

Working Draft 7-8-2016

Problem of the religious right?

ECONOMICS AND THE
SPIRITUAL LIFE OF FREE MEN:
A Celebration of Voluntary Exchange

Spencer Heath

The Chapman College Talks
And Selected Essays

Edited by
Spencer Heath MacCallum

713 W. Spruce Street #48
Deming, New Mexico 88030
915-261-0502
sm@look.net

Acknowledgments

Frances Norton Manning, the author's friend of many years and hostess in Santa Ana, California, brought him together with Chapman College and proposed these talks be given there. President of the College John L. Davis became a warm friend and sponsored the series. Edward McCrady, Vice Chancellor of the University of the South, Sewanee, Tennessee, is well remembered for his inspiring friendship and intellectual hospitality. Spencer Heath had spent the academic year 1954-55 as his guest at Sewanee, auditing advanced courses in theology and building on his vision of the Christian doctrine of man while deeply enjoying the warm, Southern hospitality of the entire University family. Dr. McCrady at the time was writing his book, *Seen and Unseen: A Biologist Views the Universe*, which harmonized with Heath's own thinking. Heath well might have dedicated these talks to Dr. McCrady, perhaps in such words as

To the living spirit of Edward McCrady
and all who seek understanding of
the non-political, organic society of men,
the Mystical Body of Christ.

Contents

Acknowledgments

Editor's Remarks 7

THE CHAPMAN COLLEGE TALKS

Preface 15

Prologue 17

The Free Community
and Its Transcendent Function 21

Property and Its Productive Administration:
Servant of the Creative Spirit in Man 39

The Christian Doctrine of Man 57

The Inspiration of Beauty 77

The Hidden Christ in the Organic Community 93

SELECTED ESSAYS

Christ as Poet 115

The Mission of the Church 119

Creature to Creator 121

The Psychological Preeminence of Man 123

The *Ways* of God 125

When the Golden Rule Prevails 127

The Mystical Body of Christ 129

Jesus' Earthly Vision: A Historical Review 131

The Practice of Christian Freedom 143

Editor's Remarks

Spencer Heath (1876-1963) pursued many and varied careers in his lifetime, but all held for him a common challenge. Whether as engineer, lawyer, manufacturer, horticulturist, philosopher of science, social theorist, or poet, he would stand back in his imagination and ask how any given kind of activity related to every other in serving and elucidating the unfolding human process which is the emergence of Society. He was interested in context, process, growth. He was intrigued by novelty, not for its sake alone, but to understand it in its functional relation to what had gone before and might yet be.

Heath was well known in the early decades of the 20th century for his pioneering role in the fledgling aviation industry. Following an early and varied career in engineering, he studied law and became a patent attorney. Through one of his clients, Emile Berliner, inventor of the telephone receiver and the flat-disk phonograph record that replaced the wax cylinder, he became interested in aeronautical engineering. Berliner had commissioned him in 1907 to design and build a set of rotary blades to test for the first time the helicopter principle, that such an arrangement of blades could lift the weight of an engine into the air. The test was successful, and the aerodynamics so intrigued Heath that he continued designing and making propellers. By 1910 this was such a successful sideline that he gave up the practice of law and moved from Washington to Baltimore to form the American Propeller and Manufacturing Company and, later, Paragon Engineers.

In Baltimore, simply for the enjoyment of designing and building machinery and not because any demand warranted it at the time, he developed the first machine mass production of airplane propellers, replacing the man who stood at a bench and carved them out by hand. Since his was now the only facility that could turn out propellers in volume, when World War I broke out, he supplied most of the propellers used by the Allied governments. After the war, his "Paragon" propellers drove the Navy N-C planes that made the first trans-Atlantic crossing. In 1922 he demonstrated at Boling Field the first successful engine powered and controlled variable and reversible pitch propeller, which did for airplanes what gearing does for the automobile. His prediction of commercial aviation that year made front-page news.

In the late summer of 1929, Heath, now 53 years old, sold all his patents and facilities to Bendix Aviation, including his services for two years as research engineer. Then he retired to Roadsend Gardens, his country place outside of Baltimore, to devote himself to studying the philosophy of science. This began an intensely creative period. He set himself the task of discovering what the successful sciences, meaning those that had given rise to dependable technologies, had in common that might help in the development of a natural science of society. He outlined such a science, and this enabled him to forecast, as he had once forecast commercial aviation, the emergence of a private industry that would produce and administer public services contractually in the market without dependence upon taxation. His examination of the fundamentals of physics led him to propose an integration and simplification of the physical sciences by their reformulation in terms of *action* instead of the abstract concept *energy*. He helped found the Henry George School of Social Science in New York City, attracted by its strong championing of free trade in all but land, and this brought him to examine private property in land and conclude that, far from a pathology, it was a basic social institution through which, as it evolved and matured, George's 'philosophy of freedom' could be made self-consistent and fully realized. Finally, he developed a unique take on the historical Jesus and the importance of his positive formulation of the golden rule, which is the subject of this book. These investigations, carried out over more than a decade, are set out in what Heath liked to call his "engineer's report," *Citadel, Market and Altar*, privately published in 1957.

Relating to a grandson

As Spencer Heath's grandson, I worked closely with him for several years after graduating from Princeton in 1955. He treated me as an equal, a colleague, the son he hadn't had, his only son having died at birth. It was a creative, informal time for both of us. He had caught my attention with a remarkable idea I had heard nowhere in my academic studies, namely the notion that a truly free society, organized on a voluntary basis independent of taxation or the acts of legislatures, was a practical goal for mankind and attainable in the foreseeable future. He once replied to a skeptic on this point, "Was it Utopian to expect to navigate the air?" Astounded that anyone could talk this way, especially a person accomplished in engineering, law and business, and widely read in history and the sciences, I was driven to find out if he was a purist on this point. Over the next two years I listened attentively to his every word, interjecting questions and what-ifs. We formed a working association and privately published his *Citadel*,

Market and Altar: Emerging Society. Then I went on to graduate work in social anthropology at the University of Washington and the University of Chicago where I tested and further developed many of his ideas about the quickening of social evolution.

Devoted as I had become to his social ideas, I realized that they were only a part of his philosophy. He once remarked that if he were to be remembered a century hence, it probably would be not be so much for his generalizations about society as for his contribution to the philosophy of science. Physics is beyond my ken, but thermodynamicist Alvin Lowi (alowi@cox.net), of Rancho Palos Verdes, California, the principal investigator in this area of Heath's work, believes Heath's action hypothesis has merit on the face of it in light of the principle of least action having provided the foundation for quantum theory. He observes that the energy conservation principle can be derived from the least action principle, whereas the converse has never been accomplished, suggesting that action is the more fundamental concept in physics. This is the unifying concept throughout all of Heath's philosophy.

The present book

Whereas *Citadel*, *Market and Altar* dealt with human social organization from the perspective of science, this book deals with the same subject matter but from the religious, which is to say *inspirational*, perspective. Heath was Trinitarian, not because he had been brought up that way (he came from Quaker stock and raised his family in Unitarianism), but because of his philosophy of science. He observed a correlation between the three inseparable aspects of the infinite Godhead as expressed in the Anglican Book of Prayer, namely, Substance, Power, and Eternity (more commonly Father, Son, and Holy Spirit) with mass, motion, and time, the three aspects of an objective event (technically *action* in the language of physical science). In each case, the three aspects are inseparable other than conceptually, but in the latter case quantifiable in the standard measuring units of gram, centimeter and second or their derivatives. The correspondence, Heath observed, is remarkable: *Substance/mass; Power/motion; Eternity/time*. Hence the difference between the theologian and the scientist has not to do with the reality each treats of, but with how they relate to it, the one treating of Reality in its infinite aspect, the other in its finite and measurable manifestations.

Heath's interest in Christian doctrine led to his spending the 1956 academic year, when eighty years old, at the University of the South in Sewanee,

Tennessee as the guest of vice chancellor Edward McCrady. There he attended classes in advanced theology, developing in greater depth and detail his own vision of the Christian doctrine of man. He had long found the language and symbology of Christianity particularly apt for expressing aspects of his philosophy, and he sought out opportunities in private conversation and informal talks to impart new meaning that could inspire his listeners.

From his earliest years Heath had been attracted to the work of Ralph Waldo Emerson. Two favorite books that he always carried in his luggage were Olive Schreiner's *Dreams* and _____. Much of his thought might be viewed as a synthesis of American Transcendentalism and the Classical-Liberal tradition in economics, a happy reconciliation of the inner and the outer life. Unsurprisingly, Heath's traditional grace at family gatherings around the table was Socrates' prayer from the *Phaedrus*:

Beloved Pan, and all ye other gods who here abide,
Help us to be beautiful in the inner man,
And all we have of outer things
To be at peace with those within.

Spencer Heath's superb command of language was at its best in conversation. During his last years, tape recording technology had become available, and although the equipment was still awkward to use and he thought very little of the project, I recorded his conversations whenever possible and transcribed them. These tapings make up much of the *Spencer Heath Archive*, which when completely transcribed and digitized will be domiciled at the Universidad Francisco Marroquín in Guatemala.

I couldn't be present in 1961 when his friend, John L. Davis, president of Chapman College at Orange, California invited him to give a series of extemporaneous evening talks to a mixed audience at the College, but through the kindness of Mrs. Frances Norton Manning, who had brought them together and was Heath's hostess in Southern California, I arranged for the talks to be taped. This book contains the transcript of those talks with virtually no editing of Heath's words. I have supplemented the questions and answers that follow each talk by making up a number of additional questions and "answering" them with verbatim material drawn from the *Archive*. Material thus introduced is set in bold type and identified by an archival number.

This book is intended as an inspirational work. Much of it is like a poem or

music in which a refrain or theme is repeated, each time against a different background and in a little different way. So it might be described as variations on a theme, the theme being the golden rule — which has a specificity and freshness of meaning that can be missed if the religious language is taken uncritically. Heath was precise in his use and understanding of words, and repetition itself, as thematic variations, may contribute to one's understanding; for as G. K. Chesterton observed,

If you look at a thing nine hundred and ninety-nine times,
you are perfectly safe; if you look at it the thousandth time,
you are in frightful danger of seeing it for the first time.

In speaking, Heath often stressed the first word in the phrase “golden rule,” making it “*golden* rule,” a departure that at once saves the phrase from becoming a cliché by implicitly contrasting the alternative mode of behavior, which he called the “*iron* rule.”

His use of the term “spiritual” interchangeably with “creative” calls for some clarification. His original title for these talks was *The Spiritual Life of Free Men*. Most people are accustomed to thinking of spirituality as something metaphysical, experienced only subjectively. Commonly among the world's major religions, however, the hallmark of Divinity is creativity in the objective world. Not unlike Spinoza, Heath conceived of the infinite Cosmos, of which we are a finite part, as the body of God, which manifests a creative, transcendent, and infinite process of variety, growth, and endless self-realization. This creative aspect of the Cosmos, its informing spirit, is its divinity. Hence when we align ourselves with the Cosmic process by acting creatively on our environment, promoting life thereby, we are at one with God, acting spiritually — *divinely*.

Sacred language in every place and time is largely poetic, requiring interpretation. When people feel the need to give expression to ideals they hold more deeply than can be put into prose, they often resort to poetry. Poetic imagery that best serves their need may endure for generations, becoming traditional in a culture. But culture is not static, least of all today. So long as the images endure, their content needs from time to time to be reevaluated, the imagery somewhat reinterpreted. Today's culture is changing so rapidly that traditional Christian imagery is in danger of being lost for want of fresh interpretation appropriate to our time. Poetry cries out for interpretation. This may be uncomfortable for the fundamentalist. Perhaps, in answer, it is enough to say that God's meaning is not revealed all at once.

In the store of religious imagery long and widely cherished in Western civilization, Heath finds a wealth of new meaning appropriate for the world now rapidly dawning. Yet in keeping with organic process, of which he was enamored, he does not discard or invalidate the old, but interprets and builds on it. He never tired of remarking how the churches of England he toured in 1930 had grown by accretion over the ages, preserving the old rather than clearing it away and building anew. So it is with this book. Heath does not clear away old meaning to make way for new, but by taking a broader perspective than most of us might, he shows how the old imagery encompasses more than we suspected. It heralds a dawning society, a society in which men will revere the golden rule — the recipe for contract and voluntary exchange — as the unequivocal standard of behavior to be applied in all affairs, public no less than private.

But a universal standard of behavior, however important, was the least of Heath's vision. It was the foundation and not the cathedral. The fullness of his vision was that, in such freedom, people will grow spiritually as creative beings, following the example of God in Genesis. With less and less occasion to act out of necessity or from negative emotions of rage or fear, fight or flight, which served in an earlier and ruder age, men will respond to and increasingly act under aesthetic motivation, the Inspiration of Beauty — the *inbreathing* of the Holy Spirit.

Heath shows how, more than people might ever imagine, underneath are the everlasting arms. On the back of an envelope he once penciled these words:

God is immanent in the universe
And nothing is alien —
least of all man.

THE CHAPMAN COLLEGE TALKS

Preface

I am always happy to approach the study of mankind and society from religious premises. In *Citadel, Market and Altar*, I approached the understanding of society along rationalistic lines after the manner of the natural sciences. That is the foundation of the book, yet it brings out religious conceptions here and there along the way, showing that there are religious corollaries. So I have contemplated for a long time, if I could be sufficiently inspired, that I should write another book, approaching the subject of mankind in his world not from the standpoint this time of science, but from the standpoint of religion — from the standpoint of the inspirational experiences of mankind, which are primarily of course seated in religion and which have had their manifestations through the ages in what we call the inspirational arts. So this little series of talks is a beginning point to treat of the same subject as *Citadel, Market and Altar*, not from the scientific point of view but from the point of view of religion and inspiration.

Spencer Heath
Chapman College
Orange, California
March 16, 1961

PROLOGUE TO THE TALKS

***Again, Isaiah pondered the loveliness
of Moses' mandate to the children of Israel:
Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.***

Leviticus XIX:18

Here is the divine command, the formula for human behavior. To many, love is a sentiment, not necessarily any kind of behavior at all. But a certain kind of behavior is implied, and this implied behavior is what we may call the objective side of love.

In a later version of this divine command, it is not merely a sentiment that is enjoined, beautiful as that may be. It is a specific mode of action — that ye do unto all others as ye would have them do unto you. Here is given to us the way of life, the passport to that kingdom of the Spirit on the earth wherein all things shall be added, even unto ever more abundant life.

These fruits of the Spirit are not for those who only profess the sentiment of love, but for the doers of the word. And this doing must be directed not only to intimates or a chosen few, it must be toward all men.

The kind of action, the manner, the how of the love is very specific. It must be done in the same manner as one would be done by. It must be done in a oneness of mind, a mutual accord of consent and desire on both sides.

When this sentiment or spirit of love manifests itself in a general system of mutual exchange, it is impersonal. Thereby it transcends all narrow limitations and becomes universal, partaking of the nature of the Divine. In the democracy of the market, in which all things are done "by consent of all and coercion of none," it is a balanced, rational system determined by the equivalence of numbers, the balancing of accounts. It is thus a high, creative technology among men, the same, in principle, as that practiced by the natural sciences for the transformation of our material world.

This system of free enterprise, in which each is equal in his self-determination, and in his sole jurisdiction over his own person and possessions, is — so far as it has developed — the rational, self-consistent, concrete and universal practice of the golden command that we do unto all others in the same manner as we would be done by.²⁷⁸⁵

The Teaching of Christ was a new dispensation to the spirit of man, its first true charter of freedom, not alone from self-limitations within but no less truly from the powers of the world without.²⁷³⁵ We cannot too often remember that freedom is the touchstone to the entire ideal world of man.⁴³⁴

The Free Community And Its Transcendent Function

We have to begin somewhere in any examination or analysis, and it is customary in most reasonable thinking that we should begin at the simple side of things. We begin with the seed rather than with the full plant or the full tree. We examine things in the little to find out how they express themselves in the large. We are influenced by Tennyson's ditty about the little flower in the crannied wall:

. . . if I could understand
What you are, root and all, and all in all,
I should know what God and man is.

So we begin this series of talks from the standpoint of *community*, the simplest level of people associating with one another. And in this relationship called community, we find that man expresses his intrinsic nature — that no man lives himself alone.

Like all other animals, men are basically associated with those who have the same parents. This is a family relationship, which people feel through their emotions and which among primitive people expands to take in all persons whom they conceive as having the same ancestors — the tribal community. I don't intend to speak very much about this, because it doesn't distinguish man. We share the family or tribal relationship with the earlier forms of life. The greater number, perhaps all, of the earlier forms have some associative relationships, but they are always based upon consciousness of being genetically related. That is characteristic of practically all forms of animal life. There is a comity, a generosity and a cooperation, among the members of the same blood-bonded group, whether they are animals or men.

But I wish to speak of man as man, and not as animal. In that I am perhaps breaking precedents. There has been a great deal of literature and a great deal of thought, a great deal of human philosophy, equating man with animal limitations. But animals are all headed for death. Nearly all have been going extinct in the world, and biologists tell us that the living species in the world today are but a remnant of what have lived before. Animals have shown no creative powers to rebuild the environment in which they live, to make it progressively more and more habitable for themselves.

Men, on the other hand, have some spark in them that seems to have been

left out of the animals. We have it reflected in Genesis. After God made the animal man, He breathed His divine breath into him and he became a living soul, something that could think, not merely feel, something that could have creative dominion over the whole world. Above all other things there was given to man a power to reason, to think, to conceive, to create.

Animals perceive, and so do we. Sometimes that is as far as we go with it; we act tropistically or by conditioned reflex, so that the stimulus produces a result automatically. Any animal, of course, can do that. Even the amoeba shrinks away from the point of a needle. So in perceiving things and not reflecting about them, we haven't reached any degree of humanness. We have only that which other animals possess — their animal nature.

Unlike animals, however, we are able to conceive things. We are able to take the impact of events that come upon us, reflect upon them intelligently and, through this delayed process of reasoning and thinking things through, as we sometimes say, find a very different kind of behavior in response to the things that happen to us. In so doing we become spiritual beings, because now we can exercise dominion. We can become creative.

Because of our delayed reactions, we can develop understandings. As the good book says, "With all thy getting, get understanding." That is the kind of knowledge that is power. That gives man dominion over the world in which he lives. That lifts him out of his creaturehood into his creativity and makes him at one with God — a partner in the work of God.

So I want to distinguish human community from biological community, which is characteristic of a great variety of life forms, and I want also to distinguish it from the kind of community that people have, let us say, in a prison camp — a place where there is no voluntarism, where some external authority determines the behavior of the people and places them under more or less severe limitations. That is why our topic is "The Free Community," the community in which the members do not practice any force or coercion or violence upon one another, but in which their relationships are reciprocal and their service to one another is mutual service brought about by the mutuality of exchange.

In speaking now of free communities, I do not mean that they are free from the weather or from any other external forces, or free from an armed force that might come down upon them as the Assyrian came down like the wolf on the fold. I am speaking now of communities the members of which are not in conflict

with one another, but in which the characteristic behavior is a cooperative, and not a compulsive, or coercive, behavior.

Through the ages, men have had two kinds of communities. Among the northern tribes, the barbarians, there has been more mutuality. Men have not known slavery in the rugged parts of the world, where slavery probably would have been too unproductive to be practical. But in the more clement parts of the world, in the easy-living lands, all written history seems to show that men predominantly have had the coercive type of community that characterized the sovereignties of the Classical world and before the Classical world.

There is going on now a contest between the free relationships that characterized the rugged lands, where men had to be men, and the unfree relationships characteristic of the sovereignties of the more clement and easy-living lands. We see that in our public affairs today. We are divided; some of us want to carry on, resting on our own responsibility individually, while others of us want to be taken care of. That seems to be the cleavage in thought today.

Happily, health is more catching than disease. Life is ever lord over death. And so without any consciousness of it, men automatically practice to a higher degree the cooperative, the mutual relationship which is productive and which aids them in transforming the conditions under which they live.

Nonetheless, we have developed in the Western world these two kinds of association, one of which we may call "political," and the other, "economic." What I wish to speak of today is the latter, which I prefer to call the "social." For I do not consider that an enduring community can be based upon conquest or violence or even upon political elections — electing persons who, as the successors of their earlier conquerors or the like must continue acting in the same manner, depending upon tribute, taxation and other coercions. I like to give attention to the creative relationships among men, relationships that are self-supporting and self-sustaining and that do not have to pull anything else down in order to build themselves up.

The characteristic of a free community is that it is spiritual. When I say *spiritual*, I mean that it is *creative*. Its units or members practice a relationship among themselves in which the things they dream and desire can be accomplished. Until men arrive at the stage where they practice a community relationship in the sense in which I have just used it, they are subject to the vicissitudes of external pressure of many kinds — pressures both of natural forces and the effects of subjection to conquerors, rulers, controllers, regulators.

To the extent that men are spontaneously cooperative one with another, they become the masters of their world. They can plan and execute their dreams. They can conceive beautiful things and then can create beauty. In the political world, by contrast, men and women can conceive of Utopias and things of that kind, but when they employ the coercive, or political, method of actualizing those dreams, they seem to get quite the reverse of the Utopias that they dreamed.

If we can leave it to the spiritual relationship among men, which is voluntary, reciprocal, cooperative, we find that men and women can become creators. They can express their spirituality, their power to conceive things as God imaged the world before He created it in that image. We find they can create the images that they dream, as the engineer, the architect, and the artist find means of expressing and bringing into the world around them the things they have imaged — things they have conceived in that part of man that seems to carry on whether his body carries on or not, that part of him that we call his consciousness, that identifies him as a living soul apart from whether his body lives or not.

So I wish to put in a word for *society* defined as the organization of men reciprocally serving one another rather than an organization of men dominating the behavior and controlling the actions of one another by force. Society in that sense is spiritual. My own investigations have been confined, therefore, to trying to understand the *society* of men, the *voluntary* associations of men, because I find that there is where we get our power to become kings, so to speak, over the world — to express our creative dominion which was promised in the very beginning of the book we all revere.

When we speak of religion there comes to the mind of most of us, I imagine, the Christian religion. There are persons who say, "Well there are lots of religions and what's the difference? Religion is religion, and we might as well take one kind as another." I must confess to having entertained in my callow years a good deal of that point of view. I was tremendously enthused about the Parliament of Religions which I attended in Chicago at the time of the World's Columbian Exposition in 1893. But I have a preference now for the Christian religion that is very decided and very well founded, I believe.

Our Christian religion was brought to us by a poet and prophet and a seer who really did see. The religion that he brought is showing us how we can extend and amplify our relations one to another without governmental regulation or dominance, taxation, or any other mode of violence. Jesus called that the

"kingdom of heaven."

He taught us to pray "Thy will be done *in earth* as it is in heaven." Many of his professed followers have gone far astray from that prayer, however, limiting it to the heaven part and forgetting about the earth, or so it would seem. The ecclesiastical establishments throughout history have been more concerned with something beyond this life than with this life itself. But the Christian religion, in its beginnings at any rate, was a religion of the here and the now.

Poor Richard said, "Take care of the pennies, and the dollars will take care of themselves." If we take care of the *here* and the *now*, we needn't worry about the future being able to take care of itself. So I like to put my religious emphasis upon the here and the now — that we should learn to understand what we are and what we have, here and now.

Looking at that, we find that we have a great deal of freedom — more things we are free to do, more choices we can make, more things we can decide upon for ourselves, than ever were known in the world before. Out of that freedom we have arrived at what we call our present civilization.

We didn't get this present civilization through slavery. Slavery didn't give it to us, war didn't give it to us. We got it through the freedom men have exercised in their relations toward one another and not through the slaveries they have imposed. So I like to bring your attention to the freedom that we have, and to look upon that as the field that we must cultivate.

If we cultivated our slaveries we might learn a great deal about slavery, but I think that is a very good kind of knowledge not to have. As Spinoza said, the wise man's preoccupation is with life and not with death. Life is something you can use, something you can improve upon, something you can carry forward. Death does not have those characteristics. Freedom is something that you can build up and go forward with into greater and greater civilization — toward greater and greater development of the individual and of the society of which he forms a part, he in it. That is why I am speaking now of the voluntary, the free community — the communion of men with respect to one another in which no man makes any other man in any degree his slave.

This free communion of men we find exclusively in the *contractual* relationship. I don't mean to say that we don't serve one another in our intimate relationships, but the contractual relationship, being rational and measured by accountancy, makes us as though we were brothers to everybody in the world. It

doesn't shut anybody out, whereas the tribal and family system shuts out a lot of people, sometimes in a hostile way. It characteristically does that. The *societal* relationship is based upon *contract*.

A contract is a spiritual relationship. It is a meeting of men's minds. It has no material form whatsoever. It is not the paper it is written on. It has no form of its own except a spiritual form, and what makes it spiritual is that when men enter into contractual relationships they are acting divinely, because they are rebuilding — creating — the environment in which they live. They are supplying more and more food, clothing, shelter, and all the amenities of life, enabling themselves to have a progressive instead of a regressive state of existence.

Society is based upon contract, and we advance only as we enter into and practice that spiritual relationship and accord which we call contract. It is a relationship in which we practice here, on this earth, the command of the New Testament that we love one another by *servicing* one another — that we do unto all others in the same manner we would have others do unto us. That does not mean to tax others or enslave others, or imprison others, or practice any form of violence upon them. It is a command that we do unto *all* others in the same manner we would have them do unto us. And they doing the same, it means that we are all lifting each other up mutually and thus starting to exercise our divine dominion over our natural world.

The societal relationship, based upon contract, is the relationship in which men become as gods because they are creating ever new environment for themselves. They are changing the face of the earth. Where a desert was, gardens bloom. Where barren rocks were, cities stand. Almost everything that we see and do in our daily affairs are things that have been created by men — the flowering of the spirit of man manifesting itself through the practice contractually of the golden rule.

We have these two contrasting things. We have the *golden* rule which is commanded of us, that we should love one another by serving one another, and doing it impersonally, in ways that take in everybody, and we have the *iron* rule which puts some men in authority over others and makes those others slaves in some degree through chattel slavery, tax slavery, tribute slavery, regulation, or whatever kinds of slavery are imposed by external authority upon the would-be free spirits of men. By our practice of the golden rule in the modern world we have doubled our life span in a single century and moved toward that goal of mankind throughout the ages of living indefinitely.

I want to give you my profound conviction that the *golden* rule is the rule that is destined to prevail. I could give you specific reasons why, but I shall just leave you my confidence, my utter faith, that the *golden* rule has more power in it than has the *iron* rule. It is manifesting tremendous results today, for it is a part of the creative order in living things.

As underneath are the everlasting arms, so does the golden rule bless and sustain although it makes no headlines, gets little attention. We can't see a forest grow, but we see the fire devastate it in a day; we can't see the giant oak grow, but we see the lightning blast it at once, and it makes the headlines. We are most prepossessed by the death and destruction of things. We must give our attention to those less spectacular things, like our practice of the golden rule under the divine command of Jesus Christ in the New Testament. That is a spiritual thing; it consists of spiritual relationships, spiritual processes. It has given us life and power, and it has enabled us to have dominion — not over one another, but over the world in which we live.

Questions

President Davis: You seem to be saying that the means condition the end. That is, you seem to imply that it doesn't matter whether I really love a man or not when I serve him. The important thing if I were a grocer for instance, is that I convey to him the daily necessities of life, and the spirit in which I convey those things is unimportant. What would you reply to that?

We do have subjective relationships. We do experience love in the heart. We feel it with one another, we feel it in our family relationships, we feel it in husband and wife, and child, brother and sister, and it is glorious.

But God's providence is not just limited to the people that we can be with and feel and see, and hear, and talk with and that sort of thing. God's providence takes in all men, provided we carry on God's providence under God's rule. That rule brings the remotest tribesman into the circle, and all men become as brothers ideally are.

We can't all be brothers in the literal sense, so we can't all have brotherly love towards one another. We can't feel that we are brothers. But we can *act* as if we were, through the divine rationality of serving one another on a measured basis, which eliminates all strife. When there is a difference between what has been given back and forth — and there is always a balance in business — we can settle that balance by a single check or a single coin or something like that. We don't have to fight.

So through the rational, the measured, way of serving one another, which is rationally loving one another, God has given us the power to treat the most distant tribesman as though he were actually our blood brother.

Mr. Udall: Although I hear what you are saying, I find it difficult to think of love as anything but a sentiment.

Love as a sentiment may exist subjectively alone. Love as an action may exist objectively alone. And subjective love and objective love may unite as one. This is true not only of love but of all things. Anything can be conceived subjectively without any outward experience of it, and anything can be experienced objectively without any conception or understanding of it. When these two things unite, when the subjective and the objective correspond, then we have knowledge, or understanding. And this knowledge is power — the spiritual power to create, to clothe the word with flesh, to transmute the subjective reality into the objective — the one source of divine self-fulfillment.¹⁷⁴⁹

Mr. Johnson: So we might say that until a market pricing system developed to any great extent, the golden rule could only be practiced within familial groups; it could not be universalized.

Yes, very small numbers of people can assume non-coercive relationships by emotional affinity without the formal technique of contract and measured exchange, but whole populations practicing highly specialized occupations and services can be integrated without coercion only by the democracy of the market, through practice of the universal and impersonal relationship of contract and of equivalence in exchange. The market so far as it is free is the only institution in which large numbers can cooperate without any coercion one upon another, without any dissident minority and with universal peace and accord.¹⁸⁴

Mr. Johnson: It is sometimes said that doing God's will is perfect freedom. Could you elaborate on that?

Whereas theology has to do with the relation between man and God, religion has to do with the relation between man and his fellow man. Christ taught both. The first duty of man was to love God, and he could love God only by serving Him by doing His will. The second duty of man was to love his fellow man, and this he could only do by serving his fellow man — by doing the will of his fellow man as his fellow man willed to be served.

Now just as God leaves men free to serve Him as He wills, so each man, so far as he follows God's example, leaves his fellow men free to serve him or not to serve him as they will. By serving others in this manner, he becomes like God, because he has other men serving his will, and serving his will in freedom without any infringement of their own free will.³⁷⁸

Freedom may be defined as a condition which is favorable to the exercise of the will, but as an actuality, it is the *exercise* of options. When the options or exercise of choice are many and varied, the field for the exercise of freedom is rich. Where there are few things one would choose but that nevertheless must be accepted or submitted to, the field of freedom is restricted and poor. Freedom may be regarded on the one side as opportunity to prefer one or another of many desirable alternatives. On the other hand, it may be regarded as the *exercise* of such options, which is the exercise of freedom.¹⁸²⁰

Mr. Otero: Mr. Heath, what is your idea of original sin?

We can only honor God if we honor one another as creatures. If God made me a totally depraved worm, then He must have been a depraved God. I can't honor Him by imputing depravity to what He creates. To do this is only to dishonor Him.⁴¹⁰

Do you know what were the last words of Goethe on his deathbed? "Light, more light." "*Licht, mere licht,*" I suppose was the German of it.

The regenerate man learns the great truth that there can be more light or there can be less light, but there is no such thing as no light, no such entity as darkness. The regenerate man is the man who sees light as light, beauty as beauty, order as order, and not darkness as darkness.

The man who can entertain these realistic conceptions is born again out of his animal limitations and into his human and divine illimitableness. That is what Christians really mean by the plan of salvation and redemption from original sin, or darkness.

It was to teach men the way of increasing life as against the way of diminishing life that God sent His Son to teach the golden rule among men in place of the iron rule, the power of the spiritual interaction among men as against the destructive dominance of worldly or political power — the life abundant even unto immortality as against life diminishing towards death. Paul said the powers that be were ordained of God. But they were not ordained permanently of God, for they are intrinsically impermanent. Had God ordained Caesar, He had not sent Christ.³⁸²

Colonel Neville: Why this relegation of the political to the background? It isn't precisely a contractual form, but doesn't it have value? What do you find to derogate in it?

There may be other aspects to it, but I think certainly the most universal aspect can be pinpointed very easily. There are many beneficences coming out of political administration, but they are always partial toward some at the expense of others. The universal characteristic of the political community is that it is based upon practicing dominion over the members over which it has the jurisdiction — those whom it is supposed to serve.

I don't know of any political community that is not based upon the exercise of the tribute-taking power, the taxing power, and all that goes with that power. Justice Marshall told us that the power to tax is the power to destroy, and historians like Toynbee have said that that is how it has happened that so many political communities have been destroyed. Gibbon pointed out that it was Roman taxation that drove the people from the civilized cities of Gaul into the woods so that they became, as he said, more barbarous than the barbarians whom they joined.

All political power, whether gained by conquest or by consent, is coercive. Any public authority that is entrusted with the general

prerogative of coercion is essentially and therefore eventually totalitarian. Contract — consent to mutual service and not unilateral dominion — is the only alternative to coercion.¹⁷⁴¹

Mr. Alberts: Then if we ever had a fully developed contractual society, would there be no government?

We would have public services, of course, as you have them in a hotel. The whole community is served by the proprietorship there through a voluntary, contractual relationship with all with whom it deals, either as guests or as suppliers from the outside.

Col. Neville: But what is the motivation for that? What's the basis for that?

It's the profit motivation. And what does it profit a man except to practice the golden rule? It profits all parties. Because there is a profit there and a profit motivation, a motivation to create things, to build where heretofore there has been no building, perhaps even destruction, we are assured of the continuation and development of that kind of relationship.

We are very much blessed with the golden-rule, or contractual, relationship at the present time. The kingdom of heaven is with us. It is in our midst and developing more and more rapidly. At first people practiced it unknowingly, as we practiced chemistry before Dalton. In Dalton's day nobody measured anything; they just tried this and that, and when something worked, then they had to do it that way traditionally and were very circumscribed. Finally, someone learned the rationale, the fundamental reasoning of the atoms and of the formation of molecules, and from that we have the creative chemistry that we know today. In a like way, we are moving from empiricism, that is, from cut-and-try methods, in our economic relationships — into an understanding of them. We are moving also into an understanding of their spiritual import and the tremendous potentialities they have for the rebuilding of our world.

Colonel Neville: You say the hotel is a purely contractual and voluntary community, yet it is controlled by certain rules and certain rulers. If you went into a hotel and upset things there, you would be dealt with forcibly.

And very properly, too. The bouncer in a hotel or whoever performs that function, like any of the 70-member security force in the Waldorf Hotel in New York City, is a very useful person. He is a servant of the hotel, and his services are in the service of the guests. That is performing a service. The person who is to get bounced out of the hotel is not a member of that organization. He is neither the owner nor one of the guests. He is an intruder. So, like any living thing, the organized community tries to get rid of what shortens its life or is inimical to it.

Colonel Neville: But how can there be any property without laws to uphold it?

Except the laws of God. We should give some consideration to them sometimes.

Colonel Neville: Some of our large electrical industries haven't been so much interested in the laws of God. Right now they're interested in the laws of men, having spent some days in prison. How could that have been remedied without the laws of men?

According to Blackstone, if laws of men are not in accordance with the laws of God, they are invalid. He says that unequivocally. So if they are valid, they are in accordance with the laws of God.

When men violate the laws of contract, they are violating the laws of God, because God commands people to make contracts with one another. Disobedience to that command is sin, and the wages of sin is death. If people don't perform contracts — keep one another alive, and more abundantly alive, by contracts — they are on the road to death.

Of course, men sometimes are impatient. They think God doesn't work fast enough, and they try to jump in and pinch-hit for Him. That's why we have legislatures. Are the legislatures necessary, then? Buckle said not. Buckle lays it down in his *History of Civilization in England* that all history has shown that the only virtue in any parliament consists in its undoing the acts of its predecessors. But men just can't wait for God. The mills of the gods grind a little too slowly, sometimes. So men, in their hubris, get presumptuous and usurp the prerogatives of the gods. They say, "To hell with God; we'll make the laws."

Now that's pretty drastic thinking, because we have a lot of traditions. We don't believe we can get along without the man on horseback any more than we thought we could get along without the Pharaoh. Unless he said the word, the

Nile wouldn't rise. He had to bring it up, the way the rooster on the dung hill calls the sun to rise. People believed that in Egypt. Later on they believed that the emperor had to bless things. And the king had to cure diseases and all that sort of thing. People would all die if he didn't.

Still later, we came to believe that unless the majority put their holy water on it, the people would die then. The king wasn't trusted anymore; so we had to have what we call a "majority" — which turns out to be only a majority of a majority. In our last election, some 62 per cent of the people who were qualified, voted. If 50 per cent of them voted one way or another, then 50 percent of 62 per cent makes a whole lot less than a majority.

This idea that the majority could do no wrong, that the voice of the people is the voice of God — or as the authorities put it, *Vox populi, vox Dei* — the people who believe in that sort of thing believe in the same sort of thing that the Egyptians believed in.

Mr. Alberts: Being somewhat of a pragmatist, I can see how a community might arise without government, had it never had any. But once government has imposed itself or been accepted as part of a community's way of life, then how do we throw off this monster?

We have imagination, which enables us to see things that are not there, or to continue to see things that are no longer there. So I would suggest that we look at one of the simplest forms of community we have among us, like a hotel community. The time was, not so far back historically, when the only reason people went into hotels was because they would not get robbed as badly there as they would if they stayed out on the highways. They got robbed in any case; the hotel was a political institution. They only got comparative safety, but they nonetheless escaped the tax collectors on the road, who were rather rude people, by taking refuge in these primitive inns.

Today's hotels have developed to the point where they find that it doesn't pay to lay their guests under tribute. They find that the worth of what they offer is much greater if they serve rather than if they impose violence or theft upon people who come under their jurisdiction. This is an example of where a hotel as a political community has evolved into a hotel as a social community — a community that didn't depend upon contract entirely in its origins but that now has come to be entirely contractual.

The hotel experience recapitulates the history of the real-estate industry

as a whole, for the institution of land ownership enjoyed political powers and privileges until it was purged of all political authority by the revolutions of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Since then there has developed a free market in land, and land ownership has begun most recently of all to evolve, beyond mere brokerage, a technique and rationale of business in the building and administration of specialized proprietary communities of all kinds such as hotels, shopping centers, mobile-home parks, apartment and office complexes and combinations of these. Yet in our imagination we still tend to see the institution of land as a political institution and the landlord as predacious or at best a parasite.

Nature — God — has endowed us with potentialities for burgeoning growth and life, both individually and in our non-violent, free-enterprise, golden-rule type of organic solidarity. Creative alternatives are only waiting to be explored and understood whereby we can *grow* out of our present darkness instead of trying to fight and complain our way out of it.¹⁹⁴⁹

Mr. Alberts: But the world seems fraught with so much hazard today. How can we not fight the encroachments of the government? How else can we preserve the liberties we still have?

All of the movements and efforts to combat error and evil are sterile. Without a positive alternative, they cannot succeed. And if they could, they would leave the victors with empty hands.

Removing obstacles does not conduct a parade, but a positive procedure overrides obstacles by transcending them. Order destroys disorder by transcending it, for disorder itself is never anything but order of a lower degree. So-called darkness is only a lower order of luminosity, cold of warmth, death of life. Zero is equally unobtainable with the infinite or the absolute. This fact establishes that we are always on the upside in a creative and dynamic cosmos. While at any given time we can be moving in either direction — we can fall away from or we can draw nigh unto God — always underneath are the everlasting arms. Nothing in itself can be alien to the Absolute. Nothing can be beyond the love of God.⁴¹³

Mr. Udall: As you said this afternoon, ideals are not goals to be obtained, but a compass to

keep us on the path of life.

Yes — concerning ideals, the only important thing is that we be going in the right direction.⁸²⁹

Mr. Harmon: I understand that ideally we ought not resist evil — but what do we do when the bureaucrat comes after us?

I revert to that scene in the Bible where Christ is offered the dominion of the world. Now if he had been *attacked* by Satan, he very properly would have smacked him in the jaw, to save his own life. But he wasn't being attacked, he was only being tempted, and so he told Satan very properly where to go — as the King James scholars put it, "Get thee behind me," or as we would say today, "Go to hell." That's what he in effect said to him. That's the proper free translation of it.

Now if the bureaucrat gets after you, if he's not *attacking* you, do all you can to resist his activities, but don't rest on that. What did Christ tell him to go to hell for? He said, "Why I've got my father's business to look after. I haven't got any time for having any truck with you. There's no percentage in you. This is a false promise you're making me, like any politician." /chuckling/ So Christ said, "I've something more important to do than resisting you, or making any war upon you, so long as you keep your hands off me."

So far as the bureaucrats keep their hands off of us, let us be *doing* something. That's what is meant by "Resist not evil, but overcome evil with good" — by *doing* good. Doing good is cumulative; the more you do, the more you can do. You get strength from your activity. Your labor brings you not only rest, it gives you more and more strength. There's nothing more fatal that we could do, than to succumb to the so-called, supposedly *inevitable*. It's not inevitable at all, except by our default.²⁰¹⁰

Ms. Gladson: When I suggest to anyone that the golden rule is the rule to follow under all circumstances, they say I'm unrealistic; I'm impractical; I'm too idealistic. Then if I say I feel the only practical way is the idealistic way, they look at me as if I'm speaking complete nonsense,

and I'm stopped. Now my premise may be wrong, but if it's right, where do I go from there?

As with all things we must discriminate — even as to the circumstances in which we can practice the golden rule. If the kingdom of heaven is in our midst, then there is something that is not in our midst, if we must draw the distinction.

In the kingdom of heaven, men do practice the golden rule; men practice no violence or discrimination upon one another in the marketplace. There we do have the kingdom of heaven. But now in some dark alley a person might hold a dagger at my throat, and some moralist would say that I should practice the golden rule. The circumstances do not permit it there. You can't heap love on a machine gun or on the man who is operating it. So we must qualify:

The golden rule is the only rule that is practiced in the kingdom-of-heaven relationship — in the golden-rule relationship. But that relationship must exist. If people are all injuring one another, fighting with one another, then fighting becomes the fashion, and you don't belong to that association unless you are a fighter. Being in it, you have to act in the manner that is characteristic of that kind of association.

Actions are not in themselves right or wrong. They are appropriate or inappropriate to the occasion. And the propriety of human behavior is not without its test. The test is this: Does it tend to preserve or to maintain or, best or all, does it tend to *advance* human life in such ways that men can have more of it — even unto immortality. That is why the *golden rule* relationship, especially its impersonal practice in the processes of contract, is superior to the *iron rule*, the rule of politics and war, which degrades men by shortening their lives, even unto the level of the brutes, if not below — which is to say, governments brutalize men.

But to practice life advancing behavior, there must be alternatives. Where the situation presents no alternative to extinction but the exercise of brute force in defense, then brute force, and nothing else, is appropriate — nothing else available. But where men have developed an alternative relationship, or a *golden rule* alternative to the iron rule of force, then the contractual relationship is possible and available, and it alone is appropriate for those who can distinguish and thereby discriminate and create instead of destroy.⁷⁵⁵

So the use of force is justified in self-defense; it is necessary to take

whatever action is required to save one's life. But that situation does not occur in society; it is not a social situation. Perhaps Christ told Peter to put up the sword because he understood intuitively that the answer to Rome was not to resist it but to act in an alternative way, and he felt if he fought Rome, that would be misunderstood as the alternative his inspired mission it was to preach.⁸⁷⁰

Mr. Bronson: Then is it also true of some business situations, that in order to keep one's business it is not always possible to practice the golden rule?

Do we find any businesses making profits out of injuring people? I would say that we don't have that question arising, because when men practice the iron rule, they are no more practicing business than men are playing at cards when they cheat. That isn't playing the game. That's breaking up the game. Plato laid it down in such a wonderful maxim, I never tire of repeating it. Speaking of the gods as being the creators of all things, he said, "He shall be as a god to me who can rightly define and divide." Let us learn to define the *golden* rule and divide it from the *iron* rule, so that we don't get our categories mixed, our minds confused, and our behavior self-contradictory.

What is CAPITAL?

Spiritual

— *creative*

— *self-developing*

— *organic*

Property can be consumed, destroyed, and be no more. But also it can be used as a means towards an end without being consumed or destroyed. Devoted to the service of others, it can accumulate and grow at the same time it is serving others. Devoted to such service, it draws to itself automatically a recompense from those served. This gross recompense passes first to those persons who have served subordinately in its administration as suppliers of labor and materials. A further portion is applied to maintenance of the property itself. A still further portion, called "profit," goes to those who, by owning it, administer the property. Finally, a portion of its income keeps it in repair, and a still further portion provides for its replacement in some new form whenever its present form becomes unsuitable or obsolete. When conditions make it so that it no longer serves the desires or needs of others, this is called "obsolescence." A portion of its revenues is accumulative for replacement in such case.

All such property devoted to the use of others is called "capital." It is alive because it grows, creative because it builds, spiritual because it creates, immortal because it provides for its own indefinite continuity. It possesses a portion of the creative spirit of man as an instrument of his creative and thereby spiritual power.⁷⁰⁶

II

PROPERTY AND ITS PRODUCTIVE ADMINISTRATION

Servant of the Creative Spirit in Man

The kingdom of heaven is built on foundations, and the foundations, on the material side, are property. When we can't have property, we can't serve others. We might impose our will upon them, or do what we think is good for them — according to our idea of what is good for them and not theirs, necessarily — but unless we own property, we don't have the wherewithal to serve people. Our bare hands are not enough to serve people very abundantly.

There has been a great deal of misconception about property through the ages. The ancients believed, and even now many persons believe, that property is something you take away from somebody else — or, at least, that you keep him from getting away from you. It implies rapacity, conflict over possession of things.

That may be true in the animal world, but I want to say a word or two about the *human* world. The trouble is, that we haven't become entirely human. The emergence of mankind need not be couched in the language of coming from sin into righteousness. Rather it is coming out of his animal nature into his *human* nature. God made him a human; He didn't make him an animal. At least He didn't leave him like that. He put a few extra touches on and made him to have creative dominion over things.

Animals are creatures. They have no dominion. Any property an animal has, he has it by force or by running away from the other animals. When a monkey grabs a banana and runs away with it, we think that he has property in the banana; he runs away from the other monkeys. But if that monkey really owned, let us say, a whole shipload of bananas, and they were in New York

Harbor, he would put a full-page advertisement in the New York Times begging the other monkeys to come and get them. The animal idea of property is the idea held by Plato and Proudhon, that property is theft. It's the Marxian idea: if you've got anything, you have to have stolen it from somebody else, and you're keeping other people from having it — like the monkey, or like the hen that grabs a worm and runs away from the other fowl.

But when I speak of property today, I am speaking in the modern and, I might say, in the pragmatic sense: how do we *use* property? If the gross national product is so much, the productive property of this country is, roughly speaking, twenty times that much. That is the value of all the productive property in the country. What makes it valuable is the fact that it will yield a revenue; it will yield five percent. What makes it divine is that it won't yield that five percent unless it is used by the owners not for their own interest, but for the interest of *other people*. Property as we know it in the modern world is an instrument. It is an instrument of freedom, an instrument of service.

Property is a very different thing in modern times than it was in ages past. When we didn't have this modern civilization, when we had tyranny in place of it, then property was loot — the kind of property the rich young man had who was troubled about being rich and asked the Master, "What can I do to be saved?" The Master said to him, in effect — everybody knew it whether it was said or not — "Why, you got rich or your predecessors did by stealing, or seizing, or tribute, or taxation." There wasn't much of any private international trade or much of any free enterprise at all in Christ's day. Trading was done by sovereigns, as sovereigns trade some today out of the proceeds of taxation.

So the rich young man had to have been an exploiter of the poor, because the only way for anybody to get rich in Christ's time was by making poor people poorer. The property that the Romans administered was property that they had seized. But the property that is administered in our modern world, other than political, is property that is *created* — by giving services. The whole productive property that we have in this nation, being about 20 times the gross national product, is property that is used for the benefit of other people and is not being taken away from those other people at all; they get services out of it, and commodities, and so on.

We have to get a different way of thinking. We don't think of property in modern terms. We *practice* it — but we don't *think* about it as much as we practice it. If a man wants to start a grocery store, he's thinking about getting something for himself and his family, maybe. He finds a place where he thinks

he can set up a grocery store. Ask him if his heart is going out to the people of this neighborhood for the poor services they are getting and he wants to improve those services, and he says, "To hell with that. I don't care whether they're getting poor services or not. I just want to get something out of them myself." That is his vulpine psychology, isn't it? But when he opens that store and commences to wait on those customers, is he then trying to get something out of them? In his behavior? No matter what he may be thinking, he is serving them. That is the only way he can get benefit to himself. While his psychology may be very archaic and usually is, his social and economic technology is very superior. If it is not, he isn't there long. Somebody else will be more superior in their behavior than he is.

So it isn't that men always have to be conscious of the good they do. They may have the wrong idea about it altogether. It's like the Patent Office; you may have all of the wrong ideas about your invention, but if it works, the Patent Office will give you a patent just the same. That's the way it is in modern times. Our administration of property is modern and creative, whereas our thoughts, our conceptions about property, for the most part are Marxian.

Thus one characteristic of property in the modern world is its productive administration. It is primarily employed as tools or instruments or materials for the service of other persons. This gives rise to a second characteristic of property in the world today that is in full accord with the New Testament point of view: property in the sense in which we have been speaking is *immortal*. It is immortal because the property that we use for other persons brings us an automatic, a spiritual, an unforced revenue called "profit." That profit is used to maintain the property, and it provides for its reproduction in case it becomes obsolescent or loses its usefulness from any cause. It builds up its own successor.

A great hotel in New York City, about forty years old, was torn down, and many people were sad to see the beautiful art in it, frescoes and marbles and that sort of thing, pulled down with no attempt to save it. The hotel had earned its own reproduction, and a new one was to be built on the site. The reason the old one was sacrificed was because the revenue could not start until the new hotel was finished and serving people. It was costing thousands of dollars for every day's delay.

I use this to illustrate that there is a livingness, an enduringness, a reality about capital property — property that is not being consumed by its owners. There is a reality about that like the reality of the Holy Spirit — the everlastingness about it, the eternity about it. Plato and Saint Paul united in

defining the *real* things as the things that never end, the everlasting things. Things are real in proportion as they can continue; things are unreal in proportion as they defeat their own ends. There is a reality about men serving one another. The more they serve one another, the more they can, and the more who can join them. Together they can make a greater kingdom of heaven.

But when you have no property, there can be no contract. And when you have no contract, when people try to make engagements without owning anything, what do you have? In the sense in which I am describing it, governments do not own anything. They have jurisdiction that is the jurisdiction of the sword. They appropriate things, and they direct the use and disposition of these things so long as there is anything for them to direct — which has always washed out in history. That is why governments disappear from the face of the earth time after time. If they don't own anything, they can't make contracts.

In calling attention to governments, or even thieves or gangsters or pirates, or anybody like that that uses force, I am not trying to speak objectionably about anybody but just to point sharply the *mode of operation*. The mode of operation involving force, seizing property and coercing persons, never produces any revenue, and consequently all that sort of thing has to vanish.

The agreements among people who really own things, in the sense of having exclusive *social* jurisdiction so that they can employ these things in the service of other persons, we call "contracts." If you promise to do something for me, and it requires the use of property, then you have to own that property or else you can't fulfill your contract.

Property is a spiritual relationship; it is a relationship by means of which people are able to serve one another creatively. People are *drawn together* — *contract*, from Latin, *contrahere*, to draw together. They are drawn together, and they find common ground in things that they want to happen. They dream something, and they want this dream to come true. Each sees to it that he makes the dream of the other come true, and that is called a "contract" — an agreement to do good to one another on both sides, mutually, by exchange.

Moreover, these people make their engagements *rationaly* — according to ratios — because they measure what they do. They measure it by going to a public place and crying out what they will give for something, how much they will accept for something and so on, and by this voluntary, spontaneous voting they fix what things are worth so that they can tell what

is the equivalent of one thing to another. An apple is worth two oranges or vice versa, and they chalk it up on the price poll. Then people can trade apples and oranges on the basis of what the common voting has determined as to their relative position on the scale of economic values.

But governments, when they make engagements — when they have a Summit Conference, perhaps, or a Geneva Conference, or a Treaty of Peace Conference — they don't call them "contracts;" they call them "treaties," or more formally, they call them "covenants." In law school, I was taught that the only difference between a contract and a covenant was that the covenant was a very sacred, serious kind of a contract. To prove it was more sacred, it had a nice red or gold seal of some kind on it. That made it a covenant. You see that on treaties. Furthermore, it was a covenant if the parties implored God to strike them dead if they violated the rule.

Later I discovered for myself that a contract is always an agreement to do things that we mutually want to have done. It is an agreement to serve one another — to benefit one another. But a covenant or a treaty is nearly always an agreement not to do harm — as God put the covenant in the sky that He wouldn't drown the people out anymore. People make covenants agreeing that they will not raid one another and that nations will not fight one another.

Two nomads by the name of Lot and Abraham once were trying to settle down alongside of one another. They were herders, and their herdsmen fought with one another between the two flocks and the two camps. So they went out and drew a line, and each agreed that one should take the land on one side of the line and one the land on the other. As with all boundaries, they put up a stone to mark it. They engraved on this stone, "*Mizpah*." Now there is a sentimental way in which that is customarily interpreted that is very beautiful. But the literal interpretation is this: "Here is a line. We are not going to trespass across this line. We have agreed that we will not do harm." Not that we're going to do anybody any good; we just aren't going to harm each other anymore. The words of the translation of *Mizpah* said, "May the Lord watch between thee and me when we are not here to watch each other." So this became sacred; they called upon Yahweh to punish the one who would do harm when he had promised not to do harm. There was nothing said about anybody doing anybody any good at all. It was a *covenant*, not a contract.

Now the curious thing about a contract is that a contract can be performed and commonly is performed. That's how we have civilization. We build values and create things that way. But a treaty or a covenant can't be performed. You

can't perform a nothing. So if you are going to *do* anything at all about a covenant, about a promise not to do harm, you can only violate it; that's all you can *do* about it. That's why treaties have always been violated throughout history. What else can we do about a covenant if we do anything about it at all?

Property, then, is the *subject matter of contract*. If it is the subject of a contract, it has to be property. The parties have to have exclusive jurisdiction over their respective properties — and, for that matter, over their respective persons; for it has to be done in freedom. A contract can only be performed so far as the people are free to own themselves and to own that which is accepted by the rest of society voluntarily as their property. The common sense of people acknowledges that this book is mine, and you would all run down anybody who tried to take it away from me by force. That's what gives me the jurisdiction. All the police in the world couldn't keep this watch on my wrist if you people around here said that I shouldn't have it.

Property is not something that is established by political authority. On the contrary, it is broken down by political authority, inasmuch as political officers invade the contract-making power of property. They take away that power. Government violates the sacredness of contract, does it habitually and unthinkingly, and we sort of accept it, supinely.

Property is necessary to civilization. It is necessary to preserving any community. "Community," as I define it, is an inhabited place in which the inhabitants are performing and exchanging services with one another. That means, then, that there has to be property there — and the basic property has to be the use of the earth itself. When people are going to establish a community, the first thing they have to do in this place is to establish property in land — because until they do agree upon some person having the authority to distribute it among other people, it is anybody's land. When they moved in on the Cherokee Strip when I was a boy, the Government soldiers held the people back — whole hordes — and then the people rushed in. They didn't have any election; the first thing they did was to drive stakes in the ground and stake out their claims. The first thing to be decided was who owned what in this territory. Until that was done, nothing but violence and disorder could reign. After that was done, then there was a contractual distribution of possession of different parts of the land.

It's as narrow as that. That's the line. If today there were no property in land, then the only way to decide whether I could occupy this place or not would be by my power to repel other people — and whether you could occupy your place or not would depend on my power to dispossess you. Anybody could grab it. Or

some dominant political authority could grab it and then say what you could do with it. But where there is property in land, the self-interest of the land owner compels him to find the most productive user for it. He sells or leases it to the one who can pay him the most, and only the potentially greatest producer can pay the most for the occupancy. That invisible hand that Adam Smith tells us about is working there too. The landlord, selfishly seeking his own interest, sees to it that at the same time, in the very act of getting the biggest price or the biggest rent, he chooses the person who can make that site most productive. That benefits everybody in the whole population.

There can be no golden-rule relationship except you have jurisdiction over yourself and over that which is rightfully your possession, whether it be land or whether it be goods, or services, or whatever it may be. When you have that jurisdiction, then you can be with your neighbor on contractual, or spiritual, terms, which means *creative* terms. So property is a creation of God, of mankind, of nature.

Property is the means by which men practice the divine relationship of loving one another by serving one another. Notice that this love is *impersonal*, because you serve people without even knowing them, much less loving them in a psychological sense. In a practical sense, by doing good to them, you don't have to know who they are. You put something in the market, and it may travel all over the world to the remotest corners, serving people. Things from all over the world will come back to you in exchange for what you put in the market. It is impersonal, and being impersonal is what makes it possible for it to be universal.

So this love that Christ commands, this loving people through serving them in a spiritual relationship called "contract," this rule becomes universal because it is impersonal. And when it becomes universal service and universal love — the universal service being the objective side of universal love — then universal love becomes *divine* love. So men are practicing their divinity that was breathed into them in Genesis, breathed into a living soul through the power of *inspiration* — *breathed into* them. They are practicing that divine love when they practice the exchange relationship upon which all our civilization as such, all our society, absolutely depends, and without which we are retrograding toward death.

Questions

Mr. Randolph: That's an interesting distinction between a contract and a covenant or a treaty, that you can't perform a treaty. I'd never heard it put that way.

A contract can always be performed. You can do something about it. You can benefit the other person, and he can benefit you. You can objectify your dream; you can realize your ideal — your common ideal.

I don't mean people do everything perfectly. Not everybody wields a pencil or a paint brush perfectly, either, but they are pretty handy things to have if you are going to do any painting or any writing. So we'll forget about how perfectly they carry the thing out; we are talking about what the thing essentially is.

Neither are we talking about a departure from it and doing something else. You don't judge card-playing by the people who cheat. Cheating isn't playing cards; it's breaking the game up. As in all affairs, cheating in business — the contrary of the thing that people are professedly doing — isn't any way of doing it. That's a not-doing of it. It's doing something else. Quite the reverse. **The only problem of business, in its purity, is how to have more of it.**¹⁵⁷¹

So a contract is something that is a good thing; it calls for good on both sides, and a kind of good that can be done — not merely thought about or wished. It can be performed. **Contract also universalizes us; it gives a functional oneness throughout the world. Like the early automobile or the early airplane, we have only begun to use it. Like the telephone — which Dr. Bell thought it proper to patent as a child's toy.**¹⁰²²

To have life, we have got to do things in concert. If each one does his part by himself and out of association with his fellow men, we don't get very far along. But when men, as one of the means of getting this concerted action, enter into the golden rule relationship of contract — of cooperation, dealing fairly and honestly and helpfully with one another, which is the free-enterprise principle, the only principle there is in free enterprise — they are born into a new kingdom, in old time called the kingdom of heaven. And we want to understand that kingdom and practice it and enjoy it.

That means we have to do things, not just have to protest and complain and resist and perhaps fight the opposition. It is what we do that carries us forward and not what we *avoid* doing, or *refrain* from doing. It is

what we actually do. That is what differentiates the Western version of the golden rule from the Eastern. It is not a principle of refraining or desisting. It is not the Asiatic version, as it has been called sometimes, of *not* doing unto others as we would *not* have them do unto us. It is a divine command that we enter into contractual relationships: *do* unto others as you would have others *do* unto you. And not to do that is exactly the opposite from the command — the negative of the command. So the two rules are not the same. They are exactly, diametrically opposite. The rule to do unto others in a certain way is a positive command, and the rule to do *not* unto others is a negative command and cannot be performed because it is negative — and nothing to do.⁷⁸⁶

When the contract relationship becomes better understood, free enterprise will so extend itself as to take over the services that men must have in common, as well as those they can separately and individually enjoy. My own investigations as a research engineer have brought me to understand that the key to the extension of free enterprise to these wider fields is the institution of private property in land.¹⁵⁷¹ It is the social institution adapted to perform peacefully and without force all of the community or public services that a civilized population requires.¹²⁹⁶

Colonel Neville: Most of us would say that property is a gift of God, but I'm not certain we would all agree that the right to *hold* property is God-given.

No, I agree with you — to hold it away from other people; merely holding property is withholding it. Administering property by contract is the virtue. The spiritual character of property is expressed by its contractual, that is its spiritual, administration.

Colonel Neville: Henry George had that idea, did he not?

No, he was thoroughly opposed to people owning land. He wanted the politicians to administer land in the city hall. He said the landlord didn't do anything. I told you a moment ago what the landlord does, but Henry George never saw that; he thought that a landowner was a parasite.

The basic public institution is private property in land. I say private not because it's so private; it's public. In ancient England, they had to

establish ownership in the presence of all the neighbors, and they had to give a piece of the land, a piece of turf, to the other fellow to show that everybody could understand it. Later we had deeds, and then we recorded the deeds. It had to become a matter of public knowledge.

So the service landowners perform is a public service. It is the most fundamental of all public services. Without that service, nobody could have any security except such as he got from the government — and you know about how much security that is, probably — or as he could get from his own gun. Then if he had to be fortifying himself and defending himself on the land, how could he ever make it productive? And how could he ever give anybody title to it if he had none himself — except the title of might, might making right?

Labor as we may to limit the coercive powers of the state, and succeed as we may, there is no freedom for mankind short of complete development of private property in land and thereby a non-coercive distribution of the gifts of God to men.³⁷⁸

Ms. Pennyworth: But unless you hold onto enough property to buy your bread when you're old, you're on society, and that doesn't make sense, does it?

It doesn't to me. Not at all. Of course, animals believe in that. I was reading about the gulls in St. Petersburg, Florida, I think it was. The fishermen brought in so many shrimp and had so many cleanings and things there, so much offal, that the gulls lived there, generation after generation having a fine feast. But the shrimp moved away eventually, and so did the shrimp fishermen, and so did the gulls. Death took them away. They had forgot how to fish. They had security, you know. They could not wait on themselves. They had to have someone else serve them. But it happened, fortunately, that some other gulls — a younger set presumably — came in from some other place and taught them how to fish. After that, they did not die anymore. So if we get so helpless that we can't wait on ourselves and have to have political authorities do it for us, let us hope that some benevolent gulls will come in and teach us how to fish again.

Ms. Pennyworth: Then there is some sense in holding onto some property .. I'm afraid I don't understand.

Let us take a hotel for an example of a piece of social-ized property, or *capital* property. It isn't owned for the benefit of the stockholders. That is, the stockholders don't even live in it, very often, and they don't get any services from it, necessarily. They use it as an instrument for serving other persons. They are not holding it; they are administering it. And so with all business. Business consists in *administering* property, not in holding it.

Sometimes people can't help holding it, though, if the conditions are such, political or otherwise, that they can't make a profit by administering it. When they can't make a profit, they just won't use it. It lies there.

Mr. Alberts: The commodity speculator holds property, and yet he performs a service to society by conserving resources against a time when he thinks they may be more needed.

Speculation *anticipates*. He who senses demand and produces in anticipation is like the heavenly Father, who knows what we desire even before we ask for it. **The only distinct command against all speculation that I know of is, "Take no thought of the morrow."**¹³⁶⁷

President Davis: Your point about the reward that comes from service in the use of property is diametrically opposite to Marx's idea about profit, isn't it?

Yes, he thought that profits were seized. He didn't think they were earned. He didn't think that property needed to be administered by its owners or by persons engaged for that purpose. He thought property was theft.

We need to get an enlightened view of property. We work it that way — we invest, buy property and buy facilities for going into business, and use those facilities not for our personal benefit but for the benefit of our clientele. And then they, being in business, are doing things for us, and we get our benefit from them. That is mutual service and mutual love.

So when we love people objectively, it isn't just how we feel about it; it's what we *do* about it. When we make money, we do it by loving people, and the money we make is their expression of what they are going to do for us — of how they are going to love us — when we spend the money. In effect, they will do things for us when the market returns to us, for the money, the equivalent of

what we dedicated to the market by selling.

As an ultimate ideal, and disregarding the kind of means employed in hopes of attaining it, the Marxist idea of the withering away of the state is perfectly sound and attainable. But not it, only the very reverse of it is attainable by the Marxian means. In the sense of employing force or fraud, without which no government can for a day exist, the best government is not the least government but no government at all. To many this is chimerical; this is because they know no alternative. They do not know the juridical distinction between the *imperium* and the *proprium*. In both there is exercise of authority, but in the one it is brute power exercised by coercion, which destroys life, while in the other it is contractual power and serves life. They have never thought of the golden rule as a going (and a growing) concern when reciprocally applied as it is in all contractual affairs.¹⁵²²

Mr. Walker: Would you consider that the administration of land consists in bringing it to its highest and best land-use value for all general purposes?

If it isn't used, it won't yield. If it doesn't yield, it has no value.

Mr. Walker: Except potential, perhaps?

Yes — prospective, psychological value, speculative value. But it has no present value. Nothing has any value except that it *serves*. And what people are willing to pay for that service is the current value — annual or monthly value. What they are willing to pay in a lump, for a complete jurisdiction over it, is its capital value.

When you are going into business, any business — I don't care whether it's running a barber shop or running General Motors — there are three things that you have to purchase, and four things that you sell. The first thing that you have to purchase is the use of some kind of stored up services — services accumulated in some form of property. For this use of accumulated services, you pay interest, because you either buy it with your own money and forego interest, or you borrow money and pay interest, so that you can buy the equipment for your barber shop or your General Motors as the case may be.

The second thing you buy is *current* services. You buy the services of those who will work with you to serve the customers, and for that you pay *wages* if it is measured by the piece or by the time. If it's *gauged*, that is to say, *waged*. If they are administrative, or if they are assisting in administration, you may pay a *salary* — and that's just because they're not gauged. When you gage the services by time or by the piece, it's wages; when the services are not so gauged, then you pay a salary, or fees, or something like that for it.

Then the third service you have to buy is public services — or public conveniences, which means public services. And for that you pay for a site location. You pay *rent* — ground rent — for the third service you have to buy.

Now when you have bought those three services, you are ready to serve other people. You serve these other people by combining the capital — the goods that you bought —, the current services that you are purchasing, and the location that you are paying for in rent. You put those three together in some way that serves people so well that they will pay you enough for you to pay all of these expenses and have something left for yourself. What is left for yourself is called income for administrative services, the other name for which is "profit." You have to work with those three things you bought, and if you do it, even if you hire somebody else to handle the shop for you, you are the owner and you get the profits if there are any. For what he does, you pay him his wages, or salary, or something like that. The board of directors, they get paid salaries.

So *profit* is the residue of the gross income that remains for the payment for administrative services, which can only be performed by those who make contracts, and only the owners can make the contracts. The party who owns the property in any sale is the "party of the first part," because he has already produced something which he can transfer to you. The "party of the second part" is the one who is going to do something. There is a time element like that in most contracts, and if there is no time element involved, it's simply barter.

I'm giving you these ramifications of the property idea because I want not only to suggest to you a great deal that I can't tell you in detail in the time that we have, but to give you a glimpse into the fact that property is not material; it is spiritual.

Ms. Pennyworth: You said you have to give out four? You buy three and give four?

You buy three, and out of the gross return, you first pay for what you have received, and then the balance is what the public has paid to you for so

administering what you have purchased. The profit is briefly stated as simply the recompense for administrative services, and administrative services are services that flow from the administration of property. It's as simple as that. Without property, we could have no civilization.

Mr. Johnson: I like your stressing that capital goods are property in the service of others. That's a different emphasis than is usually found in economics.

All goods and properties in course of exchange and all properties in any way used in connection with exchange are capital goods. Business and production have no concern with consumers' goods, for when goods have reached their consumers they are no longer in the course of production, trade or exchange. The use of wealth in the form of capital goods consists only in the administering of them; and only by the administration of capital goods are consumers' goods brought forth. A society is fortunate to have its capital goods under ownership and control of those who can best administer them and thus make consumers' goods most abundant and *real* wages high.¹⁰⁹³

Mr. Bronson: My son is finishing at one of the Ivy League schools, and I'm shocked at the extent to which his textbooks in economics teach socialism, decrying all that you are showing us about the Christian ethic of voluntary exchange.

Many of today's universities teach belief in human depravity. They have transferred the curse from the individual man in the image of God to the organization of men in creative relationships constituting the creative kingdom of God. They therefore lend countenance to that unintellectual perversity which teaches that the productive and creative actions and relations among men are diabolical and should be destroyed by the political powers of the world. Today students are being taught to despise society as they were once taught to despise human nature in the individual. The accepted textbooks naturally reflect this. We may suggest that the one thing needful with respect to the individual human nature is to understand it, and to understand it also in its built-in reciprocal relationships which is free enterprise. Our free enterprise system is the genuine organizational force of mankind.⁶⁶⁰

Mr. Montgomery: You seem to be saying that capitalism and modern technology are spiritual. It stretches the mind to think of modern technology and all its material products, such as skyscrapers, neon lights and air conditioning, as being in any way spiritual.

Modern technology is materialistic. It ministers to the needs of the flesh. It does not manufacture poems, composes no music, climbs no mountains, seeks out no secrets of the stars. But it is of the *Spirit*. For all unknowingly, it is the product of a spiritual relationship — of a system not political, not governmental, not coercive, but voluntary and reciprocal among men. All its success springs from its practice of a single, simple rule of doing unto others in the same manner we would have others do unto us.¹⁷³³

The idea promulgated by such as Reinhold Niebuhr that our hectic pursuit of material things has not contributed to the spiritual life is the old doctrine of original sin, that man must suffer for his depravity, and that the abundance of material things is unspiritual because it emancipates him from suffering and punishment. As though he should pay a price of suffering to hell for the bounty of God.¹⁰²⁹ Opulence does not *generate* refinement, but it is a condition under which refinement flourishes; poverty does not forbid refinement, but it is a condition that makes it less likely.⁷⁴⁶ The market is the means of liberating man from his animal necessities — enabling his spirit to take wings.⁶⁵⁶

Mr. Montgomery: I'm beginning to understand, but I have always thought of "spiritual" as something metaphysical. Would you clarify a bit more, how you are using the term and its relation to creativity?

It is not necessary to identify the metaphysical with the spiritual. The metaphysical is only that which transcends the physical. The *spiritual* is more properly conceived as that persistence of the entire cosmos to move in the direction of more enduring and thus higher organizational forms. This is the creative urge in which men are capable of participation through learning how to embody their metaphysical conceptions and dreams into their surrounding physical world. It is this creative element in the cosmos and this potential of participation in the creative process that is the spiritual character of the cosmos itself and the parallel spiritual nature and capacity of mankind. Not in our apprehension of mystery, but in

our potentiality to create, are we spiritual and, in our finite way, divine.⁴¹⁹

Mr. Randolph: As we were speaking of technology a little while ago, an interesting thought occurred to me, that capitalism itself can be thought of as technology — a *social* technology.

Yes, and it has developed slowly. In all earlier ages men were but little organized in any relationship but that of coercion and compulsion. The equal and reciprocal relationship of contract and of mutual service by exchange had but little evolved. The golden rule in its positive aspect was but little practiced, and under the iron rule of physical force men were but little more than creatures. Men in that form of association consumed all that they created and more; even the bounties of nature were destroyed. Civilizations rose and fell, and rose and fell again. Until well into the Christian era, such was the experience of all the world. But among Western men of the Christian tradition, under a new dispensation, a higher and definitely creative organic relationship has slowly and without much recognition evolved.

The new technology was first dreamed by the Poet of Palestine. He proposed that beyond the brotherhood of race and tribe there was a universal brotherhood to be had not by being born to this or to that but only by the practice of a simple rule of association. This rule, called the *golden* rule, was that men should cease their dominance over one another by the practice of an equal relationship by which each should be equal in authority over his own person and possessions without need for equality in any other respect. It was that each should treat the other in the same manner as he would have the other treat him. Thus violence, coercion, slavery, and even political government were ruled out, and a new kind of kingdom was to be entered into, a kingdom aptly and poetically termed the kingdom of heaven on earth. Men entering that new kingdom through the practice of that new rule were promised greater riches and life abundant than had ever been known on the earth before.

The materials of life were not to be sought directly for one's own use, but prepared for and supplied to others through the golden rule of the kingdom of heaven, in which it is far more blessed to give than it is to receive. The greater blessedness follows from the fact that the giver can

prepare with great quantity and efficiency, far beyond his own needs, that which he gives. This enables him to receive in both quantity and variety vast gifts from others, prepared likewise for him. He is thus the recipient of far greater blessings through giving than he could have been had he sought only to receive. Doing for himself, he would have but little, but by doing for many others, he and all are enormously enriched by exchange, far greater than by each serving himself alone.^{1, 1110} The Poet of Palestine anticipated the practice of modern, world-wide capitalism when he said, “Do ye first the will of the Father . . . and all these things shall be added unto you.”²⁸⁰⁵

It is astonishing to think what a marvelous productive, creative, spiritual power resides in the free enterprise system. And it is deplorable that so few are ravished by its beauty, and so many, through lack of understanding, are calling upon the war powers of the world to destroy it — to destroy the very divinity that blesses and prospers them.⁷⁸¹

Mr. Harmon: Ironically, a theory of capitalist decadence is basic to the historical materialism of Marx and Engels. It holds that since World War I, capitalism has been in a decadent phase.

Yes, it is most ironic. We must seek fuller understanding of our free enterprise system as an ideology that is on the march towards a genuine Utopian goal. Capitalism is not a finished product. Historically, free enterprise has only just begun — the beginning of a long-delayed fulfillment of the Palestinian vision of abundant life and length of days. When we catch the vision of what freedom has in store, then we as well as the communists will have our transcendent goal, a vision that will be realized because implemented by freedom and thus sanctioned in the Divine.¹⁶⁸⁵ It is the final function of social organization to enable men to become divine artists creating beauty in the world.^{727, 728}

¹ See in particular Manuel F. Ayau, *Not a Zero-Sum Game: The Paradox of Exchange*. Guatemala City: Universidad Francisco Marroquín. —Editor

Man has intimations far beyond his present self, a sense of things far off in space and time. His spirit wanders in all times and places, known and unknown, seeking the ineffable. It brings him intuitions of beauty with which he is inspired and in pursuit of which, however difficult, he achieves exaltation, he dwells in ecstasy. This is for him alone. It is his humanity.

Long ago, at the crossroads of the world where East meets West and many currents ebb and flow, a heaven-sent spirit took on mortal form. In Him was light and life. He divined the secret sorrows and the hidden powers of man. He prophesied men's selves unto them — what they yet might do and be. Around about them was a world of force and power to which they were far enslaved. But within them were the seeds of another kingdom in which they could be free, in which all could serve and none would rule.

His key to this kingdom was a golden key, a golden rule in the doing of which each would in freedom serve all and by all be freely served. This method of the market — creative, mutual, and reciprocal — would extend even into public affairs, and the iron rule of worldly powers would fade away. Love — outward love, impersonal and universal love — would dispel all iron rule and, with life abundant, ever more and more exalt all mortal men.²⁰⁹

III

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF MAN

Man is an interesting creation — creature or creator, whichever you might want to call him depending upon how he happens to behave. He has a dual nature. He is part anthropoid and part human. He is between the two. Sometimes he is predominantly human, and at other times he is predominantly anthropoid. His quest — the quest of his ideal, of his mind, is to become human.

The New Testament is the first document in history, I think, that plays up the two natures of man and draws a sharp dividing line between them. The theological language for the first nature of man, the anthropoidal nature, is the "unregenerate" man; he has not been "born again" into his humanness. I prefer the term "anthropoid," however, because we sort of castigate people as sinful if they are unregenerate. An anthropoid just isn't to be blamed for being anthropoid, whereas the totally depraved man is sort of looked down upon in a different way. The New Testament draws that line between the unregenerate man, the man who has not been born again into his humanness but still remains anthropoidal, and the human man, who is born again into a new kingdom. That "kingdom of God," or "kingdom of heaven," into which he is reborn means a kingdom in which he exercises godly powers.

When God first made man, he wasn't quite finished, if we may believe the myth — and I believe myths if you don't take them literally as many people do. You can take them symbolically, and they are just as true. In fact, I think they are more true symbolically than they are literally. But if you take its significance, what the story means, like the parables in the New Testament, then you really have something that gives you a hold on power to do things, to create things, to use your imagination to some purpose and then know how to bring that purpose about. Man is not just the thinking animal; he is the animal who sees things that are not there — who sees things that have been and are no more, who sees things that are yet to be, and brings them to pass.

The anthropoid wasn't finished. When man was first made, he didn't have any divine breath in him; he was just an animal. He was unregenerate. So his Maker breathed His divine, creative breath of power into him: *inspiration*. He *in-spired* him with imagination, the power to image things, so that he in turn could make things in his image — as he imagined them — just as his own Maker had made him in the image in which He had imagined His work to be. So man takes on his divinity as he comes into his humanness.

The unregenerate man, like all before him, is creature. His divinity sleeps.¹⁰⁸ But as he becomes human, he becomes divine. He becomes distinguished from the animals instead of being assimilated to them as we so often do in our thinking: "too human, all too human;" "it's human to err;" and all that. That all flows from the somewhat outgrown dogma of man's total and original depravity. But man wasn't *human* in that depraved condition; he is only human when he exercises his spiritual powers, when he exercises creativity.

Man can't create things unless he imagines them; so he has the power breathed into him, divinely, to imagine things. Then he has the power to bring those things about. And when he creates something, be he artist, or engineer, architect or college builder, when he sees the thing coming to pass that his mind has dreamed, sees his vision, his ideals, being realized, he gets a divine joy out of it. He looks upon his work as God looked in Genesis; he sees that it is good, and the morning stars sing together, in his heart as well as elsewhere.

I want to give you what I conceive to be the *Christian* view of man. I call it the Christian view because, so far as I know, Christ was the first person to promulgate any such ideas.

We are looking at man somewhat dispassionately — that is to say, not in terms of how he feels — because I think all the lower forms of life, all the animals at any rate, have, with one exception, much the same feelings as men. They experience love and affection and all the intimate emotions that we do. Man had all of that before he was endowed with the vision, with the power to dream, with the power to imagine things and then create the things that he dreamed. Civilization — whose instrument is society, by means of which civilization comes about — is the human man learning how to idealize his world — to transform it in the manner in which he dreams it to be.

There is little about man as transformer in the Old Testament. Men built things, and they were torn down. They built the great tower of Babel, and they lost their tongues. They built great works, and they built pyramids and they built

all sorts of mighty things. But how the mighty are fallen! All came down.

That happened under the Old Dispensation, under the Old Testament, because men tried to build on slavery there — and all the great things built on slavery are now as Nineveh and Tyre. For a very simple reason. Very simple. The things they built were not built to *serve* men and did not serve men. They may have served a few at the top, temporarily, but in general they did not serve — and so, not serving anyone, they *did not produce any revenue*. The public capital, so to speak, wasn't capitalized, because it didn't have any revenue to capitalize. The great works of antiquity, including the Hanging Gardens and the Pyramids, the Periclean Age where marble blossomed and the Augustan Age with all its grandeur, all of those things have gone to dust just because they did not produce any revenue. They couldn't be maintained. There was no way to do it.

We are fortunate to be living in a Christian era in which men have learned how to build great things that they dream and to keep those things going — to build immortal works, and not things that are bound to decay. For Christ taught men how to build works that *would last forever*. In doing that, men had to perform a certain rule and obey a certain command: "Love thy neighbor as thyself."

Now, as man has imagination and has also a body, he may love in his mind and without his body. We call this sentimental love, the warm kinds of feeling that we may have for remote tribes or peoples. Sometimes we like to think we love everybody — but the full meaning of loving one's neighbor includes *doing* something for him. And what do people do? They serve themselves, they look after their own interests, they keep themselves alive, they repel assaults, and so on. Self-preservation, the first law of nature. That is serving yourself. Well now, you are *loving* yourself when you do that. When you love your neighbor in the same way, then you are loving him *objectively*, in ways that he can respond to with his hand as well as with his heart. When the heart doesn't have the hand along with it, it's pretty flabby.

The New Testament gave men the technology of having creative dominion over the whole world, over the lesser creatures and all things. But the dominion Christ refused on his first temptation was of a very different kind. On the first temptation, the Devil said, "If you'll just give me your loyalty, you'll be the head politician." He had him up on a high tower and he showed him Rome and Greece, and Egypt, and all that. "Just give me your loyalty, and you'll be master of all these things. You'll be the top politician of the world." King James's scholars said that he replied, "Get thee behind me, Satan!" In our vernacular it would have

been, "Go to hell, Satan!"

The official Church people took over with Constantine when he made himself the emperor of the world and the head of the Church. But although the Church was now made official, the idea of doing to people in the same manner as you would have them do to you was never taken up as a political measure. It hardly could have been; politicians don't ever do that. They have to do something to you first, before they can do anything *for* you. It wasn't appropriate there. So the officials of the Church under the leadership of Constantine decided that the golden rule was for another world. You remember that Constantine told the churchmen at the Council of Nicaea what they had to believe; they had to believe that, or else!

Consequently, through the ages people have lost and not yet recovered the idea that there are two ways of loving your fellow men. In one of them, called "*golden*," you *serve* others, and you serve them in the manner you would have others serve you. That gives you power to do things. It unites men in a new organization. You are no longer just one; the two have now become as one — and it may be two million if they are all trading with one another. Now, through practicing specialization and mass production and all that sort of thing, they have power to transform the world. That's a spiritual power. That's a divine power. That's what civilization is. That's what distinguishes man. And that doesn't mean the individual man; it doesn't mean the unregenerate man; it doesn't mean the anthropoid. It means the human man in association with other human men.

These new units of organization — themselves each composed in turn of units of a vastly more numerous organization of cells — these units of power and organization become the creators of their world. They practice a new relationship. They dream, and they objectify their dreams. They are the only living things in all the realm of nature that consistently and progressively make their habitat more and more habitable. Every other living thing tends to make and usually succeeds in making its habitat less habitable, less fit for itself, leaving its world relatively in a chaos. But man is always putting it into relatively more and more order, the order that God put into the chaos when He found it was darkness on the face of the water.

So the Christian doctrine, the doctrine of the New Testament, is that man comes into his human nature coincidentally with assuming his divine nature, which means a spiritual nature that has the power to recreate the world in which it operates. And in so creating, in putting more and more order into things, man

is doing God's will. But he does it by the practice of the *golden* rule, not the *iron* rule. The Pharaohs of Egypt, who lived by the iron rule, didn't build any world; they built a lot of stone to crumble down again because it produced no revenue.

Man has his unregenerate nature, in which he is a creature; he pulls down the house, and he lives without a house. But then his divine nature reasserts itself, and he loves his fellow men by serving them in a degree, just as the pirates commenced to do when they found out the advantages of trading in place of raiding. They began loving one another, and the commerce of the world was born.

The great glories of any people, like the Grecian, the Roman, and the Elizabethan, the twelfth-century medieval renaissance and the Italian renaissance — all the renaissances we've had — were all preceded by great eras of trade and mercantile activity. People had to build the values, accumulate the capital for a culture to live on. Culture can't live on dry sticks; it has to have food. Men have to have a life before they can have a good life, and as life becomes more abundant, it can become more and more spiritual. When men live better lives, then they have greater length of days. They have more days in which to practice their divine power of rebuilding their world.

We are physically born into the kingdom of heaven today. Go back of our Western civilization, back of the Christian era anywhere you like, and see what you see there for man. We don't want that anymore. We have been ushered into a kingdom of heaven, physically, and we are enjoying it and we are living longer lives by it. We don't realize it yet; it has been empirical, pragmatic, cut and try, try this and try that.

That's why we think always of going into business to get something. Anybody who goes into business just for that and hews to that line, he isn't in business very long. He might be in government and stay that way, as long as there is anything to live on, but he can't be in business while he is just serving himself. Business doesn't consist in loving one's self by serving one's self. It consists of loving others — all others, without discrimination.

In business, whatever his religion or his race, every man's dollar is just as good as anyone else's. We hear a lot about equality, and some people argue about it: some men are taller than others, and some men are smarter than others, and so, they say, there is no such thing as equality. Well, there is such a thing. There is a divine equality. And that equality is *equality of jurisdiction*.

We sometimes use the word "freedom," and we are usually confused about it. To make it perfectly explicit, we are free when we have equal authority with one another over our own persons and our own property — not equal size, or weight, or power, or strength, or fortune or whatnot, but equal authority — the equal right to make contracts with our fellow men and thereby serve them in the same manner we would have them serve us. The practice of this equality is free enterprise, sometimes called "capitalism."

Now a consumer good is not capital. It is not the subject matter of contract; it is the subject matter of being consumed. Robinson Crusoe had wealth. He had some tools and materials. But he didn't have any capital because he was only using these things to love himself, to serve himself. In our modern society, on the other hand, when a man accumulates, through savings or otherwise, a means wherewith to obtain tools and other property, he starts right in to love his fellow men by serving them. That's what we mean by "free enterprise," and that's what we mean by "capitalism" — because these tools and materials and all the facilities that he uses in the service of the public generally are called "capital." That is why our capitalist system is our spirituality, which we have grown into without realizing it.

I was never taught that there was anything spiritual about trading with my neighbor. But all the goods that people administer in their free and voluntary, their economic and social relationships, all those goods are social-ized goods and spiritualized goods because they are not used in the interest of the person who owns the property, but he administers them for the use and benefit of other people. That is a spiritual function, and God rewards the spiritual obedience to His commands by giving people health and wealth and length of days — more abundant life even unto immortality as an end always in view.

Let us understand that God ordained this free-enterprise system of ours. He gave us the rule, what we should do, and He commanded us to do it. Who disobeys the rule is defying God, and the good book tells us that the wage of sin is death. That is the way to die. That is why civilization dies — when we refrain. That is why all the ancient civilizations died out. They didn't obey that command. They didn't even have it in explicit form. It is pretty well foreshadowed in the Old Testament. The predecessors of Christ in the Old Testament did come at it, but not nearly so squarely and so unequivocally as he did.

All the civilizations have died out except ours, and we are only living on that portion of our society and of our behavior in which we are loving one another by serving one another. That is what keeps civilization alive. If that went out of

commission, then not even the government would have a penny to spend tomorrow. It all comes from the practice of the spiritual rule, the spiritual command that God gave men through Christ. That is how we live and move and have our being today. That is the fountain of all things, the source of all that we have, physical or spiritual, except for the spirituality that is potential in us and waiting to blossom out upon favorable conditions.

Sometimes, of course, men are in an animal condition. As Aristotle said, base occupations make base men. Could the laborers on the pyramids have been philosophers or artists or anything of the kind? It is said that they toiled from sun to dark and had no time to themselves at all — no time to cultivate anything but barely enough to eat, and many must have starved to death. So base occupations make base men, and base conditions make base men. But the thing grows on what it feeds on. When men practice the divine command that they love one another, then they are in society; then they are in the kingdom of heaven, however potential it may be. It may be unforeseen, it may be like the mustard seed, it may come like a thief in the night — as it did come by piratical thieves on the Mediterranean and the Baltic, turned merchants. Nevertheless, that is where we exist and function as spiritual beings — in those relationships in which we enjoy a certain degree of courtesy and equality.

So far as it is not political and thereby copying the iron rule of Rome, our modern system of culture is the kingdom of heaven being realized. I hope I am helping you to realize that in your minds as well as you are realizing it already in your daily lives. Every time we eat good food, have good housing, or good clothing, we are realizing it on the physical and material side. But only when we commence to understand it do we then realize it with our spiritual faculties. Only then do we consciously enter in. Before that we are merely beneficiaries, almost like beggars. We have not asked for it, but God gives it to us.

We are blessed with what we have in our modern civilization, and we have something to cherish. We have something to live for and to live by, something to understand and something to die for, if we cherish that promise of God that we should have life abundantly, more and more abundantly, even unto immortality.

Questions

President Davis: In identifying Christianity with the economic system that we have in the West, don't you lay yourself open to the charge that you are agreeing with Alexander Pope, when he said that whatever is, is right?

That is a question of what we mean by "is." Some things work, while other things fail. But the reality, as Plato and St. Paul pointed out, is with the things that endure, and the ultimate reality is that which endures forever. Death cannot prevail, darkness cannot prevail. Life is ever overcoming death, as light is always overcoming darkness. So in that sense whatever continues to be, whatever endures, whatever has the power of the Spirit in it, is right.

The impermanent, the transient, the passing show is too much with us. We boast of our realism, but we are not realists; for we insist that those things that by their nature must crumble and decay are as real as, or even more real than, those that by their very constitution and mode of action must always live and eternally grow. What gives to evil its character as such is its impermanence, its disorganizing and disintegrating quality. It is not life; it is dis-organic.

All life is God: it is energy, creative energy. Energy manifests itself in structures and its activities. Activities that enhance structures and evolve them into higher and more complex forms are creative activities. Those that disintegrate are evil and destructive; they dissolve the structures in which they operate and, with them, they pass away. Thus is evil essentially transitory and unreal. The wages of sin, of all destructive activity, is death. Creation is the divine activity, the living reality.³⁰¹⁴

Mr. Xavier: The world certainly is progressing, but unevenly. Do you really think our Christian faith made the difference, that that is what gave the West such a head start?

The Western world is the Christian world, and the Western world is also the world of food, clothing, shelter, power, length of days, wealth. If you will draw a line on the globe around all the people who eat all they want, who have leisure and who have length of days, you will have included within that the Christian nations of the world. The Christian people of the world, knowingly or unknowingly, under the inspiration of Jesus Christ were the first to learn how to build their dreams into their world, how to make the word become flesh.

We have the fullness of life founded on the body, on the material things made, according to tradition, of the dust of the earth. On that we are building an edifice of human life — a spiritual edifice. But like the material cathedral, it has to be well founded or it will fall.

We are growing out of the falling, the dying away of people through fatalism, submission, lack of hope. Other peoples in the world have had through millennia to place their hearts and their minds so far as they have been able in some distant Nirvana. The Asiatic dream of Nirvana is a beautiful and wonderful thing. But we have an alternative in the Western world. The Spirit is working now and forever, and it is empowering our lives so that we are day by day making a different world from what it was yesterday. We are building our dream into it, our visions, and the people who are doing that are the inspired people, the creative people, the spiritual people.

Mr. Otero: Mr. Heath you and I were discussing this morning the content of a "Sermon Brief" written by a minister and entitled, "Civilization and Survival: Are They at War?" Since the topic tonight is "The Christian Doctrine of Man," I think the views you expressed would be of interest to this group.

You've heard of Julian the Apostate, the Roman Emperor who tried to paganize the world and get rid of Christianity? Well, men like this minister bring him to my mind, because the pagan idea of well-being is the bucolic life in harmony with nature — at a somewhat primitive level of conception — after the manner of Rousseau who wanted us to go back to nature.

So this minister wants us to go back to nature, to the land, and live more primitively, more simply and all that, like the noble savage as far as possible. In this he is apostate from the entire spirit of Western civilization. He denigrates that spirit, calling attention to its negative aspects entirely, completely forgetting that the mission of Christ was to bring us a mode of life in which we would have life more and more abundantly, and that this mission of Christ is being carried out unconsciously by Western civilization because Western civilization has only one technology, the technology of doing unto others in the same manner as we would have others do unto us. This is being done unconsciously by our whole world of economic freedom, so far as we have

that freedom, and it is to this that we owe our dominance in the world.

This Christianity-in-action is exactly what it should be the mission of a spiritual leader to explain and make people understand consciously as well as acting unconsciously in the providence of God. He should be first and foremost to point out and to bring people into a knowledge and understanding of how, as the Old Testament said, "underneath are the everlasting arms."

God is prompting us in our unconscious minds and natures to carry out His will, and we are doing that, and that is why Western civilization can never fail — because those people who most nearly walk in the ways of God and observe the laws of nature are observing the laws of survival. God blesses with length of days and ultimately with immortality those who most completely obey His will.⁴⁴³

Colonel Neville: Men have had many diverse ideas about what is the will of God.

Men most *do* the will of God when thinking least of it; the men who most profess God and claim authority from Him have often done things least divine.¹⁷⁹³

Mr. Otero: Socialists think of freedom and equality differently than you do, and it's sometimes nebulous. Would you lay out for us once more how you use those terms?

By freedom, I mean the freedom to own property not as mice do, but as capital, the way men do, so that they can use it on behalf of other men who wish to pay them for doing so. Property is the instrument of freedom, and without property, men cannot make or perform contracts for one another. Without property, they cannot practice the golden rule of doing for others in the same manner they would have others do unto them. As for equality, there is only one equality that is either possible or to be desired. That is, for each of us to have equality of authority over his own person and his own property, be it great or small.¹⁵⁷⁴

Mr. Randolph: What you were saying about our modern business being the practice of the golden rule goes even beyond the idea that "honesty is

the best policy.” That maxim is like the negative form of the golden rule that we find in so many other religions. But you've made us see tonight that the golden rule as Christ spoke it is more inclusive, more powerful, than any prohibition could ever be.

People who make contracts to do business together are serving one another — loving by serving. And who ever loves and refuses to serve? What is that love worth? I didn't say “sacrifice,” but “serve.” We don't get ahead by killing the goose that lays the golden egg, or by sacrificing ourselves. How can we serve our fellow man if we destroy ourselves in the process? We have no more right to serve him that way than he has to demand it.

Emerson made a glorious statement one time, and yet he was seeing honesty as the best policy, and he wasn't looking much beyond. He said,

A man buys and sells in the market place and takes care that others shall not cheat him. A day comes when he takes care that he shall not cheat others. In that day his market cart becomes a chariot of the sun.

Not sufficient — and negative, like the so-called golden rule in Chinese, Buddhist, and Hindu thought, that he should not injure others. That doesn't get anybody anywhere. If we all became absolutely honest this moment and *nothing more*, we wouldn't serve anybody tomorrow. To serve other people is more than being honest with them. Vastly more.

Mr. Randolph: So you're saying Christ's vision went far beyond mere non-violence such as Gandhi's pacifism. Christ's was a call to action — an alternative kind of *behavior* for building a new kind of kingdom on the earth.

Yes. The essential being and attribute of God is creativeness. Creativeness is growth, organization, new relationships coming into being. Growth is not conflict; it is the opposite from conflict. Conflict is *dis*-organization. When Peter drew the sword of conflict, Christ rebuked him; the sword that Christ brought was, as every scholar knows, the sword of separation — separation from conflict. His kingdom of God was to come not through conflict but through service.

He would become great who would serve many, and greatest who would serve *all*.⁹⁵⁹ Jesus Christ came with a spiritual message to regenerate and revolutionize the world, to lift men out of the universal dominion of political power and force into a kingdom of liberty and love.²⁰⁸

Mr. Johnson: The trouble is, that so many people today are not entrepreneurially inclined. They are looking for an easy way to wealth. They no longer subscribe to the work ethic and are afraid to take risks.

We are not off on the very best foot when we consider things in terms of their ease of execution. What we really strive for is the thrill of accomplishing something that we have never accomplished before. We have a creative impulse within us that can only be gratified by bringing something to pass that we have only dreamed before. What gives a joy in any act or process or the conduct of any affair, what gives a real joy as distinguished from mere relief from pain or from ennui, is the sense of creating something, the sense of feeling the inspiration of a new creation, and the sense of communicating that inspiration to others, either presently or in time to come. I think that we should be concerned about whether a course of action is inspiring, whether it will inspire us or inspire others, rather than whether it is going to be easy to perform. If it does inspire us, and we feel that it may inspire others, there will be no rigors, no labors so severe as to deter.⁴⁴⁰

Mr. Randolph: Mr. Heath, did you ever meet Emerson?

No, he died when I was only six years old. But I was much influenced by his writings as I was growing up. He stood for knowledge of the Tree of Life, and not of that other tree that stood in the Garden, the tree of death, which was forbidden. That which was forbidden was the knowledge of good-and-evil, of conflict, disharmony. Emerson taught men not conflict, not to destroy evil, but to seek and attain *life* — beyond the *good-and-evil* complex. He would eat of the Tree of Life, not of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, the tree of *death*. He did not deny that sin and death ‘*exist*,’ but he urged knowledge and practice of the alternative, which is creation, life. To fight sin, to resist evil — is the worst practice of it.¹⁸⁷⁸

We have been looking at social organization from the standpoint of

beauty and creativeness rather than from the standpoint of reformation and correction.¹²⁹⁶ I like to think of the universality of creative power and that its creativeness is just the manner in which it is directed. Inspiration directs it in ways that are constructive, organic, and therefore creative. Our reactions against evil make us moral and corrective, therefore disintegrative and destructive; it is only necessary for us to decide that something is evil for our moral nature to prompt us to make war against it, even putting God in uniform and hiring Him out in the service of Mars. This is a grand tribute to evil, setting it upon a high throne and engaging God with us to storm its battlements.¹¹⁸⁰

Mr. Xavier: Mr. Heath, in your own heart and mind, would you say the kingdom of heaven really is the contractual society you describe?

What did Christ say? When two or three are gathered together in my name, I will hear their request. The *doers* of the word, not the *sayers*, enter the kingdom of heaven. The rich young man, who in his day had to be on loot — there wasn't anything but loot; there was no developed commerce between men as owners of themselves and their property — came before him, and he said, "You can't enter the kingdom of heaven as a lootist." (Double-o t, not u t.)

(Laughter)

So, go through the parables, the descriptions of the kingdom of heaven, and match them up with what we have now in our system of men loving men by serving men.

Mr. Otero: Mr. Heath, how can we effectively present the Christian tradition, burdened with so many miraculous and improbable happenings, to thoughtful young people growing up in this age of science? They say, "How can you ask us to swallow that stuff?" They feel we're asking them to suspend their critical judgment.

There has been entirely too much scoffing and scorning of the superstitions, because the ritualistic practices connected with them have a profound poetic and ritualistic significance usually far beyond the understanding of those who superstitiously engage in them. The use and beauty of religious symbolism lies in its significance, not in the symbol itself, which may be and often is very crude. To divest symbolism of its deep significance and treat

it literally is a kind of religious profanation. And yet for very crude-minded persons, even a literal significance is in some degree uplifting, so only there be a sense of mystery and awe aroused, a recognition of something having a worth and power and beauty beyond their ken.

Mr. Walker: I've been thinking about Victor Frankel's book, *Man's Search for Meaning*. Would you say that there is any purpose in life beyond what we assign to it?

We definitely have purposes, and we observe those purposes in our own behavior. The cosmos has certain behavior. So, looked at in the same manner as we look at a person, we can say that what that behavior is manifesting is cosmic purpose, the same as human behavior manifests human purpose.

If, on the other hand, we mean by "purpose" something that can only be imputed to personality, then it cannot be imputed to the cosmos, because personality, by definition, is limited as distinguished from other personalities. So when we are dealing with personality we are dealing with purpose, or vice versa, but when we are dealing with the universal we cannot be dealing with purpose, because personality cannot be imputed to the universal. Personality distinguishes one personality from another and so cannot be universal.

It hinges on what we mean by "personality." If we mean by it something that distinguishes one person from another, or if that is part of your definition, then a person must be finite. So an infinite purpose could not be ascribed to a finite person. When we speak of the personality of God, we are distinguishing it from our personality, which makes them both finite.

We are speaking of *how* and *why*. Other attributes of personality than having a purpose are not relevant to *how* and *why*. The *how* does not necessarily imply purposed ends, but the *why* does, and that is why science can deal in the *how* so much, but not in the *why*. The whole dilemma of Newton was between the *how* and the *why*. His *why* depended upon his universal God being personal, notwithstanding the impossibility of God being both personal and universal.

The transactions of the market I have been speaking of — the objective love — these transactions owe their divinity to their being impersonal, because only by being impersonal can they be universal, and thus divine. The transactions between intimates are only within the scope of the intimates and therefore merely human, or rather animal, practices, since only the human can be divine. There is where the unregenerate man comes in, the man who has not exercised the divinity of becoming impersonal as well as personal in his love.⁴¹¹

Mr. Bronson: You used the illustration of the hotel. I can conceive of hotels giving service for our fellow men in every area of the service of the hotel. But I can't easily conceive of that as love.

Constantine saw to that — that the spiritual relationship should be for another world and we should look forward to it at a time when we die.

We are so accustomed to thinking of spiritual things as things just of the mind and of the heart that it is almost impossible for us to conceive that there is any spirituality in making money, for instance — in serving other people so well that they in turn serve us and we both profit. Profit is recompense for administrative services. I administer my property for the benefit of you, and you administer your property for the benefit of me, and we both profit. Profit is the recompense that we both get for administering our property not for our own use but for the use and benefit of others, and thereby in a practical way extending the love relationship outside of our inmost hearts.

The frugal Scotsman said in his prayer, "Oh God, bless me and my wife and my son John and his wife, us four and no more." The New Testament teaches us how to include the "more." It doesn't say, "no more." All men are brought under the spiritual relationship, whether they know it or not. So we have something to learn and something to enjoy knowing, and something to be inspired with — something to uplift us and give us a new hold on life.

Ms. Gladson: What would you think of a service that is completely given — when you know there is going to be no service to you in return? Of course, you do get a spiritual return; it makes you feel good because you give.

Altruism? Yes, maybe I haven't said enough about this imagination that men have. Men have two kinds of understanding of things. One is with the mind, and the other is with the heart or the imagination. We find great technologists of both kinds. Beethoven composed the Ninth Symphony. Did he ever explain how he did it? Did he even understand, himself, how he did it? It was like a divine revelation. He got it intuitively. It was inner teaching, intuition — tuition on the inside. He got it intuitively and not analytically, not through any reasoning faculties. But it is beautiful and divine.

So men's imaginations teach them intuitively. But also we take experience, and we weigh and measure things. We count, and we use mathematical reasoning to understand the things that we have counted and measured. Through this analytical approach, we get the power to put things back together again, not exactly as we found them but in the way we want them to be. We have got the rationale of how God's mind works in nature.

We find the mind of God manifesting itself in the works of God, and we find that it is a rational mind; it has the principles of the levers and the gears and the chemical equivalents and all those things by their arithmetic. When we understand these things, then we have taken on God's mind and we can do what God did. He put them together that way, and now we can put them together in a higher order using the same mind, the understanding of God's works.

Now the same intuition that taught Beethoven his Ninth Symphony teaches men that there is a solidarity between them, that man is not just something alone. As Saint Paul said, the hands and the feet don't argue with one another; they cooperate. And the head and the hand. Saint Paul goes through the different parts of the body and says so it is with spiritual men in the golden rule relationship. They are doing wonderful things for one another, and they feel that they belong together. They can't do anything of themselves alone. No man is an island to himself.

So the philanthropist has an intuition that men belong to one another, and when he sees someone suffering, his heart goes out to him. His imagination makes him feel it. Without that imagination, you can't feel the sufferings of others. The regenerate man can then go and *do* something about it. He can weigh and measure things. He can understand things with his mind, so that he is not impelled in all his behavior by his philanthropy, his sentiment. He has something to go along with that — rationality. When he has that rationality, then

he has not only the heart but also the light. He has his mind to guide him. He has reason to guide and thereby to bring into effect the ideals and dreams of his heart.

We see this in relieving the distress of the needy. Our best sentiments and intentions — those most self-approving — can find active release and expression in many kinds of voluntary aid and relief, organized and unorganized, in which we need not resort to government.

More intelligently and constructively, and without vapid sentimentality or self-vaunting altruism, we can seek productive employment of whatever properties and funds or personal powers we are still free to so engage. Such activity is valid aid to our fellow men because it is mutual and reciprocal and thereby creative and enduring — spiritual in its manner and in its effects, whatever be the conscious intent. It means participation in the functional organization and administration of property and services by investing in profit-making and thereby productive enterprises. Every such investment puts more and better organized tools and materials under productive administration and so provides more employment for labor on the one hand while raising and enriching the flow of consumable goods — the real wages of labor — on the other hand. This may seem very prosaic, but it is God's order of unconscious growth and creation.

Let us think for a moment of what happens when investors, willingly or unwillingly, withdraw their properties and funds to unproductive uses, such as philanthropy or government and war: the whole process is reversed. The facilities of saleable production are reduced, less labor must be employed in operating them, business is unstabilized, and the flow of consumable goods to the needy is diminished while their purchasing power is destroyed. Surely there is nothing creative or divine in all this.¹⁴⁵⁹

Mr. Montgomery: Are you charting a progression from intuition through imagination through rationalization?

Not dropping anything on the way. Each thing is conditioned by its past, and each is an enlargement of the scope of the past. Intuitive charity is enlarged by those persons who learn something about how to administer charity — just as we learn how to administer property to the benefit of one another. We must

administer it under the golden rule, which means by the meeting of people's minds, so that what we do for others, we do in a way that satisfies their minds as well as our minds. Then they are the judges of whether they are being benefited by us or not.

So the whole thing works beautifully that we are *growing* from the animal state. Animals do intimate things for one another within their limited circle; we are growing from that into a larger circle, a circle in which we use the *golden* rule and are abandoning the *iron* rule, the rule of the sword.

Mr. Kellog: You emphasize the importance of relationship over and over, the golden rule exemplifying that most tellingly. The objective seems to be for more and more men to have inspiration, this in-breathing of spiritual, or creative, capacity through their relationship with their fellows. Is that the be-all-and-end-all? Does the consummation come in the human race entirely? Or is the human race dedicated to something beyond itself again?

There is a Divinity that shapes our ends, and God only knows how many others. We can only know a bit about our own, but our power of deduction, our imagination, based upon what we do know and what we do experience, leaves it easily conceivable that there is an infinitude of modes and forms of life, each, like ours, transcending itself. There is a Divinity that shapes not only our ends, but the universal ends.

We may impute aim to the cosmos, as the source whence human aims are derived. But for human purposes, there are no other ends to be desired than the maintenance, the advancement and the idealization of human life. Quality and value and beauty are human concerns, human conceptions.

It is interesting to know how dependent upon freedom mankind is. For the whole world of quality, value and beauty depends for its realization upon the freedom of the human will, the freedom to choose. To choose creatively, to cherish ideally, one must be in a situation involving a large field, a wide range of possible experience, a great variety of events. From such a field of quantitative experience will arise the greatest amount of diversity, or variety. And given quantity and diversity, and then given freedom of the individual to exercise choice

among this great diversity of events — qualities, objects, or whatnot — then there is a human realization of quality as distinguished from that which is of less desirability, of value as distinguished from that which is less to be desired, and a discrimination of that which is inspiring, that which lifts the human personality out of its narrow self and gives it a cosmic sense, that which inspires, and for which the common name is beauty.³⁰⁴⁷

Without freedom, with only limited choices, man is less than human. He is in the same condition as the humble world of the animals, whose only ideal is to continue to live, whereas the ideal of man is to transcend existence into a creative technology in which he can exercise his inherent divinity through dreaming a more beautiful, more perfect, world, and creating that world through cooperation in freedom with his fellow men.⁴³⁴

Mr. Quinton: Mr. Heath, if somebody asked you what Christianity is, how would you answer the question? What does it mean to be a Christian?

**The first and second commandments:
First, Love God — subjectively.
Second, Love man — objectively.
Both are equally essential.¹³⁹**

Apotheosis

***Deep from the rhythmic heart of Time, 'mid all
The Cosmic Process, and the rise or wane
Of human hopes and dreams, comes the refrain,
Betimes, of Beauty's rapture-raising call.
She led that hand on carven cavern wall,
Those eyes of shepherds skyward on the plain;
Inspired by her and scorning mortal pain,
Artist and seekers glory in her thrall.
For she endows with vast creative urge
The earth-born spirit risen from the sod.
Beyond all impulse to destroy or purge,
Her inspiration lifts the self-bound clod
From creature, as creator, to upsurge
Enraptured in the song — the work — of God.²²³⁵***

IV

THE INSPIRATION OF BEAUTY

Men have always been trying more or less through the ages to understand themselves. As Pope phrased it, the proper study of mankind is man. I should like to revise that slightly and say that the proper study of mankind is *mankind*. We can learn a great deal from an individual, or any unit of any kind, by analysis and dissection and examination of it. But we don't really understand any single thing, an item or a specimen, until we understand it as a member of a class. The reason is that nature is always integrating into units. Once a unit is well integrated, as in the human form, then nature proceeds to put these units together in still higher organizations.

In the case of man, we can study man best by studying him not as a discrete, separate individual, but in his relation to his fellow men. And that means mankind *in association* — for in association we multiply our powers. Relatively speaking, the individual alone is helpless. The individual in the right relation to his fellow man is going onward toward the realization of all his potentialities. In the wrong relation to his fellow men, he is slipping back. He is going away from life, towards death.

We have only two modes of association. One is ancient and primitive and has to do with the animal type of existence, dependent on brute force. Men, at a certain stage of lower development, have little else towards those outside of the family; they practice a rule called the iron rule, in which they attempt to impose their will on one another without reference to the wishes and desires of the other. That is basically the practice of slavery. It is political. It includes all such activities as slavery and war, and all the destructive forces that men engage themselves in in an organized way.

The other mode of association among men is properly called the *golden*

rule, which is precisely the reverse. It is not less of the other, not a mitigation of slavery and war and compulsions. It requires a new point of view and a different motivation . . . [Recording failure for forty seconds. Some characterization of the golden rule, perhaps, and of the new point of view, which would be constructive, perhaps rational, creative — and for this there is a motivation greater than any other. — Editor]

There is no passion so great as the inspiration of the beauty that ever draws man on and on. In all such areas of life as religion and art, man is motivated not by trying to keep alive, but by his urge to transcend life, to reach higher developments, higher experiences, to reach not relief from pain or salvation from death, which is the only technique that the lower world knows, but to reach the advancement of things — the reaching out to the beyond. The motivation for that is not self-preservation. That is necessary at the low level, but having achieved self-preservation, the higher motivation is the motivation to create.

God created the whole world and man and all under the inspiration of a *vision*, an imagining, an image of things that never were but were yet to come, and He experienced the fulfillment of that image and called it good. He gave us the same capacity, that we could entertain images of ideals, dreams, visions of things that never were but must yet be, and with that He gave us the power to realize those dreams. He didn't give that power to us as individuals. We could only realize those dreams, those ideals, through the kind of association with our fellow men I have just spoken of, an association under the golden rule, the spiritual rule — which is spiritual because it is creative. Man is a creature, helpless in his environment except as he practices that golden rule. When he practices that golden rule, he ceases being a creature and becomes a creator. And because he is a creator as his Maker was, then he becomes a spiritual being.

So let us bracket *creativity* and *spirituality* and then realize not only our meaning, but in our physical life realize the results of that combination. By it we can dream something, and then build that dream into the world. And as I must repeat, perhaps, no man can do it entirely alone. Nor does he wish to do it alone. Religion and art and all those higher activities of men are in view of other men. We may go to the ivory tower, the sanctuary; that is for refreshment; that is for peace, and listening to ourselves. But when we have listened to ourselves, we will not be content until we have caused other persons to participate in our dreams, to hear our words and so on. We are ineluctably persuaded that we must build the Word into the flesh — the Logos into the material world. In doing that, we are

fulfilling our divine capacity to be creative, and through being creative, to be spiritual.

Let us look about and see what kinds of things people are doing. We can judge them by their acts, as we judge organisms by how they function, how they carry on. There are many of us doing necessary things — maintaining our lives, maintaining our civilization, making a living. If we make our living as animals make a living, as parasites on nature — by appropriation, by consuming and destroying things rather than by creating them — we are then living in the psychology of the animal. But when we move out of that and into the non-necessitous world, into the world of inspiration, we have a different motivation.

It is not the motivation to save our lives; for he who seeks to save his life will lose all his higher life. Salvation of their physical life might be considered the lowest ambition men ever have. A prominent man in the world of philosophy and science said lately that he "would rather be red than dead." His ambition apparently was simply to keep alive, the lowest ambition any creature can have, however necessary it may be.

So we see that men are not only doing the necessary, workaday, everyday things to maintain their lives individually and their civilization at a given level, but they are doing things that we consider higher. We give those things our acclaim, our admiration more, because men do them not from necessity but from inspiration. Something has come into their mind and heart that is leading them, not prodding them. When they are prodded, when they are driven, they have to move, like dumb, driven cattle. But on this other side of life, this creative side of life, this spiritual side of life, the key to it all is inspiration.

We have a common language, whether we know it or not. Whenever we are in a situation that causes us to take a great breath, stand on our toes, bring our eyes upward and our arms apart, we drink it in. Whether we say it or not, we are inspired. All that we do under inspiration is creative. All that we do under inspiration is spiritual. And that's what "spiration" means; "inspiration" is the in-breathing of the Holy Spirit.

So I am happy to call your attention or, as Plato said, to make you reminiscent, to make you remember what you have always known and have sort of forgot, perhaps, at the moment — to bring you back to your true selves, where you can see through the eye of the mind and through the freedom of the spirit, which is not bound to necessity but which can roam the universe

without limitations.

Your mind can elaborate on this in a great many different directions. You can see the field of benevolence, the field of adventure, and the field of arts, science and religion, the composition of music and the discovery of continents, and the climbing of mountains, where the human spirit is manifesting itself in its own nature, not the animal nature governing it and reducing it to the level of animals' necessity. The things that, throughout history, men have unanimously called great have been the things they did under this inspiration. And whenever they have felt that inspiration, they have always had an adjective for it. When we stand on a peak of Darien, whatever it may be, in some great exalted attitude in life and take that deep breath, if someone says to us, "What is it?" we say, "It is beautiful." I don't know any synonym for that, any substitute word that means as much. We can have approximations, but that is the all-inclusive word: *Beauty*.

Through the ages, and especially through the Christian ages, men have worshipped at the shrine of beauty. "In the beauty of the lilies Christ was born across the sea."² Christ was a poet, above all things. I once had occasion to give a talk on "Poetry, the Mother of Science." Poetry is the mother of science because the inspiration it brings liberates and directs the energies of men in creative lines. Poetry is the intuiting of things, the feeling of them as we know our own selves and, within ourselves, our own consciousness. We have a direct intuition of beauty. It doesn't have to be analyzed; it doesn't have to be explained or taught or anything like that.

And how shall we know when we are in the presence of beauty? Watch ourselves. Do we stand on our toes? Do our eyes go upward and our breath inward, and so on? Do we feel an exaltation so that we stand apart from our crude nature and become universal, seeing things, as Spinoza said, under the aspect of eternity? Standing outside of ourselves — the Greeks called it "ekstasis," or "ecstasy" in English. That is the happiness that is the lot of spiritual beings. It is happiness that the material, animal beings are excluded from. They haven't ever had that great heritage of being creative, spiritual, like their Maker.

² Julia Ward Howe, *Battle Hymn of the Republic*

Questions

President Davis: Would you say, Mr. Heath, that the destiny of human life is to reach a point where all men can be inspired?

Yes. That ability, according to the legends, was implanted in us with our creation. But it isn't automatic. It has to be developed, it has to grow. Like everything else in nature it has to begin with a seed and fulfill itself through development and growth.

Mr. Montgomery: The illustrations of beauty you have used so far have been pretty much confined to the objects that we see and things we hear and so on. Shelley had a famous poem he called, "Ode to Intellectual Beauty." He was talking about what Plato called "the ideal beauty." I assume that although your illustrations have largely been drawn from the world around us, that you essentially are talking about the same thing Shelley had in mind when he talked about "intellectual beauty." Is that true?

Yes. I was rather looking at beauty in the *functional* sense. Plato and Shelley were looking at it as a kind of an entity in itself, a kind of mystical ideal that is perhaps far beyond our grasp, although not beyond our ambitions, our aspirations. But I was speaking, and still am, of it manifesting itself in physical forms — the sound coming out of the mind and heart of the composer and taking the form of vibrations in the air. Until it does happen in that way, it doesn't reach the minds and hearts of many other persons. There are not many Platos, there are not many Shelleys, but there are plenty of people who can respond to the vibrations of a Ninth Symphony.

Mr. Walker: We often hear of Truth, Goodness, and Beauty, but thus far you've said nothing about Truth and Goodness. Surely you don't leave them out?

Beauty is the absolute. The Good is only how you feel about it;

the Good for you is what feels good to you, and for the other fellow, what you feel is good for him. Beauty doesn't have to be enforced, and the only force that enforces Good is brute force. Truth is a little better, but not much. There are so many kinds of Truth, both good and bad, that to say merely something is true, and to praise it for that, is to lack discrimination. So goodness is the virtue of slaves, Truth the color of the chameleon, but Beauty is as the song of the lark and the nightingale. It is the source of inspiration. It cometh from above, and lends no sanction to set one man above or below another, as do Goodness, and Truth.²¹⁷⁵

Col. Neville: Yet so much of organized religion addresses sin and guilt. Goodness seems to be its chief concern.

True religion is always an integrating, a reconciling, a binding force and influence. It has nothing to do with right or wrong, except so far as some things are beautiful and inspiring and others are not.¹⁹⁵⁵
True religion is whatever inspires man towards the Eternal.¹⁸⁷⁶

Mr. Montgomery: Would you say the positive function of art is to inspire by showing beauty?

Yes. On their positive and creative side, art and religion are identical as to office and function. Their transcendent value and service to mankind comes wholly of their power to inspire, to harmonize inner conflicts and induce exaltation (and exultation) of body and mind. To me this is the supreme ministry, the highest service and fulfillment of the divine, for it is only beauty that speaks directly to the soul. Under this inspiration, all human action and energy must turn away from death and destruction and be led upward into universal creation. Let religion and art but give men this vision, and they will pursue it.

Man has a limited, a partial freedom within the frame of his total environment. He can use this freedom creatively by reacting to the best, the beauty, in his environment and experience and so maintaining a condition of inspiration. Under inspiration, he can create active power in himself and use this power to build social organization and modify environment and experience. He can contact the beauty that is to inspire him in two ways — by willing to see and feel the beauties that are in life experiences, and by creating art forms that convey a sense of

beauty and inspiration. Art forms convey this by giving us at second hand and repeatedly in representative form those life experiences which are creative and whose beauty inspires us. We can make our environment more creative and inspiring by surrounding ourselves with art forms and art experiences.

Art forms are things made or done in such manner as to evoke strong emotion or produce high tension emotional states. Not all art forms are serviceable to life, only those whose total effects give positive emotional reactions. Art forms that give negative emotional reactions are of no use in themselves, being destructive in the kind of energy they release. But negative art can be used to good purpose when it is used in a subordinate way with positive art, as a painter uses shadow to heighten his positive effects. Art forms are positive when they affect our emotions in the same way as positive (creative) life experiences.¹⁰¹⁷

I often think that the aesthetic is the most inspiring, the most divine, element in human nature — that the divinity of mankind rests in his creative power, which is always greatest when he is inspired by the sense of beauty above and beyond what is personal and immediate to him. Even the scientific materialist seems to pursue his discoveries under an inspiration of beauty that he is often disposed to deny.¹⁶⁵¹

It seems to me that a knowledge of God is in reality a knowledge of Him as Creator and of His creative ways, as they manifest themselves in His creatures and in all creation. I think it is the providence of God that only the beautiful shall possess any reality and final permanence, and only through the pursuit of beauty and under its inspiration can men find their way to that which is godly and to God.¹²⁹⁶

Ms. Gladson: What inspires the person who doesn't respond? Who doesn't have the background with which to respond? The person who doesn't see the beauty around him?

The number of those who are responsive to beauty has been growing as civilization has grown. "Saith Life, 'I am that which must always transcend itself.'" Life has been transcending itself in the Western world. The Western world had the inspiration to move forward, to accept and practice the divinity that is

within man, that he should become the master of his world, have that dominion as promised in Genesis over all other things in the world. And so Western man has been gaining that creative dominion.

Ms. Gladson: Then do those who are more favored have, as their immediate obligation, the mission to show beauty?

When I was a child, they used to have mottos on pillow shams. I haven't seen a pillow sham for a long time, or a motto either. One that I once knew read, "I slept and dreamed that life was beauty. I woke, and found that life was duty." I don't need to tell you that that was in New England. But someone improved that, I think, or revised it at any rate: "Sleeping, I dreamed that life was duty. Awake, I find that life is beauty."

Mr. Kellog: Toynbee said there isn't much to be done about the unregenerate nature of man, but there is nonetheless "the opportunity open to souls, by way of the learning that comes through suffering, for getting into closer communion with God, and becoming less unlike Him, during their passage through this world." What do you say to that?

Hell is not the anteroom of heaven. Suffering and death are of hell; creation and joy are of heaven.¹⁹⁰⁷

Joy is, in nature, dominant over pain, integration over disintegration, creation above destruction. Else how should nature evolve? Order is more enduring than disorder, hence more *real*.¹⁸⁶⁵

President Davis: What place would you make in this program of yours — and you do have a definite program for the future as you outlined in your book, *Citadel, Market and Altar* — for the man who is brutalized by environment or necessity, the "man with the hoe" that Millet and Edwin Markham were so disturbed about?

As human beings, there is only one thing that men need. I said, as *human*

beings. As animals, men need only to keep themselves alive — to eat and, along with it, to reproduce. When an animal creature has done those two things, he has fulfilled his destiny. The animal man is working against the entropy of his environment all the time. He adjusts himself, accommodates himself to it. If he is cold he puts on clothes, or he moves or something; he doesn't change the temperature around him. He's always a creature and always fugitive from death, always staving off death.

The human man, on the other hand, the spiritual man, has passed beyond that. He has the faculty of enlarging life, getting more life, not merely holding what little he has. He has the power to reach out and get more. Now that power, like every good and perfect gift, comes from above, figuratively speaking at least. That is the power of *inspiration*.

The "man with the hoe," whom Edwin Markham immortalized in his poem by that name, this man who is brutalized by environment or necessity, he is various persons who are less inspired than some of the rest of us. All such persons need something. They need, first of all, food and the power to live and reproduce. Without that, there is no foundation to their house of life. But having that, then the one great and perfect gift that men can give to one another, the gift that comes from God, is the gift of inspiration. The supreme opportunity we have towards our fellow man is not to *save him*, but to *inspire him*. Emerson understood this and maintained it with telling effect against the "reformist" movement in his day:

My friend, the Prohibitionist, would deprive old Scroggs of his beer, and make him feel the poorer for it. But I, for my part, shall not be content with myself until I have so *inspired* Scroggs that he will *give up* his beer and *know* himself the richer for it.

When we ourselves are inspired, we seek to share the gift of the Holy Spirit with others. We do so, not under the prod of duty or necessity, but in the fulfillment of the Spirit — which is perfect freedom. So I say of the man with the hoe and all such persons, that the gift that will *serve* them, and not merely relieve them, not merely enable them to shift their necessities onto somebody else, is the gift of the Inspiration of the Holy Spirit in the pursuit of beauty.

Colonel Neville: But there are so many men
with hoes today. Do you think we'll last long

enough to inspire them before we destroy ourselves?

If we can persuade those men, through inspiring them, to use those hoes for production rather than for fighting each other, we will go very rapidly towards the goal of all our dreams. We have entered partly into the kingdom of heaven now. A great part of our activities are creative. Enormous parts. I am speaking now especially of our Western culture. Nearly all that we do is productive, which is creative — bringing something to pass that otherwise would not be there. We spend a great deal of our energy building and building, and as we do that we overcome our necessities automatically. And we have the inspiration, the exaltation and the exultation of being divine, of being godlike — of enjoying the fruit of our labors reflecting the beauty of our dreams.

Pessimists are disposed to say, "But how are we going to get people to respond to the inspirations of life? So many people are dead to it. So many people are not attracted by it. So many are even repelled. My own notion is that that is purely accidental and occasional and due to some unhappy experiences that have distorted the personality from its tendency towards life and inverted it — which causes suicides and causes people to punish themselves and destroy themselves in various manners and degrees — and that those things are not characteristic of mankind in any general sense. If it were true in a general sense, then the vast majority of people would die by suicide, the vast majority of people would be starving themselves instead of feeding themselves, the vast majority of people would be looking into darkness instead of turning their eyes towards the light — if that were at all generally true. And it is the over-all effect which has to prevail. The transitory and accidental can never have any extensive, especially any predominating influence."¹¹⁰⁹

There is nothing profounder than that the aesthetic motivation is the *only* creative motivation. Animals can be satisfied, but they can't be happy. Happiness results from creation. It flows from inspiration, which is the best word we have for an aesthetic reaction.⁸²³

Mr. Harmon: Oddly enough, if I may change the subject a bit, production is the central purpose and objective of both the communist world, as represented by Russia, and the capitalist, as represented by the United States. Both have the

same objective, namely more and more production of goods. The difference, of course, comes at the point of the best means of getting this maximum production. Now if production is the salvation for us all, and assuming that both of these great societies will achieve at least that aim of more and more production, would you say they are both on the road of salvation?

Not necessarily. Production is an agency, an intermediary between our ideals and our necessities. Through producing, we satisfy our necessities, and that liberates our spirits. The animal man is satisfied, or gratified and maintained, by material things and material activities. The human man is exalted and lifted into higher realms of being through those things that animals cannot dream, those things from which they are excluded. The human has a creative, a spiritual dominion — not the dominion of destroying, like the world conquerors who gained political dominion over the world at different times, but the dominion of building the dream into the world. So far as we practice that spiritual dominion, we are advancing our lives.

Ms. Manning: Mr. Heath, you had five manufacturing plants producing propellers during World War I. Were you *inspired* to design a propeller and go into this manufacturing activity? Or was it primarily because you had a wife and three children to support?

You can begin, as all such things I think must begin, with necessity. When you are born, you have an immediate necessity of breathing — and it shouldn't be overlooked.

(Laughter)

But the first thing I ever did with a propeller, I did just for the fun of it. I had no compulsion and no necessity to do it, and I had no expectation of any profit or reward from it. It was an interesting thing to do. So whenever my attention came to propeller design, it was an aesthetic interest I had. It was something that promised to have something intriguing about it, something that could give me a lift to find out about, to understand.

In nearly all that I did, I must say, compulsion was always there. There was always the prod of necessity, and I had to watch my step, as we all have to do. If we get below a certain economic level, we are going to be helpless and fall back and be creatures of our environment again. If we can keep ahead, though, economically, then we can become masters of our environment — so far as we dream. *Only so far as we dream.* If we spend our substance in riotous living like the prodigal son, or like the ancient potentates, who lived upon pelf and loot, politically, then we don't dream — and we don't create.

Ms. Manning: When you predicted in 1922 that commercial aviation would become a major industry, and it made front-page news, you must have been confident of this for some time since you already had machinery to make propellers in volume. Was it still inspiring to you then?

Building machinery was a hobby of mine. I took great risk in building a lot of machinery for the fun of it, hoping that it would turn out to be useful and I could get a profit out of it. And my hopes were realized. They might not have been. But I would have had some spiritual satisfaction in any case.

Your spiritual satisfaction, of course, is greater when you have material success. You realize you didn't dream in vain. It isn't for the sake of the dream only, great as the value of the dream itself is. It is the realization of the dream that gives you the sense that you are a creator, that you belong with God.

Mr. Udall: I'm a fan of science fiction and especially of Jules Verne, who a century ago imagined a lot of things that later became realities, like submarines, airplanes, neon lights, moving sidewalks, air-conditioning, skyscrapers. He had much the same picture as you have, of men being able to build their dreams into their environment. He said, "What one man can imagine, another man can do."

I'll make it even stronger than that. I'll say that men cannot dream that which they cannot do. The dream is the first putting out of energy towards its own fulfillment. This of course refers to race or folk dreams and not to those which are merely casual to the individual.

Mr. Quinton: Would you elaborate on what you said earlier about poetry being the mother of science? Are great scientists always poets?

A great scientist? He is greatest as a scientist who sees deeper and farther — deeper into the atom, farther into the galaxies and the nebulae — and who can objectify his dream. A great scientist builds an image in his mind as God built an image of the world and man. Like God, he can objectify his dream, bring it to pass, make it a real thing, something that can't perish, something with Platonic and Pauline reality.

It is almost a commonplace with those who write the history and biographies of scientists that the great scientist is a devoted man. What is he devoted to? It is the thing towards which he aspires, the understanding, the beauty that is hidden somewhere — way off perhaps. He is reaching out for it. He has aspirations, and he has inspiration. He is inspired by that towards which he aspires — which is beauty.

A scientist, a creative scientist, has to be a poet first. There is this difference: a poet, merely as such, is a man of the heart. He feels the great pulse of mankind. And mankind feels the unison of that throbbing, and they love his poetry. He intuits things. He sees things in imagination. He dreams of airplanes thousands of years before they happen. He is prophetic, like Shelley in "Queen Mab." He dreams of the greatness of man's civilization yet to come. He doesn't think that we have arrived anywhere yet, we are just on our way. The poet, under these intuitions of things, becomes a prophet.

The scientist has the same basic motivation, but he has a passion not only to feel, but a passion to *understand*. He has in his mind as a gift of God a certain rationality, like the rationality of God, and the rationality in God's chemical and physical works and all that enables us to describe them by mathematics. He feels a passion to exercise that *quantitative* understanding that discloses the symmetry and beauty of the whole thing. Under that emotion he becomes very diligent. He takes endless pains to make his way towards that understanding.

When he gets that understanding, it's an abstract thing, a scientist's understanding. Beethoven probably didn't have to understand his Ninth Symphony or how he did it, and if he did, he couldn't tell us how to do it. But when the scientist makes a great contribution to mankind, he gives them something abstract, something more enduring than physical things, and then

anybody can practice it. Thousands of people can practice it. But only one person could compose the Ninth Symphony.

When the thousands practice a scientific principle, they are not merely imitators. When they take that principle and put it into effect in a machine or a house or any technological creation, they are not copying one another, but are following the same basic technique, the rationale, of the field that it occupies. There again, the Spirit is manifesting itself in a great variety of forms.

So the artist, the poet, and the scientist, all three of them, are servants of mankind. Broadly speaking, the poet and other artists are serving with the heart and the kind of knowledge that is inborn in them — intuitive knowledge. The scientist is serving mankind not only with his heart, which prompted him in the beginning — the aesthetic motivation that made him become a scientist — but he is serving also with his mind, with abstract values that can be transmuted into practical and physical values in the material world.

It isn't that we need more truth than poetry. What we need is more synthesis between poetry and truth, between the objective and the subjective sides. There is no disharmony between poetry and truth; each is complementary of the other. But there is a temporal order, an order of succession. Poetry has to come before truth.⁶⁴⁰

Mr. Otero: That answers the question someone was raising a few days ago, as to whether Christ was a capitalist, a communist, or neither of those. I think he was neither. Nor was he a scientist. I like what you said at breakfast this morning, that he was a poet with a vision of the future.

He was an inspired poet — precursor of enlightened science, as all poetry is. He appealed to positive emotions — faith, hope, love. He was not a rationalist.¹⁹⁹⁵

M. Quinton: He was also an inspired teacher.

Yes. Christ said, "I am the way, the light, and the truth," and he was. His *teaching* was. He didn't mean his *body* or his *mind*; he meant what he *taught* to people. That's the way and the light and the truth. All we need to

do is to understand its practical application here and now, and know that we are already potentially in the kingdom and have made considerable progress towards its full realization.²⁰¹⁰

Mr. Quinton: Someone said a poet is a man with a great emotion under the control of a great intellect. I like that.

He's well balanced, then, between the two. I want to tell you that John Tyndall, to my mind, was one of the greatest literary artists England ever had. His greatness came at a time in the nineteenth century when science was the main thing in England and artistry and religion were highly formalized and conventionalized, so that his fame to this day is almost entirely that of a scientist. But like our Emerson, whose sun has not risen yet — we had only a foregleam, a false dawn, with Emerson — so with Tyndall. It is my conviction that his fame as a literary artist will one day supersede or transcend his fame as a creative scientist. He was called by some persons, in his own time, the poet of science.

The individual man is the creature and not the creator, not the master, of his environment. His inheritance of the earth and dominion over it awaits the coming of the collective man — of

a kingdom or rulership of heaven under a golden rule whose links bind men together in mutual service — in a quite objective, impersonal and universal love. As men emerge from barbarism, this high kingdom comes upon them slowly and silently, they know not how. They dream of it as afar but do not see it silently serving and growing in their midst.²⁸⁹⁶

The true means to a desired end, once revealed, needs no enforcement. It invites its own adoption and cannot be refused, for it fulfills the will. It is the how, not the what, that is spiritual and transcendent, creative. For in action, means determine ends. Ends are finite, have no abiding reality. Means, process, are abiding, eternal, spiritual, real. The new illumination will be as to the how.²⁶⁰

V

THE HIDDEN CHRIST IN THE ORGANIC COMMUNITY

Jesus Christ is far more than a body, far more than a man, far more than a person. Jesus Christ is a transcendent idea. He taught us not things, or persons, but *ways* — *one way*, the *way of life*. He taught us not to live, not to stay alive,

but a transcendent life, the life of the creative spirit. It is in that sense that I wish to speak about Christ, and not about the body — which some people say resurrected and some people say didn't. As to that, we can take it either way without impugning in the least the tremendous heritage that we have from the spirit of Christ.

Considering the time and age and part of the world, I think that nearly everything stated in the Scriptures is symbolical, and I think that the most effective way we can starve our spirits from enjoying it and living by it is to take it literally.

So what I am going to say about the hidden Christ in the organic community has to do with Christ as a spirit, as a mode — not a thing, not a substance, but a mode or manner of conducting ourselves. And in that respect, there are two ways and only two. As in mathematics we have *plus* and *minus* and it's all built on that — that's all there is to the foundation of it — so in life there are only two ways of life. One way is toward the advancement, the exaltation of life, and the other is toward the retrograde, the abuse, the diminution of life. There is no zero. Life is absolute, as is heat; there is no absolute zero of temperature. We can always move towards it, but we can never reach it.

The soul is everlasting, and mind is everlasting. Body is everlasting too, if you don't take account of how it's organized. The body is a particular form of organization, and what is organized in the body is the spirit that animates it — as the dream of the architect is manifested in the structure, in the cathedral that he builds. The dream of the engineer is manifested in the suspension bridge or whatever may be the product of his mind and heart. When I speak of the hidden Christ in the organic community, I mean to say that Christ is hidden, the spirit of Christ, the way that he laid down for us, the course that he commanded us to pursue if we would enter into a kingdom of heaven on this earth. I am having reference to *how* we *do* things.

Some have said that the greatest thing in the world is love. Yet, of all the four-letter words, even "love" may perhaps require some qualification. I have a three-letter word that I especially favor. That is the word "how." Whether it is "love," or "live," or "think," or "do," the key word, the qualitative word is "how" you live, or love, or do. I have sometimes said that if I ever got a chance to talk in the eye of a preacher, I from the pulpit and he in the pew, I might take as my text, "How Do You Do?" Not *what* do you do, but *how* do you do it. It is the strictly qualitative word.

Christ laid down a way of living that would lead men into the ever greater fullness of life and length of days. He made it perfectly simple. In his representative capacity he commanded; he didn't advise or suggest. He commanded that we do unto all others in the same manner we would have them do unto us. He in effect commanded that we practice free enterprise and the capitalist system, because when we look at free enterprise — how it works and not merely what it does and the material in it — we find that it works by the spiritual process of the communion of men's minds — as the lawyers call it, the "meeting" of minds — in voluntary contracts by means of which they love each other. Is that too strong a word? No, that isn't too strong; they *love* each other because they *serve* each other, whether they intend it or not. Effective love consists always in serving others.

There is a kind of "reality" current among our poets and novelists nowadays. Anything that really smells bad enough, they think is real. So they delve into and dwell upon all that sort of thing. But Plato had the idea that that is real that is the most enduring, the most everlasting. Saint Paul followed him in that. The real things are the things that can never pass away.

The most real thing among us today is the command of Jesus Christ that we practice not coercive, warlike, political or governmental relationships with one another, but that we practice the golden rule which he came to give to men as a way out of the dominion of the United Nations of his day under Caesar. If we fail to obey that command, that becomes a Christian sin, and the same good book tells us that the wage of sin is death.

The golden rule is not given in just one place or in one form alone. It is also put forth in the First and Great Commandment, which is to love God with all your heart. That means to serve God. It doesn't mean just a theoretical, "Yes Lord, Lord" — those who say, "Lord, Lord," but don't *do* it, you know what Christ thought of them! It means to serve God, to do the things that God wishes to be done, and then God, in loving us, does the things that we wish to be done.

What does God wish us to do? The Second Great Commandment is to love your neighbor. And that is exactly what we do in free enterprise. One man meets another and he wishes things to be done — for himself. Each does. But each, knowingly or unknowingly, finds out what the other wishes to be done and makes a promise, an agreement to do it. Each serves the other. Each is doing what he otherwise would be doing for himself. The relationship is reciprocal and mutual, and it's measured by an accountancy system that makes it rational. So it expresses not only the heart of God, but also the rational, the reasoning, the

measuring mind of God as well.

So we have it in two forms. There is the golden rule of doing unto all others as we would have others do unto us, and there is the Second Great Commandment that we love our neighbor as our self — which is to do unto others in the same way we would have others do for us. When we do that, then we have transformed our whole outlook on life, our whole way of getting a living.

The old way was to get a living willy-nilly, even if you had to cannibalize your neighbor as most living things other than regenerate men have been and are still doing in this world. The alternative way is to advance the interest and life of your neighbor while he advances your life, and in this way a double result occurs. Your neighbor can do many things for you that you can't do for yourself, and you can do much for him that he can't do for himself, especially if you practice specialization and all that sort of thing. So both parties, or all the parties in the contractual system, are elevating each other, lifting each other out of the limited necessities of an animal state of existence, which is a mere saving themselves from starvation or death and finally losing, as all the animals have been losing throughout all the millions of years recorded by paleontology.

The animals are all on the road to extinction except man. They consume whatever they find and, destroying it, move on to another place and destroy some more. But the regenerate man is not doing that. He has an imagination, as God had an imagination in Genesis, and with that imagination he is dreaming things that are beyond us for the moment but that will be behind us tomorrow.

The mills of the gods grind slowly, they say. Not only slowly, they grind exceedingly small. But more important, they grind unconsciously. We don't observe it. Those mills are grinding now. All over this broad land we are building self-sustaining communities. While these communities, such as hotels and shopping centers, have no government as we know it, each has its public services; the whole community is served by the proprietorship there. The proprietorship serves the community through a voluntary, contractual relationship with all with whom it deals, either as guests or as suppliers from the outside. The motivation for these public services is the profit motivation. And what does it profit a man except to practice the golden rule? It profits all parties. Because there is a profit there and a profit motivation, a motivation to create things, we are assured of the continuation and development of that kind of relationship.

The people who occupy these communities are [receiving services such as]

protection against violence, protection against fire, protection against theft, protection against the weather — and they are not being *taxed* to support these protective and other kinds of community services. Each is paying the value of whatever is supplied at the place that he occupies. He is paying all it's worth, because if he doesn't someone else will, yet he isn't charged more than it's worth, because if he is, why this tenant will leave and go somewhere else where he is charged properly and fairly. And if someone says to him that he can't leave one of these communities, which could be possible since we have the example of Alcatraz and other communities you can't leave, like public schoolhouses and things of that sort, then the community authority has an impoverished tenant — a tenant who isn't worth having. He can't pay much for being there! We can never advance ourselves by giving *dis*-services to people; that always hurts not only them, but us.

We are doing all these things without realizing it. I spoke to groups of businessmen in several cities across the country and told them about these communities such as shopping centers — thousands and thousands in the last decade — and hotels and motels, research centers, apartment communities and manufactured home communities, office parks and medical centers, and other kinds, many of them federating themselves for the common services that the whole chain would need. This is a rising tide of beauty. This is spiritual creativeness arising in our *public* affairs.

These men asked why we hadn't noticed this — why no one had noticed that we really are outgrowing bureaucracy. I told them that we are building underneath it — not on the sand, but on the sound foundation of Jesus Christ's law. There is where we are building the future, and we haven't noticed it. We notice death and decay easily, the animal part of us at any rate, but growth is normal and slow, unspectacular. It creeps on us unawares, as the kingdom of heaven is supposed to come on. We don't notice it for perhaps the same reason that we don't notice the part of the iceberg that holds up the part that we do notice. That is the hidden part, the unspectacular part.

So we are being held up today. We are being held up as the light of the world, inasmuch as Christ was the light of the world and we are practicing his light and sending out his light. How was Handel's oratorio? "Send out thy light, and thy Truth let it lead me?" We are sending out all over the world. Not all eyes are open. Our own are not sufficiently open. We don't realize it ourselves. The very persons who are organizing these vast communities and vast chains of them are doing it for what they think is an immediate profit for themselves and are not

thinking much about the service. But it so happens in the providence of God that we don't have to know we are doing good in order to do it.

Adam Smith said that when men are seeking their own best interest honestly and legitimately, they are guided by an invisible hand that sees that they are contributing to the welfare of all. This invisible hand is the hidden Christ in the organic society today. I say "organic" society, because "organic" means alive; we are a living society of people who are practicing a living doctrine, a living law of mutual service, of each serving others as they would wish to be served. That is loving them in the practical way.

Sentiment in our intimate affairs is beautiful; it is the zest of life. It is that which makes life worth living — all inspiration, which is sentiment, which is emotion, divine emotion. All these things are beautiful, but they are limited to the relationships of a few in intimate concord. They are limited to groups together; they don't reach out worldwide. But Christ has quantified that, as physicists would say. He has told us how to be beneficial to people to the ends of the earth, and they, practicing the same, are beneficial to us, and we all rise. I would like us to realize that whether we look at it individually and personally or understand it rationally with our minds, that either way, under the golden rule of Jesus Christ, we are going forward to victory not over persons, not over armies, soldiers, or politicians; we are going forward to a victory over death. We are going forward to the transcendent life. And the basis of that is that transcendent relationship of love taking the objective form, which enables us to extend it over the whole world through the interchange of services of all men.

So we live and move and have our being today by reason of the living Christ working hidden, obscurely. Why is it obscure? Isn't it light? Isn't he the light of the world? Yes, but we have to have eyes. Time was when men or their predecessors didn't have very much if any sight, probably, but their sight kept growing and developing. So our eyes have got to go on developing — our eyes of *the mind*.

I said something to a group of school children one time about "your inside eyes." "You didn't know you had inside eyes? Well," I said, "take a good look at me and now shut your eyes. How many of you can see me now with your eyes shut? That's your inside eyes."

What makes science so magnificent today? Men understood some of the arts and crafts that they did three or four hundred years ago very well — in a limited way. Fine brewing and dyeing and tanning, various arts like that were

carried on empirically. But today we know how it's done. The processes of nature have been revealed to the minds of men.

The processes of nature represent the mind of God. When we study nature we are studying God, or at least the works of God, and when we understand the works of God, we understand the mind of God. A scientist who discovers the operation of God in his chemical or biological or physical works partakes of the mind of God, and he turns around and practices the mind of God. Knowing the divine method of forming molecules or crystals or what not, he turns and, using the mind of God in him, directs the formation of molecules and crystals. That's how it has come about that we have synthetic chemistry today.

It's the same through the whole realm of life. We're doing the will of God to a considerable extent, but we all know we are not doing enough of it. We are not loving enough emotionally, ideally, and practically — with the hand as well as with the heart. We are blundering into it the way we blundered into tanning and dyeing and brewing years ago, and some of it we are doing very well in a limited way.

We are almost as little conscious of the processes, the functions, of our society as ancient man was of the physiology of his body.¹⁸² But think of the glory when we understand our social and economic relationships as science understands the chemical and biological things today. All of the facts in the world can't be utilized until we learn how they are related to one another — the significance of the knowledge. Factual knowledge is not power. Understanding is power. That is why the good book tells us, with all thy getting, get not merely knowledge, but understanding. Think what we will be doing with it then, when we understand the organization of units like you and me forming molecules like families, or business corporations, or churches, or any kind of organizations, all reciprocal and voluntary. (I didn't say governments!) When we understand that, then look what we will be able to do with it. Men will become not only the creatures of God; they will become co-creators with Him. Then they will be singing the song of God in unison with Him. And so our hearts all yearn for Christ, for the beauty that he discovered in the world and discovered to us.

Questions

Mr. O'Connell: Mr. Heath, what is your understanding of the Christian Articles of Faith?

The Articles of Faith? It's a fine thing to get it down in black and white exactly what the theologians believe and want everybody to believe. And I believe it, if you let me take it in my own sense, my own interpretation. I see no reason why everybody shouldn't believe it if he interprets it for himself. The only thing I object to is having other people interpret things for me.

The Christian Creed embodies this: the deity of Jesus Christ, His virgin birth, His blood atonement, His bodily resurrection, His personal ascension back to the Father, and His coming again. I've no quarrel with any of this, and I don't see any reason why anybody should find fault with it, if they have a sufficiently high regard for the precept of Christ and pay some attention to that as well. For Christ gave us an important message, an absolutely divine, spiritual precept. He gave us a precept the following of which will give us abundant and eventually the eternal life.

If some think Jesus went up to heaven in his flesh and blood, that doesn't make me think any more or less of his doctrine. His personal ascension back to the Father and His coming again is perfectly good poetry to me, and if you let me interpret it, in my own way, then it makes good sense. I would take it like this: The actual deity of Jesus Christ consisted in His spirituality, that He intuited the spiritual power that men have through associating with one another under the golden rule. It takes a spiritual quality for a man to perceive that, to have it intuitively as a poet gets his intuitions — and as He got it, doubtless, because He never undertook to explain it in any logical or rational fashion.

I've no objection to His virgin birth; He was born somehow, maybe she was a virgin; I'm not competent to say. And insofar as the immaculate conception signifies something like freedom from contamination, from mire and mud and that sort of thing, I should think it likely that a man of His character would have been born not out of the gutter but rather out of a more exalted relationship.

His blood atonement? Had He not died on the cross, it is highly

improbable that His memory would have lasted at all. His teaching would probably have gone largely into discard or into what was considered secular teaching. But his dying on the cross emphasized it. It appealed to people's emotions, people's feelings and sympathies, and it fitted in with the old tradition of the Jews, that they were going to have a Messiah who would come and rule over them after many vicissitudes. So his blood atonement is a good symbol of how he took away the sins of the world, because through His life and death He showed men how they can live sinlessly, that is to say, how they can walk in the way of life instead of the way of death.

As for His bodily resurrection, I don't feel any confidence that actually his body levitated and went up contrary to the force of gravity. But I have no doubt that his followers believed it themselves, and that they told honestly when they reported that the heavens opened up and He rose in His glory — because they supplied that with their imaginations and *believed it*, just as Saint Paul believed that the heavens opened and the voice of Christ spoke to him out of the sky.

Jesus' personal ascension back to the Father might be placed in the same category as His bodily resurrection. It is a figure of speech meaning that He was particularized in this life as we are, and went back to the Universal whence He came. He came out of a universal, spiritual nature of the cosmos and returned to it — and He and his spirit will be embodied again in other men. Christ in respect to His doctrine will be born again and rise again. Being God's immortal truth, it can't be killed; it will be sure to rise again. It's all fine poetry.

I like this statement of exactly what the theologians believe. I can say that I have no quarrel with it. But Christ had another jewel in His crown, another gem in His diadem, which is that He taught men how to *act*, not just what to think and what to believe. He offered them something besides the magic of a miraculous faith that was going to do wonders for them. Not denying that this faith could perform miracles, not gainsaying any of that — but He gave something more practical that *all* men can understand easily and don't have to doubt. Nobody can question it. It only needs to be stated, that when men treat other men as they would have other men treat them, and this process is general, then men will live better and longer lives. And if they keep on doing that way, they will enter into a new kind of relationship which makes them citizens of a new kind of kingdom, different from the kingdom of this world, a spiritual world, and spiritual because in

that kind of world they will be able to dream dreams, and see visions, and then create the thing which they dream.⁴³⁸

Mr. Johnson: If each of us should be free to interpret the good book according to our own lights, would you say then that the only fault in the “social action” people, the socialists, interpreting Jesus’ precepts to their own ends is that they want to use the element of force?

Christ’s precepts do not lend themselves to interpretation as precepts of force. That is not founded in the Gospels.⁴³⁸

Mr. O’Connell: Would you tell us your interpretation of the Body of Christ which we celebrate in the Eucharist?

My vision is that the Communion service is a beautiful ritual symbolizing that when we practice the spirit of Christ, the teachings of Christ, the works of Christ, we are then partaking of his reality. In everyday thought and experience, we think of the table as real, and so on, and so it helps us, at least some of us, to realize the spirit of Christ by having his body symbolized in bread and wine and representing not the transitory Christ but the everlasting Christ. We refresh our spirits by going through that symbolism.

Mr. Quinton: If men seek enlightenment and further spiritual attainment by worshipping the Body of Christ, why does the Body of Christ take a secondary role in the institutions of the Christian Church?

I would suggest that the reason why men aspire to a devotion to the spirit of Christ rather than to his body may be the same reason that keeps us from loving the bodies of one another. We don’t love one another’s bodies very much. The more primitive we are, to be sure we do, but as we become more exalted, we become more Platonic in our loves. We become more conceptual and more imaginative, and more artistic, more aesthetic. That is where we are employing our *human* nature, which is our spiritual, our creative nature.

Don't let us decry the body, or cry the body down. The body is the product of the spirit, and it is the instrument of the spirit, as a violin is the product of men and it becomes the instrument of their own artistic expression.

In a certain sense, in the causal order of things — in the order of their coming into being — the body comes first. In this life, at any rate. But the body doesn't take control. If it did, it would be my body and not my mind that drove the automobile or wielded the brush or played the violin. It is the mind back of the body that does all these great and wonderful, these truly human and thereby creative and thereby spiritual things.

Mr. Quinton: In other words, then, your body is merely a tool for the carrying out of man's eventual place in life, or destiny?

A beloved and respected tool, the edge of which should not be dulled.

Mr. Udall: You speak often of a *rational* understanding of things. As you use the word, must *rational* thinking always have to do with numbers and measurement, numerical expression — with quantitative analysis?

It seems to me that all rationality must rest on the ratios between quantities numerically expressed, hence dependent upon integral units of organization, whatever be the level of investigation. This rational understanding and the beauty it involves surely is the key to the creative power of the human spirit.¹⁵⁶⁹ We discover through God's creation how His mind works — that it is rational — and to the degree that we develop the like understanding in our minds we find ourselves at-one with God and potential creators the same as He.

Mr. Bronson: Several times, you have seemed to be saying that the highest Christian service is making money. Could you clarify that for me?

It needs clarifying, according to what you mean by "highest." The most important thing in life, in one way, is that which is necessary to everything that follows. Without the foundation, your house has no importance because you have no house. It won't stand. And so in the genetic order, the order of coming into being, the creative order of things, the evolutionary or the developmental order of things, the most important things are the things closest to the earth, or the foundation.

But men have another scale of value. We have an aesthetic scale of value. What thing is most enjoyable about your house, let us say? Is it the foundation? What is most enjoyable to our spirits, to our consciousness, are those things that are most remote from that which is most essential at the bottom. But I said "most essential" at the bottom. Don't forget that. **Let us not be too scornful of the foundations of things.**³⁶⁴

So let us modify this, or clarify it, by saying that making money is receiving the voluntary gifts of others for serving them. That's exactly what making money is. I didn't say getting somebody's money or seizing money; I said *making* money. When you make money, that money measures what good you have done for other people in their estimation, or else they wouldn't give it to you. Not your estimation of what is good for them.

So at the base of things, the physical basis of things, nothing is so important as serving your fellow men well, which means they will give you a lot for it, which means that the most important thing at the foundation of our civilization is making money. Now when we've made the money, what's most important — not as a matter of necessity but as a matter of the freedom of the spirit? The joy of the spiritual life, the life of the artist, the poet and the astronomer, and the sportsman, the mountain climber and all those things. Now we are free to do those things we don't *have* to do, and the spirit manifests itself not in mere physical forms but in spiritual achievements — music, poetry, philosophy, and art, and all such things.

That's the clarification of the statement that the highest Christian service is to make money. Most essential at the bottom, but less enjoyed at the top. It's like two thermometers. One measures how much heat you have as it goes up. The more heat you have, the higher it goes. Another thermometer might measure how much you enjoy it, and it might work the other way. We don't enjoy *having* to do things. We put up with that in order to fulfill our mission as spiritual beings. We don't enjoy the physical world; we use it. We bend it to our will, as God used

the dust of the earth to make men.

Mr. Palmer: Speaking about what is the most important thing after you make money, what I should like to know is, how do you keep it?

You don't bury it in the ground, as the unfaithful servant did. The slothful servant, I should say.

Mr. Montgomery: There are people, like Colonel Neville here, who would have us believe that a type of one-worldism is the way to reach Utopia — if there be a Utopia. Would you comment on one-worldism?

They are fundamentally right. We want a type of one-worldism. We want the type as set by Jesus Christ — which we are practicing in the Western world largely. We don't want the type set by Caesar, Alexander, and Napoleon.

We want a type of one-worldism, yes — the world that Christ again and again calls the kingdom of heaven on the earth. Always on the earth, mind you, not in the sky. I'm not saying but what we can have the kingdom of heaven also in the sky, if we are patient and wait. But here and now we want that one-worldism, and we are getting it silently, hardly consciously, through those activities that give us a greater hold on life and give us more leisure for creation.

In America, we are building a one-worldism without understanding it. We are building *two* kinds; we are building a great war machine, which in the recent past has had the power, no doubt, of dominating the world and reducing all the rest of the world to subjection under it. Along with that, we also have the power of creating a new world — and we are engaged in doing it. But that isn't spectacular; that's growth. We don't notice the silent workings of the Spirit in things, the power of life, the vital powers of growth.

We have a field of activity of special promise and relevance to the building of a new world. It is a necessitous field. It is the field of our common services. We have to have common services of defense and protection, fire protection, physical protection, and ways and means of communication and that sort of thing that we can't each have separately from one another. Into this field we are now moving with our golden-rule, free-enterprise technology. Many of the exponents of free enterprise don't know it, but we are building free communities, self-sustaining

communities that don't call upon any political organization, anybody in the city hall, or the state capitol, or in the central power.

These free communities are sustaining themselves. In them we are outgrowing government, we are outgrowing bureaucracy, and we are doing it by the prescription of Jesus Christ; for the way to enter this kingdom of heaven is to do to all others in the same manner you would have others do unto you. Do it by the process of contract, and not by coercion — by the meeting of people's minds, and not by forcing one another.

Mr. Otero: You and I have had many discussions. In one of these, you made the statement that Christianity would survive. But what do you think will take place to stop communism and atheism? Where are the signs of that today for us to look for?

Christ taught us to resist not evil, but to overcome evil by doing good. So when he was tempted by Satan to become the king of the world, to become the Caesar of all things and take the place of Augustus, he didn't turn around and fight Satan. He told him where to go!

Now that's the difference. The church militant goes on the theory that they can destroy evil as an engineer might start out to destroy darkness. The only way an engineer can destroy darkness is by lighting a candle or something equivalent to that, and then the darkness is gone. Darkness is a negative thing, and evil is a negative thing. It's a *not doing* something that means life, achievement and glory to man.

When we do things that put our feet in the paths of life and light and glory, then we can't be using that energy to undo or destroy anything. So far as we have the freedom to do it — the physical freedom — so long as we are permitted to raise crops, so long as we are permitted to create values in the marketplace, so long as we are permitted to do the things that Christ commanded us to do — to do unto all others in the same manner we would have them do unto us — so far as we practice this freedom creatively, which is spiritually, so far do we have all things — *all* things — added unto us.

If he must, an animal caught in a corner, even a rabbit, will fight. And so far as we are cornered by the powers of the world, let us fight. But so far as we

are not being cornered, do not let us betray God by using our divine powers to fight something unless it is absolutely necessary to fight in order to survive. If we can survive without fighting, then don't let us waste any energy fighting about it, or opposing, resisting evil.

Let us put our energy forward in the manner commanded by God and thereby become like God, become self-realizing and infinite in all of our human powers and spiritual powers — as we *can* become by living in that world of the creative imagination, not bending the knee to Caesar and not trying to do the work of Caesar, and not getting in the armies or in the army opposed to Caesar unless Caesar's armies are bearing down upon us. If Caesar's armies are bearing down upon us, then we must prefer life above death, even if we have to fight for it.

There is no place to fight except for survival. Fight then, and fight with a right good will. But when we have survival, then don't let us betray God. Let us act in the Godly manner, as God commands, and receive the vast spiritual rewards that are awaiting us for it.

Mr. Xavier: This is a genuinely radical departure from what we have grown up believing, in the Church, but I don't find any fundamental inconsistency with established doctrine.

The religion of the New Testament had to do primarily (though not necessarily exclusively) with the objective life of this world. Its Founder dwelt among men in the living present, giving inspiration and counsel for the life of this world. He was not a cloistered metaphysician, withdrawn to his ivory tower or cell, or desert cave, but a man of this world and of this life in all its beauty and potentiality. He did indeed for a short time betake him to the wilderness, but He found no inspiration there. All his lessons were drawn from and illustrated in the common, everyday doings of men among men. He repudiated worldly power and extolled only and always the golden rule of mutual service without servitude as the divine alternative to the iron rule of "worldly" power, whether imperial and worldwide in Rome or local in the Sanhedrin.⁷¹⁰

This application of Christ's golden rule principle in no wise takes the place of the customary beliefs about the future world, but it does give the Christian philosophy credit for being valid and redemptive in the affairs of this world as well. Christ's message was for all humanity in every world —

not only future worlds, but in our world of today.

He brought the message for today, yet for ages most Christians thought, so far as blessings and rewards are concerned, that it was only for tomorrow and for other days to come.¹⁵⁹⁶ His formula of regeneration in this world was taken over by men with instinct for power. Pauline metaphysics for another world was the first departure. The Church soon took on the garments of the Empire, in alliance with the powers of the world that its Founder repudiated, and taught the life of the spirit for a future world while grasping the powers of government in the world of living men.⁷¹⁰

President Davis: Mr. Heath, our technician tells us that our tape runs out in about ten more minutes.

Better taper off, then.

(Laughter)

Mr. Otero: Why is it that communism seems to have so much more charisma, such greater appeal to people than capitalism?

Communism has a false but definitive philosophy. Likewise, a false religion with glowing promises of Utopian freedom under political change. Capitalism, until of late, has been relatively inarticulate. It practices the golden rule of each serving others as he would be served, yet has little conscious knowledge of the sound philosophy and vital religion that it constantly puts into practical effect. The object of my own contribution, set out in my volume, *Citadel, Market and Altar*, has been to discover the scientific basis on which it rests, the social technology under which it operates, and the transcendent Utopian goal to which, of its own nature and in freedom, it leads.¹⁶¹⁸

I think we do not often enough avail ourselves of the strength and beauty of the religious approach to the philosophy of freedom.¹³⁴⁹ It offers a foundation for libertarian support of free-enterprise capitalism and all that it implies. It speaks especially to those who have long felt that the libertarian movement was handicapped for want of emotional fire and enthusiasm as well as for want of a transcendent ideal.¹⁶²⁴

Mr. Palmer: I didn't have an opportunity to be present at the other meetings, but I have a question. I have taken the attitude that if people decide to make money it becomes the golden calf that they worship, and you have to temper this thing with a little bit of justice. I think in our modern world, there are too many times in hard-headed business where we as salesmen, as representatives of management, as representatives of labor, let greed overtake us and make a compromise with our own integrity in order to enhance our financial position. So I would disagree with the statement as I understood it, that making money is a Christian-like attitude. It can get to be a whip that will beat you to death.

Mr. Palmer might disagree with me, but I do not disagree with him. I am wholly in accord with his point of view, while I am observing, however, that he is speaking about getting money without making it, and that does degrade men. That does give men overweening ambitions and all that. It is the ill-gotten gains that corrupt men. The gain, the wealth, that men make through obeying God does not degrade them; it elevates them.

We forget Plato's maxim, "He shall be as a god to me who can rightly define and divide." Let us define making money — *making* money, and not getting somebody else's money — and then let us in our lives divide the making of money, which is Godly and spiritual, from the getting of somebody else's money, which is Satanic and leads to death rather than to life.

Mr. Randolph: How you make this money is twice as important as how much you make.

I should say. The qualitative is always spiritual; the quantitative can be merely animal, degrading.

The spiritual world is the world of *how*. Not the abundance of material things is spiritual, but *how* we get them is. Getting them by force or fear is one thing. Getting them by freedom in exchange, by the process of contract

is another. The one is disintegrative, unspiritual; the other integrative, spiritual — tending towards immortal life.⁷⁵

Mr. Johnson: These talks have expanded my thinking about the Christian gospel, especially how the golden rule, as you so well interpret it, brings all mankind into the circle, and harmonizes the capitalist system with Christ's message. I would never have imagined such an integration.

The whole modern system of free enterprise is nothing but the development of the golden-rule relationship among men. Only a few are conscious that this rule is the sole ethic in all contractual relationships.³⁷⁸

A great new age surely will dawn when it comes to be better recognized that religion, in its outward and practical aspects, is social even more than it is individual and that the creative spirit manifests itself not alone in religious behavior consciously as such, but in all the creative, harmonious and non-political processes among men — that freedom is the touchstone, and that free enterprise, impersonal and thereby universal, is our widest present manifestation of the divine.

My own most special interest is in discovering to as many as I can the imminent present potentials of that divine manifestation in our voluntary, non-political and supposedly secular affairs — that kingdom of heaven that is in our midst and the *conscious* practice and joyous extension of which is, both socially and individually, to be born again.¹⁶⁷⁷

Mr. Palmer: I have certainly enjoyed this, and I would like to have been here at the other sessions. I've learned a great deal.

We love to be appreciated. I feel embarrassed when people direct compliments my way, but I don't feel embarrassed when anyone sees the beauty, the loveliness, the wonder of our divine capacities and the fruits of our divine labors. I love people to see those things and to love them, to appreciate them and enjoy them, and to communicate them to others. As we do that, I think that we radiate not by a light that belongs to us particularly as individuals, but by a universal kind of light that reflects from some more brilliantly, perhaps, than it

does from others. But it is not our personal selves; I would never want anyone to celebrate my bodily life or anything like that. Animals have that. But if there is anything in my words that inspires, that lifts the spirit above the limitations of the animal and the low human level of life, that makes men feel their divinity and inspires them to practice their divinity, let us love and worship those things.

President John Davis closed the question period following this last of the talks by asking Mr. Heath to recite his version of the Lord's Prayer composed in words of one syllable. Mr. Heath replied:

I love the old Anglo-Saxon words, and my preference is for especially short ones. Four-letter words are all right in their way, but there is a three-letter word that beats all of them, even "love" and "live." If you turn that last one backwards, you notice what it means: *evil*. But there is a three-letter word, and that is the *how* of things — the *how* we do things. It's the qualitative word. That's my favorite.

So this version of the Lord's Prayer is in words of one syllable only. I should tell you the circumstances of the Lord's Prayer. If you read the *New Testament*, you will find that Christ gave a very severe lecture that when you pray, you must go into your bedroom and shut the door; under no circumstances must you pray in public. It was absolutely forbidden, as strongly as anything that is in the New Testament. Then he said, and when you go into your bedroom and shut the door, pray after this manner. He gave them a pattern, like a sample ballot — the manner in which they should pray. There's your *how* again: Pray *after this manner*.

Now when he did this, he obviously wasn't praying, after he'd been commanding that nobody do it in public. He was just giving them a guide as to how they should do it when they went into their secret place to pray. So "Prayer" has been changed to "Plea" to make it a single-syllable word. This is a "Plea" to the Lord.

Plea to the Lord

OUR SIRE, who in the skies doth dwell,
Thy name in love and awe be held.
May Thy rule come, Thy will be done,
In earth and sky Thy rule be one.
Give us our need of bread each day,
And as we take not all we may
From those who in our debt shall be,
So be Thou mild when we owe Thee.
In ways that tempt let us not go
But save us from all harm and woe.
For Thine it is to rule, and reign,
And have all might, all praise, all fame
For now and for all time to be.
And so, Lord, do we pray to Thee.

***Only God and the God that is in Man
can create.²⁹⁷³ Man is the only dust
that can take on the Divine
prerogative.²¹⁰***

ESSAYS

Christ as Poet

Creature to Creator

The Mission of the Church

The Psychological Preeminence of Man

The *Ways* of God

When the Golden Rule Prevails

The Mystical Body of Christ

Jesus' Earthly Vision: A Historical Review

The Practice of Christian Freedom

Poetry is the nebulous morning mist of the human psyche, tremulous with promise beyond creaturehood unto the attainment of creative, that is, spiritual, capacity and power. She is the pregnant, wide-eyed and wondering mother of the sciences. Their abstract generalizations afford the rationale under which objective technologies invest with concrete substance the desires and dreams of men for ever more abundant life. And the voluntary interfunctioning of men in reciprocal exchange, free enterprise, is the rational (measured) and spiritual (creative) technology wherein they advance lifeward into riches and ever lengthening days.³⁷⁷

Christ as Poet³

Christ can be looked upon in a different light than he is usually presented to us. He can be viewed as a poet — a poet with a vision of the future for mankind on

³Spencer Heath Archive Item 373. Random taping by Spencer MacCallum from conversation with Heath. April 29, 1956.

this earth. He has been referred to variously as a poet, but not in the specific sense of a heart full of sympathy and love and a mind with a vision of future life on this earth — a poet like Shelley, for example, who developed his grand vision of the future in his long poem, "Queen Mab."

Shakespeare is commonly regarded as the supreme poet, and he was supreme, in his own way. With unmatched powers of imagery and beauty of expression, he was the supreme expositor and illustrator, and reflector, of human nature and of human life as he knew it in his day. But from beginning to end, there is in Shakespeare no great suggestion that human life in his day was essentially any different from what it had been in the beginning. Life was more a matter of being than of becoming, and for all he told us, the life of man in this world would remain always as he so completely and so beautifully mirrored it.

Jesus Christ was a poet of the opposite extreme. He saw life not merely in being, but — and more significantly — in becoming. He saw not only the depths of darkness in men's hearts and minds, but more vividly the power and glory that was potential in their lives. He was no scientist, no rationalist, but his intuitive powers were little if any less than divine. Beauty was his watchword and the inspiration of the Holy Spirit his guiding star. He sensed and felt, and with an intuition deeper than rationality he knew and described in general terms, supported by beautiful imagery, the glory that of a certainty was in the future of a reborn and thereby redeemed mankind. He knew peradventure of a doubt, and declared, that his word could never pass away.

What was this rebirth out of "the world" and into the kingdom of heaven where all men would be as brothers?

On the metaphysical side, this meant that men's personal natures would be personally purged and redeemed through change of heart and outlook upon God and man, and that the immortal soul would become assured a future metaphysical glory beyond this world and through all worlds. This was the secret of his great personal power, his filling human nature with a sense of its own spiritual potentialities, its own dignity and divinity, its own kinship with God.

But this was not all. Christ came into this world to redeem it, to proclaim a heavenly kingdom potential in the hearts and minds of men despite the ravages of the dominant and destructive powers.

His first temptation was worldly power, and this he repudiated with scorn of the tempter. Throughout the Gospels he refers to the political powers, whether

of Senate or Sanhedrin — the tax-taking and war-making powers — as the powers and kingdoms of "the world." The kingdom that he envisioned was not of this world in the sense of worldly power, but in the sense of *creative* power — which he knew would eventually prevail above and beyond the destructive powers of "the world." He knew the key to that kingdom, a key that was then and always in the midst of men, calling them to repentance and a change of ways and making all men as brothers, of whatever race or creed or clime.

The simple key to the kingdom we call the *golden rule*, as opposed to the *iron* rule of the political powers dominant in the world. Christ did not forbid evil. He was not a prohibitor. He was a commander of the spirit. He commanded that men should enter into the free contractual relationship in which alone could all men far and wide do unto others in the same manner — that is, non-politically — as they would have others do unto them.

His divine intuition included a sensing of property as the instrument of equality through the contractual relationship — that only through the administration of property, and especially large property, could any man become the servant of many or of all. He laid the groundwork for a conception of the administration of property as the instrument and subject matter of free contract, and thus for the *golden rule* unto the salvation — and not the salvation alone but the exaltation — of mankind.

These things he could not describe in detail. Had he done so, his hearers could not have comprehended him. Nor is it easy for them today. He could only tell it in the poetic imagery of his parables, in almost every one of which there is a man of property as the head and central figure. Instances could be multiplied: the owner of the vineyard, the master of the sheepfold, the householder who entrusted property to his servants.

All of these were, in his imagery, heralds of the coming kingdom in which men would be free from the dominance of the powers of "the world," a condition in which there would be only one kind of equality: freedom — the equality of equal jurisdiction over one's person and over one's property, justly gained. In this freedom through the contractual process, men would become vastly unequal in their possessions, yet the greatest in the kingdom would be those who were in fact, though not in pretense, the servants of all.

This is the redeeming character of the golden rule, the way out from injustice, tyranny, taxation and war into the heavenly kingdom promised and potential in the divine nature of man from the foundation of the world.

To Jesus, God was the father, and not the stepfather of man; he was no respecter of persons except they were *doers* of the Word. Nor did God discriminate between the life of man in this world and the life of man in worlds to come. He was as much the creator of this world as of any other. And as visioned by the prophets of old, His commands were simple. Yet simplest of all was His command through Jesus Christ that we love one another through *servicing* one another, a love that could be enduring — and thus real — only through being equal and reciprocal.

Other religions have taught against sin. They have been prohibitive. They have taught men how to avoid punishment, how to stave off the wages of sin which is death. But the dreamer, the poet, the prophet, Jesus Christ, saw that the spiritual power of men consists in the good that they do, and not the evil that they shun. He therefore proclaimed the greatest law of all time, that we love one another through *servicing* one another and thereby enter into our spiritual, our creative, our divine estate, that we may have life, and life more abundantly in all its implications, including ever-lengthening days.

The Mission of the Church⁴

To establish a *religion* is impossible; it is only possible to establish a *church*. Religion is an element that exists in nature.

⁴ *Spencer Heath Archive*, Item 3015. Random taping by Spencer MacCallum from conversation with Heath while driving from Elkridge, Maryland to Sewanee, Tennessee January 1954

Christ didn't establish a church, but he practiced a religion. What he did above all else was to inspire people. There never was a church with this function solely in view, of inspiring people.

Historically speaking, to establish a church has been to formulate a body of belief or tradition different from others and claiming to be only or absolute or most inclusive, and then to obtain membership to support a formal clergy, their qualifications conforming to accepted doctrine and perhaps ritual practices, with or without any inspirational element or any element of religion — which is the same.

Religion was planted in man's nature when the divine Breath was breathed into his material body. All of those things in nature or human nature that lift men out of themselves, the things men call beauty, constitute the divine element or aspect in the cosmos. In the degree that men are receptive to this inspirational influence, they are redeemed from their merely animal and necessitous condition into creative power and joy. They become co-workers with the Divine by becoming co-creators.

Salvation is for the unregenerate man — salvation out of his animal nature into his divine nature. Morality likewise belongs to the unregenerate world. So far as men open their consciousness to the persuasions of beauty they are inspired and thereby divine. They need not even to be admonished as to their belief or their behavior, much less be governed or ruled.

The one and only mission of the church is not to save men even from themselves, not to prescribe their beliefs or their behavior, but only and always to inspire them. When the church fulfills this mission it will be the home of freedom for men, for the inspired man is always the free man — the only man who can create a free civilization.

When the church becomes the source and home of inspiration, and thereby the institution of freedom among men, it will draw to it all those activities of men and women that flow from their spontaneous natures and desires and cause them to seek beauty in the heavens and in the earth and in the living things, plant and animal life, including themselves. In this great institution the sciences, born there, will flourish to a never-ending maturity. The aesthetic arts, sponsored and cherished by the church, will flower into such beauty and grandeur as the imagination cannot now conceive.

The church is the ultimate home of every expression of the free spirit of

man: the arts and sciences and the recreations with which the human body and spirit are refreshed. It will be the crown and summit of civilization, which has its basis in the physical keeping of the peace, and its sustenance and nourishment in the reciprocal relations of economic men practicing the golden rule of service by contract and exchange, each serving all and all in turn serving and thereby loving each.

No church embodying the inspiration of the Holy Spirit will ever be set up, but it will grow. As men come more and more under the inspiration of beauty they will be drawn more and more to one another, and so far as they practice the spontaneities of the intellect and of the intuition in the sciences and in the arts, they will become extremely reciprocal one with another. This body of inspired persons, building an ever new and renewing world around themselves, and within themselves, will constitute the living body of the church.

Creature to Creator

It is a premise of Christian doctrine that all men fundamentally and potentially are of equal worth; that in his creation out of the dark and void man was specially endowed with the spiritual power to continue the creation and thereby take dominion over the natural world. The Creation was the first technology in which man was concerned. In it the word (logos) was made flesh; a part and chapter of that endless cosmic creation in which the infinite Creator manifests forever His transcendent dreams. Man, in all this, was unique. Part of the

creation he was, rude and crude in his genesis, but no *mere* creature was he. In the image of his maker, he took also the image of His mind, the gift of endless dreams. And with this gift, implicit in it and long hidden, was the germ, the seed of a mighty power — the power not only to share in the divine conceptions but also to put them into effect. Deep in the crude nature of man was hidden the creative power, the spiritual power, when realized and developed, to take up the drama of Genesis and as God's delegate and continue the creation of the world.

Such was the gift, not only to inherit the earth — all of God's other work — but the promise and the potency to build into it "the music and the dream," "to mold it ever near to the heart's desire." Such was the transcendent power implicit even in the crude creation of man. But the cosmic creation moves on and with it man, unconscious, for the most part, of its unimpeachable ways. In his primitive nature his desires are crude and but poorly realized. He knows no goal but to exist. Empirical technologies raise his power to utilize environment. Folkways tend to make life more secure and men begin to dream. A few sense beauty in the order of nature and seek not merely to use but to understand. A time comes when physical knowledge is grasped and marvels are wrought. Greater marvels await the like understanding of the large relationships among men.

It has been the task of man to develop use of his high endowments and thus emerge from the state of creature to his destined high estate as participant in the cosmic creation. But to be *creators* men must be free. Necessity spurs them to actions that sustain and preserve life but never to advance it. Under pressure of danger or necessity only the animal faculties are aroused. The whole effort is to escape or attack, never to create. Only as men rise above necessity, up from slavery to circumstance or to fellow men, do they find acceptable alternatives of action none of which they need escape or beat down. Only where there is choice without necessity or compulsion is there any free choice. Quality, value and beauty spring from selection; they are highest where the field is wide and rich. Under freedom alone can they be chosen; under freedom alone can there be creation, whether it be mediately human or directly divine

Thus for men to act divinely — creatively — it was essential that they be free, that they have increasing alternatives without compulsion. So men were given freedom to choose, free will in all things not compulsory or necessitous, that they might become creators in the degree that their compulsions diminished and their options enlarged.

When man descended from his infinite perfection in the divine mind into

his aboriginal state, when the perfect dream of him the word (logos), became flesh he took on the limitations, the necessities and compulsions of other created forms; but his dawning gift of dream gave him, however minutely, the power to create as well as to destroy and with it some measure of freedom from the compulsions and necessities of merely animal existence. Thus was the dual nature of the primitive man. The clay in him, the animal nature, could only deplete and destroy, but the divine in him, the free dream, could in its limited way create. The choice was his own. He could yield to the animal urge and mightily destroy and consume, or express in measure his divine prerogative to create and conserve. Such is the conflict between the animal and the spiritual, the unregenerate and the regenerated man. Yet by the compelling dominance of the spiritual the conflict is self-resolving for the way of destruction leads ever towards extinction while the way of creation, the spiritual process, gives abundance and ever lengthening days towards immortal life.

The unregenerate man today is he who is not aware of his creative divinity, his genetic unity with his Origin nor of his divine potentialities, one whose choice of alternatives tends towards destruction and thus towards extinction. The spiritual man is he who moves under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit in the continuing creation of the world. Exalted in his conscious unity with the divine, his works and ways tend ever life-ward. He dwells in ecstasies. This is his individual salvation.⁴²⁴

The Psychological Preeminence of Man⁵

It is probable that man alone has the gift of objectivity, the capacity for detachment, the power of viewing objects and events in terms of their own constant structures and relations. All sentient beings have feelings, sensations, response to immediate stimuli, but most of them lack memory and imagination and therefore mental grasp, conception or understanding. Reflex actions alone,

⁵ *Spencer Heath Archive*, Item 471. May 15, 1949.

both inherited and conditioned, seem to constitute their principal if not their entire psychic process.

But beyond all these motor or emotional reactions, man possesses in addition a picturing faculty. His mind reflects; it mirrors and thereby remembers his experiences. And out of the separate elements of these remembered experiences, uninhibited as to proportions and magnitudes, he weaves new pictures, composes both his sleeping and his waking dreams, even constructs his ideals, for ideals are but the happy aspects of experience magnified in dreams.

The psychological preeminence of man is in his creative and thereby his spiritual potentialities and powers. Beyond all mere motor or emotional response to stimuli, he dwells also in an inner or subjective world in which he is a weaver of dreams, in which from elements of beauty or joy drawn from pictured and remembered experiences he builds his ideals. In this inner subjective or metaphysical life man advances to and occupies a further plane of existence and action higher than that of mere reflex and motor response. In his thus enlarged field of being he is less limited; he is no longer a mere creature wholly predetermined for now he aspires beyond the mere tropism of direct or immediate response. To the degree of his native endowment the unbound psyche (creative spirit) within him chooses and selects congenial elements from its field of crude experiences and predetermined reactions and by a creative process weaves them into patterns of things that never were but are desired and dreamed. And here a new kind of motivation arises; not a mere necessitous response motivated by desire to survive. It is a self-created motivation, an inspiration to action not for the satisfaction of a need but towards the fulfillment of the self-chosen, the self-created dream.

Tropic or reflexive actions are immediate, undelayed and unrefined through the practice of imagination and choice. And these reactions, such of them as are favorable to maintenance of the life are inexorably required and imposed. Yet those which through changed circumstance or environment have become outmoded and no longer serve must give way to new or modified reactions if the life is to prosper or even to prevail. In all this the motivation is *necessity*. The action is prescribed and disobedience is death.

But man, the creature who imagines and dreams, builds in himself the motivation not of mere blind continuation upon terms that, as creature, he must obey. He is subject to nature indeed, but there is an ineluctable principle

operating throughout all nature that is called divine and under which all life transcends its past. Preeminently endowed with this divine principle the picturing mind of man transcends the limitations of its creature state, for it finds therein not thorns alone but blossoms of beauty and sustaining joy, and these it weaves into dreams and ideals.

It has been said, "All that a man hath will he give to save his life." And so he will. When life is in the balance he will give all for bread to sustain it; but man is more than creature; he does not live by bread alone for he is also a creator and as such he lives by every "word" that proceedeth from the divine, by every dream and ideal with which he is inspired.

Does creation then consist of dreams alone? Far from it. The spirit of creation is made manifest only in its works. The dream is the non-manifested, the unexecuted picture of works to be made, creation to be thereby *performed* — formed through the dream. The ideal is far more than the will to exist, to sacrifice for sake of salvation. It is the picture of beauty conceived but unborn, the inspiration, the motivation, the divine urge to create. Under this motivation, this self-impulsion from within, there is no seeking of salvation, no sacrifice required, yet under it, all that a man hath will he give. He will hazard even life itself, not as a creature or from any necessity imposed but from a self-necessity, from the creative divinity incarnate in him.

The *Ways* of God

Men can only emulate the *way* of God — not the nature and being of God. The cause of so much conflict and controversy about religion is that the Church places its major stress almost entirely on being instead of doing. It is another case of that bastard verb, *to be*, which attempts to read static significance into the dynamic cosmos. It is ontology versus technology — what God is, thinks or believes versus what God *does*. This, applied to the human entity, stresses what

man is, thinks or believes versus what man does.

The true God is a God of doing, not of being, and the true nature of man resides in what he does, not in what he is. The usual order must be reversed. We must learn what God is from what God does, and what man is from what man does. This is one of the senses in which man is divine. For, just as God is self-creating through what He does, so man creates himself quantitatively by what he does, qualitatively by the manner of his doing it. So far as he acts as God acts, he is creative; he is no longer creature, but creator. Thus he takes on his divinity.

The general statement is, man has no being as such, but as he acts; that establishes his being. So far as he acts like an animal, that establishes his animal being. So far as he acts divinely, creatively, such action establishes him as a spiritual being.

Theology lays great stress on the nature and being of God. This is not anything that can be emulated by man, but it is a fertile field for controversy and in which to justify the exercise of authority by men over their fellow men. It involves no technology whereby all men can serve instead of govern other men.

Science takes little account of God as being, and gives all its attention to His works and to how His works proceed rather than to what they are. In the natural sciences, men discover the ways of God and therein the mind of God — the divinity in its procedural aspect. Without knowing it, science worships God in His procedural aspect, that of the Holy Spirit, and not in His aspect as Substance or Power, not in His materialistic nature, not as ruler over men.

Learning the mind of God as manifested in the works of God, the rational mind of man becomes at one with the rational mind of God. He thus has knowledge of God's works and ways, and this knowledge is power, for it is the power to create as God creates — to bring about events and actions in the manner that God acts. By this technology, the creative man — the spiritual man — enters into and plays his part in the continuing drama whose first act is described in the Book of Genesis.

It is only necessary to learn how God wishes men to act with respect to other men. The injunction is simple and plain: "Do unto others in the manner ye would have them do unto you." This means that men shall turn away from political relationships — away from the iron rule as between man and man and

act upon the golden rule, the only rule of conduct divinely prescribed.³⁷²

When the Golden Rule Prevails⁶

Theology is what men know (or believe) about God and about their relationship to Him. It is a matter between man and God, understanding the will of God. It is

⁶ *Spencer Heath Archive*, Item 380. Random taping by Spencer MacCallum from conversation with Heath. No date.

subjective, contemplative, conceptual.

Religion is a matter of man's action towards men, of doing the will of God with respect to fellow men.

Commandment presupposes choice, freedom to obey or to disobey. When the choice is to obey, then the will of man and the Will of God are as one. Freedom is not lost but gained — freedom into life more abundant, into security and peace and length of days.

There is no commandment to do anything but to love. The first is to love God and thereby to live. God gives choice of two ways to men: disregard His will and remain as creatures, unregenerate; learn and do His will and be born again, regenerate as creators in company with God, in a creative and thereby spiritual dominion over the world,

The first commandment is to love God, to learn and do His will, to create, for to live and be creative with Him we must learn His will, comply with His terms.

The second commandment is to love our fellow men by doing the will of God with respect to them. We must not merely do unto them; we must do unto them in the same manner as we would have them do unto us. This is the golden rule in the practice of which we enter into a new kind of kingdom, a creative kingdom that does not resist or reform the worldly powers or, least of all, employ them. For it is the creative and thereby spiritual and divine alternative to force and war, not by either resisting or destroying but by transcending them.

To be real, that is, enduring, not passing away, the golden rule must be mutual and reciprocal. It is not one-sided, like benevolence, transitory and merely remedial. It is mutual and reciprocal and thereby creative and enduring, not to save or maintain but for the advancement of life. It is the common denominator of all contractual relationships as against the coercive and political. In the wide ramifications of trade and exchange it can be impersonal and thereby universal, uniting all the ends of the earth in the advancement of life. It is the hidden genius that has given to the Judeo-Christian peoples of the world, and to them alone, such mighty power to create a vastly richer world in which to live securer lives and thereby to multiply their length of days.

But this creative technology, this spiritual process among men, has evolved almost solely with respect to those services and goods that can be

individually or separately and privately owned, for only such as are recognized and treated as private property can be the subject-matter of trade and exchange and thus become instruments of the golden rule. Almost all of those things that man must have and use in common still remain, for the most part, under the arbitrary and coercive administration of the “powers that be.” The great public properties, the political wealth of governments, are not created by them. These public properties are not acquired nor are they administered by any golden rule of consent and exchange, hence have no revenue or profit of their own.

Whatever governments have, they must take by force or stealth or as conquerors in war. They must draw their revenues out of the properties and values created by the golden-rule relationships of men, and since there is no automatic ceiling on their power to seize, the sovereign powers have always, soon or late, destroyed the wealth and freedom of the world and thus themselves gone down.

The lives of men can be secure and free only when the golden rule outgrows the iron rule of governments, when the owners of public communities shall be organized and shall administer contractually and for profit the common properties and services of their communities.

Then will the golden rule prevail, God’s will be done, His kingdom come, in the public administration no less than in the private properties and affairs of men.

The Mystical Body of Christ⁷

It is in their social organism, so sharply distinguished from the compulsive state, that men find all the power that enables them to transform their world. This higher organism emerges and evolves out of the barbarous and predatory

⁷ *Spencer Heath Archive*, Item 1312, September 12, 1940

pre-social state of mankind by its human units and groups coming to adopt and accept the organic relations of contract and consent — of operating together without destructive opposition but by exchange of differentiated services, just as the many parts that compose the individual are organized, ordered and arranged.

This functional integration of parts into an organic whole, this integrity, this at-one-ment of himself, is what gives to man in all its varying degrees his own self-kingdom and control. But this self-sovereignty does not give him the power to build a better world. Not all his individual strength, but only his social power can do this. Not until he unites in the social bonds of property and peace and service by contract, consent and exchange, can he even begin to re-create either a niggard or a bountiful world.

All of men's social and creative power rests in the services that they perform for each other — in their practice of the divine injunction to do unto others in the manner they would have others do unto them. This lifts man, and man alone, into the kingdom of the divine and gives him his inheritance of and dominion over the earth. It makes him a lord, that is, a *giver*. He thus becomes a creator in his own right, for it incorporates him into the body of the divine to carry on the perpetual and continuous creation of the world.

Into the cosmic dust was breathed a breath — a spirit — of divine life and power, and that dust became a living soul with power of choice, election, will. That which was void became full. God realized himself in his extended work. So man, carrying on God's creative will in peace and unity (contract and consent) with his fellow man, touches the rock of mountains and cities gleam and deserts bloom. In this divine commission and communion man creates the kingdom, builds the holy city of God with mansions of glory for the habitation of the soul.

And this is not the end. In this habitation, the spirit of man is forever and ever reborn. It recreates itself not from the casual dust of the earth but from a bounty that its own labors have transformed into a subsistence more creative and more divine. Through its own concord and communion of work the spirit of man that came from and is the spirit of God marches ever into higher realizations of itself — the ever infinite extension of God. This is the vision, — but it is a troubled dream.

For these ends we yearn. The means are close at hand but only slowly do we open our eyes to them. Blind to the beauty with which our social structure is already endowed, we lack the faith, the inspiration to create, and in our

desperation we turn and return to the powers that destroy. Like the many brands and breeds of collectivists, we actually invoke the power of taxation, the technique of mass enslavement and basis of all slavery, as though it were or could be employed as a social or creative force.

The divine power, the creative power, comes to us from the Beauty that lies within the heart of the world and in the consensual engagements and contractual institutions of men. When we seek we shall find and when we open our eyes we are infused and inspired. Seeing that which abides and endures, we are free to rejoice in it, to think creatively — divinely. And divine action will follow.

Jesus' Earthly Vision: A Historical Review⁸

⁸ *Spencer Heath Archive* Item 2251. Typed working draft for an essay never completed. Title supplied. No date, possibly early 1950s.

Jesus Christ was born at the geographical center of the United Nations of his day, free from international wars, but under the centralized tyranny of the then Imperial Rome. He brought a new light into the world. With matchless divination of the human mind and heart, he called to the unborn grace and beauty unawakened yet potential within and proclaimed a new dispensation of peace and freedom, a new kind of kingdom, a kingdom of heaven on the earth. He showed the way, the truth and the light for the attainment of peace and joy within and for the creation of the kingdom outwardly in the earthly lives of every race or creed or clime.

This new kingdom was to spring from a new kind of *action* — co-operation in place of *contra*-operation among men — that in fullness of time would lead them out from political servitude and domination into a life abundant and eventually immortal in this new kind of world and in the timeless Great Beyond whence all life springs. He was the poet who dreamed and the seer who foresaw the creative power that lay within His golden-rule commandment of the *contractual*, the non-political and non-coercive process among men, for the transformation of their material world to nurture of their bodies, and for the transfiguration of their souls. He was herald of a transcendent civilization that in this modern era has only just begun and whose birth pangs disturb and terrify the but half awakened soul of modern man. His dream was for a solace in his day and for the healing of the nations in times far away.

But in that age of world conflict and dominion by political power, as in our own, His vision of world-wide reciprocal relations quietly growing and eventually displacing and superseding the political, was too strange and distant from the thoughts of men. Only simple and unlearned minds, and of these only a few, could conceive so great a marvel. So it had to be told in stories that would entertain and not greatly challenge but yet that, for those who had eyes to see and ears to hear, carried a profounder meaning than was ever known before.

Love for others would be objectified in reciprocal services, become impersonal and universal and creative, thus spiritual and divine, throughout all the nations of mankind. This new kind of relationship would regenerate men from destroyers into creators and thus loose the bonds of death in the freedom and abundance of a new form of life, of mankind fulfilled and redeemed in a social organism that may well be symbolized as the living body of the Risen Christ.

In such circumstance and where imagery and metaphor were the habit of the common speech as it is today, it need not be wondered that the deeper

meaning was clothed in speech that even to the most devoted could at times be only privately explained. The full true meaning, consistent with the place and time and with itself throughout, was hidden from the hard of heart and blind, and even more so today; for its magnificence was of necessity diminished and obscured in the gospel narratives and commentaries of those who long afterwards re-told and wrote them down, and again by the fixed and dogmatic preconceptions of official translators into modern tongues.

The vision was too magnificent, too far prophetic for the times. It had its metaphysical aspect of present salvation for as many as could be, as it were, born anew. This was the new life of serenity and peace for the individual, the kingdom *within*, abiding in his certain hope of a like kingdom potential in the midst of all and yet to come. And for all men to grow into and achieve also the glory of this outer kingdom as well as the one within, but one single and simple rule need be observed and followed. There was the old rule of peace by covenants or treaties to refrain from trespass or aggression — and the penalty was war, retaliation in kind. And the old rule — that of mere survival — was not to be destroyed but a higher purpose fulfilled. It was to be outgrown by practice of the new rule, the higher law — “that ye love one another” by *doing* unto, by *servicing* one another.

This was no rule of resistance against evil, nor was it any rule, like the Buddhist, to refrain. The golden rule was positive, balanced yet dynamic: that ye *do* each to others in the new manner — as ye would that all others should do unto you; that each should love others by serving them, as he would have others love and serve him. To gain admission and to realize this new kingdom there was but this single simple rule. It was to act towards one another with only one kind of equality, the freedom to own oneself and one’s property, the equality of equal authority over one’s person and his rightful possessions. Mere covenant to refrain from mutual evil, with its sanction of retaliation, was to be transcended and superseded by the rule of *contract* — of drawing together in mutual agreement and accord to perform mutual good. In so far as any practiced this new rule they would be thus far in the kingdom of heaven, for they would become creators of good and thereby spiritual and divine whether they understood it or not — and this irrespective of any subjective or self-conscious metaphysical considerations. For, like the laws of God in all His living and His physical realms, even an unwitting obedience brings its blessings no less than their defiance brings the undoing of mankind.

Under this new and Golden rule of *contract* in place of coercion when

faithfully performed, there could be no domination by force, only service by mutual accord; and any departure would be punished, for it would be a loss and privation of the good. And just so far as any men failed to practice that rule they remained unregenerate, uncreative — lost in the evil of their evil doing whether aggressive or non-resistant, given over to the dominance of destructive powers, to force and war.

To the early Christian leaders this was all too simple and too inclusive of others. They rejoiced (gloried) in its magic transformation of chosen souls by faith redeemed and in the narrow communion of those thus elect and eligible, as they thought, for the kingdom soon to come to them alone. In growing numbers they brought hope and promise in a weary world. But, with the passage of time, they formed instead a membership society conditioned on tests such as professions of faith, adherence to metaphysical doctrines and the like. The coming of the kingdom of heaven was for the elect, and it was to come quickly as by a miracle with great acclaim — not by slow and quiet development as the small seed grows and the little lump leavens the mass.

As the generations passed and no signs in the heavens came, leaders lost faith in the quick coming of a last judgment day and a literal separation of the "sheep from the goats." Nor did they permit men to hear and freely do the living word. East and West, they organized churches militant and coercive, assuming sole authority to interpret the living word and to rule the bodies and the thoughts of men. In Rome, Byzantium, Alexandria they thus postponed the "second coming" into distant time and, to save their iron rule of politics and war, decreed as their successors do today that the kingdom of the Golden rule on earth, so far as affairs of this world are concerned, could have no such objective reality as the Gospels taught. It was only for the future practice of men who were soon to die, conforming to their churchly decrees and conditions for the gracious gift of immortal life in another world. The Golden rule relationship was reduced to a mystic subjectivity in preparation for the final end and a ghostly brotherhood of the elect in worlds to come.

So it was that the Christian Gospel of a kingdom of peace on earth through the practice of love and service in creative and non-political relationships was lost for a thousand years in tyrannies, persecutions and wars amid promises of eternal bliss beyond the grave. Yet the vision of the Gospel kingdom was not wholly lost. However little comprehended, it was too pregnant, too prophetic to be lost from the hearts and hopes of man.

As Imperial Rome impoverished to her own long decline the nations united under her, the Western Church took on the "garments of the empire" in a milder earthly rule throughout an "age of faith" virtually unchallenged as to its temporal as in its spiritual power. Then principalities, reviving, grew to kingdoms. In an age of violence and insecurity following the decline of Rome, men enfeoffed lands to those stronger than they in return for protection. Great barons rose and, often aided by the Church, grew into kings to take their crowns from the Papal hands as sovereigns over rival barons until by force of arms they should gain the power to crown themselves. Nobles high and low ruled servile populations (and often served them well) while robber barons and pirate navies ruled the highways and the sea.

Then, a thousand years from Calvary, came silent stirrings of the heavenly kind of kingdom in the works and ways of ruthless men. Like a thief in the night came the long neglected spirit of the Golden rule into their secular and practical lives but not the conscious minds or hearts of men. The old device of oath-bound covenants of mutual defense merely to refrain from mutual evil was left to warring kings and sovereign powers that had now succeeded Rome; for here was a new kind of compact that had no respect of persons but had power to unite in mutual service all the sons of men. The Church had taught the Western World that all were created to be free. The common men came to own themselves, and from this it followed they could own property in the products of land and sea. An almost universal right to own property, as against the old sovereign right of expropriation by the few, came all unnoticed. The Golden rule of reciprocal services by contract without coercion now could be practiced widely in the world.

Thus began a new kind of kingdom in the right of a man to own his person and therewith his right to own property, as against the political prerogatives of compulsion and of expropriation. A new kind of popular jurisdiction over property under the juridical designation of the "proprium" as against the "imperium" was born into the world, and the golden rule of contract and mutual exchange of services and of property or of its use became the hidden genius of the creative power that was to build civilization in the modern world.

But this new kind of jurisdiction, except in Saxon England, was confined to the properties and services that could be had separately and exclusively of others. It did not nor has it even now evolved to include such properties and services as cannot be enjoyed individually and separately from others but must be had in *common* as public properties and services.

Nevertheless, this practice of contract among persons who granted each to

the other full and equal authority over his person and his possessions was marvelously and increasingly productive of profit for all. Drawing servile populations towards the cities and towns it weakened the lesser barons while kings and dukes extorted from the towns the 'gifts' and blackmail that grew to become the modern system of taxation after the manner of ancient and self-destroying Rome.

Nor could all the robbers on the seas or land withstand the call to better ways. Finding richer gains in trade, many ceased to raid, defended their coastal cities and developed their own free system of property and contract, the *Law Merchant*, free from legislative enforcements or sovereign decrees. But the divinely sanctioned sovereignties and kings continued growing great on tribute from the towns and trade. And in the logic of war among themselves, the sovereignties grew fewer and larger and became colonial and imperial powers that fattened on tributary trade until freedom of contract became, as now it is, largely outlaw on land and sea.

Thus arose the powers of the modern world whose expropriations from its markets without having contributed thereto take many forms. As lamented long ago, the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence and the violent take it by force.

Strangely, these successor sovereignties, these national states prototyped in all the pagan powers of ancient times and flouting every Gospel precept, are esteemed as "Christian," and the Church gives sanction not only to the heads that once it crowned but alike to those that still deny its temporal claims. Even those Christian sects that profess non-violence seldom if ever fail to enforce their will by rudely compulsive political enactments, once they gain that supposedly Christian power.

The golden rule practice of free and creative relationships with respect to the sources and the means of life has been for centuries far more than simply ignored. In its rebirth from mediaeval darkness it was scorned and defamed and its practice relegated to unhonored and unchristian men — especially to those of the race whence came the Great Exemplar, prophet of the warless kingdom that would come — notwithstanding that it was the mother-fountain from whose breast the worldly powers withdrew by violence all the wealth and creative power that their wars and rulerships destroyed.

Yet the revival of trading between the towns and on the seas brought with it revival of learning, new degrees of intellectual freedom and the spirit of adventure among men. There was widening of all horizons artistic, scientific,

geographic. Whole new continents called to the spirit of freedom in the hearts of men. In large numbers they fled their tribute-taking tyrannies and planted seeds of the golden rule of property without expropriation, contract without coercion, far and wide.

Intuitively, in North America men founded proprietary jurisdictions, but they lacked both knowledge and tradition of how to practice them. The truly Christian polity of property without expropriation was only dimly conceived, for the Anglo-Saxon tradition of land lords and free men as the only valid basis of free community organization had been completely lost. So they established a political government on the Classical model of Republican Rome and hedged it about with constitutional restrictions they hoped would hold it within the powers assigned — the minimum of the imperium and maximum of the proprium that they could conceive.

Yet notwithstanding constitutional limitations, free contract was permitted only as to such private and personal property as would remain above taxation, and as to community or public property and services, not permitted or provided for at all. All this was left to political administration resting on coercive taxation, instead of on the proprietary based on rents freely negotiated and fixed by the market value of the public benefits received.

But even so limited in the nineteenth and notwithstanding the vast extension of twentieth century political powers, the system of contractual free enterprise has been the marvel of mankind. Aided by science, it has yielded to society so much of good and to government such power of harm as never existed in all the ages of the world, for the same science that serves is no less powerful to destroy.

In the hands of the *proprium* — of the system of ownership and property, and thereby of free contract and exchange — all property, knowledge and power must be employed directly and primarily in the service of others; for on this the recompense depends. The process is creative and therefore spiritual on both sides for, irrespective of ulterior aims, each does to the other in the manner he would have others do unto him and each becomes the more creative in return. It were as ungenerous in spirit as it is false in reason — the devil's logic — to decry the essential virtue of good works by imputation of self-regarding motives, whether false or true.

But under the *imperium* there is no practice of the golden rule — none but the iron rule of force. Property is de-social-ized, seized out of the societal amenities of contract and consent and of equivalence in exchange. It ceases to produce, even to maintain itself. It must be consumed or destroyed and can be replaced only by further violence. All that the *imperium* provides for anyone, it must seize from others for subsidies and doles or to be destroyed wantonly in peace or from necessity in war. The *imperium* is the power of "the world" in the New Testament sense, destructive therefore *anti*-spiritual now as it was then, notwithstanding its early adoption by the militant-metaphysical Church and ages of indoctrination of the divine rights of governments and kings.

The Christian alternative is in the "proprium," the positive evolution of the Christian Society under the alternative of the golden rule — objectification of the Christian dream of a kingdom of heaven on the earth.

As in the past, there is no escape from imperial rule, under whatever forms, except as Society evolves and extends its proprietary and thereby golden rule kind of administration into the field of community protection and over the properties appurtenant to the community itself and requisite for the conduct of public and community affairs. For it is the incompleteness of this social evolution, of this kingdom of heaven on the earth that leaves men exposed and beholden to the worldly powers.

In the meantime, to all those who conceive the Christian way and the golden rule merely as precept to charitable works or alms and as no more than a command of non-resistance and surrender to aggression — a covenant not to do good to all men but merely to refrain, neither to do evil to them nor to resist evil from them — to all such there is no Christian alternative, no recourse but surrender to the "dominations and powers" of the world.

This kingdom of heaven was not to come suddenly or with trumpets and acclaim but in the quiet and the dark like a seed in the soil, or a tiny lump of leaven in the meal, nor would it tarry with any but virginal hearts. It was the story of a different kind, an unheard of kind of kingdom, a heavenly kingdom that would bless and serve not one family or tribe or single nation but all the nations of man. It was a new dispensation not for any tribe or race alone or special membership organization, but in its freedom, life and love to embrace all mankind.

It came not to destroy the old law of escape and survival through enforced

obedience, through rulership and punishment either by God over man or of man unto man, but to proclaim a new law of freedom through love and life moving ever onward in cooperation between God and man — not merely to survive the conflict called good and evil, but to partake of the waters and the Tree of Life, the life abundant — everlasting. It was the vision of a new relationship between God and man, a new kind of kingdom, a kingdom of heaven in the life of all — not only in the hearts and minds of men — and a civilization whose glories would not be exclusive or divided but alike for one and all.

But in that age of world conflict and world dominion by political power, as in our own, the vision was too magnificent and vast to be grasped by nation-bound or race-bound worldly minds. It could be felt and told only in strange new parables, symbols and figures of speech.

It would fertilize with life the nations unawares, not out of the hands of warriors or the great but out of the hands of the lowly and despised, and in this kingdom of heaven he would be greatest who would be the servant of all. And the kingdom would suffer violence and the violent take it by force. Disciples and early followers carried forward the Gospel words, but not their wide interpretation.

The constructive and truly Christian alternative is neither aggression or non-resistance, neither attack nor defense by force of arms, but the Gospel golden rule as it is practiced unconsciously in all the peaceful amenities of contractual relationships. This great creative power, instead of being revered is scorned with jealous hatred by self-styled men of God. It is sought to be crucified by the Imperial power and destroyed out of the world.

How shall practice of this truly Christian ethic, so consonant with the parables and precepts of the gospel and its golden rule, be saved and therewith the lives of men be served and saved?

The true Christian precept is "Seek ye the light" and "With all thy gettings get understanding." For the good serves life and so brings its own reward — and men do evil, thinking to do good, only by unguided impulses in the darkness of their minds.

Men of none but humble pretense in modern times have sought and learned the ways of God and thus the mind of God in the rational organization and processes of His material and non-human world. They have learned much of

the rationale of His creative ways and to share, in large part, His creative power. It only remains for men to seek a like knowledge of God's ways and mind in His creation of a no less rational order in the relationships among men — the creative organization of men under his golden rule of reciprocal services and therein of mutual love.

As that understanding is gained it will be found that only through property as the subject-matter of contract can the golden rule be put into any wide and general effect. The ownership of property as well as of oneself is thus ordained of God. And it will be found that the golden rule administration of property, for the benefit first of others and of its owners last, has been thus far limited almost exclusively to those properties and services that can be enjoyed individually and separately from others and not carried into the administration of those properties and services that must be had *in common* with others in the community form of life. From earliest times and in England since the Norman Conquest, the administration of community properties and services has been in the hands of invaders or of conquerors by force or by popular elections and administered by the political process of coercion of all kinds of properties in widely varying but ever increasing degree.

It is for want of developing the golden rule type of administration by the contractual process and the equality of exchange into the field of community property and services that the archaic methods of political administration have not been relegated, as commerce relegated private piracy, to the past.

As recently as two centuries ago dominion over land **was** secured only by conquest or expropriation. Land holding was a purely political institution. All holding was by might and not by title or right, and all occupancy was by sufferance or compulsion without benefit of contract or negotiation. Its evolution out of government and politics and into a social institution has been the indispensable foundation of modern social freedom as against slavery and serfdom in every degree. For this institution performs automatically the one fundamental public service of exercising a non-political jurisdiction over the community sites and resources in which it performs the distributive function of constantly allocating and re-allocating to the most productive users titles to sites and resources.

For this primary public service — the only alternative as against the anarchy of no distribution and no security and the ultimate tyranny of political distribution and administration — it receives by free contract without coercion its just and appropriate recompense in the highest rent or income from the most

productive use.

In its performance of this basic distributive function — this primary and above all essential public service by the contractual process as against the arbitrary and coercive, and for a public revenue that is automatic by agreement without taxation or any form of force — property in land proves itself the non-political social institution whose contractual administration without coercion of any kind, can evolve under the motivation of profit or recompense eventually to cover the entire field of public affairs. For its services will precede and thus create the revenue. It gives the answer to the crucial question propounded by Princeton's President Dodds: How can we conduct our public and community affairs without resort to violence and war?

During the era that preceded modern democracy (and demagoguery) land holding was a political institution resisting the tyrannies of kings but as yet unpurged of its powers of seizure, taxation and aggressive war, for it was organized politically and functioned as government. Now that it functions only with services and for a revenue that is no more than the market value of the services it performs, it needs only to be organized, not politically but as a business organization in pursuit of recompense and profit according to the market value of what it does. High or foremost among these services, because most profitable to all, it will again stand ground in its communities against the profligacy and corruption of their rulers, whether voters and demagogues or kings.

And this proprietary institution, organized doubtless in corporate or similar popular form, and finding great profit therein, will extend its contractual administration to the entire field of public administration. This will be of double benefit to the inhabitants; for it will at the same time relieve them of taxation and its devastating effects, and provide them with definitely valuable public services, both of which will enhance the value of their occupancies to the inhabitants and to the organized owners the value and income from their lands.

Under this system of community services for profits to all, taxation and all its evils will become outmoded and eventually obsolete, and the two systems of business, the private and the public, will create such wealth and values as cannot at present be conceived. In this abundance social evils springing from poor living will disappear, the general adult life span will be extended perhaps indefinitely.

This truly Christian organization of the public economy in the

profit-making service of the private economy and each in the service of the other will universalize the golden rule of performing services both public and private, without coercion or aggression. It will make *real* in its practical fulfillment of that last great commandment *that ye love one another* in all the relations of life.

And this kingdom is not militant. It is no creation or growth in either aggression or defense, nor in submission without defense, there being nothing but destruction in these. For the creative power is spiritual and positive. Above all worldly conflict it goes forward by its own self-growing into ever more abundance of life.

The golden rule, in its reciprocal and thereby creative significance, is the only positive and self-consistent interpretation of the Gospel message as a New Dispensation of life, for without this there remains no Christian ethic beyond that of old time — an eye for an eye — and the age-old struggle between the always orthodox Right and the heretical Left for the Satanic world-dominion that the First Christian was first and most firmly to reject.

THE PRACTICE OF CHRISTIAN FREEDOM⁹

Gentlemen of the Christian Freedom Foundation:

⁹ *Spencer Heath Archive* Item 2026. An address by Spencer Heath before the Annual Meeting of the Christian Freedom Foundation, Great Northern Hotel, New York City, May 1, 1957.

I am happy to stand before you today — grateful for the opportunity — for you are men who stand for something — for something that is so precious to the flowering of the human spirit it can never die. Because you stand for that human freedom whose seeds were sown by the Christ on stony ground in Palestine, in the darkness of a United Nations — a super-sovereignty — of long ago. I can speak with confidence to you, as to no other kind of men.

In speaking of human freedom, I would first of all and in grateful reverence, pay tribute to that sense of inner freedom of the spirit, to that mystical exaltation which is the authentic sign and seal of all truly religious experience. This wonderful inner gospel to the mind and soul of man is without limitations; it is absolute and complete for all worlds and in this.

For it extends to and includes the objective lives and the bodies of mankind as well. Not only is the spirit inspired from on high, but underneath also are the everlasting arms. And it is of this outer and practical aspect of Christ's Gospel — too little realized — that I would speak especially today.

The full significance of a true prophet's words is seldom seen at once. The immediate is served; but there is also meaning in them that may lie latent perhaps for ages yet to come. So it was with the message of the Christ. It is like a fine poem. We can feel its healing power while of its full meaning and blessedness we are not yet aware.

For example of this, let me cite to you the mood of a little poem by David Morton that I have entitled, THE TIMELESS HOUR.

O, perfect and complete, and like a flower,
Most shining and most sweet — most memorable hour!

What grave compelling chime, in what hid tower,
Called to the Heart of Time with such sweet power
As summoned Time to yield the Timeless Hour?
Unto the mortal field the immortal flower.

The Christ came not merely to *save* men. He came to quicken their spirits and infuse them with consciousness of their own potential powers in a new and creative dominion, a new way of life in this present world. This was the new salvation — not a divine righting of wrongs, but a New Dispensation of the Creative Spirit in man. The key to this new kingdom on the earth was the new Gospel. It lay in a single simple rule — in the divine command that men enter into *contractual* relationships with one another and thereby do each unto others in like manner as he would have done unto him. Note that the word is DO — not refrain or desist. It is not a prohibition. It is a command, a call to action for all who would enter into the really secure, the creative, and thereby the spiritual and exalted mode of life. And the inauguration of this new kingdom was to be not any triumph over evil but in the practice of peace in place of war — in serving and in being served in return, and thereby loving and being loved in return. It would begin small, like the mustard seed and like leaven in the meal. It would steal upon the world softly and unannounced, like a thief coming in the night. And so it has come, in this modern world of ours — not by principalities and powers, but in all the widespread and world-wide, honest and value creating, non-political relationships of men.

When the one-world power that crucified the Christ at last went down, out of this darkness a rude Barbarian freedom could then arise. Pirates, all unwittingly, could make the laws and rules in which the commerce of the modern world was born. Such were the seeds of the quiet kingdom of Free Enterprise whose fruits in Christian lands have become the wonder and the envy of mankind. Sanctioned by no worldly Authority, and without honor or acclaim, the enterprise of free men has practiced increasingly, albeit unknowingly, the Christian golden rule, and thereby blessed with peace and riches all the non-political interrelations of men. And so far as this enterprise is allowed to operate freely and in faithful observance of its own rules, it practices through credits and accounts a beautiful numerical rationality that we all too little value or seek to understand.

The Christian Gospel is universal as none other is. It is for the body no less than for the spirit of man. The regenerative power it proclaims not only exalts his spirit and mind; it attends and presides in all his atoms and in the proliferation of his cells and in his vital functions, of which he is, for the most part, wholly unaware. And still more and more wonderful — it guides all those relations of freedom among men whereby the life of each is enlarged and advanced through his serving of others and thereby serving the whole in the like manner as they, in

return, serve him. This serving and being served in reciprocal free relations, impersonally and without discrimination, be it conscious or unconscious, from low motive or high, is the veritable doing of God's will through the mutual serving and thereby loving of fellow men. It is finite and thus can be measured in the balanced exchanges of widely interfunctioning men. Being impersonal, it can become ever more *universal* and thus ever more inclusive and divine. Whether we realize it or not, in this universal loving by serving, to the extent that we practice it, the Second Great Commandment is ever more and more fulfilled unto life more abundant and ever lengthening days.

In this almost unwitting obedience to the divine command that we practice free contractual relationships, lies the whole foundation of that heavenly kingdom on the earth in which the golden rule of exchange is destined to replace the iron rule of force in the public as it does now in all honest private business and affairs. To this supposedly secular kingdom of mutual service on the earth we need only open our eyes and seek spiritual understanding of it. As its measured and balanced and thereby *rational* processes come to be better understood, we can learn more and more how the Infinite Intelligence, in the profit-yielding practices of our day, has prepared the way for its growth and extension into the field of our *common* services, from local to world-wide, until we need no longer say, "the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence and the violent take it by force." We must give to this kingdom not only our hearts but also the rational understanding of our minds, as we have done for the atoms and the stars and in the plant and animal world. And surely the creative power won through understandings in these lesser realms will be a thousand fold exceeded when we have a like understanding of the freedom that is won and held only by the practicing of it in the realm of re-born men.

It may be asked how Christ's golden rule can come into the practice of our public as well as our private affairs.¹⁰ As to this, there is much for us to learn. If we seek we can find; and it may be that the stone long despised shall become the corner and support. I would call your attention to how property in land affords a free market in which the sites and gifts of nature are distributed as other things are — by the process of contract instead of by force. This insures their going into possession of those who can make them most productive — for only such can produce the wherewithal to pay the highest rent or price. We need a new orientation of mind with respect to the modern institution of non-political property in all things, and especially property in land. Only in quite recent times

¹⁰ For a full theoretical and practical development of this theme, see the author's *Citadel Market & Altar*. Baltimore: The Science of Society Foundation, 1957. —Ed.

has this latter institution become social-ized, entirely separated from the tax-taking and war-making power. But so far, in its modern form, it only *distributes* the sites and lands — including all the advantages, public and private, with which they are served. May it not one day evolve to the point of not only *distributing* the public services — such as they now are — but also of creating and supplying them, precisely in the manner that private goods and services are now supplied — that is, through the free market, and thereby to those best qualified to make productive use of them? We need to *think* on these things.

Jesus Christ held in fiery scorn the taxers and the tribute-takers and the money-cheaters of his day. His very first public resolve was rejection of the enticements of political power. Not the mass destroyers of properties and of men, but those who conserved property and administered it productively, were honored by Him. Least of all would He have Caesar or the local City Hall take control over the gifts of nature and thereby over the livings and the very lives of men. The trend is now back towards the age-old slavery to the State. The kings of the Gentiles exercise authority over them, and they that exercise authority upon them are called benefactors. But, said Jesus, *ye shall not be so*. But we need not despair so long as private property in land, un-honored and but little understood, abides. It gives us a *social* instead of a governmental mode of access to the sources of life, and it is potential to carry its golden-rule administration more and more into the public realm, where the iron rule has so long and tragically prevailed.

All that we shall be does not yet appear; but of this we can be assured: the spirit of the living Christ, recognized or unrecognized, is working with us today, now and forevermore. It has brought us out of Dark Ages into a modern Promised Land where His golden rule can and eventually must prevail creatively without any force or fraud in our public no less than it does now in our non-political affairs, and with vast blessings to all.

If I have any mission among those who bear witness of the creative spirit that lives in the teachings of the Christ, it is to draw their minds towards an understanding of his doctrine not only in the secret places of the heart and in worlds to come but in its actual and present operation in the world that now is. For it is in His word and in His freedom, in the degree that we practice it, that the Christian peoples of the world shall live and move and have their being, both private and public, towards ever more abundant life and length of days.

May I give you a few lines in commemoration of Him?

Embosomed on the stream of time
The ancient hills of Palestine
Resplendent in the sinking sun
Drowse golden when the day is done.

'Twas here the old-time sages trod
Communing intimate with God,
Prophetic of that Promised One
Whom He would bless, Beloved Son.

Remembering stars now lambent gleam
In Jordan's dim baptismal stream,
And hills of Palestine still stand,
Mementos in that Holy Land

And solemn, silent vigil hold
O'er tragic turmoil as of old,
Yet on the brow of one of them
Shines an Eternal Diadem.

God is Spirit, life process, an ever-becoming.

God is life, ever-flowing, ever growing.

God has never died but ever-rising,

Never risen from the dead.

God is Substance,

God is Power,

God is the Eternal,

The ever-flowing.

He flows in the evolving systems of the suns and stars,

In the life that bursts perpetually from the Sun.¹¹ 229

¹¹ Jotting made in a notebook on Easter Sunday, 1942, at the Friends Yearly Meeting on 15th Street, New York City.