

A T T I T U D E S

C Y C L E

Dedication

Attitudes Cycle is affectionately dedicated to my wife and son, to whom I leave it as a heritage.

By David R. Graham, April 1978

© David R. Graham, 1978

Table of Contents

Attitudes Too	p. 2
Attitudes To	p. 35
Attitudes Two	p. 60
Addenda	p. 71

Attitudes Too

Introduction

Attitudes Too is a philosopher's presentation of the facts of life. I have not engaged in proving or arguing my statements. The philosophical probing that has preceded these thoughts cannot be reproduced by me in more than summary form. This inability is deliberately achieved. Proofs are impossible -- Hume showed that -- and arguments are a disease. So I let the statements in summary form stand or fall on their own. Only experience can validate them. If an idea stands up in the historical drama for a lengthy period and survives all opposition, it is true. I have made every effort to put down here only such ideas.

This work is summary in nature, not expository. If I were to do an expository volume it would fill all the books ever written. So, to avoid that nonsense, I adopt a summary method. The last thing I want to do is impress some academic with my scholarship.

The section headings are taken from Attitudes. However, little else, either of structure or of content, reflects that original. At the end of this volume is a section that specifically rewrites Attitudes. Here, however, my purpose is to show what lies beyond the scope of Attitudes. Therefore the title, Attitudes Too.

Prologue

Seven years ago six friends and I brought out a small volume in manila folders called Attitudes. We had a great amount of joy doing this. It was even well received.

Now those seven years look to me like seventy. Teresa and Christopher labored long and hard to get the thing in print. They and Paul generously used their own funds to foot the bill. The title had been agreed upon among the four of us one day on the road to Remuda Ranch in Wickenburg, Arizona.

We spent so many days thereafter, in the desert, shooting guns and writing articles.

Over the years the little volume has not faded for me, either in the intellect or the affections. It took shape amidst great storms in our personal lives and these storms eventually drove me apart from the rest. They drove the rest apart also.

We knew we were on the trail of truth. I feel, we did not know how close we were and we were not prepared to withstand the blasts that come from the opposition when the truth is neared.

I am not in regular communication with these friends. I do not even consider them friends in the ordinary sense of the term. So I cannot speak for them.

But, for myself I will say that we envisioned a sequel to Attitudes even before its publication and we included a note to that effect in the published manuscript.

I would like herewith to bring forth that promised sequel. The editorial board is now only myself and all articles are from my own pen. I would not blame my friends for the lines that follow.

But lines must follow Attitudes because they were promised. And here they are. But, if my friends ever choose to publish in sequel form to Attitudes, then I recognize their right to do so and regard before the fact the lines they bring forth as sequel(s) to Attitudes.

My generosity in this matter is quite spacious.

Seven years is seventy to me. I am a happier man than I was then. I have survived the rise and fall of three separate careers, three assaults on my personal life and three attempts to end my life.

My friends have not always felt I was sane. Nor would I claim they were wrong. But God and I have a partnership and we can turn human wisdom into divine folly and divine wisdom into human folly. We act on principles that are not readily apparent to cursory examination. We have a way of seeing that is a little more single than most people are used to. We have a readiness and propensity for action that surprises and often alarms the weighers of good and evil.

One friend did not make mention in Attitudes, Robert Theobald and his wife, Jean Mary Scott. These two lie behind it all as friendly enemies and hostile friends, depending on the day.

Once I was their closest adviser and friend. Once I was the object of all the wrath they could muster.

My affection for them, as for the others, whom they knew, has never dimmed. Many times I sent them all or in part such terrible harrangues as to make them think I was uncivil!

With Theobald I learned the genius of action. Without him I learned the genius of silence. The student grew apace beyond his teacher, as all students should and all teachers expect.

In this he was wiser than I -- there was no need for me to hang around him. I didn't.

The next thing we did was bring out Attitudes.

What follows is a sequel to it. Whether there is another sequel after this I do not know. I do know I have had no new thoughts in the intervening years. And I expect none.

In my mind and to my eye, Attitudes Too is a refinement and reorganization of Attitudes. I have added nothing and subtracted nothing. I hope only to have said it better, plainer.

Whether anyone else sees the present work in this way is none of my business and no care to me.

I used to lash Theobald for not having a new thought in fifteen years. Now I am in that position after only seven. But there is a difference. His one thought -- the guaranteed income -- is harmful both to individuals and to society. My one thought -- God -- is beneficial both to individuals and to society.

There is no compact between humanism and theology. But there is love between men and that is all we are ever going to be asked about,

It is nice to have only had one idea. You don't have to babble and you can spend time happily doing what is happy for you to do.

No one can have more than he is given. I am of the belief that the full three score and ten of a man's life are only given for one or two experiences he has during their course. The rest is obligation, serving time in a penitentiary. With good behavior he might get an early release.

When we brought out Attitudes we had none of this sentiment. We felt new ideas were ours almost for the asking and that we were already set free in a sugar-cane field.

But the truth was not long in dawning. The wonder is that we managed to put down in seed form the truth that we did. We were very young, bright, gay and frivolous. Inside, we -- or I at least -- were very sad.

Attitudes testifies that the truth is greater and stronger than the weak vessels given to hold and shape it. May Attitudes Too continue and intensify this testimony. May it too be found to express the truth and to have stripped off some of the rind so that the sweetness of the fruit itself may be taken into the mouth.

David R. Graham
San Diego, January 1978

Metaconcepts

We must recognize the greatness and the truth of Aquinian theology.

This will lead us to recognize the greatness and the truth of Roman moral and social theology.

This will lead us to appreciate the power and fidelity through struggle of the Roman Church and Her Pontiff since the Fourteenth Century.

This fidelity and struggle is especially apparent and praise-worthy -- though it is no more than fulfillment of duty -- in the series of Papal Encyclicals starting with the Sixteenth Century.

Notwithstanding, it is clear that Aquinian theology, so lucid and true, is not alone in the virtue of truth, and that completely.

Pere Pierre Teilhard de Chardin has established another system, equal with Aquinas' in the truth, yet starting from a different point.

Thomas' epistemology is pre-mystical and dualistic.

Teilhard's epistemology is post-mystical and non-dualistic.

Just as Rome has accepted Orders with different rules and missions, so the Pope must accept different theological systems if they show clearly -- by the lives of their proponents -- to lead to the same goal.

It is possible to ascend the mountain of holiness by different routes. This is our situation when faced with Thomas and Teilhard.

Their starting points are different, their ending is the same. Their respective routes are different yet they do not clash and indeed they are incomparable.

One man will be led by devotion to love God as his Judge, another as his Companion, another as his Spouse, another in one of His aspects, viz. omniscience, omnipotence, mercy, faithfulness, humility, glory, works.

So with Thomas and Teilhard. Leaders of the Church have always recognized this principle of differences in piety.

It remains only to recognize that Teilhard's piety and his theology -- or better, wisdom -- which goes with it are not heretical.

He only sounds heretical against, on the one hand, Thomism, and on the other, pantheism.

The error is to compare him at all.

This error is committed by Roman interpreters who compare him with Thomas, by Protestant interpreters who don't know what to make of him and so compare him with anybody they like, and by scientists and fadists who compare him with everything off his self-declared home base, Rome.

In his life and works Teilhard showed his fidelity, by obedience.

The Leaders of the flock have proved their wisdom by recognizing differences of piety. They must further prove their wisdom by recognizing differences of systematic theology, and not differences of degree or emphasis only but differences of order or kind from start to finish.

Teilhard gives us the first mystical philosophy, comprehending the sum of science as popularly denoted, since the doctrine enunciated in

Ephesians and Colossians.

Teilhard begins with, restates and elaborates the Doctrine of the Pleroma.

Since Paul, the examples of mystical theology have been based on morals -- Bernard, Jerome -- aesthetics -- Bonaventure, Jerome, Augustine -- or an attribute or characteristic of the Incarnation -- Teresa of Avila, John of the Cross, Ignatius.

And these have not been systematic, in the sense of covering both philosophy and general science, as Thomas does so admirably.

Teilhard is the first since Paul to cover all of knowledge in a bound and that from the mystical point of view.

Aquinas covers the field also, but he does so from a pre-mystical point of view. Indeed, the Vision he received terminated his writing. He considered the Summa so much much straw -- an attitude we must adopt and which does not lower our estimation of it, or vitiate its perpetual usefulness.

Paul tried the cosmological argument -- a basis of the Summa, along with the given of Revelation -- in Athens and vowed never to use it again.

It is ineffective with non-believers, though it helps to bolster the faith and deepen the devotion of believers -- because to them it is self-evidently true.

But Aquinas was a Dominican and Dominicans are preachers, especially to heretics and heathen!

The Doctrine of the Pleroma, together with the Doctrine of Kenosis -- that is, Christ crucified -- this message had power to convert the heathen, and, judging by Paul's constant reliance on it, it also had power to correct heretics and was more useful in deepening devotion and upbuilding the Church than the cosmological argument.

Teilhard's words have this power and because they proceed from the same source, the Doctrines of Pleroma and Kenosis, which are inseparable.

The effort to present Teilhard as a restater of the cosmological argument is misguided and misleading.

He will not be accepted in Rome by proving him a latter-day, disguised Thomist. He will be accepted, if anything, as Pauline, and at most as Teilhard, a sage.

Jesuits also are par excellence preachers to heretics and heathen. Teilhard fulfilled his Order's calling and that most abundantly.

He alone since the Sixteenth Century has confounded the arrogance of scientists and scholars without requiring of them a leap outside their way of seeing, their epistemology -- that is, without requiring of them to think Thomistically.

To think Thomistically is virtuous and truthful in its own right. I am not denigrating Thomism.

It is a contextual issue. Teilhard not only performed as a Jesuit but also as a Dominican, the founder of which Order delighted in personal argument with heretics and heathen in their terms so as to convert them to the truth by superior insight.

Teilhard does this. He does not rely on a valid but, to his audience, foreign point of view. He wades in where they are and shows them ipso facto what they have not seen; and he even gives them the rudiments of a vocabulary to describe the phenomenon to which he has with authority and boldness invited their attention.

This "ipso facto" is the very essence of evangelism, of piety and of theology itself.

The story is told among Protestants that when Karl Barth answered a question it was always in Barth's terms but that when Paul Tillich answered a question it was always in the questioner's terms.

Teilhard is like Tillich except unsullied with foggy notions.

It may take scientists to point out to Rome who Teilhard is and what he bequeathed the Church. Certainly the pace of contemporary Jesuit adulation for Teilhard is no guarantee that his theology is understood. People are trying to make him fit the Thomistic mold and doing head spins and back flips to do it.

Nothing of the sort will do. In military terminology, Teilhard is a front-line general, even a point man. God has always expended his senior staff on platoon point duty. He doesn't think the way we do. But his way works where ours muddles along, fruitlessly.

Teilhard is a General Staff Officer assigned platoon point duty.

To see him and what he's doing we have to stay close behind him and in the sector of the front to which he is assigned. Aquinas is in another sector, that is all. He and Teilhard have the same objective but they face different field positions. They have different assignments.

That is all Rome must recognize. Though by saying this I do not mean to belittle either the task or the repercussions.

I do not know Thomas' assignment. I know he himself considered the systematic theological part of it ended well before he slept.

Teilhard's assignment is to bring down the pride, the hauteur, the immorality and the insatiable frivoloty of the modern scientist, such as began in the Sixteenth Century, and to raise in its place the principle of unity in diversity, verity in variety and a systematic theology to express that principle.

Thomas and the scholastics did this in their own day by approving realism and rejecting nominalism. Teilhard does the same today, except that where Thomas rejects nominalism and goes about building realism, Teilhard enters into nominalism, exposes its so-called principles and comes out with it organized Christologically, on the Pauline model. Teilhard is the first

philosopher who is beyond philosophy.

When Aquinas got beyond philosophy he quit writing. Teilhard started beyond philosophy and wrote from there. He therefore gives the correct post-philosophical (and post-religious and post-scientific) point of view. Teilhard made it and wrote back describing how things look.

His philosophy is only described as non-dualism. The essence of it is this: a thing and its nature are one and the same.

Take the Doctrine of Transsubstantiation. What is the use of this Doctrine when all Creation is the Body of Christ? In one system this Doctrine is necessary and true. In another it is a moot point.

Take the Doctrine of the Church. In one system it is the Company of Believers, in Heaven, in Purgatory and on Earth. In another system it is Creation.

The novice in mystical theology is often tempted to think Creation is illusion. But this is wrong. Creation is not illusion. Taking it as Creation is the illusion. Creation is God's Body, and only a fraction of It at that. Creation is the Incarnation, the one and only "miracle."

Is Teilhard a pantheist? Nothing could be more untrue. The difference between a pantheist and a mystic is this: behind everything visible and invisible a pantheist posits, by his own imagination, a concept, which he calls Absolute; whereas within, before, behind and around everything visible and invisible a mystic sees, in his own experience, a Person Who is incomparable and Who thinks, speaks and acts. A mystic experiences this Person interiorly as Truth, Consciousness, Bliss, the Essence of all.

A man does not make himself a mystic. This Person does.

What do you do with a man who cannot hear, see, touch, taste or smell anything without knowing for a fact that the thing, the sensation of it and he himself are one and the same God, and only a fraction of Him at that?

Such a person in Chardin.

What can you do with such a man? There is not much to do with him. Bury him in a quiet grave quietly.

This much can and must be done: his theology must be recognized and promoted by the Leaders of the flock as appropriate. By this I do not mean the current efforts to view him Thomistically. These cannot succeed.

For example, what are next steps in the systematic he described? Are there indeed any?

What about the parallels in both Thomas and Teilhard with Indian philosophical systems? Why, indeed, can there not be a true ecumenism, a brotherliness and forbearance among the major religious groups?

And beyond, what steps can be taken to evangelize scientists in Chardin's

manner? Doesn't one have to be as competent as he was in both philosophy and science in order to safely and successfully weather the voyage and its many storms?

Monthly, astrophysical research is filling in a picture Teilhard described. Molecular biological research does the same, but with less public notice. Yet even as men in these fields fill in the picture, accurately too, the meaning and full design of it escapes them.

A dullard can describe a flower without noticing the ecosystem that supports and produces it. In the same way, a scientist can see that the universe expands quietly and in order without noticing the Love which makes it so.

This is a phenomenon. Penny-wise, dollar-foolish.

Scientists still need help filling in the picture and interpreting it. They also need help to not look down their arrogant, misinformed and frivolous noses at Chardin.

These are all next steps after Teilhard.

Chardin has described to some extent the philosophical aspect of the reality Bonhoeffer meant to denote with the words religionless Christianity. This is the post-mystical reality, the anonymous, non-sacerdotal, blissful reality of those whose piety has been successful to the point of placing them, to appearances, outside the Congregation and especially outside its formal ritual.

Once a person discovers that the Church is Creation he then discovers that Work (liturgia) is Worship and that Duty is God. Such a one has no need to come apart from the world to worship periodically. He is always apart from the world, though in it, and so every act of his is worship. He does not go to Church, he wears the Church as a vestment, his only garment. When is he ever outside Her? Yet he must travel beyond Her too, if he would reach the Kingdom of Heaven.

The Popes have behaved more like the successors of Constantine than the successors of Peter. An election and coronation do not make a Pope. Without the heart of a Pope a man in the position is a monster. Ritual without the internal attitude of worship and prayer is deplorable. Nothing goes with the office that does not come from the heart.

The test of a Pope is not whether he is obeyed but whether he thinks, speaks and acts the Truth, whether he puts the truth in action in his own person.

Many will disobey God himself, even being themselves believers and in good standing with the Church. How can we expect people to obey a Pope therefore?

The Papal fruit is in the personal life of the Pope. There he does his shepherding and therein alone lies his power or lack of it.

The Church can rise or fall on the behavior of one man. If he is the

Pope then what havoc is done when he falls and what greatness is achieved when he rises!

He who preaches must first practice his sermons. Let sermons arise from direct experience and if a man has none or little of this then let him keep silent.

Teilhard exemplifies these principles.

To say that every Pope has spoken inerrantly on matters of faith and morals, regardless of his personal condition of grace or disgrace, is not to say that every Pope has spoken the truth but that to test the faithful and to correct them the Holy Spirit at times has given the Church shepherds who spoke evil and did evil at his behest, in order that men might be drawn closer to Him.

Providence is omnipotent even during the reign of wickedness. Indeed the suffering of the righteous always has the purpose of bringing them closer to God by concentrating and focusing their devotion to a single point.

Who can question Providence?

God has no vicar on earth. He speaks for himself. Rome maintained orthodoxy and true doctrine during the early years, much to the gratitude of all concerned, but that was a duty incumbent upon every Christian and did not amount to a vicarage, which means a continuing oracle.

The defense against heresy and the counter-attack upon it were conservative, dutiful actions. A continuing oracular function is nowhere indicated, not even in tradition, unless one does back-flips as with the doctrine of inerrancy mentioned above.

The continuing oracle is the Bible with the canon used by Jerome. All that is necessary is to believe it and to put it into practice. God speaks and appears to people in countless, unpredictable ways. He has his own ways and means.

Teilhard gives the appearance of restating the cosmological argument. But he does not do this.

He starts with a non-dualistic epistemology, clearly delineated in the opening pages of the Phenomenon. This is new in the West, at least for a philosopher.

Teilhard writes from the Seventh and inner Room of Teresa's Castle. For him, cosmology and ontology are one and the same. He writes in this consciousness.

Word-Play

Neo-paganism is the effort to make man's destiny, personal and corporate, appear to be the result of blind force, fate.

Physicists, charismatics, communists, fascists, scientists, economists, psychiatrists, psychologists, educators, clergymen, dope addicts, cultists, philosophers, musicians, doctors and artists -- these are some of those pushing neo-paganism upon mankind, hoping to drag the human community through the mud of vice and wickedness.

The first thing neo-pagans deny is the power of Grace to rewrite destiny, personal and corporate, at a stroke.

The second thing neo-pagans deny is the power of men, personally and corporately, to rewrite destiny, personal and corporate, at a stroke.

Thus they would infringe on two sacred prerogatives, the rights of God and the rights of men.

By what then are neo-pagans motivated if it is not by hatred, pride, fear and envy?

Lacking power because they volunteer for the minions of wickedness, which has no power, neo-pagans attempt to convince others that they have no power -- all the time setting up regimes to lord it over men who consider such regimes potent.

It all will come to nought because there is no power in paganism but only the appearance of it.

What harm and damage neo-pagans can do is to what is passing anyhow and so this is no harm at all.

Let us, therefore, be wise about these things, observing them, marking down what we see, giving them no room in areas we control.

Neo-paganism is a test sent by the Almighty for the benefit of his people. It is for their aid and comfort, that they may have the exhilaration of overcoming evil and all its temptations. It is sent so that the crown of the righteous may be the more glorious and their experience the more awesome.

Neo-paganism is ruling the world at this time. What chaos it sews, what misery and disaster it reaps. It goes by so many names and takes so many causes!

Yet the common denominator, the single thread of all neo-paganism is there for all to see: dissention, strife, discord, dismay, disharmony, disintegration.

All that men built patiently for centuries is destroyed in a day's orgy of ridicule and arrogance.

All the building-blocks of hard-won trust, forbearance, brotherliness, sacrifice and deference are slaughtered in the lelee of perdition.

We are told that to lust after money, after power, after recognition, after lust itself is a virtue.

We are told that to be proud of accomplishments, to lord it over weaker men, to seek ever expanding influence is commendable behavior.

We are told that to cheat, to steal, to lie and to plot another man's downfall is the way of Life!

We are told, in a word, that down is up, that bottom is top, that back is front, that left is right, that evil is good and that vice is virtue.

But we do not believe it, Crooked is not straight. Coniving is not convincing. Discord is not concord. Hatred is not love. Lies are not truth. And noise is not news.

We do not believe this neo-paganism. We do not even believe it has any power to stay around, not of its own accord.

Our life and the life of our friends bears witness to the power of light over darkness. For, darkness is sheer void. It is nothing at all.

When the wicked prosper they seal their own doom. When the righteous suffer they seal their own triumph.

Where did this neo-paganism come from?

It came from the family and from within the Church. The Church is not it but the Church, like rain, fostered it, as was her duty. The sun shines on, the rain falls on and the Church -- Creation -- fosters everyone equally.

To a point? No, forever. The judgement comes at the End and will have been planned from the Beginning. The Book of Life has the names of the righteous inscribed in it. On the basis of its Holy Writ will the separation be made.

So, where did neo-paganism come from?

From the family. From parents who yearned for tinsel and trash, who failed to keep vigilant watch of their charges, who pressured their children into anti-religious and immoral habits of mind, body and spirit.

Neo-paganism is the product of the home, the destitute home, the home destitute of principle and therefore of virtue. The home infected with the bats of ambition, laziness, greed and fornication bred pagans.

That's where it came from and that's where the cure must be applied because that's the locus of disease.

The cure will not be in any movement, cause, religious order or civic program.

The cure will be in the home. It includes a return to the pattern of family life laid down at creation and supported by Righteousness itself. The man is the head of the household, the woman takes her authority from him, remaining anonymous, and the child or children obey them both as with a single will.

The structure here defined is love itself and it fosters love, peace and harmony. A family so constituted and fixed in its determination to be steadfast cannot be drug down by any movement or cause.

The heart of neo-paganism is propaganda, to make people believe that destiny is blind force, unattentive to the family. The whole of neo-pagan effort is directed at subverting and tearing the family to pieces.

But these efforts are doomed to failure. They go with the current of public opinion. But they brook the current of evolution which is toward ever deeper, wider and more abundant love. And love always assumes a form, a physical form.

Love is more than and beyond form, but it always also takes form, countless forms.

This I am here to affirm, and it is no small thing in the face of three hundred years of so-called science: that, the very universe itself is structured to overcome neo-paganism; that, wickedness is doomed to obliterate itself on the very structure it seeks to destroy.

Nature, if you will, is constructed in such a way as to triumph over all opponents and to vindicate the righteous at every turn.

Nature itself is consciousness in varying degrees of explicitness but all the same kind.

Indeed, what we call Nature is expressions of consciousness. It is also forms of love. Consciousness is enveloped throughout and by nature.

This is why all creation has been groaning for the appearance of God, groaning both as a suffering servant and as a woman in labor.

Creation cannot be brooked, she cannot be teased, fooled or cajoled. She too is structured and that as virtue.

The righteous have in nature not an inert lump but a willing ally. Indeed, a quick and fascile servant would be a better description.

What need is there to rebuke the neo-pagans? Like rock walls they think they can stand against the sea. In fact, however, it is with them as T. E. Lawrence once said about the great cliffs of Western Ireland: "Sooner or later there will cease to be an Irish question."

Righteousness is such a sea into which all flows and all is made to dissolve. We call an island an island because it is smaller than what we call a continent. But continents are only larger islands, are they not?

Islands and continents rise from the sea and they return to the sea.

Nature is a conscious ally of righteousness. The wicked can only perish in the thing they take as death itself, namely, Life. What a tragedy that they should think so. Yet they clearly do think so.

There is no blind force at work anywhere. That is my message. My life is its guarantee.

If a person would like to glimpse the truth that is at work in the world, I would invite his attention to the writings of Ayn Rand. For there it sets itself forth in absolute clarity.

Neo-paganism, for all its over-arching vanity and vaunt, is hollow foolishness. We do not believe it and we never will. We are convinced by experience that it is a lie. We can conceive of no more inherently satisfying knowledge than knowing that neo-paganism is a lie and that the father of lies is a plain magician, a poor trickster and a patent hoax.

Systems

Sources of culture: principles, techniques, works of art, rituals, good men.

When one goes looking for the sources and building-blocks of culture, where does one look? In one's imagination? In anyone's imagination? In speculation and theory? In the latest fad of music, morals and mischief?

One looks to antiquity. Not to a certain period, such as Greece or Rome, but to the length of period covered by the sacred texts.

One looks for recurring themes over a long period of time, ways and attitudes that have survived the tempests of all times and climes. These are guaranteed by experience. Like a ~~proven~~ proven naval design, they can stand up to storms and so they are trustworthy.

We are today afflicted with people who have the attitude of Antiochus ~~Epiphenes~~ Epiphenes: they think things just began with them, that they master the world. In their over-arching hubris these greeks think they know all, are all, have all and will be all. They have erected abominations to their pride over all the country. They think they need nothing except their own will, which they consider supreme.

These people have many names. They are dopey, drunk philosophers. They are musicians and businessmen. They are liberationists and cause-joiners. In particular they are academics.

The colleges and universities of this country, at all levels, are producing Epipheneses at the rate of thousands per year. No institution today contributes more to the decivilizing of society than the institution of higher education. It is an abomination of desolation.

So, one seeking the sources of culture will over-look these know-it-alls,

these new-worlders, who are already senile, and will look instead to the ancient way, the proven, tested path. There is no security else.

The first thing one finds, at the heart of things, is principles. ~~Culture~~ Culture is built on principle.

The first principle is that we must at all times, regardless of circumstances, love God with a pure and simple heart.

The second principle is ~~that~~ ^{all} that we must at all times, regardless of circumstances, love ^{all} men equally with a pure and simple heart.

There are other principles but they are aspects of these two.

Love of God involves love for him in his many names and forms. A Christian, for example, cannot love God while denying that Krishna, Rama, Allah, Ahura-Mazdah are all names of the same God he worships as Yahweh Sabaoth, Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit.

Equally, he must treat every aspect of Creation and every item of it as a mantle of the same God he meets in the Person of Jesus.

Francis showed that the brother is not only men but also animals, streams and the sun.

Just as clothes cover the body, so Creation covers the Creator.

The one who loves the Creator will penetrate the veil of clothing and behold the One whose wardrobe has no equal, not even in Persia.

How often the ecumenical movement has foundered because it is not truly ecumenical!

Would ecumenism not include an examination of doctrine to marvel at how the several religions correlate, doctrinally?

What is administrative unity? This is no basis for ecumenism. The certainty and apprehension of inherent, existing doctrinal unity -- that is the basis of ecumenism. ~~x~~ But what honest labor must be done to make it ~~appear~~ appear!

One thing you cannot do is hand people wisdom. They must earn it. And that by grueling labor under punishing circumstances. Wisdom does not come cheap. It comes at a greater price, mental, physical and spiritual, than does any worldly wealth. That is why so few people ~~x~~ even attempt to earn it and why a mere handful persevere to the last sacrifice.

Wisdom is the pearl of great price. One who has it has sold everything he had in order to obtain this one thing.

Many names, one God. But then there is doctrinal correlation. On both counts there is much labor to be expended before a person digests the facts of the situation.

Love of God is best done by imitation of his incarnations. This will be

different for different people. But the foundation of all imitation of divinity is humility, the practice of kenosis.

This is what modern man seemingly cannot do. Even if he is poor as dirt and living in rags he will be arrogant about something, even his rags.

Without humility nothing can be done, seen, remembered or thought. Humility is the golden door to clear vision, pure deeds, clean memory and strong thoughts.

Humility is also the surest defense against the assaults of wickedness, which are legion and do not cease in this world.

Humility is the great shield and protector. No threat can get by a stabilized, steady humility. No attack or threat of attack, regardless of its source or seeming power, can get through the outer defense of humility.

Humility is omnipotent. God himself has no power greater than humility. He himself cannot breach it.

So, the basis imitation of God is the practice of humility.

Protestant piety has been mournfully short in its understanding of the ways of loving God. A Protestant clergyman can tell you your duty toward men and your ritual duty toward God. But as for the interior life of God-intoxication, a Protestant clergyman can tell you nothing. It is a realm of experience Protestants cut off at the start. It has emerged piece-meal at intervals in only attenuated form.

The great vacuum of Protestant silence regarding the interior life is a reason for the crisis we are in. Protestant clergymen scurry for cover when anyone mentions mysticism and its great cultural reservoir, monasticism.

This is a shame and very lamentable.

Mention Bernard or Benedict or Bonaventure and Protestant clergymen shrivel. This is no fun at all.

But it is precisely this reservoir of experience, gained through centuries of monastic life, upon which we must fall back again and again if we are to identify the imitatio Christi and its nuances of stage, torment and triumph.

Dieterich Bonhoeffer is the first of modern Protestant clergymen to do this and survive, adding, in his own way, to the treasured storehouse.

For, a man may love God in one way and another in another. God's attributes are infinite. His attractiveness is different depending on the man's inner dispositions.

Humility is an immeasurable mansion, whose riches and splendor are beyond earthly comparison.

It is a flowing river, nourishing all the trees along its bank.

It is a genius of action, full of dash, vigor and unexpected exhilaration.

Whoever has humility has God.

This is the foundation for culture. Without this we have no culture but only the machinations of Epipheneses. Our situation is this today. Led on by those whose responsibility it is to foster wisdom, we find instead the fostering of stupidity and dumb imbecility.

Arrogance leads to mental disorders if it is not handily nipped in the bud. So with the leaders today; they exhibit various stages of mental disorder, leading toward retardation.

Love for God exhibits itself early and with increasing strength in love of good company.

After humility comes good company as a foundation stone of culture. Those who are strong spiritually may find no difference in company. And that is a point made by Paul. But he also implores the weaker brothers to keep only good company -- and he asks the stronger to help them and not feel superior.

What a great and marvelous pastor is this Apostle Paul!

Good company is those who care only about God and who every day bend every effort mightily to practice what he teaches. They will always be talking about God so that the air around them is g fragrant with devotion and inspiring to ever greater, more powerful acts of faith and love.

Bad company is those who care about satisfying their appetites. Their talk is about vice and leads to dullness and rust. Bad company drags a man down with filthy talk, foul thoughts and empty activity. It is the lot of many people. Like arrogance, it too leads to mental disorder and retardation.

Bad company corrodes the glass so that the lamp yields no light. Good company polishes the glass and even fuels the wick so that the lampx yields splendid light and warmth to all.

The quest for good company is a first and crucial step on the spiritual pilgrimage. Actually, it is a series of steps.

The devil is quick to rise to the occasion. He catches many whose resolution is imperfect and for them it is better never to have set out at all.

For those whose resolution is stronger, he commits more units to the fray. The reason is simple. He has the person to begin with. No one is a free agent. Either one serves God or the devil.

When, therefore, an individual resolves to serve God he has resolved to change masters and the old master feels under attack and threatened. And indeed he is.

To step out on the spiritual pilgrimage is to declare war ~~xxx~~ on the devil.

It is a rebellion of universal proportions because it is a march to the death on the very gates of hell.

The spiritual pilgrimage is a warfare, the stakes are total -- life or death -- and the enemy is not flesh and blood.

The carnage of battle will be tremendous if the pilgrim's resolution is firm. It will be infinite if his resolution does not stand -- because the casualty then is his own soul.

The spiritual pilgrimage and the hippie dream of peace-love-groovy-flow are exact opposites. Indeed the former is an open declaration and act of war on the latter.

The ~~an~~ image of a pilgrim is not a bespangled, flower-draped young maiden with no bra on. It is a hair-shirted, emaciated Clare, carried to the ramparts on a slab of wood~~x~~ -- her death-bed -- stomach scraping with hunger, eyes brighter than diamonds, holding aloft the Monstrance to fling back the Turkish hordes.

The image of a pilgrim is not an Indian-shirted, barefoot, guru-beaded, swami-bearded young pot head male stud. It is Anthony, self-shut in a tomb, beaten whipped and munched to such pain as no human torture could ever muster, confronted with such monstrous opulence of foul apparitions -- courtesans, lizards, crawling spiders and spindly spine-breakers -- as no acid trip could ever conjure, yet serene, smiling, ~~xxx~~ jolly even as he awaits the outbreak of light which he knows must come and does, scattering the minions of hell as if they didn't exist. And this as a mere text of his resolve -- and after full thirteen years of pilgrimage.

War is war and not a party. It is not a hippie "flow." A pilgrim must be a front-line General. He must know strategy and tactics. He must know logistics and communications. He must know intelligence and planning. He must know personnel and diplomacy. Every section of a Field Army must be accounted for in the personality of a pilgrim.

The aid he receives, however, is substantial, if he is firm. Half his army will be the angelic hosts which have already won their victory over Satan. This is no mean conscription.

The pilgrim himself will not have enough power, especially in the early stages, to maintain his position, much less to remain on the offensive. He absolutely must have the ~~an~~ help of angels. And angels are powerful.

Now, angels are not the "aides" or "guides" of the psychics. These are the minions of hell masquerading as beneficent "aides" -- a favorite disguise.

Angels are created beings, not of flesh and blood, in whom there is no evil at all and who serve God by helping men on the spiritual path. As in Tobit, angels can appear as flesh and blood, but this is appearance to enable them on some mission, as to help Tobit and his blind father.

Angels are always available to help when the suppliant asks and even when he does not, because, being created, angels can see in advance of some

men and can act both to avert danger and to deliver from it.

But mostly angels furnish the combat divisions that the pilgrim must hurl into battle, himself being both C-in-C and point.

This implies that angels are put at the service of men for this purpose. Yes, the Creator puts them to this service.

It is recommended that every pilgrim become versed in every aspect of military life, administration and manoeuver.

Just as a campaign does not go according to a detailed plan but by a general strategy that is filled in tactically as circumstances progress, so the spiritual pilgrimage is not an exercise in programmed learning.

There are advances, counter-attacks, strategic retreats, forced marches (many of these), rallies and disillusionments.

These last, disillusionments, bring grief unspeakable, but, because they are dis-illusionments, they should be welcomed because the conquering of them, by en-lightenment, leaves the army for stronger and the army against weaker.

Each disillusionment that is overcome by the gaining of true vision is worth approximately the equivalent of another Field Army at the pilgrim's command.

As these disillusionments are met and conquered, the additions in troop strength occur geometrically, which in itself is exhilarating to observe.

When the pilgrim finally awaits entrance to the bridal chamber, he must have all the created orders literally at his feet and under his command.

Love for men does not derive from love for God. It is co-equal with love for God. Indeed, it is love for God.

A man cannot love God and hate his brother. God is his brother.

Love of men starts also with humility.

It follows with strong doses of deference, tolerance and forbearance. On these virtues and with humility under all, culture can be built to an entirety.

The specific ~~duties~~ duties of love for men and love for God are summarized in the Ten Commandments, which are interpreted mystically in the Sermon on the Mount.

These duties are all contained in the virtue of forbearance.

Forbearance is not a matter of letting evil pass when your duty is to prevent or punish it, as with the duties of a father, a judge, a teacher, an employee.

Forebearance is a matter of not stepping outside your duty to render judgement of sentence on a matter that has not been assigned to you. Forebearance is minding your own business and ignoring the rest. It is the highest yoga.

We do not realize how the various duties of society are all assigned. Detachment requires of us that we perform our duty with quiet enthusiasm and efficiency, leaving the rest to those assigned it.

The dysfunctionality of society is not on account of no-one being assigned certain duties. It is on account of people claiming to have responsibility for functions they do not have responsibility for.

Isn't it true that we waste ~~xxxx~~ countless hours second-guessing, back-seat-driving, monday-morning-quarterbacking?

We waste other countless hours, peper and money seeking to insinuate our petty, fetid~~x~~ opinions into councils where we have no business.

Forebearance is foregoing all of this and performing our duty which, no matter who or where we are or what we do, is of equal importance with every other duty given to men.

When everyone does their duty it is impossible to tell who has the more important duty. Each duty is equally important, just as each member of the body is equally important.

Our problem today is not non-functionality, no one to work, but dys-functionality, individuals straying outside their spheres of responsibility. Dysfunctionality is the cause of mal-functionality, individuals not doing the work assigned them or doing it poorly.

This is all solved with the cultivation of forbearance.

Many principles of daily living derive from love for God and love for men:

obedience to civil authority
 respect of parents and elders
 living quietly, eschewing demonstrations and other incitements to disorder
 never letting the sun set on your anger
 admitting faults gladly and correcting them promptly
 calm resignation under persecution
 being ~~xxx~~ always cheerful
 sublikation all the passions
 fostering compassion for all makes and manner of men and things
 never acting in anger
 acting in confidence and trust
 eschewing occasions for vice and ill-discipline
 keeping a low profile and, preferably, no profile
 renouncing the fruits of your actions
 doing your duty cheerfully and fully
 keeping a quiet, soothing tongue
 living simply, healthfully, gladly
 acting always in love

never associating with bad people
 always associating with good people
 never borrowing, never lending
 always acting, regardless of consequences
 accepting the consequences of one's actions
 paying all debts promptly and cheerfully
 never seeking occasion to be puffy
 always ~~not~~ seeking the least desirable place, the lowest position
 forgiving all faults, including your own
 forgetting the past, the present and the future

All these principles of daily living are summed up in two -- be strong and be happy.

If we will treat these principles not as options but as injunctions of bounden duty, we will gain the Kingdom of Heaven.

Strength is single-mindedness. The strong man is not him who gets his way -- this man is tottering on the precipice. The strong man is ~~not~~ he who has only one way and whose mind never vacillates. Evil is vacillation. Never to vacillate but to be steady and firm -- that is strength.

Happiness is doing what has fallen to your lot and doing it well. That is the sum of happiness. The lot of ~~every~~ every man on earth can be his happiness if he desires it to be. If a man wants other than his lot in life he will be unhappy.

Being strong and happy fulfills all the obligations of being born in human flesh. A person infused with these principles is no weight or bother on society. He causes no concern to anyone and because of this he lives in peace. He has earned peace.

He is free to do as he pleases because he pleases God. Augustine: "Love God and do what you want."

Technique is also a source of culture. Men are able to build, farm and clothe themselves. They are able to make things that support life and render it enjoyable.

Technique, or know-how, is an essential aspect of culture and one of its sources.

The body cannot withstand the elements on its own. Therefore it must be provided with shelter and raiment.

It is susceptible to ~~the~~ disease. It must be accorded medical attention and treatment.

In order to perform its duty, the body must be fed and that cleanly and adequately. Therefore, it must be provided food at regular intervals.

These basics -- food, clothing and shelter -- must be available to men on a sustained basis, without interruption or the threat of interruption.

Technique is necessary in order that food, clothing and shelter be available to men. It is necessary in the production, the distribution and the use of these commodities.

Without technique in all aspects of life, living is an impossibility.

But technique, left to its own logic, follows a path that becomes a great and positive evil.

Technique spawns technique and soon the effects of technique outstrip man's ability to invent new ones. The application of technique produces change, and change invites the invention of new techniques to apply to new circumstances and also to control them.

A chain-reaction occurs. Soon there aren't enough inventors to make techniques to cope with new situations. And any new techniques so change the situation again that we never reach a period of stability.

This is our situation today. We have so many techniques for this and that that we never can settle down as long as we think technically.

Technique, left on its own, produces not organization but randomness. Only when it is vigorously made to serve the simple goals of adequate (modest) food, clothing and shelter does technique serve a man and the whole community.

When it takes off on its own it produces first luxury and next, desolation.

Ellul said this many years ago and he was right. No one has improved on or contradicted his observations of technology. Technology, as Ellul saw it, is merely the deification of technique.

Man's hands are meant to work; but man is not meant to worship the work of his hands.

Man's hands are meant to win for him the necessities of adequate food, clothing and shelter. The means or techniques he uses to win these necessities are no more worthy of worship or awe than his hands themselves.

What keeps technique from spawning materialism is simplicity, an aspect of love for God and brother. A simple man has both technique and control of it. A complex man has neither.

Simplicity is single-pointedness.

It is surprising that so many today feel that technique is unimportant. Hippies want "natural" food yet they don't know how to grow it. Middle-income people want entrance to cultured social ~~x~~ circles yet they don't know how to behave in a mannerly crowd. Women want children but don't know how to bring them up. A young man wants to compose music but he doesn't know how to play the piano.

We have had a reaction against technique that has been destructive to culture. We have had a heterogenesis of technique that has been destructive of culture.

Technique is a problem for us. The problem is idolatry -- cineramic stupidity fed by ego, pride -- taking the work of one's hands, a dumb tool, for a power.

Yet technique remains a sure source of culture. The control of technique lies in a limited application of it, the limits being adequate food, clothing and shelter for all men who work.

Technique is a tool for the body to contribute to its own maintenance. If we maintain the body simply, we control technique. If we maintain the body opulently, we do not control technique.

The law that applies to technique is: qualitative magnification is inversely proportional to quantitative diminution.

What the body craves will harm it. But what the heart wants will benefit both the heart and the body, if the body, through the mind, is made to obey the heart rather than its own appetites.

Technique is bionics, the isolation of a function of the body in the external world, outside the body. All technique is bionics.

So, since the body and all its functions are transient and passing, it makes no sense and is positively insane to elevate any bionic masterpiece -- technique -- to a level of worship, awe and reverence.

No matter how powerful the computer, it is only a big pencil and a pencil is only a stylized finger.

Divinizing technology is another way of divinizing the body, and this is absurd.

Technology -- tractors, machines, pipe-lines, factories -- is hard-programmed technique. It is technique put into relatively stable memory. The farmer doesn't have to wake up each morning and reinvent a tractor and irrigation pipe. The secretary doesn't have to start each day by designing and manufacturing a typewriter.

There are no theoretical limits to the production of technology. But there are biological and geological limits. There are also spiritual limits, outlined above, but these are not inherent in technology. They are inherent in our approach to technology.

The biological limits of technology are the points at which it makes the biosphere and its supporting geosphere, lithosphere and bhayrosphere non-conducive to life. The application of technique is capable of reversing, for a while, the processes of evolution and involution.

This reversal of life's supporting context is apparent in the mental disorders that afflict individuals. The same disorders on a large scale can be reasonably expected.

All we know is that the course of evolution cannot be stopped, but it can put a big clout on those who, through ignorance or vice, would destroy its fruits, which is life -- and that abundantly.

The geological limits of technology are the limited raw materials available to manufacture things. Miniaturization and light industry may push these limits out farther than the limits of petro-chemical-metal manufacture. But there are limits here too, if only those imposed by the technology required to fabricate miniature technology. Even the technology of cloning has limits imposed by the fact that man cannot construct a bionic apparatus that duplicates himself. The means he has to do this now, ordinary reproduction, is not a duplication process. It is reproductive and generative, producing uniqueness.

So far, technique has only begun to explore two great characteristics of the body, miniaturization and anonymity.

The brain does not encircle the cranium. It lies within the cranium. But electric and communication lines encircle the globe. They need the protection of anonymity.

Also, the central nervous system does more with less power-through than any technology. The shortage of fossil fuel can be an incentive to produce more efficient technology. Efficiency should be measured in terms of an output/power-through ratio. The more technology increases output while decreasing power-through, the closer it reaches the bionic ideal. (Today, 33% of the electrical power generated -- at such huge cost -- merely evaporates from the transmission lines. And the power company tells us to be energy-efficient.)

In addition, such efficient technology will have to be based on chemical-reactive power more than on combustion. Nuclear-reactive power is out of the question. The energy source must be far simpler. Chemical-reactive power, combined with a low-level combustion power, is the bionic model.

Nuclear-reactive and nuclear-fusive power are non- and even anti-bionic power sources. They are both unnecessary and harmful.

Technique is morally neutral. It is like a surgeon's knife. It can be used to help life or to harm it. The issue depends on the man wielding technology.

This is why adjustments in technique, by themselves, will yield no cure for the crisis we are in. Technique is a source of culture, but it must be at the service entirely of the principles mentioned in the previous section.

Works of art are sources of culture. They formalize for men the highest principles and virtues and they inspire men to practice them.

Beauty is Bliss. Works of art are beautiful. They formalize and present beauty in its most assimilable forms, for the era, the eye, the hand,

the mouth and the nose.

Works of art are rarer than a glance at the entertainment section of the New York-or Los Angeles Times would suggest.

Things which express doubt, disbelief, ^{and} depravity ~~and disgust~~ are not works of art. I am not one to say art for art's sake but rather art for God's sake.

Works of art move a man's heart to an experience of quiet, peace, nobility and love. They encourage a man to behave this way. They elicit a response in action of like kind.

Art, especially music, quietens the passions and transmutes them into passings of divinity itself.

The experience we have when something truly delights and thrills us, when something is near and dear to us -- that experience is God and the thing which elicited it is a work of art.

God is the great Artist.

We often think of nature as an artist, when we see the sunset or a country vista. But nature is no person, no independent, sufficient force. Nature veils the great Artist and what we see is his continuous drama, performed for our enjoyment and his. And indeed, we are no more than actors also, assigned definite roles.

We enter the stage and leave the stage at his bidding. The stage, the script, the scenery, actors and costumes are all decided upon beforehand.

We can earn the right to play higher roles in successive births.

Works of art are aspects of this drama and ~~they~~ they are patterned on the noblest characteristics of it.

Human artists are not plentiful, at least not today. For every thousand who say they are artists in this and that medium, one will be.

A friend once said to me that every town has one good horse-shoer. But when he left, the town was without one.

One master may have many apprentices, but most, if not all, will be good craftsmen, not artists.

One wonders, for example, how it could be that so many young pianists are concertizing since the 1950's. Are they all artists? No, they are, nearly to a man, craftsmen, very good ones even.

Most of what we call art work today is copy work. The breath of life, which is love, is not in it, no matter how dazzzaling or competent it is.

The public that claims to appreciate art does not know art when they see it. En masse, we are interested in the depraved rather than the divine.

We listen to another's opinion rather than evaluate for ourselves.

Thus, nowhere is art being encouraged today in an official, paid manner except in some rare cases where artistry has had the ~~fortune~~ fortune of being recognized along with something else -- as with Van Cliburn, namely his origin and his storm of Russia.

But we have a legacy and it will carry us over any dry times. We also have art being produced today, as it always has been, regardless of circumstances.

The art that is being produced today is simple, not opulent. It is colorful, not vague, charming, not monumental. Art today has a certain lightness both of weight and vision. It looks transparent, transcendent and transcient. It looks slightly rude and rustic but this is only on account of its being compared to the refined ~~technicalism~~ technicalism of what passes for art but is not.

The same people who want their bodies to look just so want their art to look just so. They're willing to spend hours to achieve one small effect that they calculate will increase their attractiveness.

Art does the opposite. It achieves not effects but causes. Art is a prime mover, a motivator, an inspirer, a prod, a chide, a pat, a paddle. Art can bring a sinner to penance and to glory.

Art does not imitate life. Art is life. It is Eternal Life.

Paul chartered art and artists in his words to the Philippians: "Finally, brothers, fill your minds with everything that is true, everything that ~~is~~ is noble, everything that is good and pure, everything that we love and honor, and everything that can be thought virtuous or worthy of praise. Keep doing all the things that you learnt from me and have been taught by me and have heard or seen that I do. Then the God of peace will be with you." (4:8-9)

What great words these are! They are examples of divine art, creations of the aternal artificer.

Art is serious business and a calling. Today the people who have no morals and no way of life, who are wracked and wrecked with ~~doubt~~ doubt and discontent call themselves artists. It is fashionable.

They are sons of riches, these degraders of life and morals, who appoint themselves teachers of muck, having been born from nowhere and being bound for Hell. The evil of opulence has bred them.

The artist has a calling. With saints and sages, he is put in his role to uplift, strengthen, encourage and lend joy to the pilgrim paths of his brothers. His is a duty. Like Jeremiah, he cannot but make works of art if he would not be incinerated by the Word that is in him.

In so many walks of life we forget the injunction to perform them well! Life is not a matter of choicebut of injunction. God does not lay

possibilities before us for our examination. He lays burdens of obedience upon us and with them promises of reward or punishment. We forget this to our peril.

So art is also serious business. It is bounded on six sides by threat and promise.

Here is an experiment. Pick up a copy of Playboy. Look at it. Now, pick up a book of Kandinsky's prints. Look at it.

Again, pick up a copy of Saturday Review. Read it. Now, pick up a copy of the Jerusalem Bible. Read it.

Again, smell a modern office. Now, smell a rose petal perfume.

Again, ~~xx~~ run your hand over a stadium wall. Feel it. Now, run your hand over a Bernini. Feel it.

Finally, taste a dish at La Cote Basque. Now, taste some cake from Baba's Hand.

Art, like truth, is self-evident. Our desires may be impure and lead us to prefer anti-art to art. But art is thereby in no way diminished or obscured.

The desire for depravity is overcome by the desire for truth in deeds (service), in emotions (worship) and in knowledge (wisdom). The foundation is deeds of service. Love is next and wisdom comes as the ~~next~~ highest goal. All three belong together and cannot be discriminated.

Works of art inspire men to treat the God-ward path. This makes them a source of culture since the God-ward path includes in its wake the great edifice of civilization.

Works of art do not enrich men. They enrich the spirit within a man. Money, power, influence, name and fame are of little value. It is continuing testimony to the greatness of man's spirit that works of art are available to the public free through museums, concerts, radio and city planning commissions. They should be. They are the property of mankind.

Works of art are not for entertainment but for inspiration. Entertainment is dissipating and hollow. Man must be on the move forward, god-ward ~~x~~ or he will be on the retreat backward, hell-ward. There is no stopping but only continual progress.

Diversion, or what we call entertainment, is retreating backward.

Art, therefore, inspires a man forward. It demands a response in like kind. Like the Incarnation, it fosters the desire to imitate in mind, body and spirit what it describes in color, word, sound and stone.

Art inspires imitation not of the work itself but of the truth the work describes.

Art does not describe nature. It describes God and since he can never be fully described, art will always be with us.

Art is serious business because the various media of art -- stone, wood, paint, sound and the artist's life -- must be vigorously churned before God can be described in these media.

It is like getting butter out of milk. The butter inheres in the milk but only prolonged labor will make it appear in the milk. So with God. He inheres in everything, but only prolonged labor -- called spiritual exercise -- will make him appear in everything.

Media by themselves communicate nothing worthwhile. With strenuous churning they can be made to reveal God.

Media theorists and art critics speak in ignorance.

I repeat the words of Paul to the Philippians: "Finally brothers, fill your minds with everything that is true, everything that is noble, everything that is good and pure, everything that we love and honor, and everything that can be thought virtuous or worthy of praise. Keep doing all the things that you learnt from me and have been taught by me and have heard or seen that I do. Then the God of peace will be with you ~~XX~~ ." (4:8-9)

I am fond of these words. They express so much in such a short space. How like Paul!

Next to Jesus himself, the New Testament has another great example of love in action, and that is Paul, whose apostolate was not by laying on of hands but by command of Christ himself.

There are several examples of art that I would like to mention. I do this not for critics only but for all.

In painting: the works of El Greco, Kandinsky, Marc, Klee, Jawlensky, Cezanne, Matisse, Rembrandt, Giotto, Lippi, Angelico, Homer, Russell, Remington. ~~Also pictures of~~ Also, the icons of the Eastern Church and the stained-glass of the Western.

In Print: the Jerusalem Bible, with notes, without Dali.

In writing: the works of Dante, Sathya Sai Baba, A. A. Milne, Melville, Ayn Rand, Sts. Bernard, Teresa of Avila, Ignatius, Benedict, Jerome, Douglas MacArthur, MacArthur's staff officers Whitney, Willoughby, Kenney and Eichelberger, Chesterton, Bonhoeffer, Paracelsus, Doughty, T. E. Lawrence, Cyrano de Bergerac (Hooker translation), Papal Encyclicals, Teilhard, Tillich, Calvin, a Kempis, Johannes Pedersen (Israel).

In music: the works of Bach, Beethoven, Brahms, Palestrina, Franck, Prokoffief, Dupre, Handel (Messiah), Gershwin, Rachmaninoff (Second Piano Concerto, Second Symphony).

Recordings:

Heifitz-Reiner-Chicago, Brahms
 Cliburn-Reiner-Chicago, Brahms, Second Piano Concerto
 H. Walcha, Bach organ works
 Archive, Bach, St. Matthew Passion
 Bernstein, Gershwin (the only thing I feel Bernstein does well since the 1950's)
 Dupre, Franck, Dupre, anybody at St. Sulpice, Paris
 William Kappel, piano, anything
 Gould, anything, but especially with Stokowsky on Beethoven Emperor
 Concerto -- my favorite recording of all

In sculpture: the works of Bernini, Cellini, Michaelangelo, Cezanne, Remington, Russell, Pippen and St. Peter's, Rome

Books about the saints are especially important. There are many and the reader must read much to get an idea of what is fact and what is lazy sentiment. ~~These~~ These stories are an excellent way to bring up children.

Photography is not an art. It is a handy copier of art but is not itself an artistic medium. Photography and recordings are of the same type. Both can be done by countless thousands and this right away shows that they are not art forms.

Both photography and recording shut off the top and bottom harmonics of the electro-magnetic spectrum. The shut-off point can be stretched through improved technology, but it cannot be open, as it is naturally.

When either photography or recording masquerade as art forms, as they do today, they have overstepped their calling and serve the purposes of anti-art.

We have many absurd ideas about art and artists today. These few notes give a true description of both.

Works of art are a source of culture in that they formulate and inspire men to practice the highest principles and virtues. One can look at El Graco's portrait of St. Jerome and see preserved and preached the great virtues of renunciation, fidelity, strength and purpose. One can hear Franck's Grand Piece Symphonique played by Dupre on the organ at St. Sulpice, Paris, and hear the very angels conversing with shepherds watching their flocks. One can hear the music of Bach and hear all over again the surrender and joy of a small boy, trusting and loving the great power of his eternal Father.

I do not agree with Schweitzer's interpretation of Bach's music. Schweitzer was a Stoic, not a Christian. Bach was a Lutheran Christian. He had the great virtue of Lutheran Christianity which is trust and joy in the Father. Schweitzer had neither of these virtues. The whole theory of tone painting is a Germanism. It has nothing to do with Bach's music, or with art, and not with philosophy either. In fact, the whole German academy, from the Eighteenth Century onward, is a stinking pit of darkness. Schweitzer, unlike Bonhoeffer, was at home in this pit. He is no judge ~~of~~ either of religion or of art.

To illustrate the splendor and depth of the divine artist, I include here some of his names as found in the Bible.

El Shaddai, Yahweh, Elohim, The Most High, The Fear of Isaac, The Mighty One of Jacob or Israel, Lord, Melchizedeck, Father, Consuming Fire, Pillar of Light, Love, Righteousness, Justifier, Avenger, Liberator, Judge, Blessed One, King of Heaven, The King, Yahweh of Hosts (Sabaoth), The Living God, Master, Majesty, The Almighty, Glory, Omnipotent, Omniscient, The Holy One of Israel, The Rock, The Refuge, The Defense, The Shield, The Righteous One, The One, Horn of Salvation, Stronghold, The Eternal One, God of Gods, Lord of Lords, King of Kings, A Hedge, A Wall, Creator, Ineffable, Invisible.

Jesus, Messiah, Son of God, Son of Man, Anointed One, High Priest, Wonder-Counsellor, Mighty-God, Eternal-Father, Prince of Peace, Lamb of God, Son of David, Man of Sorrows, The Man, The ~~xxx~~ Word, Holocaust, Redeemer, Judge, Shoot of Jesse, Vine, Branch, Bread, Blood, Emmanuel, Teacher, Expiator, Faithful Servant, Servant of Yahweh, Suffering Servant, Shepherd, Good Shepherd, Bridegroom, Physician, Son of the Most High, Sun of Righteousness, Savior, Word of God, Wisdom, The Truth, Light, The Way, The Life, Mediator, Pleroma, Reconciler, Revealer, Stumbling Block, ~~Scandal~~ Scandal, Vineyard, Living Water, Light of the Nations, Covenant of the People, The Despised, The Ugly One, The Bread of Life, Mother.

The Spirit, The Holy Spirit, Deliverer, Comforter, Protector, Spirit of Yahweh, Breath of Life, Paraclete, The witness, The Advocate, Peace.

Section
Rituals are a source of culture. They are prescribed by God as medicine for our moral and mental invigoration. They are not habits of large groups and they are not rites of passage, signaling a change in one's position in the community.

Rituals are divine medicine, divinely prescribed, by which we can be nursed back to health. They are means of grace, ~~xxx~~ positive motivators, sure and certain calls of the Divine Person to forward movement.

Rituals are action along the path of spiritual progress. They are prescribed with the fullness of divine benediction.

Yet, if they are insincerely done they may as well not be done at all.

Rituals are sacraments and there are five of them.

First, baptism. Baptism is the moment at which God receives the individual into his company and promises to save him from destruction. It is the moment an individual enters the Ark called the Church and so survives the Flood.

Second, penance. The heart of all piety is the confession of sin and the acceptance ~~through contrition and~~ of absolution through contrition and a firm resolve to press forward with renewed ~~vigor~~ vigor. Contrition itself is enough penance. The resolve to press forward and the actual stepping out in action are the means ~~in~~ of achieving the goal of piety

which is Eternal Life. This ritual, unlike baptism, is repeated as often as necessary.

Third, marriage. Marriage is both the means of continuing humanity and a means of gaining Eternal Life through the dutiful fulfillment of the obligations and rights of the marriage order. It is also an opportunity to repay debts incurred in the previous births. Ordination is not a sacrament and is contained instead in the sacrament of marriage.

Fourth, communion. Communion is an on-going participation in the life of men by God and in the life of God by man. It encourages the individual to travel beyond the church, beyond the limits set by reason and the mind, toward merger with the absolute. Confirmation is not a sacrament and is contained instead in the sacrament of communion.

Fifth, unction. The individual is helped by God in the last moments of his earthly sojourn to ~~xxx~~ visualize the heavenly Paradise toward which he is striving with all his heart and soul. The last moment of earthly life is the most important.

These rituals are sources of culture.

There are many acts of habit and good manners which foster the uplift and preservation of society. These are important too but they are not ~~xxx~~ rituals merely because they are done repeatedly throughout life on earth. They are actually principles practiced with the strength of habit, essentially, good manners, which are love in action.

Good manners can be practiced by pagans who are unenlightened by the revelation of God's will for us in Scripture.

Whereas, the aforementioned rituals are laid down through revelation and stand to us as God's very active good pleasure for us. They are not available to the unenlightened pagan's groping attempt to establish order-- as, for example, good manners are.

Rituals are distinct from all habits of good manners. They are an intervention of divine will. They introduce an entirely new order in the skein of earthly existence. In fact, they help the individual to penetrate that skein and visualize the Truth. They establish an individual apart from the world while still in it. This is divine, not human doing, though a man must become progressively more stabilized in these rituals by wholehearted participation in them.

Medicine will not help a patient who does not obey the doctor's directions for taking it. So with ritual. It must be done steadily, in an attitude of prayer and thanksgiving.

Also, just as a man does not boast about the medicine he is taking -- ~~h~~ because if he were not sick he would not need it -- so an individual does not boast about the ritual he performs at divine command.

Ritual is an example par excellence of divine mercy toward the sick.

If there is rejoicing at baptism that an individual is grafted onto the Body of Christ, how much more rejoicing will there be when the individual is well and on his own.

The Church is a hospital. It is expected that patients committed to her motherly care will get well and walk out into Eternity. There can be no more rejoicing in a growth in church membership than in an increase of hospital admittances. It were a real occasion for joy if the Church were unnecessary.

Church membership is ipso facto transcient. The Church's job is to heal people and to send them back out on station

It is good to be born in the Church but not to die in it.

Good men are a source of culture. They are living examples of the sort of person God takes pleasure in. Their hearts are pure, no wickedness can lodge in them. Out of their store of goodness they bring forth goodness. They accomplish heroic deeds, leading men on by precept and example to the highest reaches of achievement.

Good men are the ~~cement~~ cement that holds the bricks of culture in a stable edifice. They are the gates which release or hold back divine patronage and blessing. They are the arbiters of the affairs of men, deciding now in favor of this course, now in favor of that.

Politicians may believe they control the affairs of men. Artists may believe the same, housewives, doctors, lawyers, ministers and laborers the same.

But all of these people believe an illusion. In truth, good men everywhere are in charge, and they also will answer for their actions and decisions, to the last one.

Good men even control the appearance and disappearance of divine incarnations.

The thoughts of a good man take effect no matter where he is.

It will be seen at the end that the governing council of the earth is not the educated, powerful men but the wise and good men, whose numbers are smaller than those of the educated and powerful.

Goodness in a man is what makes his memory sweet to future generations. When he dies, it is with a smile and a bow, and with weeping among men.

Good men foster life, they foster goodness and they foster love. They are always busy fostering what is eternal. They water, tend and nourish the roots of culture, they guard culture against attack -- and this is why they are fondly remembered.

People say to themselves about a good man, "I'm glad he lived." When those words are said about a man in the privacy of another man's heart -- there we have a testimony to goodness, and to greatness.

I am glad General of the Army Douglas MacArthur and General George S. Patton lived. They are good men. It is of such men as these that culture is established and maintained. They are the very life blood of culture.

Good men are the living standard by which other men are evaluated. They do not judge other men, but other men think so. So, good men are persecuted in this evil age.

~~And~~ Goodness is not a feeling or a warm glow. It is universal order. It is the power that sustains life. It is the way which builds and passes on what is valuable. Goodness is not a state but a course of action. It is not a possibility but an imperative. Good men incarnate all of these ~~x~~ aspects of goodness.

Goodness is ~~x~~ what brings forth food and rain and clothing and shelter for men. It brings forth the teacher, the spiritual preceptor. It brings forth the child and the life's occupation. It brings forth the family, the Church, the community, the nation and the world. It brings forth great leaders. In a word, it brings forth everything that is necessary to support the physical universe, society and the individual. And it brings these forth in order and peace, full of mutual cooperation and brotherliness.

Good men incarnate all of this. They are a source of culture and so they are imperishable. Men remember them forever.

A man must seek the company of good men if he is to ~~g~~ be good~~x~~ himself. This will be his life's work.

We have discussed five sources of culture: principle, technique, works of art, ritual and good men. It has been an enjoyable discussion. In fact, it has been very enjoyable.

Sometimes a man must drive a straight course between Scylla and Charybdis if he is to get into navigable water. I have done this with Attitudes Too. The temptations which arose after Attitudes to wreck on one side or the other have been met and overcome. These temptations were legion.

Completed on the Thirteenth Day of January, in the Year of Our Lord Nineteen ~~M~~ Hundred and Seventy Eight.

Attitudes To

Introduction

There is a need to show in words one's attitude toward recent and current events. This need arises not from a desire to be prominent but from a moral responsibility to one's heritage, one's principles and one's ideals. It requires no courage to be prominent. Beasts do this on instinct. It does require courage to think things ~~thru~~ through rationally and, to the best of one's ability, to set forth what one sees and the attitudes one has adopted toward what one sees.

That is the purpose of Attitudes To. It is a combination of intelligence report and attitude peper. It is not a policy paper in the sense of being a call to a particular set of actions. I am not in a position to set or ~~x~~ even to recommend policy. But I am in a position, as every man is, to observe events, to understand them and to select an appropriate attitude toward them.

An attitude may or may not ~~x~~ contain inherent policy recommendations. An attitude, however, has no explicit policy recommendation because it does not seek to influence the events toward which it has been formulated. It is an observer's posture toward events he sees and understands.

Attitudes To is a collection of intelligence reports and attitudes which I have made concerning recent and current events. Like all my writing, it is not expository but summary in nature. It is a sequel to Attitudes and to Attitudes Too.~~xx~~ I am solely responsible for it. No one else is to blame.

Chapter One

Compounded Confusion Confounded

Here in the United States the most accurate description of events for thirty years is confusion. Our daily existence has the characteristics of Alice's game of croquet in which the ball is a living hedgehog, the mallet is a living flamingo and the player is a living Alice. All is confusion: metarandom coupling.

At the same time we have an orthogenesis of rules and regulations. These seem to be meant to relieve confusion but actually they are meant to increase it. Why is this so? The answer will be forthcoming.

Confusion in the little things of life, like the international trade deficit and the boundaries of national sovereignty, are reflections of confusion in the big things of life, like whether one should work, being loyal to one's spouse or sell one's children for profit. In other words, confusion anywhere is a reflection of moral confusion.

St. Francis felt obliged to intercede with the Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, throned in glory in the forests of Germany, on behalf of a flock of birds about which he ~~x~~ was concerned.

Recently we saw established the principle that men, not laws, govern the United States. Richard Nixon resigned under, but the principle, so-called, had already been established and was standard operation procedure among

certain groups since many years. The main group which had used this principle for so long was the government itself, regardless of which political party held the White House, and in particular, the civil service.

The principle that men not laws govern the country -- which is no principle at all but a species of violence -- had an easy time of it because a real principle had already been extinguished. This is the principle that morality, not laws made by whim, that is, men, govern the country.

The order of operation is this: morality, laws (reflecting morality) and men. Men are answerable to laws, laws are answerable to morality. Morality is absolute, unchanging and eternal.

During the Administration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the source of it all, morality, was chucked out the window. The Administration of Harry Truman went further and chucked out the law. Nothing changed for twenty years and the Administration of Richard Nixon, an easy patsy, got left holding the bag.

What I want to point out is that the damage was done in the Roosevelt years and particularly in the War Years. Damage had been done previously, even as far back as the period of the Founding Fathers, but the Roosevelt Administration gave morality ~~xxx~~ a complete kick out the door of this country.

This Administration established two procedures that have ever since been standard. The first was to consider the individual a ward of the government. The second was to consider lies, evasion and prevarications in the national interest. The first procedure enslaved the citizens. The second procedure eradicated policy per se. The country was without liberty, the engine of its existence, and it was without direction, the life of the living.

The Truman, Johnson, Nixon and Carter Administrations followed up on the lead of the Roosevelt Administration. The Eisenhower and Ford Administrations were polite but inactive caretaker governments. The Supreme Court since the Truman Administration has hastened the rule of whim and the Federal and local courts have greased the skids. Congress and the civil service have succeeded in creating chaos.

The Kennedy Administration was probably taking corrective action. The evidence points in this direction.

Why has the orthogenesis of laws since the Roosevelt Administration caused such confusion? The answer is that these laws were meant to cause confusion. And if we ask why anyone would want to cause confusion the answer is, to seize power. And if we ask who wanted to seize power, the answer is, that is the heart of the issue. In general terms, the siezers of power were a series of gangsters and rival groups.

We have become confused by the idea that certain grand concepts and theories cause the historical drama. Everywhere we hear this explanation

of events, especially from psychiatrists and academics. But the truth is that men make events, plain men with names, desires and goals.

The confusion we have inherited down the line from the Roosevelt Administration is the direct result of perfidy, treason, both as regards morality itself and the United States also.

It surfaced cleanly just before the Chinese attacked in Korea. Someone told the Chinese that the United Nations forces would not attack their bases north of the Yalu River. This someone was probably in the United States Department of State, probably in the Far Eastern Section and probably the then Undersecretary in charge of that section. The weight of circumstantial evidence points here. This man was Dean Rusk. However, the word could also have come from George C. Marshall.

To say this does not delete the possibility, which is overwhelmingly great, that officials above and below Rusk knowingly assisted him directly and indirectly. Nor does the fact of severe British government pressure at the time to betray every standard of justice and right relieve this individual or the so-called "Club", a collection of East-coast intellectuals cum businessmen, whom Rusk, along with many others, represented, of ultimate responsibility.

The United States Department of State, then and now, is staffed with intellectuals who think communist ideology is cute and ~~is~~ chic. They feel also that it enables them to lord it over the masses. Communism is a movement of intellectuals, not of tradesmen. The intellectuals it attracts are all Lenin types, regardless of their pin-stripe suits.

These people, in State and in all branches of business, government and, especially, education, have been deliberately creating confusion for years in the hope that they may attain to a prestige and power they could never reach by honest means, namely, upright living and hard work. Are they Soviet agents? No, not today so much. Earlier many were. But today they are agents for their own private dreams of grandeur. Many are also agents, in operation if not by employment, of Red China.

Whoever would stand to benefit from and so actively desires ~~is~~ mass confusion among a nation's citizens -- these people are the support ~~is~~ if not the employers of this bag of immoral intellectuals -- or, as a member of a rival gang once called them, "an effete corps of intellectual snobs."

To unravel the labyrinth of so-called United States policy, ~~the~~ domestic and foreign, since the Roosevelt years is impossible. It is a mass of confusion, and confusion cannot be straightened out of itself. That is why it is called confusion.

However, when we look at what happened we can read a policy behind the verbiage: it has been a policy of rapacity in the pursuit of unearned prestige and power. Basically, the policy of your common bandit.

What we must do is see when the confusion occurred first and why. I have already described that: it occurred during the Roosevelt Administration

as a result of that Administration's disposition of morality to the trash heap.

The idea that the individual is a ward of the state, now the law of the land, appears beneficent. But it is malevolent in the extreme. Roosevelt introduced the idea of the benevolent dictator, in form and substance no different from Lenin's idea of dictatorship. He got the idea from his coterie of intellectuals. They had been reading Marx and Lenin and were impressed. They saw an opportunity. Even Reinhold Niebuhr was impressed early on. So was the whole international academy. Union Theological Seminary, New York City, quit the Presbyterian Church in defense of a communist faculty member.

But the academy was wrong, and not a little, but absolutely and totally wrong. The idea that the individual is a ward of the state makes those who work support those who will not -- welfare, social security, retirement. It allows the government to rob the citizen blind by inflating the currency (raise benefits, get votes). And it allows those who work to be taxed out of the fruits of their labor.

The idea that the government can lie, evade and prevaricate whenever it wants to means that the country has no policy at all -- except the policy of thieving by anyone strong enough to carry it off. A country without policy is a ward of any gang of bandits strong enough to hold off rival gangs.

This is the meaning of "Eurocommunism" -- ~~which~~ which also indicates racism -- and it is the position of the American political parties vis a vis Soviet, Red Chinese and Mexican claimants to sovereignty within and over the United States.

If treason can also be taken to mean the deliberate waste of American -- not to mention other national -- lives on the battlefield, then the word can be applied also to describe the behavior of the Secretary of Defense in ~~the~~ late 1950 and 1951, George C. Marshall.

The whole point about American policy since the Roosevelt Administration is that there has been none. This means there is no direction to American ability. Having the appearance of activity, America takes no action, except the action of thugs and thieves looting the public purse. To be without a direction, and one that leads toward life and not suicide, is death itself, both for an individual and for a nation, which is a group of individuals.

The logical extension of so-called American policy in Korea -- not to disturb the Soviet bear -- is to let that bear devour everything, America included. And to let other predators do the same.

Picture the state of American men if they were called today to defend their country. It is a picture of confusion. Who would be able to think straight enough to shoot, much less to plan? Everyone is blitzed on dope. Who would follow orders? No one recognizes any authority. Who would not desert and go over to the other side if someone there offered a free beer party? Who would have ideal one or principle one to help steer a course to victory?

If any foreign government could have devised a plan of ~~subterfuge~~ subterfuge in this country they could not have had a better idea than dope. In fact, that dope is at least in part a program of communist sabotage is a ~~xxx~~ reasonable suspicion. It is lucrative, de facto legal and sabotage all in one.

The huge logjam of legal problems that ~~max~~ has faced us in recent years is an aspect of this general confusion. People want to evade the responsibility of making decisions and living with their consequences.

The whole fruit of confusion, lead on by treasonable men, is seen first and clearly in the conduct of the Korean War. There Americans lost their moral footing and they have never recovered. They have only sunk deeper and deeper into corrosive depravity.

The highest-placed outright schemer of evil during this war was the Chief of the Far Eastern Office of the Department of State, Dean Rusk. This same individual pursued the same behavior of lies, deceit and treason for eight years as Secretary of State. It is my surmise that he is the brains and the will behind the assassination of President Kennedy.

The chief purveyor of moral depravity during this war, the man who had never held field command, who allowed his jealousy to forfeit thousands of lives, who treated soldiers in the classic totalitarian mold as cogs and digits, was the Secretary of Defense, George C. Marshall.

The chief dupe during this war, who had no spine either for the British government, which was socialist, or for his own Far Eastern Chief, who was a traitor, or for anybody else, was the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff during this war, Omar Bradley, was the highest-placed center of stupidity both in military and in intellectual matters. Not an evil man, he was plain stupid, a nincompoop, and so was no match for Truman or Marshall.

There is much hooray now over Harry Truman but in fact he exerted an evil influence during this period because of an over-arching ambition. What he accused General MacArthur of having in the way of character flaws -- ego, insubordination, ambition -- he had and the General did not. Truman was, above all, a constant and irrepressible liar, like Hubert Humphrey.

Each of these men was easy going for Rusk. Marshall would provide an a-moral, totalitarian and intensely vindictive influence regardless of Rusk.

The source of disturbance, the source of moral collapse was the Department of State in the Roosevelt Administration. George C. Marshall brought the whole depravity of American Far Eastern policy to public view with his famous trip to China. The Department of State, staffed by communists, sympathizers and dupes instigated this monumental atrocity against every standard of justice and integrity.

The same Department of State operates today on the same terms. Henry Kissinger brought the policy of having no policy to its quintessential perfection and for the same reason that motivated Rusk, his predecessor.

The reason that motivated both men was actually the non-reason of personal prestige at the direct expense of the citizens they were meant to serve. Neither man is a simple communist ideologue. Both men sought merely the prestige of rule and did anything they felt would augment that prestige. But the prestige they sought can only come one way. They did not seek the prestige of moral rectitude or of battle won against invading forces. They sought directly and unequivocally the prestige of standing on the litter of human degeneration. In theological terms this is the prestige of Anti-Christ who feels his life is worthwhile when he has ruined and devoured a victim. In street terms, it is the prestige of a gangster as he stands on the riddled corpse, smoking gun in hand, the virile conqueror of the unarmed and undefended.

Such men as these have held the reins of power for 30 years now in this country. In essence their goals are no different from those of ~~the~~ the men who run the Kremlin.

What we are most confused about is the notion that we live in a free society, that is, one in which a man can pursue his life's goal without external interference except in the case where he violates another man's right to do the same. We already in fact live in a totalitarian society, that is, one in which everybody but the individual has a legal right to compel the individual to a specified goal and to certain means to achieve it. But this is especially true of the government, which can insert itself now at will into any aspect of the citizen's life that it chooses.

The best evidence that this is the case is the behavior of the police. Ask a policeman for help and he will tell you that the law is not set up to handle the case you mention. Even if it is, the police force and the courts are always tied up with other more important business. Criminals cannot be dealt with until after they commit a crime, by which time it is too late. So citizens go about clenching their life in the palm of their hand.

The point is, when the citizen is unprotected by law from what in normal conditions would be criminal behavior, he is equally unprotected by law from the government, acting, as it does, under the cover of public interest.

Public interest is one of our favorite terms. So also public service. But in Russia and Red China and ~~in~~ in scores of "emerging nations" citizens are sent to prison (reeducation centers) in the public interest. Public interest is only a matter of who holds office, that is, which gang of thugs.

All of this comes when we throw out morality. For then we throw out law and we have a nation governed by the whims of thugs. That is our situation today. A thug is no less a thug when he wears a Phi Beta Kappa Key on a pin-stripped suit vest instead of the common dress caricature of the type. Whether from Harvard, Palermo, Bavaria, Moscow, Djakarta

or Mazatlan, a thug by any other name is still a thug.

Attitude: polite refusal to be anything less than morally certain of the certainty of morality and of its triumph against all forms and manners of evil.

Secondly, to bear any burden and pay any price in the active fulfillment of the highest ideals ~~and~~ and principles.

George Wallace did not draw his comparison clearly enough when he said that there isn't a dime's worth of difference between the Republican and Democratic parties. He could have said that there's as much difference between the Republican and Democratic parties as there was between the followers of Al Capone and Bugsy Moran.

Chapter Two Constitutional Loophole

The Founding Fathers were apparently not far sighted enough in stipulating that the federal government should regulate interstate commerce. The reasons for this provision were clear enough: to achieve a uniform currency and to protect states against economic deprecations.

It might have been slower and more painstaking to let individuals in different states find trustworthy men to trade with, but it might also have worked better than federal, that is, foreign, regulation. We shall never know.

We do know that the present state of federal regulation of commerce is enough to ensure chaos and confusion for some long time to come. It also stifles initiative and, expectably, decreases the profits of the companies so regulated.

The issue here is constitutional. The Founding Fathers intended no evil inheritance upon us. But the provision they wrote in the Constitution has been an invitation for diverse and sundry plundering of wealth in the name of the public good. Various Administrations and Congress itself have accepted the invitation willingly.

Attitude: watch, wait and see. There's not much to be done. The government cannot be expected to exercise any restraint in this matter. In fact, it is constantly extending its regulations and its regulative authority. Since the citizens are enjoying being wards of the state at this time, a constitutional initiative to redress the grievance is little likely. The states have been turned into provinces.

Chapter Three Money

The federal government has been printing money for over a decade now.

On a lesser scale than the one of this last decade it has been printing money for thirty to forty years.

Printing money is a principal means the government has of robbing the citizens it is constitutionally chartered to protect. That both Republican and Democratic parties have engaged in this procedure validates George Wallace's observation on the difference between these parties.

When there is a budget deficit the government simply prints more money. When a new program is wanted, the presses turn out the funding. Historically, the only basis for a monetary system is gold bullion with silver as a subsidiary basis. Even real estate, a partial economic base under peaceful conditions, is not a stable economic base because it is not easily exchanged. Bullion is such a stable base, it always has been and it always will be.

Borrowing and lending money in either stable or unstable conditions is undesirable, but especially this is true in unstable conditions. Borrowing and lending anything at all in unstable conditions is suicide. Pay for everything in cash on delivery or don't buy it.

Attitude: wait, watch and see. There is no alternative to an inflationary cycle than a huge deflation and resulting widespread poverty. The only people who can physically and spiritually survive such an event are those who have at their disposal media of exchange that are widely recognized as valuable. Even now the greenback is not recognized as such a medium, especially by the United States' creditors and suppliers.

Savings accounts of any kind are a deterrent to financial stability. An individual must have an economic base and that can only be bullion and, secondarily, real estate.

Chapter Four Medical Issues

Socialized medicine will not and does not work. Patients become hypochondriacs and physicians lose the initiative of making on the spot diagnoses and prognoses. They also lose the initiative and self-respect of being self-employed. No room is allowed for the physician to make adjustments, of his own free will, in charges. Research is stymied ~~and~~ in bureaucratic wrangling and priorities in this area are drawn along arcane rather than functional lines. Something weird looks better on paper than something useful.

The whole issue comes to a head at the point of using or not using bionic support systems for people who would be dead without them. In fact, these systems are the result not of ~~the~~ medical wisdom but of arcane research. They raise a host of totally unresolvable questions in a logical series that runs ad infinitum, which means, ad absurdum. Once you pose any question regarding these systems you're hooked to the endless logic ad absurdum. These systems, indeed, are not so much for saving life as for further research on saving life. The researcher's goals, not the

physician's goals, are behind them.

The whole issue is resolved by three questions. First, will the individual require this system indefinitely to stay alive? Second, is the individual a minor or a major? Third, can the individual express his desire to remain with or without the system?

If the individual will not require the system indefinitely then, major or minor, he must have use of it if it is available and he can pay for it. If the individual will require the system indefinitely, then, if he is a minor, his parents must decide whether or not to use it, and their decision is binding. They must pay for its use. However, if they decide to use it, the individual using the system must decide for or ~~ag~~ against continued use when he reaches his majority. He must pay for its use. If the individual will require the system indefinitely, then, if he is a ~~major~~ major, he must decide whether or not to use it, and his decision is binding. He must pay for its use. If the individual is a major and will require the system indefinitely but cannot express his desire either for or against use of the system he should not use it unless his immediate spouse and/or children decide for him to use it and pay for it.

This leaves the decision for such matters right where it belongs, with the individual, or his parents if he is a minor, and, secondarily, with the individual's immediate family. In all cases the decision must be backed by the ability to pay for the bionic support system. No pay, no machine. Medicine cannot ~~protect~~ protect against destiny. The cost of these systems today is artificially high as is the cost of anything hospitable.

Who decides if the patient is competent to decide for or against use of the machine? He does. Whatever he says is competent. If he can say ~~nothing~~ nothing his immediate family can speak for him, wife first, then oldest to youngest son, then oldest to youngest daughter.

The answer to the supposed problem of too few doctors is simple: first, don't be a hypochondriac, and second, get well. There is no glory in ~~having~~ having more doctors but only in having fewer, because if we get by with fewer doctors we are healthier than when we require more doctors. And, after all, health is the goal.

The blame for medical woes today is 90% patients and 10% government. Patients are making ludicrous demands on doctors and the government is encouraging outrageous research. The government is also inflating the price of medical attention in order to eventually ~~seize~~ seize it directly. It is only a matter of time before this seizure occurs.

Through inflationary policies the government has been driving up the cost of medical attention more lustily than any Robber Baron would have dreamed possible in his own business. And as for monopoly control, old Rockefeller was a small fish compared to the state and federal departments of health.

The issue of permanently using addictive drugs in order to alleviate pain

or cause emotional highs is simply resolved; don't use any. As for screams of pain, that is the patient's business. It is his life and he should face his responsibility for it. Pain caused by the undeserved attack of Satan is alleviated by God who has only allowed it in order to draw the individual closer to Him. Pain caused by the patient's rotten living is his own fault and he can only be left to face it. In this second case, the permanent use of addictive drugs is only more painful, spiritually, and cannot block the final pain of death which is worse than the stings of a thousand scorpions and which also might be prevented if the patient uses the original physical pain to progress spiritually. As long as a patient is using addictive drugs, including marijuana, spiritual progress is impossible because his mind is addled.

Much if not most of the pain individuals suffer now is the result not of undeserved devilry but of their own bad living. Reality is a rock wall that people must sooner or later slam into with great pain if they have led lives of irrationality, anger, injustice, intemperance, dreaming or lust. Medical economics today encourages people to live unrealistically because it promises surcease of sensation when it comes time to pay the piper. But this is a hoax, though it is widely believed. Reality has the last word and it is entirely unbending. There are laws around and all these crippled down, broken up old people who frittered away their own and their country's glory in the pursuit of inane pleasures are, in the time allotted them, running into the penalty for dissipation. No man can save them from this penalty and neither can the government.

We can save ourselves a lot of time and trouble by packing the addictive drugs for permanent use into the furnace. A furnace, after all, is the affect they have on a patient.

Attitude: pay your bills and find a good doctor. Nothing beats independence both in the giving and the receiving of medical attention.

Chapter Five Women's Movement

The women's movement is a fad that has biological and emotional limits. Women belong in the home tending the business thereof. When a woman fulfills the duties prescribed by the home she has great power and dignity. Outside this setting she is like a nail in ~~mx~~ water: she rusts.

The women's movement is another hoax of the so-called Jews. The original injustices that needed remedy, namely, lack of the franchise and the ~~infidelity~~ infidelity of husbands, have been lost in a blizzard of petty, peevish and insane ~~behavior~~ demands.

These demands are reminiscent of the ultimate Negro demands for racism. Not content to correct injustice, Negroes and women have demanded that injustice be done to their former oppressors. This is absurd.

That women look to the government to implement their demands is evidence of their own wish to exercise totalitarian power. ~~Now~~ Now, besides all

the other gangs of thugs seeking by any means to control the populace & there is a new one, women. Society has splintered into a chaotic mess of gangs, sexual, racial, economic, religious, governmental, professional, each claiming that the others are occupying its territory -- the public purse and the public administration.

In the American Southwest we have this effort carried to the heights of lunacy by Caesar Chavez and other communists. They claim 5 or 6 southwestern states belong to Mexico, read themselves. Pancho Villa is not dead here. It is good to remember, in this matter, that Leon Trotsky settled in Mexico and that the Soviet maintains a huge embassy in the country. Huge Soviet embassies indicate huge Soviet espionage and sabotage operations. Chavez and his gang claim that these states belong to them. All of their effort is meant to further confuse and disrupt the economy of these states and, by that means, of the United States, which fills its belly three times a day from the area.

The women's movement is yet another pack of thieves and bandits after the public domain, and the private domain also. As each of these gangs gains more power we will see that far from being friendly, as they appear now, they are rivals for the same turf, the private and public pocketbook and power.

For example, the Episcopal Church recently started ordaining women and then lesbians/. Do those who voted for this situation not believe that once they get women bishops these will cease ordaining men? What naive people these were to think that aggression does not have an end except by counterattack and defeat. Would Hitler have stopped at Russia and Arabia? The lust for power is insatiable and cannot be stopped except by force of arms.

Our naivete in this regard dates back to the Korean War. Now American troops will pull out of Korea and the President does not think the North Koreans will flow in and Red China behind them if necessary. (President Carter.)

The Negro, Indian, Jewish, student, etc. movements are on the same pattern as the women's movement. No longer aiming to correct an injustice, they aim to impose one, deliberately and with public malice ~~afre~~ aforethought.

In New York City many years ago a disillusioned old liberal minister of some prominence regretted sadly to me that whereas he thought the Negroes wanted freedom in fact all they wanted was to "grab a wart off the elephants's tail as it went lumbering by." He finally saw what the Fivepercenters in Harlem had seen for years, that most Negroes would sell their glory for a mess of pottage and in the twinkling of an eye. The Fivepercenters were a radical group that believed five percent of Harlem's Negroes deserved to live.

I am not a judge of who deserves to live. But of those who sell their lives for pottage I am a judge and that is just what the Negroes did. Instead of holding the issue of individual liberty and freedom aloft as a beacon to every oppressed man, regardless of race, they attacked other oppressed people, Jews, Mexicans, Caucasians, women (including

Negro women), in classical gang warfare and, when they could extort jobs and money from the government and from private industry, they went on a bacchanal which has yet to cease. A sorrier showing has never been made by people seeking their right to freedom. The country and the whole world suffered yet another bereavement when these people traitorously overthrew the issue of justice and turned instead to wine, women and dissipation.

The women's movement is another one of these gang fights. Set originally and rightly to correct injustices, the movement has gone over to the side perpretrating injustice. It has no recourse but to end up as every other movement of injustice in this world, smashed, sacked and spoiled by a rival movement. The women's movement, like the emptied wombs it promotes, will end up deprived of progeny by the knife, the noose and the numb-skull.

Attitude: watch and wait. None of these movements, except the Mexican, would be possible without an inflated economy. Watts erupted in 1965, a year after the printing presses raised hopes. When the economy reverts to stability the whole issue of freedom and rights can be looked at again/. The pressure will be off the men and they will have time to think things through. Meanwhile, keep these women out of your house, and especially, keep them away from your children. They are more deadly than plague.

Chapter Six The So-Called Church

Of all the things that needlessly bereave men today, none is more culpable than the Church. Chartered to uplift and nourish, to sooth and encourage, to be a bulward against every form and manner of evil, the Church today is the exact and total opposite. A theologian is not surprised at this turn of events. He may even derive some relief thereby because when the Church is under the Anti-Christ the Parousia is very near. A gardener lets the weed grow tall so that when he pulls it it comes out roots and all.

The Church today is marching en mass to the Rebel's tune. It is presided ~~over~~ over by witches, warlocks, charlatans, deviates, atheists and communists. And that is not a description of a part ~~of~~ but of every single branch and bough of the Church. All the Christians have long since been driven out. What remains is best described as a witches' coven or a charlatan's trophy case.

Attitude: leave it alone. The real Church is alive and well in hiding. Sooner or later the so-called Church will be destroyed, by its own larceny and from direct assault by the Truth. The Rebel is, after all, the Rebel and his days ~~x~~ are numbered.

Chapter Seven Capitalism

The only economic system that guarantees conditions in which life is possible is pure laizze-faire capitalism. This system is not a thing of the past but of the future. We have approached pure capitalism in this country but we have not had it yet. But we must and we will. Every other economic system stultifies initiative and energy by sapping the rewards of success and easing or eliminating the punishments of failure. If a man does not live with all the consequences of his actions he is not a man but a robot or a slave.

Those who are ashamed of capitalism are looking for a chance to loot their neighbor. You do not hate one thing without loving another. If, therefore, you hate honest labor and honest gain, you love dishonest labor and dishonest gain, which means you prefer to steal rather than to produce. Stealing is gorging dung and so a person who hates capitalism is alerting everyone that he wants dung in place of food. Such people deserve no respect at all. Furthermore, they bear constant watching. The so-called public sector of the economy, a euphemism for the government, is staffed throughout by such people.

Capitalism will not return, it will appear, though we have had glimpses of its splendor in the past. Capitalism is the exact opposite of dog-eat-dog materialism. Dog-eat-dog materialism is what we have in this country now, an advanced form of socialism leading inexorably to communism.

Capitalism is based on the rights of the individual and these rights are first expressed in property rights. For a discussion of this matter I refer the reader to Ayn Rand and to Pope Leo XIII's Rerum Novarum.

Capitalism is yet to come.

Attitude: behave capitalistically at every ~~an~~ available opportunity.

Chapter Eight The Soviet

Every thought that the Soviet Union is not an implacable enemy of the United States and of freedom itself is a patent hoax. Anyone who suggests such a thing is a dupe, a brigand, a communist or a Soviet agent. There can be no compromise or appeasement of evil and the Soviet is an incarnation of evil.

Soviet foreign policy is based on bluff and bullying. This is the first step in understanding him. He does not use force -- at least not his own troops -- except where he can get away without a fight. He uses the threat of force, or, intimidation.

He does not have territorial objectives in the sense of wanting to administer foreign countries. He wishes communist parties loyal to him to administer his territories. However, he does have territorial objectives

in the sense of maintaining strategic control of certain areas. He wants, specifically, strategic control of Africa, the Middle East and ~~the~~ Near East as far as Iran, the Mediterranean and its bordering countries and the Carribean. He would also like strategic control of Japan.

The reasons are as follows. Control of Africa would yield control of all Mid-East oil, shipping lanes and natural resources. It would yield essential control of the South Atlantic, the Indian Ocean and Antarctica. The Middle East and Near East yield control of oil, sea lanes and land invasion routes to the homeland. Control of Iran especially would add security to Soviet heavy industry and oil production located just north of it. This would also offer flank threat to Chinese expansion and open routes to Soviet control of India, an old Russian dream. Control of the Mediterranean would give the Soviet the same posture as ancient Rome in this reea, with corresponding military and economic advantages. The Mediterranean, for strategic purposes, is an inland ~~laxk~~ lake -- Mare Nostrum. Control of the Carribean with Cuba as the pivot yields threat of flanking manoeuvres north, south, east and west. It also serves as the eastern littoral of Mexican defense, the Soviet being increasingly able to claim that country in its sphere of dominion. Control of Japan yields a flank threat on China's west and it also yields warm water ports. The Aleutians and Alaska itself are part of the strategic arc across the Pacific which the Soviet sees hinged on Japan. The Japanese saw the same situation. Control of this arc is both flank pressure on China and effective control of the North to Central Pacific air and sea lanes.

The immediate objective, as since Korea, has been the Middle East. There is the latent power of American, European and Japanese industry. Industrial power is military power. The two are synonymous. Every immediate effort of the Soviet will be toward control of the sea lanes around the Middle East and, collaterally, of Africa itself.

Soviet strategy always contemplates flank rather than direct pressure.

The Middle East is so important to the Soviet that he will readily engage in shooting as long, again, as he can get away with it. The next most important area to him is Japan and the North to Central Pacific. There is some question who will get to Hawaii first, the Soviet or the Red Chinese. But based on estimates of mobility it will probably be the Soviet. In this area too he will have no hesitation about shooting, especially if he has already secured the Middle East. If he does not move on the North to Central Pacific until Africa and the Middle East are secured, he will move in great force and confidence, deploying every available means to take the area swiftly.

Europe has always been and remains for the Soviet a latter day operation. There is nothing of value in Europe, strategically or materially. General MacArthur pointed this out years ago, before he was relieved in Japan. After Korea the North to Central Pacific was secured in principle and his attention turned to the Middle East and to both sides of the South Atlantic. Here again, as always, his actions followed the course of least resistance to his bullying tactics.

At any point the Soviet can be stopped by direct and concerned resistance.

He is a bully, a cringing coward, not a conqueror. He takes only what he can get without resistance. He has no stomach for a fight to victory, at least not off his home soil. So far he has only learned that there is no resistance and so he continues. But determination would chill him in his tracks and force him to retreat. It's all that simple.

Attitude: think resistance, think victory, be not afraid for the Lord your God is with you. When the opportunity comes, attack. The Soviet bear will vanish like a mist. He is extremely weak on the home front, as all bullies are.

Chapter Nine The Red Chinese

The Red Chinese are no bullies. They are determined, imperialistic racists. Their racism is enough to make Hitler blush. Their territorial goals are of the plain administrative variety. They aim to use subject people not as communist slaves but as straight, outright slaves, like the Mongols before them. They have none of the Soviet pretension of communizing the world for its betterment. They have only the intention of enslaving the world and for the same reasons Hitler did but only a thousand times more so. The Red Chinese are fully prepared to make Hitler's policy look like a tea party.

The new leader~~x~~ of the nation is cast in the classical mold of Stalin but with Chinese racism, which antedates communism, as an added engine.

This is what we may expect. First, a build-up of military/industrial output. Then, in lightening jabs, the conquest of the entire Pacific, including Australia, Indonesia and Hawaii. They will take out Japan too, for the reason that the Soviet wants it. Also, the conquest of all Southeast Asia, ~~via~~ including Vietnam, and another attempt at India. It may be in Soviet hands by the time China is able to take it. Or, more likely, India will remain independent -- and ~~join~~ lead both Russia (non-communist) and America in taking out China once and for all.

All of this will be accomplished under an atomic, not a fleet, umbrella.

Red Chinese expansion will resemble the Japanese efforts. The same strategic considerations that affected Japan affect the Red Chinese. The expansion will be almost identical to the Japanese pattern.

Red China, furthermore, can be expected to take out the Western United States and Western Canada in the same way the Japanese did Pearl Harbor. Except now it is not ships that must be taken out but staging areas. This will be accomplished nuclearly.

The first blow will fall on Formosa. If no international resistance is developed, the next blow will fall on the Phillipines or Southeast Asia or both. If no resistance is developed again, Indonesia and the Pacific Islands will be struck, followed by the Western United States and Canada, and then, Australia.

The time to stop this juggernaut is obviously at Formosa, but it will be a costly fight no matter what because the Red Chinese are not cowards. They are fanatics and racists. All present indications in this country

are that an attack on Formosa would not be resisted and would maybe even be applauded in Washington.

The Department of State, the media and the academy all think Red China is cute. So-called Chinese communism is exactly what people in these places consider worthwhile and nice. They are to learn otherwise, but not without bathing the world in blood for their own vain glory.

Attitude: watch and see. Nothing can be done until the federal government decides its policy. The situation has not changed since Korea. We have no policy concerning our Western frontier which is still, basically, the east coast of Asia.

The stunning fact is that, except for minor Soviet meddling, the strategic situation is no different than it was in 1951. That is, it is completely indeterminate and the Red Chinese know this now as they did then.

The Pacific, however has strategic importance above every other area. The Middle East is next in importance. The Pacific is where the United States must one day meet both Red China and the Soviet as separate callers. This is inevitable and cannot be avoided. It will not be avoided, not even if Red China were to occupy the Western Hemisphere.

The Pacific Ocean is the stage on which will be enacted the final drama in man's age-old duty to establish the right and destroy the wicked. The epicenter of Armageddon has moved east to a point mid-way in the Hawaii-Phillipines-Japan triangle. Around that epicenter the great battle will be fought.

This battle could have been avoided if the reasons for it had been nipped in the bud -- in Korea. But, by treason and appeasement, this did not happen. Some generations of us, therefore, are ~~dx~~ destined to correct the perfidy and mistakes of our predecessors. God help us or them to get the job done this time.

Personal note: two great events were severe traumas for me as a child. One was the indeterminate length of the Korean war. One Sunday in Church, during a prayer that concerned the war in Korea, I asked my mother, "Will men always be fighting?" The scene is etched in my mind today as vividly as it occurred then. She brushed me off -- we were supposed to be praying.

Shortly thereafter, I ran up to my room in screaming terror one evening. I hid under a table and drew blankets and boxes in after and over me. My father took concern. He came very gently and asked with true sincerity what was bothering me. I could hardly speak. I said it was the atom bomb, that it was going to destroy everybody. He said that we could not be sure of that and that in any case I should not be afraid.

I was afraid the good guys would lose as, at 8 years, I knew we had in Korea and would again after Soviet nuclear espionage.

After my private theological studies and despite ~~MEM~~ near overwhelming

evidence to the contrary, I believe the good guys will win and that Americans have the ability to be victorious good guys, myself included. I did not start out, as General MacArthur did, with this faith strongly implanted. So I have taken much time to catch up to where he started even as a very young boy. But I am embarked and shall not falter now.

Chapter Ten President Kennedy

There were many who responded with a deep love for President Kennedy. I was one of them. The day he died I was shattered and it has taken some 15 years to recover.

I do not believe the gossip that is going around about him. Knowing how far the press and the government went to lie about General MacArthur I assume the same is true about the stories concerning President Kennedy. I believe, in fact, that the same people who misrepresented the General misrepresented the President and for the same reason -- to cover their tracks. In the President's case, I also believe the tracks they wished to cover were the ones showing them to be his assassins.

On the matter of lying, Sam Ervin recently cautioned against H. R. Haldeman's recent book by pointing out that this same Haldeman lied under oath before Congress. A liar is a liar is a liar.

These tracks, I am sure, lead through the Department of State and come eventually to the shoes of Dean Rusk. The evidence I have for this belief is circumstantial. I will go through it.

On 30 January, 1949, then-Congressman John Fitzgerald Kennedy addressed an audience in Salem, Mass. He said: "Our relationship with China ~~since~~ since the end of the Second World War has been a tragic one, and it is of the utmost importance that we search out and spotlight those who must bear the responsibility for our present predicament.

"It was clearly enunciated on November 26, 1941, that the independence of China and the ~~st~~ stability of the National Government was the fundamental object of our Far Eastern policy. That this and other statements of our policies in the Far East led directly to the attack on Pearl Harbor is ~~well~~ well known.

"During the postwar period began the great split in the minds of our diplomats over whether to support the Government of Chiang Kai-shek or force Chiang Kai-shek as the price of our assistance to bring Chinese Communists into his government to form a coalition.

Our policy in China has reaped the whirlwind. The continued insistence that aid would not be forthcoming unless a coalition government was formed was a crippling blow to the National Government. So concerned were our diplomats and their advisors ... with the imperfections of the diplomatic system in China after twenty years of war, and the tales of corruption in higher places, that they lost sight of our tremendous

stake in a non-Communist China.

This is the tragic story of China whose freedom we once fought to preserve. What our young men had saved, our diplomats and our President have frittered away."

Robert Kennedy was a dedicated and hard-working staffer of Senator Joseph McCarthy, a Republican.

During the tenure of President Kennedy, General MacArthur received the highest accolade possible for a citizen of this country, the Thanks of Congress. The vote was unanimous. During the same period, he also received the Sylvanus Thayer Medal from the Association of Graduates of the United States Military Academy at West Point, New York.

The efforts to pin the assassination of President Kennedy on the CIA, the FBI and/or ~~right~~ rich Texas oil men just hasn't help up. Without implying that these people are shining beacons of moral strength, it is possible to say that their implication in the assassination has not been proved. In fact, I don't believe any of them had a motive. Hatred alone is not a motive for murder. Lyndon Johnson also had nothing to do with it, nor did John Connally. The whole effort to pin it on the so-called right wing -- Texas, oil, intrigue, etc. -- is more likely a canard of the left wing. Besides, the right wing, if at times rigid and stiff, has always been patriotic. On the other hand, the left wing, sinister and vasциllating, has always been unpatriotic -- in the name of some mythology of "higher allegiance," meaning communism, and often, the Soviet or Red China.

The first important deduction is that Kennedy came from the right side, not the left as is commonly assumed. Only brother Ted comes from the left. I believe Robert was shot by a private citizen for the reasons stated by the citizen. He was trying to cross his heritage and background -- taking up with Cesar Chavez.

The new spirit President Kennedy infused into the country was honesty and energy, not left-wing socialism as is commonly assumed. The left wing wants people to ask what the country -- read, government -- can do for them. This is socialism which is communism with a gloved fist. But President Kennedy wanted people to ask what they could do for their country -- not for the government but for the ideals and principles which are the fountain of liberty. Kennedy was no right-wing ideologue. He was a free-thinker, a liberal, a ~~capitalist~~ capitalist in the old tradition, and above all, he was a patriot, that highest of all possible human endeavors.

So, we must look to the left to find his assassins.

That he was ~~not~~ shot by more than one man is well established. The Warren Commission could not have ~~been~~ covered itself with more disgrace.

The motivation for the assassination is that the President was pursuing a policy. Any policy at all would have been too much for the State

Department which was committed to maintaining no policy as a cover for confusion and treason. The State Department had, since the Roosevelt years, become a ~~Rxxx~~ Prime Ministry, unelected and self-perpetuating. It still is.

My guess is that Kennedy was pursuing a policy prejudicial to Red China and to Cuba and supportive of Formosa. In addition, he had embarrassed the Soviet. I believe also that, true to his promise in 1949, he was shining a light on rascals and traitors all through the government, especially in the State Department.

Probably most important, Kennedy was not going to allow the sell-out of Formosa to Red China. This has been a major goal of communists, sympathizers and dupes in our government since the last world war. This movement finally succeeded under the tutorship of Richard Nixon, the supposed foe of communists and traitors, but clearly a traitor himself to the right. It may even be conjectured that Kennedy was thinking of making Indo-China the place to get the Korean job done. This idea must be seen ~~xxx~~ in the light that North Vietnam's supplier was the Soviet, not Red China. However, Cambodia and Laos were and are Red Chinese wards. Vietnam may still be also, against its will, which is why Vietnam is making overtures to India for support.

The President's policy regarding Southeast Asia was in the process of formulation when he was assassinated. It is entirely safe to assume that his policy was not to the liking of the State Department.

The assassination itself had the characteristics of the Watergate heist. It was bungled. The only thing not bungled was the capture of Lee Harvey Oswald. Just as he said, he was a patsy.

What was behind the murder of Oswald I do not know. I am inclined to think, however that Jack Ruby, if that was his real name, of which I am not sure, acted alone in a gang-land type murder. If he was covering for anybody it was some unrelated gang thing in which Oswald was tangled quite apart from the assassination of the President. But I am more inclined to take Ruby's statements on face value. He just took justice into his own hands, vigilante style. This is not an unusual attitude in the Southwest.

This means that the State Department hired out the assassination to a gang. It was probably done through the Club in New York. This is the elite group of businessmen and academics from whose ranks the non-elective upper echelons of the federal government have been filled since the Roosevelt Administration. It includes the Rockefellers and many other much older New York and Northeastern families. The Club filled much of President Kennedy's Cabinet for him, ~~xxx if not the whole thing~~. From this group the contract was let out. This group's power, which continues, is what has kept the facts of the President's assassination from the light of day. The Club's power is both economic and informational. These men control the banks and they control the media. Their wishes have kept the government inflating the economy because they are a shadow government, from whose ranks the bureaucracy is filled. Kennedy himself

remarked that, when he motorcaded down Fifth Avenue, he could see these Club men in their shirts and ~~ties~~ ties looking violence at him from their office windows.

The whole thing about Texas and oil is a canard. The perfidy comes from the Northeast, from old Tory New York, from old Fabian New York, from Wall Street New York. Texas oil is Rockefeller oil and Club oil. The presence of policy was the issue, not politics.

Sooner or later the truth will out in a court of law. Then ~~it~~ there will be rejoicing in the Kingdom of Heaven.

Attitude: wait and watch. Inquietness and confidence shall be your strength.

Chapter Eleven The So-Called Jews

It is true that there are Jews alive today, but there are very few of them and they do not hold Zionist political philosophies. Just as he has taken over the Church, so the Rebel has taken over the Jewish community. Real Jews are noticable for their detachment from the State of Israel and their deploring of what ~~is~~ goes on ~~there~~ there.

The issue is theological, not political. The Temple, the heart of Judaism, was destroyed by divine fiat and forever in A.D. 70. This was a theological statement of untold and unfathomable importance. The Temple is no longer a building but the human heart. The divine land is no longer a piece of real estate; it is the human being, body, mind and spirit.

We have been told by God to grow up. We are no longer in an infancy concerning His Will. In the Old Testament He veils Himself. In Christ Jesus He comes right out up front and says "It is I, do not fear." The sacrifice is now not animal but ego, not blood but deeds, not fire but love.

It is this divine injunction to grow up that Jews then and now have refused to do. However, their position ~~is~~ is still honorable, ~~as~~ just as that of the prodigal son's brother, and they will be grafted back onto the tree off which they were cut. They belong on it.

But as for these millions who claim to be Jews regardless of practice but merely on the basis of some tenuous ~~ancestry~~ ancestry, they are hypocrites and charlatans. Their one aim is to secure real estate, specifically Palestine, free of charge. This they did, with British and French (Rothschild) assistance. Now one of the Rothschilds wants to rebuild ~~the~~ the Temple of Solomon.

Judaism since 70 A.D. is a diaspora religion. And it is only a religion by virtue of being an heretical sect within the Christian Communion. It has no independent status as a religion. This is shown, apart from theological and historical demonstrations~~in~~ in the New Testament, by the fact that, even with Jerusalem in supposedly Jewish hands, the Temple

has not been rebuilt and the sacrifices not reinstated.

It is quite another phenomenon that occurs in Palestine today. It is a phenomenon of racist imperialism called Zionism. It is a recrudescence of Slavic ~~imperialism~~ racism supported by European banks. The Aionists, in addition, have played on the moral weakness of Europe and America, implying that the Anglo-Saxon-Frankish racial stock is responsible ~~for~~ collectively for the behavior of Adolph Hitler, the Czars, the Communists and anyone else the Zionists hate. The Zionists have extorted the West under the threat of blackmail. But there is no basis for this blackmail. The ~~weak~~ inability of people to think through the dynamics of racism has left them open to this particularly vicious gang of racists, the Zionists.

We have another situation parallel to the Negro's demands for sanctioned racism under the title of "civil rights." The situation is the same as calling white black and black white. After Jewish "rights" we got "Negro" rights, then Mexican "rights," Indian "rights" and women's "rights." On the way is homosexual "rights." After that may we expect Murderers' "rights," rapists' "rights," burglars' "rights," arsonists' "rights?" There is no reason not to suppose that all these people will be demanding status and recognition for their particular "interests." Doesn't, they will say, a man have the right to pursue what makes him happy?" So goes the logic of moral gang warfare such as we have brought down on ourselves by timidity, vascillation and absolute treachery toward what is right and good.

We have shot all sense of right and wrong out from under ~~us~~ us, giving the wicked free rein and putting the righteous to the sword. What is left is chaos. Who is there to blame ~~by~~ but ourselves?

The sons of Ahab have come back to establish Israel. Had they been sons of David their behavior would have been different: no Gaza Strip, no property seizures, no confiscation of ~~pssessions~~ possessions of the ~~poor~~ poor. But these are not sons of David, they are sons of Ahab and so they rightly named their edifice Israel rather than the Kingdom of David, for the King of that Kingdom is the Eternal God.

Attitude: sooner or later the Arabs will roll them up. The Arabs have a religion, Islam. All the hardware and hard work in the world cannot succeed against the right.

By their noisy, obnoxious and cantankerous behavior the Zionists have kept themselves in the center of the world's attention. But in fact their situation is a sidelight and only has strategic significance in connection with Middle Eastern shipping lands. It has unfathomable moral significance. The State of Israel is akin to Red China in deserving to be wiped off the face of the earth.

Chapter Twelve
General View

In general, the problems we face are derived from the advance of socialism and its antecedent immorality. We see, for example, a generation or two of young people who actively desire to be wards of the state. We see leaders of the community and leaders of families unwilling to shoulder their responsibilities and, simultaneously, anxious to give advice to others. The confusion attendant upon our corporate life is inspired by the release of immorality and vice in the name of freedom. We look and look for people who have moral courage to draw the line against dissipation and aggressive ignorance. Such people are rare, though they are not unknown/. We can draw the line by means of regulations. But morality is harder to achieve than any regulations. It is still true that morality cannot be legislated. The achievement of morality requires intellectual effort and severe mental focus.

Just as you cannot win a war without straining every nerve and sinew of the body, the mind and the spirit in the indomitable pursuit of victory, so you cannot be moral and live morally, evaluating and expecting to be evaluated, unless every faculty, high and low, is brought to bear on the axis of advance in a committment of total exertion.

If God is to reward a person with the Vision of Himself, ~~they~~ there must be something rather substantial there to be rewarded. The person must already have been made grand by his own heroic effort.

Moral heroes are the foundation of what is to come. This is not a new situation. It has always been thus.

Socialism is the general term to describe the activity in this country which makes moral ~~xxx~~ heroes today especially desirable. Socialism is the general trend of the mass of people, ideas, so-called policies and movements. It is not necessary to have Soviet or Red Chinese influence to get socialist influence here. We have it aplenty in our intellectual coteries, in government policy and in the take-care-of-me attitude of so many citizens.

The only sure defense and offense against socialism is moral strength and moral certainty. Even small amounts of it have salutary effects far out of proportion to its apparent mass. The very thoughts of a good man, surcharged with wisdom, have effect throughout the world, regardless of his location.

The country was fully and sufficiently warned by General MacArthur. The academy was fully and sufficiently warned by Ayn Rand.

The warnings were not heeded, degeneration has continued at an accelerating pace. The patient now looks in a terminal condition.

Will some deus ex machina save us at the last moment? I think not. I think, in fact, that in what outlines of the great design of things I can see it is our destiny to undergo a physical collapse.

The direct historical parallel I would draw is with the so-called Dark Ages. I believe we are at the beginning of just such a period. However, unlike the academics who fear it as such a great loss, I yearn and thirst for it as a great loss of what is worthless and a corresponding great gain, though for a time hidden, of what is ~~not~~ worthwhile.

I would invite the reader's attention to the opening chapters of G. K. Chesterton's biography of St. Francis of Assisi. There you will discover the correct and salutary observation of the Dark Ages. It was a time of purification.

The academy shudders at the great loss of art in Rome and Pompeii. But, what was lost? Pictures of sex, circuses, pantheons, golden pitchers of obscene import. Chesterton's point is that, just before the Vandals struck, nothing good or wholesome or uplifting could be thought because everything everywhere ~~was~~ had ~~been~~ been given a universal purulent connotation.

Society and culture had to be cleansed. They were, ruthlessly. ~~From~~ Six hundred years later, after the long winter that killed the perdition and washed it away, a young man appears who greets the sun as a brother and a fellow heir in Christ. Dawn has broken on earth again and with it a poet and a minstrel to sing the glory of Him who had wrought such a fresh, clean and pure beginning. That man was Francis,

Was he a hippie? Only a stupid moviegoer would think so. To see Francis as a nature boy is insane.

My point, however, is not about Francis. It is about what preceded him, for there is our historical parallel, the great, mighty and pregnant Dark Ages -- the term is the academy's and not correct but I use it for the sake of easy identification -- and even, I may say, to show that I do not fear ~~what~~ what the academy fears -- I relish the thought of it and pray for its rapid spread.

During the Dark Ages, when vandalism, hooliganism and thugery blew themselves out on civilization, culture went into the cloister. If Pompeii's frescos were lost, what was kept? The Bible was kept, reverence for hard, honest, self-sufficient work was kept, and so too the Liturgy, the arts and crafts, the writings of the Fathers, a system of government, and all the highest ideals of which man is the capable heir. This great effort of preservation in preparation for a new day was expended, in spite of doom, by the institution we call Benedictine Monasticism.

Today, scattered through the world, people who remain faithful to the divine imperative follow the same course. Now, however, there is no cloister, no Pope, no cultured respect and no order bound to a rule. What sanctuary the monks enjoyed from topographical and ecclesiastical advantages is not available to today's preservers of culture. They cannot even be monks. They must take their stand in the thick of things, accepting victory and defeat with the same rugged will to carry on, seemingly unprotected, unloved, unrespected, unsung. What they do have is Baba, the Pleroma, and He is sufficient.

Whether the dawn comes in 4 years or 400, these people will be calmly at their task, like the ancient monks, but exposed, vulnerable, with no

more than a thin thread between them and extinction. However, that thread happens to be the axis of advancement of Christogenesis. Nothing can sever it.

This is how I see our situation. As the Vandals -- women, homosexuals, criminals, various racist racial groups, political parties and movements -- tear the world, ~~and~~ culture and themselves to pieces, others, quietly, but in exposed positions, are preserving what is good and true in preparation for the Dawn of the Sun of Righteousness, the onset and suffusion of Dharma, the irradiation of Divinity.

Completed on the Twelfth Day of March in the Year of Our Lord Nineteen Hundred and Seventy Eight.

Attitudes Two

Introduction

Attitudes Two is a conflation and clarification of Attitudes. I have not included Attitudes itself in this volume because its structure is ~~xxx~~ incomplete and misleading. I have not included individual articles from it because I believe these articles could be restated. In seven years my perspective has not changed but certain matters I would emphasize and certain others deemphasize.

That has all been done here. Some chapter headings are from Attitudes but the content is reworked. Other chapter headings are new and reflect my current feelings regarding emphasis.

In general, I have taken out the speculative aspect of Attitudes and replaced it here with some hard-nosed information concerning what does and what does not foster the great artistic enterprise called living. Attitudes Two reflects much more than Attitudes did the residue left in the crucible of experience.

Metaconcepts

Metaconcepts are one of the most useful philosophical categories, recognized even by nominalists. Indeed, I am indebted to Gregory Bateson for the coinage.

Many people today listen to tone of voice and mannerisms to seek out the true import of what a person is saying. Actually they are not seeking the meaning of the speech but merely whether the speaker approves or disapproves of them -- as if that meant something!

There are some, however, who look at the words themselves to ascertain what concepts lie behind them. The concepts that lie behind what is said are metaconcepts. They precede concepts -- hopefully.

An adept at ferreting out metaconcepts does not have a ~~xxx~~ happy time today. A speaker will say something that has no clear metaconcept. He will say something that involves contradictory metaconcepts. He will speak in vague metaconcepts that do not apply to reality. He will speak in a manner which indicates that he believes there are no metaconcepts. Any way it goes, it's no fun listening to most people speak. Their ~~xxx~~ words are incoherent, their meanings are contradictory and their intent is the opposite of clarification -- "let me make this perfectly clear ... (obfuscation).

Nonetheless, metaconcepts exist and they exist with a vengeance. It has been my hope that some day a government briefing officer will suddenly throw out his carefully prepared statement and begin his remarks with, "Alright now, here's what's happening" Confusing metaconcepts and even the fact of their existence is something everyone so engaged ~~x~~ will be called to task for. Sometimes it is deliberate, sometimes it ~~x~~ is the result of sloth, which is a kind of deliberation also.

Here is an example of the deliberate confusion of metaconcepts. After the Red Chinese attacked in Korea, the State Department attempted to blame

General MacArthur and also to disparage the courage and fighting qualities of his men. This was done by anonymous sources but in a way calculated to create the impression of the highest official authenticity. The specific inference, current yet, was that General MacArthur ambitiously disobeyed orders in crossing the 38th parallel and so himself precipitated the Red Chinese intervention.

Two wires illuminate the scene. Arthur Krock of the New York Times queried the General about this inference:

"Answering criticisms of military action beyond the 38th Parallel or Pyongyang, some officials here saying for non-attribution but for publication that every time such stoppoint was suggested, you replied you would not accept responsibility for security of your troops if decision was made; that this faced authorities with the dilemma of taking risks replacing you with elections coming on or letting you proceed against their political and diplomatic judgement and against some high military judgements also." ~~Nothing was done in Washington to counter the~~

Nothing was done in Washington to counter the inference or to stop the attacks in the press on the courage of the soldiers. The General answered Mr. Krock's query with the facts.

Then on December 7, 1950, the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, wired William Sebald, the General's diplomatic advisor in Tokyo, as follows:

(Whitney's MacArthur, page 447-8.)

Acheson sent this wire to Sebald at the same time his Department was leaking anonymously the inference that MacArthur precipitated the Red Chinese invasion, and through insubordination.

This wire was not for public view. Simple, plain, understandable, it is a far cry from the calculated, byzantine rhetoric of State Department releases for publication.

Whenever people are talking in less than plain terms, when you wonder where they're coming from and what they mean it's because they're confused metaconceptually -- or they're being confusing metaconceptually. When metaconcepts are unclear, the person speaking is lying. That is the case with the State Department releases concerning which Mr. Krock queried General MacArthur. He had the good sense to query. He apparently had not the heart to believe the evidence of perfidy which the releases tried to mask. No one did, not even MacArthur.

It takes great effort to read through talk to the metaconcepts of it. Often to do so is disheartening because you must observe deliberate lying and cheating. But, if you want not to be fooled by the world, the effort is worthwhile. There is no liar or obfuscator or confuser who does not give himself away in his own statements. If you are a good sleuth you can pierce them.

The non-deliberate confusion of metaconcepts afflicts nearly everyone. Most people are too lazy to do anything about it. But for those who are

not, the clarification of metaconcepts can be a life-long occupation. Indeed, it is such an enormous job that it had better be started very early, as a child, and every resource should be brought to support the project.

Here are some examples of conflicting metaconcepts:

My parents are good.
My father says you shouldn't tell the truth if it will hurt someone.

Christians are good.
The minister says parish ~~git~~ fights are natural.

If I am nice to people, they will be nice to me.
Everybody should do what they feel like doing.

If I work hard and save my money I'll be wealthy.
The government has a right to tax us as it pleases.

All babies are basically good.
Children have to be disciplined.

The minister says the world is good.
My science teacher says the world is neither good nor evil but is dying.

People say all men are good.
Some men commit crimes.

Parents and teachers impart these and many other conflicting metaconcepts. Taken individually they amount to half-truths. The individual is responsible throughout ~~his~~ his life for penetrating these half-truths and finding the full truth. No one else can do it for him. If he does not do this he wastes his birth, his life and his death. Mental order and upright living demand that half-truths be expunged and replaced with the truth.

Completed on Good Friday, the Twenty Fourth of March, in the Year of Our Lord Nineteen Hundred and Seventy ~~Eight~~ Eight.

The Mandala

It is commonly thought that the Mandala is built on the number four and its multiples. Actually, however, it is built on the number five and, sometimes , on the number nine.

This thought occurred to me a year after I constructed the Mandala for Attitudes (called Lotus Elaborations there). But even with this early construction I was concerned with the meaning of the fifth point, the center.

Studies of Indian and Alchemical systems led me to decide that the Alchemical systems were either inaccurate, confused or misleading. This is no little discovery when it is realized that all "occult wisdom" in the West,

including ~~Free Masonry~~ Freemasonry, is based on these same Alchemical systems. The whole occult phenomenon is shot through with fatal inaccuracies, confusion and self-deceit. Freemasonry in particular, because of its broad constituent base, is seen to be resting, for all its apparent might, on plain confusion.

The trouble with these Alchemical systems is this: they all recognize only four elemental principles, air fire, water and earth. They missed the first, ether. This makes their anthropology inaccurate, since the five elemental principles originate the five senses: hearing (ether), feeling (air), seeing (fire), tasting (water), smelling (earth).

Alchemical cosmology is also inaccurate since there are five elemental principles, not four, and since these have a specific order of emanation: ether first, then air from ether, then fire from air, water from fire and earth from water. The earth's phylogeny recapitulates this cosmogony.

There is also an interrelationship between these five that is described by their weight: ether, the lightest, is most subtle; air, the next most subtle has both air and ether; fire has ether, air and fire; water has ether air, fire and water; earth has all five and is the most gross of the elemental principles.

This is easy to understand by means of an illustration: ether can be heard but not felt, seen, tasted or smelled; air can be heard and felt but not seen, tasted or smelled; ~~air can be heard~~ fire can be heard, felt and seen but not tasted or smelled; water can be heard felt, seen and tasted but not smelled; earth can be heard, felt, seen, tasted and smelled.

Alchemical ontology is also inaccurate, and here Alchemical systems show their utter foolishness. Having left out the most subtle of the elemental ~~five~~ principles, ether, these systems go on to posit a source for the four they do have. But, with the exception of Paracelsus, they are confused from this point on. Actually, the four come in sequence from ether, so the question is, where does ether come from? Paracelsus, though missing ether, realized and was taught, he says in Persia, that the elemental principles emanate from a source which is a different logical type than these principles.

This source is the inner principle of duality, male and female, cosmos and effort. From it come the elemental principles in their order of emanation, starting with ether, sound -- the Pranava, OM, about which Teilhard speaks with reference only to his own experience.

Since the inner principle of duality is a different logical type than the elemental principles, it cannot be thought of or represented graphically on the same plane or mandala with the elemental principles. Alchemists made this error and so do their occult progeny

At the ~~xxx~~ least, the inner principle of duality must be represented on a plane separate from and behind the plane on which are represented the elemental principles. Paracelsus does this grammatically. I have not seen any graphics by him stating the matter.

However, a plane is probably not the best way to illustrate graphically this inner principle of duality. It would be better illustrated as the central axis of a cone. The cone represents the five elemental principles and the axis represents the inner principle of duality.

Paracelsus, unlike any other Alchemist, went further still. He realized and was taught that the inner principle of duality also has a source. He called this source primal matter or Unity. Some Alchemists called it compositum solis, sun substance, but they completely confused its logical typing, and therefore confused it itself, by placing it at the center of the plane of elemental principles.

Paracelsus realized that this entity is yet a third logical type and so he represented it grammatically: type one, elemental principles; type two, inner principle of duality, type three, primal matter, or, what I have called point zero. In the Bible it is called Wisdom and is often personified.

Represented graphically, this point lies at the apex of the aforementioned cone and is the original terminus of its axis. Once this figure is borne in mind, we can make it more representative of reality by stating that the point is the inner core of the individual's heart, the axis is his life's course and the cone is the world that is created, destroyed and preserved while he holds to and actively pursues his course.

The question may be asked, what is the source of point zero, primal matter? The answer is not contemplated by Alchemy or any of its derivatives, for example, Freemasonry. The answer is not given by the introduction of yet another, fourth, logical type. The answer is The Eternal, but ~~X~~ The Eternal is not a logical type. It is typeless.

This may be illustrated in the following manner. The cone of elemental principles --, which we call the world -- represents a man's waking state. The central axis of the cone, the inner principle of duality, represents a man's dreaming state. The point of origin of the axis, point zero, represents a man's deep sleep state. All three states are superimposed on Itself by the Eternal Absolute, which is stateless.

All of this philosophy lies behind the mandala.

It is useful to understand what the positive integers represent. Therefore, the following list is provided.

- #1 represents unity, no illusion of duality
- #2 represents the partnership and friendship of ~~God~~ God and the individual who loves Him
- #3 represents the Trinity
- #4 represents the compass points and the Apocalypse
- #5 represents the five elemental principles
- #6 represents the six systems of philosophy and the world
- #7 represents the seven vital centers of the body: forehead, between the eyes, throat, heart, stomach, genitals, feet
- #8 represents the compass points subdivided
- #9 represents the Eternal, as does its multiples -- the universal number

The purpose of the mandala is not to induce a hypnotic trance but to aid logical thought. The very geometry of it suggests that there is more here to be discovered than might immediately be apparent. All geometry is a spur to inquiry concerning the significance of the shapes themselves. The mandala is a particularly good one because it early suggests that the most significant shapes are other than it and it gives some early clues as to the shape of these shapes. The mandala, unlike many other shapes, points beyond itself to its source.

Boundaries

The essential thing about boundaries is that they be recognized. Boundaries exist quite independently of our regard for them. If a boundary is trespassed injury occurs in some form or another. This is a law of reality. Therefore, ~~bound~~ boundaries must be recognized if one is not to live suicidally.

Today we are told that there are no boundaries, that life is a mystical flow. This nonsense is expressed by phrases like the following: it'll work out, let it be, if it's meant to be, whatever. People who use these phrases and others like them hope to put across the premise that neither they nor anyone else has responsibility for what is going on. They are being evasive. But they cloak their evasion in a pretense of wisdom. Surely, they are saying, you understand that everything just unfolds and comes together by mysterious but beneficent forces. The very fog and imprecision of their premise is supposed to be taken as proof of its high intellectual merit. There is also a note of intimidation: if you don't understand that everything just comes together there is something WRONG with YOU. This indicates defensiveness.

Behind all the misty eyes, shrugging shoulders and air of finality about these statements one plain fact exists as if behind thick smoke: the individual is lying, he is trying to evade his responsibility for what he has just done, hoping thereby to enjoy any possible fruits of his action and to avoid any possible harm from them. He is deluding himself with aggressive conceit. He is trying to delude everyone else also. All actions have causes and consequences. It is impossible to act and disclaim responsibility for the consequences, of whatever kind.

I treat people who use these phrases as slithering snakes. If they try to evade their own ~~responsibility~~ responsibilities, they are causing harm to others. This is always the case. The responsibility for an action has to be somewhere. If the individual who acted tries to evade responsibility there is every likelihood he will try to shift it to another party. Had the buck truly stopped at the desk of HST, would things be different today?

To evade responsibility which rightly belongs with oneself is to act as if there are no boundaries. To take responsibility which does not rightly belong to oneself is to act as if there are no boundaries.

Theologically, the denial of ~~bound~~ boundaries is equivalent to the old

heresy that one doesn't need to do the works of faith as long as one has faith. It can be come at from the other direction also. It is equally a heresy to believe that one doesn't need faith as long as one does the works enjoined by the Law.

Many times the Church, through her teachers and preachers, has had to stop this ~~xxx~~ double nonsense. The first error -- faith, no works -- is an evasion of responsibility by the obliteration of boundaries. The second error -- works, no faith -- is an arrogation of responsibility by the obliteration of boundaries. The common theme is this: no boundaries, all possibilities are open. Most of the trouble today comes from people pressing home the first error.

There is a relationship between the fact of boundaries and the genuine mystical experience which has been described many times. I will not redescribe it here. In the first place, I will not redescribe it because an honest misunderstanding of this relationship is not usually what one meets. What one usually meets is an aggressive, irresponsible rat trying to cover his evasions with a pretense of mysticism -- and shoddy mysticism at that. In the second place, I will not redescribe it because this relationship is not my immediate subject.

A common sense illustration of the matter will suffice. How would a hand lift a fork to the mouth if the hand had no skin and the mouth grew indefinitely in all directions? It is nonsense.

Now, what is true regarding the boundaries of the hand and the mouth is true regarding the boundaries of logic and of the mind itself. One does not think with nothing. One thinks with thoughts and these have boundaries.

Or, how could an amoeba crawl if it had no surface?

It is impossible to live in the body without acting. The heart beat is an action. Therefore, one must make the best of it -- acting to live and to be a hero of ~~responsibility~~ accountability.

A peculiar phenomenon today is that while people accept the gratuity that the hand and mouth have boundaries, they want to use their minds and live their lives as if these have no boundaries. Most try to evade responsibility, a few pharisees try to arrogate it.

A boundary is necessary if you want to get something done. To take a step you have to make a set of preliminary ~~xx~~ dispositions, execute them and then take the step. If the necessary commands travel nerves that have no boundaries, a command to the leg might end up on a telex in Bangkok. When you dial a number you don't expect a random selection of any phone wired up to Ma Ball or Pa ~~Breshnev~~ Breshnev.

Boundaries enable effort to reap a desired result by canalizing ~~the~~ that effort in a determined direction. When a rock is thrown up it doesn't have more than one possibility as to its trajectory. Gravity is a boundary.

The boundaries that pertain to the mind and to thought in general are ~~x~~

called rationality. Today rationality is often taken as a dirty word. But it is an essential aspect of life and of living.

It is necessary that the mind and its thoughts be coherent, non-contradictory and lucid. Coherent means that the mind has thoughts that follow one from another. A coherent mind has patterns of activity that belong together either as species of the same logical type or as species of different logical types.

A non-contradictory mind is one not afflicted with opposites that are kept as independent, conclusive truth. For example, when it is raining a contradictory mind ~~xxx~~ would hold to the belief that it is raining and also to the belief that it is not raining. When contradictions are present regarding ~~i~~ higher intellectual and moral matters the results are devastating.

A lucid mind is clear, it knows itself and can speak clearly regarding its ~~x~~ content. It is not enough to know that something is true. One must know why it is true and the contexts in which it is true. The matter of ~~xx~~ context is especially important. It may be raining in Seattle and clear in Los Angeles. An Angelino who looks up and says that Seattle is obviously clear just like Los Angeles is being irrational. In the same way, a man who reads Lincoln and Lenin on the subject of the authority of the people of a state and concludes that they mean the same thing is being irrational. Again, a man who reads communist economic theory and reads the account of the early Church in Acts and concludes that they are the same is being irrational.

Besides being lucid about context, it is also necessary that a mind be lucid and forthright concerning its own content. A rational mind has no secrets of hidden traps or pits. It is thoroughly explored, mapped and controlled. It does not have any unaccountable surds lurking in murk ready to jerk the owner berzerk. A rational mind can always give a full account of itself, to its ~~furthest~~ furthest reaches. It is steady, stable, in ~~equilibrium~~ equilibrium and it clearly understands where it is and why it is where it is.

The irrationality of pumping young people full of formula concepts and sending them into the world is apparent from the shipwreck so many experience. The problem is that they meet the enemy with undigested truth. They may say what is right but they do not know why it is right and in what context and to what extent. Their ideals shattered by the tactical and strategic advantages of the enemy, they are doomed to destruction in detail. Pat formulas of truth lack mobility. Often in spiritual warfare you must roll with the punch in order to gain room to manoeuvre. Often you must pivot to ward off flank attack. Then, in order to carry the battle to the ~~xx~~ enemy, you must have the utmost in manoeuverability in order to gain tactical and strategic surprise. Filling a person with pat formulas of undigested truth is like dressing a knight in armour but giving him no horse. The individual is a sitting duck. Better let David go out with his own means.

So, lucidity, knowing what one knows -- and what one doesn't know -- is an essential aspect of rationality. Nothing but the hardest fort of

work can make a mind lucid, non-contradictory and coherent.

The boundaries that pertain to life in general are called morality. Morality is a derivative of rationality. In fact, the two can be considered one and the same. This identity is often denied today by so-called Christians, educated and uneducated alike. They have made Christianity out to be vague impulses of some supposedly transcendent origin.

Morality is a simple thing, really. There are any number of Biblical and extra-Biblical descriptions of it, both by precept and by example. In itself morality is not difficult either to understand or to do. The difficulty is interposed by the forces aligned against it. These forces are formidable, especially to the neophyte, and this is why he must have the greatest degree of manoeuvrability.

Manoeuvre is the traditional strategy of inferior against superior force. Even for superior force, which the neophyte will come to have if he perseveres, it is the ideal strategy against inferior force because it is the least expensive and the quickest way to victory. The forces of immorality always have less manoeuvrability than the forces of morality. These forces rely mostly on frontal assault tactics, even in the latter stages of battle when their attrition because of them is fierce. The devil is not real smart.

Morality can be summarized as the totality of thoughts, words and deeds that ~~further~~ foster truth, righteousness, peace and love. An easy check on any thought, word or deed is to ask about it, "Does this please God?" Some of the more basic requirements of morality are as follows:

honor your father and mother, and indeed, every grey head
 always speak the truth
 accept responsibility for everything you do and have done, even every
 thought and every word
 speak softly
 do nothing to weaken your body, your mind or your spirit
 whatever you put your hand to do, do it mightily and with enthusiasm
 honor great men and women with every breath
 defend, protect and preserve the helpless -- but not the lazy
 do not draw attention to yourself
 keep your nose out of other people's business
 make every decision on the basis of what you consider right and what you
 consider wrong -- and choose the right
 be fearless in both victory and defeat
 seek not the easy, comfortable way but the hard and strenuous way --
 so that your victory may be grand and absolute
 treat all men equally as regards the law
 have no favorites of any kind
 do not murder, steal, harm, tattletale, fornicate, adulterate or covet
 accept reprimand and punishment willingly, cheerfully, and correct the
 errors that brought them about
 be cheerful, be grand, be courageous (the unforgivable sin is cowardice)
 spend your time only with your own business
 pay your debts promptly
~~xxxxx~~ evaluate and expect to be evaluated

never accept employment below a dignified wage
 never employ a man below a dignified wage, pay him promptly, and look
 after his family and living conditions -- you will have a friend
 besides a servant
 never seek a favor, rise or fall on ~~xx~~ your own intrinsic and earned merits
 fear no man, fear no aggregate of men
 fear God if you have to -- but when love matures, this fear too must go
 trust yourself and act in full self-confidence
 be generous, dashing, humorous and noble -- remember the dignity of your
 birth and ensure by noble carriage through life the honor of your death
 do not demean yourself by being arrogant, haughty, immature, unclean,
 lazy, conceited, stiff or irascible
 above all, arrogance demeans the nobility of one born in the likeness of God
 your origin is God, your destiny is God -- ~~xxxx~~ ponder, remember and
 digest this fact and live forever in quiet, ecstatic joy -- you
 belong to God, He belongs to you -- meditate thereon

The End or Parousia is the event which will fulfill and transfigure our
 earthly efforts. Those who say that our efforts here on behalf of truth,
 righteousness, peace and love are ~~xxx~~ forever forlorn speak in ignorance.
 Those who say that these efforts will be superceded and shown to be
 tiny, insignificant specks speak alike in ignorance.

The truth is that our efforts are the very warp and woof of what is to
 come. They will not be superceded. They will be fulfilled and
 transfigured. Our efforts are the substance of the Parousia, they are
 what it is made of. The Parousia will validate, complete and conclude
 our efforts. It will also transfigure them from within, ~~leading them~~
 lending them the eternal luminescence of divinity.

~~xxxx~~ Boundaries are the means to the end of eternality. They must be
 used energetically in the hard work of preparing the body, the mind and
 the spirit for the completion and transfiguration of everything we hold
 dear which is promised the faithful at the End. No maxim better expresses
 the urgency and weighty importance of boundaries than this, from the
 Koran:

Hell is veiled with pleasures
 Heaven is veiled with hardships

Addenda

Mary Catherine Bateson, Gregory Bateson and Paul Tillich once had me very exercised about the matter of metaphor. The matter arose from the so-called philosophy of positivism and was dealt with by Charles Dodgson in his famous triptych about a young girl. Positivism is nominalism all over again -- "it's all just semantics."

The Batesons handled the matter from a humanist, that is to say nominalist, point of view. Tillich handled it from a theological, that is to say realist, point of view.

Both parties, as near as I could tell, started with the assumption that the matter was not settled conclusively and might be with effort.

I tried this assumption too and had a spinning head. I tried both approaches. The Batesons' approach, though appealing in its sheer brilliance and British wit, look, at the end, nominalist. Tillich's approach, in The Religious Situation, looked realist but it proceeded as if the answer were not a given at the start and so it didn't arrive at the only satisfactory answer.

Teilhard has the answer at the start and it is the Biblical answer.

But what the Bible says about the matter of metaphor will not convince a Bateson or a positivist because the Bible does not start with the assumption that there is a problem with regard to the matter of metaphor. Positivists and humanists have a problem here because they assume that there is a problem here. Even Wittgenstein perceived a problem and so he never answered it.

My head only stopped spinning when I looked at Teilhard, read Sathya Sai Baba and remembered a flock of Biblical texts.

Simply stated, the metaphor is the tree or the cultivated vineyard.

I do not understand why this is or even where it leads, but this is the metaphor for all life and all aggregates of life on earth and, indeed, for the entire universe, animate and inanimate. No other will do.

The upright man is like a tree planted by water streams. The wicked man is like chaff, blown away by the wind. The upright man produces both the seed and the chaff around it. But the chaff is winnowed out at the harvest and the seed is kept and replanted. God is the seed of creation. The Universe is His Body.

We have tried other metaphors. For example: the monarchical hierarchy, the Great Chain, the machine, the random game (an impossibility). These are all useful to some extent, but they are aspects of the horticultural metaphor which is the basis for all the rest, including the mechanical metaphor.

Mary Catherine Bateson provided a nice restatement of nominalism: "You are your own central metaphor." Nominalism is a path to insanity.

Tillich's sentiments are realistic but he doesn't start with Biblical ~~language~~ language. He starts with the language of the academy, which is no language at all.

There is no cornering a nominalist in his own linguistics. He can be shown what he has not seen in the record, such as Teilhard did, but he does not have to admit that he has seen it or that it exists, or that he must take it into account. With the Red Queen he says, "It is what I say it is."

Language is inherently dualistic, reality is inherently non-dualistic, and so you cannot by logic make anyone see the truth. You can blizzard them with facts and examples of their short-sightedness. But argument will convince no one. Indeed, those who argue share the defects of those they are arguing against.

Ardor combined with logic can be convincing if it is not mixed with excitement.

But logic will not lead to what is beyond logic. Again, the cosmological argument will convince no one.

A person knows what is true to start with or he'll never get to know it. Preaching and evangelizing are harvesting procedures, not seeding procedures. God seeds, men only harvest.

So with the matter of metaphor. It is there in the Bible as clear as the noon-day sun. Either you start with the horticultural metaphor or you start with a mental disorder. I haven't found any other cases than these.

Start with the horticultural metaphor and six hundred years of humanist/positivist/nominalist philosophy drops off with a resounding crash. Hold to that metaphor and the academy will hate you but you'll walk lightly over its smoldering carcass. Abelard has to be forcefully and ruthlessly emasculated. His progeny is a stinking pit. But the pit can be stepped over by a person who is faithful to the Bible and to its metaphor for life. It requires great courage in the face of apparently overwhelming odds.

This is very important and no trifling matter.

Things have to be settled philosophically and theologically before they can be settled any other way. I have never been able to find a distinction between philosophy and theology that held up longer than five minutes.

The matter of metaphor is settled before it becomes a problem. There is no problem. All metaphors must be part of the ~~basic~~ basic metaphor which is horticulture.

It is not a plain botanical metaphor, namely, wild plants, but a horticultural metaphor, namely, dressed and cultivated plants.

This too is important.

If we will keep this metaphor in mind and use it deliberately as the model for all our thoughts, words and deeds, society will become clear and the many problems we face will be resolved. We will see clearly and we will

act in ~~maxx~~ harmony with the ~~sixxxxxxx~~ structure of reality.

Reality has the structure of a tree, the tree of life.

It is not enough to say, "think." We must say, rather, X "Think Horticulturally."

Addendum Two

Eugenics is a word that is difficult to understand. It raises hackles. This latter fact is one reason I ~~fx~~ feel the word needs to be explained. For, anytime a word brings passions to the top there is indication of a festering sore beneath the surface.

Such a word is eugenics. In its roots is means "good birth." in the sense of auspicious beginning. It indicates something auspicious, charged with good fortune and high promise of hope. Something is auspicious when it fosters the God-ward path and encourages men along that path. Incarnations of God are ~~engex~~ eugenic events. So are wise and just decisions rendered by a judge, a father or a council of elders.

The word has been applied to simple physical breeding and this has caused passions to stir. Not until this physical meaning we have applied to the word is replaced by its true meaning will we understand it and be able to use it.

Breeding is one thing. Animals do this. Eugenics is another thing. Men are supposed to do this. It is only a salacious mind that can take eugenics to mean breeding.

When we think of breeding in regard to men we get one of the types of pride, pride of clan.

Let us examine this phenomenon and see why it is no basis for vanity.

Among horses we breed to good ~~ix~~ pedigrees in hopes of getting a strong, fast, good-tempered foal.

But, this does not work every time. And the breeding of horses without good pedigrees occasionally produces a champion.

So, breeding is not a sure thing. There is also over-breeding which is a general term meaning that undesirable characteristics enter a strain after certain factors like time and in-breeding have been at work.

When the idea of breeding is applied to men, as is frequent today, especially among the wealthier citizens, there is no basis for pride. For, ~~x~~ dissolution, lassitude and even physical weakness are a constant presence when breeding is pursued among men.

The whole idea of breeding just will not serve for human beings. In fact, it is positively dangerous, physically, but especially, spiritually.

Eugenics does not mean breeding. In the last years it has been taken to mean just this, however, and hackles are raised on that account.

The Popes have even felt constrained to condemn eugenic practices, so-called. But what they condemned, rightly, was breeding in general among men.

The condemnation rightly applies to all of the following practices: abortion, frustration of the natural course of intercourse by any means, mutilation of genitilia, extra-and pre-marital intercourse, bestiality, homosexuality, incest (defined in the Bible), state-controlled breeding of humans, civil laws restricting or encouraging marriage between certain classes, types or genders of persons.

All of these practices are forbidden by God, the Bible and the Church. There is no harm in repeating again in this wicked age that the law concerning these practices is already laid down, long ago, and it carries heavy penalties for the offender, both in this life and in the next.

Eugenics is not any of these practices. It is unfortunate that the word is already ~~misused~~ misused. But it stands on its own and only awaits to be rediscovered.

Now we must do that.

In the broad sense, eugenics is a word that indicates any auspicious act because any auspicious act has effects that accrue to the benefit of mankind. We must think widely to understand eugenics in this sense.

The greatest eugenic acts are the incarnations of the divine person. These acts par excellence result in benefit to mankind. The incarnations of God protect the righteous, they destroy the wicked and they establish truth, righteousness, peace and love. No other acts benefit mankind individually and corporately more than these.

Next come the acts of saints and sages. In ~~xxx~~ many ways and in different times and climes the acts of saints and sages reestablish and foster the way of righteousness and love. These are surrogates of the divine person; in fact, they are he. Saints and sages like Sankaracharya, Francis, Nanak and Paul have not only fostered culture. They have sanctified and charged with spiritual power certain places and habits of devotion. Thus they have helped mankind on its difficult path to the divine.

Next come the acts of good men. The little words and deeds of these ~~xxx~~ servants of the Almighty motivate, explicate, feed and often amuse the yearning in men to attain the grandeur for which they have been given this birth. Good men's deeds stand as a daily, constant, ever-present reminder of our high calling and of the daily drudgery of achieving it.

Next come the acts of angels. I cannot expatiate broadly on this subject, but ~~the~~ that does not mean it is not a fact. Angels are always present with us and ready to act on our behalf for good if we draw them near

with sanctified living. In many ways, unsung by men, angels promote the good, the true and the beautiful, thereby contributing eugenically to life on earth.

Next come the acts of all the gods who control aspects of nature. I ~~am~~ cannot explicate broadly on this subject either, but these countless gods have a eugenic role to play.

In the narrow sense, eugenics is a word that indicates auspicious acts within the family. The family is the basic organism of society. Society is an organism composed of families. The family, therefore, is where eugenics primarily occurs. This is true also of the whole of humanity which, together with all creation, is a family organism begotten by God the Father.

The family is established by the husband and so the first act of eugenics is his choosing a wife. Eugenics first and foremost can be described as rules for a man to use in choosing a wife.

These rules include the following:

- a woman who is a comfort and not an inciter of discord, passion or distress
- a woman in whose ~~am~~ company a man is never defensive, irritable angry, lustful, fearful, hateful, greedy or ambitious
- a woman who is satisfied with a man's lot in life and wants no other
- a woman who has control of her passions, her tongue and her fortune
- a woman who never gossips ~~am~~ or talks idly, who is always at work that remunerates her family, and is always in the background of civil and social matters
- a woman of clean, neat and orderly habits
- a woman who likes housework and does not seek diversions from it
- a woman who travels only on business and then anonymously
- a woman who is simple and plain in dress, speech and manners
- a woman who can run a household in peace and love
- a woman who can raise children to be straight and true
- a woman who has no concern beyond the welfare of her husband and children
- a woman who gives wise and just counsel
- a woman who keeps silence both in public and in private
- a woman whose hand is always open to the poor

If a man finds a woman who meets these requirements, he is doing well to choose her for a wife, if she is ~~am~~ available. If she pleases him physically, then he has a fortune. Such a woman and such a choice are auspicious indeed. Eugenics starts here.

There are daily decisions in married life that can be eugenic events. Decisions which foster truth, righteousness, peace and love within the family are eugenics in action. A husband and wife must exercise all their abilities of perception and intellect to keep the family progressing spiritually. There is no slack time, no let-down of vigilance, no lassitude ~~am~~ or procrastination. The instruments of decision-making will be called into action every minute for greater or lesser matters requiring judgement. All of these little decisions, taken every minute, can add up in the course of life to a great and powerful eugenic

phenomenon. Indeed, the real test of eugenics, the real laboratory of life is right here in these countless daily decisions. They are course settings and course corrections on the individual's voyage across the sea of life.

In so far as the myriad decisions of life are made to foster and keep the individual on the God-ward path, life on earth is a total eugenic enterprise. Eugenics then is not an option but an injunction and the word eugenics carries the same weight and meaning as the word dharma, righteousness.

Eugenics is started after the Fall by the call of Abraham and it is ~~the~~ charted by the blessing given Abraham by Melchizedek, the priest-king of Jerusalem whose name means "King of Righteousness."

Melchizedek is the same person we meet in the Bhagavad Gita, bearing the equivalent Sanskrit name, Dharmaraja. He is one of the five Pandava brothers who ruled Bharat after the Mahabharata War.

So, eugenics has an ancient beginning and a good thing it does, too. It is the very ~~the~~ blood and sinew of life, the means to make life worthwhile, happy and prosperous. For, all creation bends to support dharma, ~~the~~ righteousness, which is eugenics.

Addendum Three

The philosophical and moral work of Ayn Rand came to my attention in 1959. My advocacy of her position landed me in my first dispute with a teacher, in this case a high school history teacher.

I am still an advocate of her position, if anything only more so ~~the~~ than I was then. How she broke so ~~clearly and~~ cleanly and clearly from the moral and philosophical torpor of her age is hard for me to understand. But it is not hard for me to appreciate. Her work belongs in the forefront of all Her work belongs in the forefront of all philosophical and theological writing. It is a gift to men of divine grace.

It is a third theological system, alongside those of ~~the~~ Aquinas and Teilhard.

If we substitute the word intellect (buddhi) for her word reason, we can see why she has admirers in India. For her system is one of the Indian ~~the~~ six.

It is also Christian in the extreme and fundamental sense of that name.

The mainstream of so-called Christian thought has been wrecked for centuries on the shoals of moral relativism. Pascal pointed this out four hundred years ago. Unfortunately he did it in a cowardly manner, under a pseudonym, and so his writing had the horrible fate of being admired for its literary brilliance by ~~the~~ that prince of fiends, Voltaire.

Ayn Rand has come right out up front and pronounced both verdict and sentence on the moral rot that ^apasses for Christian and educated.

She has also laid down the principles of moral strength and these are eternal.

Her work is an example of the fact that in this age when Anti-Christ rules both the Church and civil society, the Truth is pressed home and revealed outside the Church and in opposition to what passes for civil society.

Her work consistently and fully expresses the very essence of the Bible and of the theological tradition. It will be seen in this light by those who are called to be Children of Light.

At the very least, Ayn Rand has given back to the English language the meanings words intend. This is no small feat in view of the barbaric treatment of this language by intellectuals and bureaucrats.

Her work is an example, the best around, of the law that Paul insists is written on even the pagan heart. Medieval ~~xxx~~ tradition formalized this law as the Natural Law. But the Medieval expositors of Natural Law had reference to God in their expositions.

Rand has no such reference and so her work is the more honest and enlightening. The whole point about Natural Law is that~~x~~ it does not need God for a crib or a stay. It is the law available to man's unassisted reason. Rand exposes and applies this law as it occurs in reality.

Ayn Rand makes reading a newspaper no fun at all. A newspaper is read not for news but as an intelligence operation against the enemy.

The news is not what the enemy is doing but what we are doing. The enemy has been doing the same thing for centuries. The news is our own offensive action directed at the ~~xxx~~ very gates of his abode.

That a person should be thinking the way Ayn Rand thinks is news. Her life is a eugenic event.

I do not know what else to say. I am glad she has lived.

Addendum Four

The essentials of musical performance.

Supple rythmn. The individual cannot be made to mimic an external rhythmic standard. He must not try to be supple. He must, instead, find his own sythmns for a particular piece and bring these to fruition.

The insides of rythmn are what must be supple, so that notes are not metronomic but lie within the discipline of a performer.

This means his spiritual discipline. ~~His~~ His spiritual discipline will put order in his rhythm.

If a person has none of this discipline he either cannot play, for lack of rhythm, or he must adopt an external rhythm and apply it forcibly -- which is the reason we have so many people apparently playing music.

A music teacher is a Master, an instructor in yoga. He brings out what is inside the student and does not force an external structure on him. But he brings out what is good, not what is bad.

Within the boundaries of his discipline, a performer has complete freedom to do what he wants with any piece of music. If he stays within his discipline and neither postures beneath nor above it his interpretive freedom is absolute and cannot be gainsaid.

We have interpretive squabbles only among those who posture above or below -- usually above -- their range of discipline.

The absolute freedom and ~~un~~ unassailable interpretive rights of a person performing within their discipline cannot be emphasized ~~to~~ too much. But such people as these are very, very rare to find: Glenn Gould, Marcel Dupre, the conductor Ozawa.

Supple use of tone, not for effect but for construction. Tone is built together and it is the building, not the way it strikes you, that is worthwhile. We see this in the fact of ~~the~~ notation. Franck's performance of the Grand Piece Symphonique is not with us in ~~an~~ immediate effect. But the structure it is is with us in notation. Therefore, performance, no less than composition, must aim for construction.

The particular emotions one has about music do not last beyond the performance or the remembrance of performance. But the structure of a piece, if it is good and internalized, lasts forever. Music structure shapes the man hearing it. As he is shaped so he shapes others. But the emotion one has during a performance shapes neither the listener nor the performer nor anyone else. The emotion doesn't carry. Structure alone lasts.

The great ~~many~~ teachers have students who perform differently. It is nice to have an exemplar of a popular style, say Heifitz, but the continuation of music depends on the genesis of unique, personal musicians who express the Truth in the way they personally are ~~to~~ given to.

The unity of Truth is expressed and gotten to by the variety that it surrounds itself with. To insist on one style as true is death. To force one style on everyone is ludicrous, ghoulisn even.

Great teachers do not do this. They lead out what is good in each student.

What makes a musical performance true is not that it follows ~~a~~ certain rules but that is what the performer truly believes the music to be. If the performance is the performer's personal statement, completely thought through with no trace of posturing or contradiction, then it is music,

regardless of "style." And it will touch home to a listener who can hear music -- of which we also have today very few.

The same is true of composition.

What musicians pass on to one another in their traditions is the full independence of interpretive rights that they must use.

This is what makes music difficult: not the need to learn a style but the need to bring forth one's own manner of playing. Independence is harder to achieve than imitation.

An independent performer will fulfill the intentions of an independent ~~composer~~ composer. The sympathy in this case is not established in the externals -- tempo, tone, instrument -- but in the internals -- intent, vision, structure. Independence itself is the message. It can be expressed in many ways, but any way will fulfill the composer's desire if it expresses his own independence.

Under all music, even dirges and requiems, is joy. If there is no joy, such as in Wagner's work, there is no music. The composers ~~we~~ we like the most are those who give joy the simplest musical structure. We must see Bach's counter-point as simpler than Grieg's or Chopin's monophony. We've talked ourselves into the opposite view mistakenly because we find it harder to compose fugues than nocturnes. We forget that Bach and Franck wrote fugues easily. They could improvise in six voices.

Chopin worked harder on his nocturnes than Bach did on his preludes and fugues. This is why Bach produced more. Where Bach worked harder than Chopin was in his spiritual life. This made his musical work easier coming and more relaxed.

The performer must recompose the composition he plays and he must also compose a new one. Every performance is a composition.

It is possible to reveal God by playing Bach's music. But by playing the same music it is possible to conjure the devil.

The notation is like a surgeon's knife that can heal or harm. It is up to the surgeon and the performer.

The key to success is not in having a Schnitger or a Flentrop. Nor is it in a certain style of rendition.

The key to success -- revealing God rather than conjuring the devil -- is the performer's success in making the music his own by recomposing it himself throughout. The degree to which he can recompose it is directly proportional to his spiritual independence. So, the essential of musical performance is the essential ~~of~~ for every person's life, the individual's success in treading the God-ward path.

A musician is no different than anyone else in this fundamental matter of spiritual discipline. Spiritual independence is the source and fountainhead of his artistic success or failure.

Addendum Five

In the matter of biblical interpretation I have found the most confusing situation among modern scholars and going ~~x~~ back several hundred years.

I cannot say that I understand fully where the confusion comes from, but I have identified two possible sources for it. One is the effort to excise the Old Testament Apocrypha from the canon. The other is the attempt~~x~~ to use extra-biblical standards to judge the text of the Bible as to authenticity, source, etc. This first effort is an unaccountable slight at the history of the canon's formulation. I cannot conceive that it arose from any but a kind of plain arrogance. The second attempt can be traced to the gradual triumph of nominalism, which triumph is directly caused by the internatinnal poltroonery of churchmen.

Saying this does not make me more comfortable. Nor does it make the effort to deal with modern exegetes less difficult. I simply cannot understand why, on the one hand, these exegetes cannot accept Jerome and have done with canonical problems and why, on the other hand, they cannot measure their own exegesis by the standards of such as Jerome, Augustine, Bonaventure, Irenaeus, Basil, Francis, Ignatius and the rest. There is such abundance of expository material from so far back that is revealing and instructive as regards both method and content that I wonder why the pundits of today are not compelled to pick it up and parrot it. Nothing, in fact is more precious than the exact representation of the truth as it appears to one. If the ancient writers do not appeal to the modern writers it must be because the modern ones are uneducated, despite their pretense of degrees in this and that. What good is a degree in systematic theology to one whose exegesis is so far in quality below Jerome's that it disappears from view? Such a degree is worthless, a mere sham and pretense.

Why, for instance, is the burning, lovely truth not put forth as Benedict did, or Jerome? Instead, the most popular preachers rely on tricks and slogans which come from advertising methods. Bob Schuler: "I sell Jesus the way other people sell toothpaste." At least he is honest about that.

I think our preachers and teachers have stopped reading the Bible. They're reading Satre or Camus or some newspaper theologian like Cox. They're also reading the newspaper far too much and tuning in the electronic media. This is a shame.

The say the world has changed, that religion must change with it. Both premises are incorrect. Plus ca change, plus c'est la mem chose. The more things change, the more they stay the same.

Religion is a great edifice that has been built over centuries. It cannot be torn down. Pruned and adjusted by the vicissitudes of times and events, yes, but religion cannot be destroyed and cannot even be retarded in its relentless march against irreligion. Religion is something precious, in itself more precious than any other commodity.

The source of religion is the Bible.

The central and determining fact of the Bible has become so important for me that I am at a loss for words to express my feeling for it. It is a principle, a thing that is incorruptible, immovable, unchanging and inerrant. It is the unshakable center and focus of everything. It is not that printed thing on the bookshelf. It is in my heart and my experience.

I now find it quite impossible to conceive how our modern scholars can regard it as a maybe, a might and a sometimes. I used to think that I was a cynic believing as I did that their endless papers and discussions were means of keeping their jobs, much as computer programmers would miswrite programs in order to stay employed debugging programs. Now I believe I was no cynic but merely a keen observer of what was going on.

The Bible must first be taken literally. But that's not easy. The student must fit the Bible with itself, pick out and analyse the metaphors, uncover the correlations, understand the symbols and believe the historiography. You cannot do that and be a fundamentalist. The whole must be brought under understanding and that takes work, and no sloganeering.

Then, if ideas from some other source clash or appear to clash with one's understanding of the Bible, these ideas must be adjusted or thrown out or one's understanding of the Bible must be corrected. Today, it is safe to say, most ideas from extra-Biblical sources will end up thrown out. Some are false and some are useless half-truths. From the field of ~~x~~ psychology practically everything will be tossed, especially the methodology, the dream theory and the anthropology -- that is, the works.

Once the Bible has met and overcome the challengers the student has some degree ~~i~~ of freedom in what he reads. He may not even read the Bible very much, at least not directly.

Instead, a new stage emerges: observation. Equipped with eyes to see and ears to hear, the student turns his attention to the world and to its Christogenesis, in other words to the Parousia and its immediate context, Pleroma and ~~Kenosis~~ Kenosis. At this point the scholar may feel inclined to take up life as a menial laborer.

It is one thing to have tools to do or make something. It is quite another to have tools to observe something being done or made. The first has its satisfactions and rewards. The second does also. I find myself increasingly drawn and driving to the second of these activities.

The Bible becomes a watchtower and a powerful glass upon its top-most perch. The tower is manned for the sole purpose of keeping vigil for the dawn. Without the Bible we should have no tower, no glass, no vigil and not even a knowledge that dawn is coming.

Having an attenuated and misrepresented Bible is perhaps worse than having no Bible.

In any case, I'd like to make the point that the Bible has to be taken

literally. The so-called literalists will be shown up as eisegetes of a special type, not as literalists. In fact, their type of literalcy is a chic now among certain intellectuals -- the common man and all that. Taken literally, the Bible makes good sense, it rises above but includes common sense, and it is the antidote for all nonsense.

Addendum Six

Comparison causes a lot of intellectual and subsequent trouble. The reason is that comparisons will not hold up indefinitely, either as logical fixtures or as descriptions of reality. Sooner or later a comparison must be replaced by a simple statement of what is and then this statement must, in turn, be replaced by an ecstatic silence.

The greatest ~~is~~ metaphors, for example, the horticultural metaphor, are not comparisons, they are statements, and even these must give way to silence. Just as the ultimate goal of organization is limpness, even in musical rhythm, so the ultimate ~~is~~ goal of logic is silence.

Comparisons have ante-penultimate significance and usefulness. They are stepping-stones on the road to statement, and ultimately, silence. As long as we recognize them as such and accord them no more or less value than they deserve, we will find them beneficial to us. But when ~~we~~ we take them for statements of fact or even as facts themselves, we are in deep trouble. The ante-penultimate cannot serve as the penultimate, much less the ultimate.

Comparisons are neither malleable nor ductile. An irony of Schweitzer's comparison of Bach's music to painting is that the comparison itself does not have the "plastic" character he so much desires. Malleability and ductility are not options, they are necessities, both in the spiritual and the physical realms. A comparison, however, is brittle and stark. Its terms are not easily adjustable and the aspects of the things compared which do ~~is~~ not fit the comparison are left unattended.

Perhaps the deepest problem of a comparison, the fundamental reason for its transience, is that it establishes a duality which ~~is~~ insurmountable within its own terms. The two things being compared are left as two things. Logic will not abide this result either in its penultimate or in its ultimate disposition. Logic cannot abide two. If there are two it can only be taken, penultimately, as one twice. The inexorable result of comparisons ~~is~~ to establish, seemingly indefinitely, two things unconjoined by the very terms of comparison is a tip-off to the fact that comparisons are not finally valid. We know a priori that we cannot end up with more than one, or even with other than one.

So, comparisons are fine so long as they are kept in their place. Beyond them is metaphor or statement, and beyond metaphor is fact, taking the objective form of ecstatic silence.

Addendum Seven

Paradox is a result of trying to treat two things each of a logical type different from the other as if they were of the same logical type. In mathematics, for example, one would get a paradox if one were to treat both circles and squares with the formulae applicable to squares. In theology, one would get a paradox if one were to treat both the principles of God's goodness and his omnipotence with the formulae applicable to classical jurisprudence. This is, of course, a standard illustration of paradox. Another one, from theology, is the misreading of the great Creeds at the point of the human and divine natures of Jesus. The paradox here comes when we treat these natures as aspects of the same logical type, a procedure the Nicene and Chalcedonian Fathers most ~~emphatically~~ emphatically anathematized.

Much of the insipidity and torpor of contemporary religious life and thought can be traced from the resolve to resolve these and similar paradoxes in favor of one of their terms and to the exclusion of the other. The proper procedure is to never arrive at paradox in the first place and to do this by the steady recognition of logical types and their differences.

But instead we have a sort of lazy flop to one side or the other of the dilemma. For example, some theologians say now with baited breath that God is responsible for evil. The Bible, however, makes no such claim. Its statement is more circumspect and satisfying: the problem is not where did evil come from but rather, how come men are able to distinguish good from evil? The ultimate soteriological issue is not the triumph of good over evil but rather the inability to distinguish either, that is, taking everything as God's will and doing. One who loves God will not see anything that is not He; he will not see any threats -- or any beneficence.

Genesis 3 could not be plainer. Up to this ultimate point, of course, the whole tool shop of law, redemption, grace, justification, sanctification and the crucifixion and resurrection are essential. But the final issue is beyond these. It is beyond determinations of good and evil, life and death, this and that, here and there, then and now. The Church has ever spoken thus.

So we cannot flop over onto one side of a paradox we shouldn't have gotten to ~~anywhere and there~~ anyhow and there rest content. Another example is the contemporary evangelical depiction of Jesus in only his supposed humanity: a rebel, a fighter, a soothwayer, a social martyr, a pal. Here we have today what one intellectual recently deplored as folk religion -- no brains, no history, no awe, no dignity, no sense of transcendence, final urgency. The fear of men has supplanted entirely the fear of God. Men go about holding their lives in their hands, in fear and desperation, wondering what happened to the appellation "Sons of the Living God."

What today's evangelicals ~~for~~ forget is the traditional and biblical counsels of evangelical poverty. They're so fond of lucre as signs of divine benediction upon them that the manner, the means and the temper of the original missions is not a subject of their attention. The

boon-conferring aspect of Jesus, which these people associate with his humanity -- strangely, for I associate it with his divinity -- is their sole infatuation.

In contrast, the Bible and the tradition have always seen Jesus' humanity under the aspect of obedience, surrender, work and joy in the will of the Father. Nothing was ever said one way or the other about gold rings and pin-stripped suits. The humanity of Jesus and his divinity are treated as different yet mutually important logical types. There is no conflict or paradox in the Bible. All is action.

Paradox results from logical error, a confusion of logical types. If a paradox is achieved, one should neither hold it nor flop over onto one of its terms. The thing to do is to backtrack and sort out the logical types, then proceed to discover how if at all they are related. It can be assumed to start with that correct inquiry will never produce a paradox. Therefore, a paradox achieved simply indicates an inquiry to be corrected.

In this and in all other matters there is nothing wrong with being wrong. One is just thereby in need of finding the correction. That, however, may entail a lot of hard work.

(11/13/82 -- it is a remarkable fact that for 14 years no one has challenged the validity of my writing; it has been appreciated a little, questioned for clarification a little more and ignored a whole lot; but, it has not been directly challenged or falsified)

Addendum Eight

Two things appear to me clearly on the agenda of mankind in the coming centuries. The first is that the theatre of focus is the Pacific and Indian Ocean areas and Asia. The second is that the standard of living in Asia must be raised to parity with the Western nations and this must be done by the ~~nations~~ and cultivation there of two principles, the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Men.

In return, Asia, and in particular India, will cultivate in the West the great edifice of religion.

The first two agenda items cannot, I believe, be accomplished without another armed conflict. I might wish it were otherwise, but I do not see an alternative -- unless it be in some fortuitous shifting of the planet's geological plates. That ~~first~~ fight will be waged upon the Pacific and Indian Oceans and their bordering dry lands.

The cultivation of principles in Asia must proceed by flank approach, namely through Africa. Africa is at present and will remain for some long time the moral hot-house of human kind. There we watch with breathless interest the cynosure of Asia itself. As the struggle for principle is won in Africa, Asia will take heart and redouble her efforts. India is already firmly in the camp of principle and when Africa is lined up also, Asia will be confronted with echelons disposed in great depth

on her southern and western flank. The Atlantic, Antarctica and everything west thereof will have strong protection on their southeastern flank.

The ~~principle~~ principal clash is going to come across the North to Central Pacific and specifically through the Aleutians and through Alaska. A secondary clash will come again across the Southwest Pacific toward Australia ~~in~~ and Antarctica. A tertiary clash will come west from Malaya-Indonesia to Africa and Antarctica. The south-polar region represents an area of great strategic significance.

I conceive of these clashes in the same terms as did Commodore Perry: a battle between the forces of absolutism and the forces of freedom. Asia has for centuries been the bastion of absolutism. In the West there has been a progressive cultivation of the shoots of freedom. This process has its roots in India, for Western culture is Indo-European in origin and character. The Aryan stock is ~~Indic~~ Indic in origin.

Now that the theatre of interest has passed from localities to the universal, the stage is set for a meeting between these two ways of living. In this conflict, India plays the role of Dharmaraja, Russia plays the role of Bhima and the United States plays the role of Arjuna. India is the oldest and chief of the brothers.

There is a question with many whether a free nation has a moral right to declare war against a totalitarian government. The answer is that such a nation has both a moral right and a moral obligation to liberate an oppressed people. But once embarked, they must get the job done.

We feel that a citizen of this country who observes a fellow citizen being victimized has a duty to intervene to stop the violence. The same reasoning applies in the affairs of nations. Many treaties are based on this principle. Yet the principle applies whether or not a treaty exists. The foundation for the principle is the universal validity of truth and justice and the universal brotherhood of men. We are all neighbors one of another.

One God. One World. One Race. One Caste.

We can describe the coming conflict as a battle between the supposed absolutism of human whim -- totalitarianism -- and the real absolutism of morality -- liberty. One or the other can survive but not both. The issue involves divergent and incompatible philosophies: whim or ideals. One is absolute and the other makes a claim to absolutism. So conflict is inevitable, until the false is annihilated by the true.

Addendum Nine

Capitalism, as already stated, is the correct economic system, at least here in the West. It has, however, been misused in one important and, ultimately fatal or near-fatal respect: it has been largely built on the practice of borrowing and lending money. This practice is the weakness

of capitalism as we know it because it gives easy occasion to greed and its resultant, injustice. Today we pay for this weakness in daily sorrow.

It may well be that industrial growth could not have had such a rapid rate of growth without the engine of debt. On the other hand, it may also be that the misery and injustice attendant upon this rapid growth may have ~~been~~ been less or not at all if the engine of growth had been thrift and simplicity. We do not know because the course went all one way, and that by the engine of debt.

In any case, the Bible stands against usury and for centuries the ~~Church~~ Church with some success forbade Christians to practice it. The Jew, being loyal to nothing, including the Old Testament, which forbids usury, lived in no such harness and found many an Antonio to take his funds at interest. The die was cast. The Christian built the factory with the Jew's money. But, after time, the lender exercised his legal rights -- through an increasing number of Jewish lawyers and judges -- and gained thereby ownership of what the Christian had built -- because the money for it all was the Jew's.

Europe several times had enough of this nonsense and swept the Jew out, with greater or lesser success, as in the German exterminations. Never, however, did these campaigns ~~strike~~ strike at the heart of the problem. One can get rid of the lender as long as one has physical superiority ~~over~~ over him. But if one's appetites drive one to borrow again from his former creditor's great grandchild, one is right back in one's own soup.

One is tempted to ask, ironically, how it was, after Hitler took Paris, that the House of Rothschild survived. Was Krupp in debt to Rothschild? Rothschild financed the State of Israel from the beginning. How was it that a million ghetto Jews were led away but not one Rothschild, and certainly not the Bank? There is an hypocrisy in the way the Jew was handled. The non-Jew still wanted to borrow from the Jew. He apparently had not thought thoroughly about the origin of his difficulty.

Don't borrow from the Jew, or from anyone, and the whole problem is solved. Let the Jew feed on his own, not on God's own.

It is not untrue to say that borrowing from any lending agency in this country is borrowing from the Jew and that giving to any charity in this country is purchasing Israel Bonds.

So, when I commend capitalism, I mean to indicate capitalism in every respect we understand it except that of debt. And, for that matter, lending becomes as bad as borrowing. In fact, the Bible prohibits both activities. The history of debt and lending shows exactly the misery from which God, through the Bible would spare us.

Addendum Ten

Tantum homo habet de scientia, quantum operatur. Man has as much of knowledge as he executes. St. Francis

Fac secundum exemplar. Ideals ought to be put into practice. Old Franciscan saying

What ideals ought to be put into practice? If one saying were to be taken for a life of living by it, what would it be?

Without presuming to infringe on the choice of those who want their own taste and tone, I offer this ideal and saying: Hoc est Corpus meum, This is My Body.

How to put it into practice? Here are some suggestions, a Rule of Life:

Borrow nothing, lend nothing.
 Eat fresh foods, excluding flesh and eggs.
 Read no newspaper or magazine,
 See no movie or TV
 Listen to no radio.
 Forego all rock and roll, pop, country western, etc. "music."
 Cultivate the virtues.
 Set the mind on Heaven.
 Do not gossip.
 Study the Bible and great literature, if you must study.
 Live outdoors except in inclement weather.
 Dress modestly and for the ~~xxx~~ weather.
 Discipline your children.
 Control your wife.
 Obey your husband.
 Be strong and happy.
 Adopt toward all the most courtly ~~x~~ manners.
 Strive for the greatest elevation of character.
 Travel little and infrequently.
 Raise a family.
 Use no birth control.
 Pray constantly.
 Be satisfied.
 Use no liquor or hallucinogenic drugs.
 Uphold and preserve what is good, right and beautiful.
 Work much, talk little.
 Never argue.
 Furnish house and garage with the minimum essentials and engage always
 in extending the minimum downward.
 Invest money in the education of children and the care of widows, orphans,
 travelers (strangers) and the sick.

The aim of the Rule is to free a person to see everything under the saying, Hoc est Corpus meum, or in the Hindu, all is Vibbhuti, sacred ash, Vasudevasarvamidam, God is all this.

Addendum Eleven

What model should we choose ~~fr~~ from history for the present. I suggest the Benedictine model which has, behind it, the Hieronymean model. But I feel there must be a difference which amounts to a further turning to the outside, visibly revealed, of the mystery inside. The soul of the Benedictine was to wed its Bridegroom, Christ, through the aid of a cloister. Today the same ~~ap~~ approbation formerly accorded the cloistered life is to be accorded the married life in which husband and wife, in peace and unity, show forth, without a cloister, but in the middle of the world's bluster, that unity in which God first created earth and its premiere adornment, man.

This is a higher, more difficult, yet more fundamental calling than that of a monk. It represents faith in the original design and purpose of creation. It represents in full the meaning of Bonhoeffer that man should come of age, he should act the part assigned to him at his beginning and overcome himself in the plenitude of grace now showering him.

The cloister is a dangerous place, indirectly. Its value can be lost if a monk leaves it for a moment and, having no experience in the world's snares, falls headlong at the first temptation.

The world is a dangerous place also, but directly and therein lies its ironical comfort, the comfort St. Francis sought. One who has learned the ways of the world and overcome them, one by one, stands in less danger of falling unexpectedly than one who knows only the cloister and is suddenly thrown outside it.

Coming of age means walking calmly through the whirlwind of this world's tempests toward the calm of a distant shore. The walk is across water, indeed a great sea.

It might be easier to take a boat (the cloister) but if the boat sinks one must perchance have to learn to swim and then to walk on water. Better to acquire both of these skills at the start. One can acquire them in the cloister, but how much easier will it seem just to take to one's cabin.

So, it is a Benedictine Family Era; Benedictine because we must preserve what is good and beautiful -- no doubt for some future Francis to scatter -- Family because we must grow up into our original purpose, Era because an Incarnation of the Divine Personality walks the earth, which fact signals a change of Era.

Addendum Twelve

I would like to underline and bring together three doctrines mentioned in the first chapter of this book. They are the doctrines of Pleroma, Kenosis and Parousia.

I would like to say that these three are actually three aspects of the

one doctrine of the Incarnation and are the string on which are strung all the pearls of Christian doctrine. They are the foundation doctrine and comprise together one doctrine, Incarnatus est. They are inseparable and cannot be treated as different in either space or time. It is a great mistake, for example, to write a systematic theology and end it with a section on eschatology. For none of the apostles, fathers or mystics was the Parousia less than an immediate expectation, even experience. Nor are we justified in treating it as "distant."

The prefix para is an intensifier. The word ousia means being. The word Parousia, therefore means being or reality or God intensely present right now. The Parousia is what is really and only. The word is equivalent to the Sanskrit Paramatma which means the undifferentiated, eternal absolute, Reality Itself. Atma is the equivalent of Ousia and both words use the same intensifier, Para.

The doctrine of Kenosis is the fountain of anthropology and ethics. It has traditionally served as the straight road to mystical "favours."

The doctrine of the Pleroma is the common ground of the five religions: Hinduism, Buddhism, Zoroastrianism, Islam and Christianity.

To say more than this would involve me in a book on systematic theology, which is not my purpose here.

I wish only to underline these doctrines and to point out their importance and essential unity as the one central doctrine, Incarnatus est.

Addendum Thirteen

The reader will have noticed an absence of footnotes to the text of this book. This absence is deliberate, or rather, unavoidable. There is one footnote to the entire text and that is ~~xxx~~ simply the author's life. It is my habit to practice what I learn and thereby to judge of its truth or falsehood through experience. So I can claim that what I have received from others has been so thoroughly lived by myself that what I have kept is genuinely my own. I therefore have every right to treat it as my own and not footnote anything in the traditional manner of scholars, ~~xxx~~ a manner with which I am intimately familiar.

The reader will notice, however, that many names, mostly well-known, appear in the text and he may safely assume that to these people I am in firm and final debt.

Another reason for the absence of footnotes to the text is this: my purpose has not been archival; it has ~~been~~ been seminal. I have not sought to catalogue what others have said on an issue. That task never did appeal to me. I have, rather, sought to reconstruct and preserve in appealing form the ancient foundation and edifice of Christian doctrine and epistemology, showing along the way that these saturate every condition and situation of man's life on earth.

The very nature of my purpose has been to digest and serve up the truth. The names of those who have spoken, thought and done the truth are secondary to the truth itself. The process of digestion removes the medium and leaves the nutrition, it removes the name and leaves the essence, it removes the footnote and leaves the life of the author. There, in the life of the author can a person judge whether he has spoken the truth.

So, I offer my life as the one and only footnote to this text. God ~~appreciates the love~~ wants the love, not the lover.

Addendum Fourteen

I would like to point out that the doctrine of reincarnation, which we meet in the Orient, is not foreign to Christian theology. It's parallel there is the doctrine of purgatory. There ~~is~~ it is not specified as easily or clearly as in Hindu orthodoxy, but the effect is the same. Reincarnation is a fact that is accounted for in the doctrine of purgatory.

An unprejudiced student of Christian and Hindu orthodoxy cannot miss the parallel doctrines. The Conquest of Canaan is the same doctrine as the Mahabharata War. Down the line of doctrines one finds the parallels. Even names are often equivalents. Such differences as there may be appear to me to consist chiefly in degree of specificity. Hindu orthodoxy tends to specify everything in detail where Christian orthodoxy often speaks in parables. But read the Christian mystics and there the very metaphors, words, phrases and even manners of speech strike one as typically Hindu, which means, simply, true, factual.

Christian orthodoxy dwells generally on the preliminaries of the mystical experience, hinduism orthodoxy as much on its details. Jesus and certain of the Old Testament books dwell extensively on the mystical experience -- what Hindu Orthodoxy details as several types or grades of liberation -- but in parable form. The mystics, starting with St. Paul, speak more clearly and in detail. But the orthodox Christian tradition dwells somewhat back from direct description.

This is not to say that Hindu orthodoxy excels Christian ~~or~~ orthodoxy. Far from it. The general plan is there, clearly, in both. Apparently the divine purpose is to speak plainly in one and in the other largely in parable -- except in the great Christian mystical literature, where the ~~speech~~ speech is often very plain indeed. For example, St. Teresa of Avila.

The more I have looked at these parallels the more I see my deep ignorance of the Bible. Among people who have come in contact with Oriental philosophies there is a tendency to regard the Bible as a child's primer and even as incomplete in comparison to these philosophies. But, this is a great mistake, both intellectually and morally. People who believe this carp in ignorance. They are arrogant cynics. A little more study of the Bible would show them that they are making a great and fatal mistake. I have spoken here of parallels, not of inequalities or inferiorities.

Indeed, the tragedy of our civilization is that we have lost faith in its root which is the Bible. A plant cannot live away from its root and that is the reason for the decline of the West. We cannot go to the Orient for we were born here. The Orient will not save us. We have imported from the Orient its heresies.

We must go back to the Bible through its three great exponents: Jerome, Paul and Moses. There is our root, our orthodoxy, our culture and our civilization. Many say otherwise but they carp in ignorance.

Addendum Fifteen

I would like to draw attention to the fact that Communism (Socialism) and Psychiatry (psychology) are the handiwork of the Jew. And I would like also to be more specific in identifying the Jew's function in history since the Incarnation: he is the devil's army.

Let me call attention to some facts:

Marx and Freud were Jews

their earliest followers were Jews

their intellectual roots were the Jewish students and faculty of the German academy and these were nursed by the great pantheists, Hegel and, ultimately, Spinoza, a Jew

Among the earliest Communist theoreticians and leg-men were poor European and American Orthodox Jews -- the "workers"

In England, Communism was taken up by a Jew-sympathizing group of anti-Christian, liberal intellectuals whose life-style was predominately homosexual -- the Fabians

These people enormously influenced the founding and policies of the United Nations, not to mention the pro-Soviet and pro-Red Chinese policies of the Allies during and after World War Two, up to the present Russian Jewry was originally an enthusiastic support and contributor to the Soviet Union and only turned "dissident" when the opportunity to establish a pure Jew socialist state arose -- the so-called Israel; the Stalinist purge of Jews was an in-house Communist battle for control of the Party

The so-called State of Israel has a socialist government (no descendant of David) and no Temple (no priesthood); there for a theologian to see is its lack of any claim to Old Testament authority or religion

A roster of psychiatrists and psychologists reads like a Jewish who's-who

The essence of psychiatry is to replace legitimate authority -- starting with parental authority which is of divine origin -- with various appetites of the mind and body; the differences in psychiatric and psychological theories consist in the emphasis given to different appetites, namely, tweedle-de and tweedle-dum.

The Jew is the proto-typical despiser of authority, legitimate authority.

The Jew is the Rebel of Revelation. His power on earth today is exceedingly great and is based on his bullying attitude, which he cannot change, even if he wanted to. In the words of St. Jerome, the Jew is the devil's

army. His station in these days is to subvert righteousness and order, to precipitate decay and decline in government, business and morals, to attack the truth with every means at his ~~disposal~~ disposal. And he owns the means: he owns the media, the money and, by mortgage, the Church Herself. This state of affairs cannot but be ordained by Providence.

The Jew fosters two lies to conceal his activity. First, he claims to have a religion of his own. In truth, he is an heretical sect of the Christian religion. Second, toward Christianity he claims to be a neutral and a brother. In truth he is the opponent to Truth, to Christianity and to Christians on all fronts. He said long ago that his King is Caesar. He is an idolater of his own power, hardly neutral toward the truth.

It is a ~~xx~~ remarkable fact that among the thousands of young people who appear to have given themselves to Oriental and occult philosophies and religions, the bulk and leaders are Jews. This was so apparent ~~x~~ at the inception of these movements that I remember being astounded at the regularity of the phenomenon. Repeatedly I asked these people who they were. Always the answer was the same, "We are Jews." They even claimed to lead the so-called charismatic movement as "Jews for Jesus," as if there could be such a thing.

The point is this: the Rebel used these movements to further ~~x~~ screen his efforts to spread moral and theological confusion. Yet, upon challenge he instantly identified himself: "I am a Jew."

The Rebel has a role to play: he sorts out the Christian from the hypocrite who defiles the name by only wearing it. A Christian cannot be deceived by the antics and nonsense of the Jews, no matter what their latest disguise. Nor can the truth be subverted by falsehood.

In fact, Christians are obligated to love the Jews, for one day they will see the truth, and besides they are men. Only their own ignorance sets them apart from Christ. But, even that is Providential. So, the best policy toward the Jews is to love them and watch their antics in high amusement.