prepare the -- his speech really a little more." Which means that my time is not recognized as present time, as arrived time, as acceptable time. It is time to be delayed, to be postponed, to be announced later. The same is of course true if I seem to be very obsolete, bygone, old, veteran, toothless, stammering, trembling, tottering to my grave, "he's a has-been." "He's a have-been": that means that his time no longer has to be taken into account. His time has fallen into the abyss of the night of forgetfulness.

Once you see that times are always in the plural, you also see that you and I car- -- carry on our back this -- these gallow beams, which we call the Cross, in such a manner that it isn't -- not just one time for which we can be mistaken, or for which we can be judged; that -- that we have a claim to be seen

in a threefold extension or expanse. We may be of the present. We may be of the future. We may be of the past. And you and I -- we ourselves -- must try to be the correct judges of this strange dilemma where we belong. Are we still welcome? Are we already bidden farewell? It's obscure.

Now this obscurity the philosopher denies. The last 200 years of Protestantism, of Enlightenment--I should better say, of philosophy--have very -- tried very hard to dislodge us from this rootedness in a living time, in an ambiguous time, in a time yet to be decided and yet to be created. And therefore, time seemed to be something that was quite clear: what was past was past, what was present was present, what was future was future. As though anybody knew. The most people around me I declare to be totally past, passé, bygone. But they don't admit it. And they make great trouble. They may execute me because I am a revolutionary. And I may then shout, "But you are obsolete. You are already dead."

But they answer, "We don't know this. We don't believe it. We think we are still up and com- -- coming."

Any innovation in this world consists of such a clash of the conviction of the next, that he is a next; and the conviction of the pre- -- of the bygone, that he is not bygone. How is this to be explained? How is this to be lived? How is time to be judged and to be adjudicated to the various people according to their merits? Well, here, the gallows, the cr- -- gallow beams of the Cross tell us the story that the contradiction is indispensable, that a man has to stand up and be counted and say, "The new times must arrive; they have arrived; they are to arrive." It's a clash. All recognition, all cognition, all our knowledge in human affairs is not to be had harmoniously. It is quite out of the question that we ever shall agree on when we live.

The date of history is a debatable date, and it is not debated in schools, in classrooms; that it is debated in battlefields, on battlefields. These battlefields may be of armies, they may be of barricades, they may be of vo- -- voting booths, but it is a total error to assume that there are no battlefields. Time can only be ordained and time is only constituted as a result of a victory after a conflict. All times exist only on the basis of such a conflict. And in order to create time, human hearts must be willing to -- fight it out, to be re- -- recognized for what they are worth. The moral equivalent of war, William James said in 1910, is inevitable and indispensable, because life cannot be constituted without such a decision between two different times, two different experiences of when we live. What is now, and what has been cannot be known. It can only be de- -- decided.



And you and I live only as long as we are--well, let's say, on the side of the angels-- that is, as we think we have heard the voice which tells us, "Now is the time." If they -- we haven't heard this voice at all, we don't live.

It is true, however, that between Halloween and Labor Day -- that is, for fully a thousand years, mankind had its battlefields and mankind had their victories and their defeats in the realm of the global expanse of the earth. You can say that from the Normans, who went to Vinland via Greenland, via -- and over -- via Columbus, to the days of the conquering the -- South Pole and erecting the Russian and American camp at the South Pole, mankind has preferably expanded its knowledge of space. And the conquest of space has been the topic of world history between Halloween and Labor Day. And this is the reason, I think, why time has so -- been so misunderstood.

If you are an explorer, a geographer, a physicist, an -- administrator of space, of new provinces, of the -- global expanse of this earth--of Nova Scotia instead of Scotia, and New England instead of England--if this is the theme of the most important acts of your own biography, you will be inclined to say that mankind's history consists of the gaining of ground on this earth. And since space outweighed, in the experience of the last 1,000 years, the news about time, the neglect of our understanding of time is easily explained.

The event, the earthshaking event usually was in the last 900 years or thousand years, the gaining of new ground, or the uniting of new peoples, the founding of new cities, the naming of new rivers and new mountains. So space was of the essence. We can say that the millennium from 1000 to 2000 is filled specifically with the expanse of Christianity, of reading and writing, of knowledge, of manufacturing--certainly an expanse in space. It is so breathtaking -- if you think of our airlines that it -- is easily explained why people felt this was the foremost movement through time. And so all times seemed from this viewpoint to be filled with expanse. And the expanse goes in one direction: more, bigger, better, longer, greater distances.

So this I think explains our growing neglect, or our decreasing understanding of the mystery of times. Take the -- relation between the generations. The hurry with which we move through time makes it for the young man quite feasible to forget the greatest riddle of mankind is the peace between fathers and sons, and grandsons, and how this should be obtained or created that a grandson is even patient to continue what his father and grandfather have started.

If I look at the railroads in this country, it is a depressing sight that the

greatest thing the grandfathers tried to create, the net of railways through this country, are of not the slightest interest to the public opinion formed by the hippies or formed by the beatniks. They don't care for this at all. They don't breathe in the magnanimity of those people, who in their little villages enabled the railroad to be built, by coming forward with great sacrifices, and allowing the railroad to build their railroad station in their village. This was a dream of an infinite future. And now this dream already belongs to the past. That's an unheard-of event. It's an acceleration, but it makes it understandable that these adventures through space have filled the imagination of all of us to such an extent that the bleak idea, or the bleak necessity of understanding what it means that a grandfather and a grandson can tolerate--even love each other affectionately--that this secret is not discussed, is not debated, and to tell the truth, is not understood.

I had a discussion here, as a sequence of the last lecture, with a young man who is a minister's son. Now that is a hard situation; I understand that a minister's son must revolt, must rebel. But this man really denied to me that he had to know anything that people had known before him, that he had perhaps to join, or to ad- -- understand the great sentences of truth which have glued together mankind through 20, through 30, through 40 generations. When I tried to formulate a sentence that he could understand it, but without losing faith, without denying my loyalty to all our common ancestors, he got very angry and he said I had to speak a language which he could understand and it didn't matter that anybody before us would not understand the sentence. He mattered. The others did not matter. So he denies even the task. My task is, if I talk of time, to speak in such a way of the present, that my -- the first Adam and the last man would still be able to recognize of what I am talking.

This young man, and I think most hippies, and most beatniks, and most students, and most -- even philosophers, I'm afraid to say, are perfectly satisfied if they alone in their own moment of time can understand what I'm talking about. This is, however, for -- to me nothing. It is not satisfactory. It's not even truth if what I say can be understood by him and by nobody who lived 50 years earlier and by nobody who is going to live 50 years later. This is the riddle of speech, that the speech is a flow, is a stream, a river that must fertilize and wet all the -- banks of the river, whenever the water touches the ground. Every foot of this riverbank is a year of mankind. And the river, of course, must connect these various decades, years, centuries. And he must not form puddles, where every puddle is a -- left alone to itself and the whole country then at the end is one big quagmire, because the circulation of the speech is stopped, is not even intended, is not even hoped for.

I find that our modern speech moves in this direction: total indifference to the question, "Can this sentence be understood 100 years later or 100 years before?" But if it cannot, then language has been abused, because language is the connecting link between all the generations of men.

Today it is only the -- the link between the subscribers of a boulevard paper. Well, for this purpose neither printing nor writing would have -- had to be invented. You must -- understand that a newspaper can be replaced by sign language. A neon line -- light will do exactly the same. It can point out where you get your hamburgers. I read the sign, "Two and-a-half billion hamburgers sold." Well, I envy the man who counted them. They'll nev- -- that's of course one big lie, the two and-a-half billion hamburgers, and that's what we today usually do when we try to say things in the -- in writing that shouldn't be put in writing. Two and-a-half billion -- million hamburgers obviously is an abuse of human writing, of human language. But it pays. And what pays seems to be -- to go today. It has nothing to do with truth. It has nothing to do with life. It has nothing to do with the future. And it certainly doesn't belong into history. The Cross, however, taken as the gallow beams, as something not an ab- -- not abstract, but as something burdensome, expanded in space and in time...  
[tape interruption]

The loss of the Crucifix in our common tradition in the churches, our preference for the abstract cross, and our final abstraction that time is one and space is one in a fictitious singular may be the bridge for a third millennium. It may be explicable why we had to go and dismiss the Old Testament notions about the gallow beams or original sin -- sin. Perhaps there is a great blessing in disguise in this transformation of our vocabulary. Just as I tried to tell you that after Halloween, mankind plunged for this great quest, this great crusade for space in Heaven on -- on earth--from the Norman -- Norsemen and the Crusaders, to the fliers in -- on Qantas--just the same way, perhaps, these last 200 years have prepared a new excursion which then will show the other beam of the cross in great clarity.

The -- eccentric fact about crucial thinking, about crucial living, is that they are -- irreconcilable in their directions by any logic. One beam of the cross and the other beam of the cross, they point forever in opposite directions. They always mean that somebody has done something, although it was not expected by him to do so; it was not natural. The cross saves our power to do the unex-

pected, to do something different, what an- -- from anything that the natural scientists, the -- physicists can derive from its -- his laws of gravity, of trends. Man is, thanks to the gallow beams which he can carry on his back, able to overthrow any trend.

And so I think that at this moment the singularity of space, the idea that we only gain ground by more and more in spatial expanse--getting richer, getting faster, getting around more definitely--may be s- -- relieved, may be replaced by the other aspect of the figure of the cross. May it not be that our speed itself forces us now from our hastening forward to reaching the other end of the globe in 10 minutes--by light, by signals, by what have you--that it must be -- opposed is perhaps the best way, really opposed by the opposite tendency of slowing down, of going behind even the measure of human marching and human living, and becoming so slow that we can understand the slowness of our ancestors again and join the -- with the anthropologists the quiet pleasure of having endless time, of going backward into infinite times of the past. Not just dreaming, but trying to resume the rhythm, to resume the patience, to resume the slow beat of the human heart which, for the first time, is faced with the great task of coming to know some other man, of joining, so to speak, the first society on this earth by making peace.

Everything this momentary world -- world seems to be able to do, except concluding peace. Peace is something that you and I cannot be ma- -- do -- cannot do, cannot produce on the spur of the moment. Peace only occurs after you and I have forgotten our timepieces. Anybody who wants to know that peace can be made in 10 minutes will never know peace. The strange thing of peace is: it has as its condition your and my total indifference to time. Man steps out of time when he forgets that he is in a hurry -- that something has to be done within 24 hours or in -- within five minutes. Anything under the sword of Damocles called "watch," "schedule," is already poisoned with some element of struggle, of peacelessness.

The true peace of God passes all understanding for this one reason: that we people who want to understand want to know how we come out, when we can go home. In the peace of God, nobody goes ever home, because he is at home. The condition is that you start where you want to lead to. Anybody who is not at home in the divine mansions will never find this peace by some contraption.

The third millennium to -- into which we enter simply chronologically after Christ--it's very soon, 2,000 years--will have to oppose the quanta -- the

quantities of the schedule of hours, and days, and years, and kilometers, and mileage by some realization that there is outside these measurements something that cannot be measured because it is the condition inside which we must live and breathe so that we may be able to measure. You must be out of breath if you always want to live with the quickest, the fastest, the latest news. And once you yourself are out of breath, time is lost on you and on ever -- whatever you undertake.

The beam of the cross, which in the last thousand years of the existence of man on this little globe--and I don't see how he could exist far longer than another thousand years--this beam of the cross for the last thousand years seems to me to go vertically into the ground of the beginnings. Man at this moment is desperately in need of connecting himself with the times when there was no timetable.

Time has to be tabled, if I may say so. It must be dismissed. The wave of the future certainly is deprived of any future. We have -- overdone this in the last 100 years. "The wave of the future" has even been advertised. You know the famous book -- Madame Lindbergh, *The Wave of the Future*. Well, it was the beginning of fascism. It was the beginning of World War II. It was the beginning of all the misery that is now visiting us, because it was naive -- the naive faith that if you ran, ran, ran, you would arrive. The funny thing about man is that by running, he does not arrive. The runner must have a very stable home so that his running can make sense. And this, of course, was true of all the explorers. They had a place to go back to. There was a woman who waited for his return; and she was more important than the gentleman who explored and got the Nansen or Sverdrup Medal.

It is very strange that the -- that the crucial situation of men and women in all these last thousand years can be overlooked. One and the other belong to each other. One had to stay; the other could run. The fiction is in our history books that Mr. Nansen, or Mr. Sverdrup, or whoever the explorer is, did it all themself -- by themselves. They could only do it because there were somebody who waited for their return. Without somebody waiting for my return, I cannot go out, because there is just nothing to return to. And this is so self -- self-explanatory that soldiers have never doubted that their -- their sweetheart at home had to wait for their return. And the soldier is nothing but the most explicit and most outspoken explorer of the universe. The -- in the soldier, all these things came to a -- come to -- and come to a head. The soldier cannot go to Vietnam unless he can return -- some form. He may not return in -- in the flesh. He may be killed. But then he wants to live on in the memory of those people who

have not gone to Vietnam.

So what I try to say is that the overweight given to movement, the overweight given to spatial expansion in the last thousand years--from Greenland and Vinland to the South Pole--in our imagination, in our books, in our political theory, has never really been able to extirpate the other side of the cross. They are simultaneous. But I believe one thing. That the other side of the cross, the staying power of man, his power to stay -- at the beginning, and never forget that all the consequences--all these progresses, so-called--are still predicated on the existence of a root, of a beginning, of an initial paradise from which we start, that they would be doomed. It is impossible to go on in the direction of the one -- beam of the cross, just outside in space, just forward or backward in geographical expanse. Man is much more in a crucial situation than he cares to admit. The man who travels carries with him the other beam, the other -- of the -- the other side of his existence, "Where do you come from?" He's -- responsible just as much for the further existence of the place which he leaves than he is for the conquest of the place to which he wants to take us.

Once this is understood, the relations between the sides of this crucial life become more interesting than they are now. The relation to ancestors will become just as interesting as the relations to grandchildren. The relation to neighbors will become just as fantastically important as the relation to the Eskimos. And I think Alaska is really the last state which the Union could aggregate, could assimilate, could take in. It is more important to discover New York. That's an undiscovered island today. And it is in great danger of becoming as frozen out as Alaska is.

Thank you.

[tape interruption]

I promised to disclose the crucial structure of history.

We come from a time when time had no form, no shape. It was a line. I have told you all the abuses of historians of this very precious creation, this time -- God's time with man, God's time in man, God's time i- -- through His creation. I think you may see now that when I dated the middle part of our historical present between Halloween and Labor Day, I prepared the structure, the picture of the structure which now I think every one of you will be able to realize. The Church came into this world saying that it was not of this world. The

-- Church came from above. The arm of the cross that first became visible hung down from Heaven into a dark earth. And all of the fathers of the Church, all the missionaries were able to convince the people that they lived in darkness and that a new light was shining downward into this dark, leading them on, guiding them, giving them direction. We have not to give un- -- any of these pictures of Christmas, or of Easter, or of Pentecost, or of Halloween and All Saints; it is the superior light of the martyrs, the superior light of the man who went to the Cross without complaint in order to elucidate that on this earth, without the gallows beams on his back, man could not live as he was meant to live: in peace with the past and the future. The gallows beams of man, the cross on his back, appeared in the story of all the saints, and martyrs, and the Lord Himself, as the only way in which his momentary, day-by-day, ephemeral existence could be chained, could be connected with the way of the creator through the centuries and through the thousands of years. Without the gallows beams on His back, our Lord could never have interested anybody -- and he -- but He did fascinate men of all centuries, of all ages, in all districts of the earth, because He made visible whence they came and where they were meant to go. From the future and from the past of the human race shone a light into this rather silly existence of 30 or 70 years on this earth.

This ended the Church history of the first 1,000 years, the one you -- every one of us knows through the holidays--as I said, from Christmas and Easter Day to Halloween. The second phase illuminates the vast expanse of the earth, of the sky, of the heavens, of the waters, of the seas. Geography is, so to speak, the hunting ground of our maker in the second thousand years. We are placed in all directions to discover one more item of his deeds of his creatures, and organize them, and connect them and allow us to draw on them at any time we -- it pleases us. The second thousand years, therefore, illuminate the horizontal beams. They go everywhere--these people, these hunters, these navigators, these discoverers--and we are back of them. We are proud of them. We give their names to the countries we discover.

At this moment, nearing the year 3- -- 2000, the direction changes once more. The -- it's lunacy to get too excited over flying to the lu- -- moon. I think that will wear off. Just as it has worn off to become a martyr for the Christian faith. At one time people said it was wiser to populate the earth, and to go out into the land, and to plant woods and forests, and navigate the seven seas, instead of burning your body and castigate it. But at one time, it had been very necessary, before. So there was a change in direction around the year 1000, between the vertical direction from above into the horizontal direction all over the globe.

What I have tried to prepare you for and to sow into you as a potential future for our race is the necessity to change the direction once more. The geographical expanse, let it be. It will go on. And all the investment there need not be jeopardized or jettisoned. But we will not have peace; we will not have offspring; we will have famine, and disease, and rebellion, and --; fecundity will disappear from this globe unless man begins to approfondir, the French would say, to deepen again the origins -- the restful, pacific origins in which man in endless time, opening his eyes to his creator, in great wonder that he was there at all, not asking for his own aims, but trying to discover the aim of his creator in creating him, the little human. At this moment, where the Great Society knocks at the door, we must make peace with people of other creeds, with people of other races, with people certainly of other idioms, and other religions. And a new pluralism makes its entrance which is conditioned on our having infinite time. You cannot explain the third millennium by the timetables of the Southern Pacific, or of the -- United Airlines. You can only believe in any future on this globe for mankind if people have so much faith and so much good will that they do not count the hours for their arrival, but that they do -- are not in a hurry to depart.

I could give you chapter and verse on the little steps in my own existence which have led me to practice what I here think I can see and perceive as happening in all people of good will. You see many people retiring before they have to retire. You see many people slowing down, cutting down on their possible movements of speed. Any one of these people is already leaving the horizontal beam of the cross which -- that which cultivates the expanse in space. He is already leaving this, and cultivating, and rooting himself in eternity, in the length of time, in the endlessness of time.

And this is, I -- I feel, the simplest way in which I can make you see that the cross is much more than a symbol, as they -- like to call it. It is the clearest expression of our march through our own strange jungle of ignorance and misunderstanding. We ourselves have first to learn that we stem from above, that a seed has been put into us which demands incarnation, that then we are entitled to lusty, adventurous life all around, but that we miss the bus, and we miss our goal if in the speed with which we move we feel bliss. This is not the end. The end is the domination of all schedules, the play with all speed, all quickness, all efficiency. Man is not made to be efficient. He just may be sides -- that's a side issue, the horizontal one. The deepest one, the profoundest one, is our entering the secret of the rest of the creatures. They are from the beginning to the end without time. There are there.