

EUGEN ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY FUND



News & Reflections

(October 2009)



Classroom Tutelage, February 1954

Rules of Life, Laws of History

“So will you kindly take down this very strange rule, gentlemen: ... the more central a truth is, the greater is the variety of ... ways in which it must be expressed. The greatest truth, therefore, must be expressed by everybody in his own terms. The smallest truth can be expressed by everybody in the same terms. Such indifferent things as that the earth turns around the sun you can express in mathematical ... terms.... It is very indifferent what Mr. Einstein tells about relativity. It doesn't help you and me at all in your decision who you should marry.... To propose to a girl has to be done by everybody in a personal way.”

Professor Rosenstock-Huessy introduced many rules or laws or principles in his classroom lecturing, virtually all of them of his own devising. He taught what he knew and had learned from study and experience and from deep wells of inspiration. These rules sometimes appeared to be impromptu, but they rested on stable foundations. In the case above, quoted from a lecture on February 19, 1954, in a course entitled “The Circulation of Thought,” he asked the students to “take down” the rule as one of the principles of the subject. On other occasions, however, he would say just the opposite: “Gentlemen, stop taking notes and listen. This is important.” It was obvious that sometimes the fervid student note taking was a substitute for actual listening, and the act of listening, as the reciprocal of speaking, was fundamental to all of Rosenstock-Huessy's thought.

He regularly asked students to write two- or three-page reports on what he had said in previous lectures, an exercise that he explained in the following amplification of the rule enunciated above:

“The reports which you have to give, gentlemen, are the first attempt [by you] of personalizing truth. It's a journey from my utterance into your language. That's why I do not wish to have notes regurgitating the same words which I have used.... Your work begins only *after* everything that I have said is brought back from your memory.... I'm not interested in your repeating what I have said.... But I am very interested in your digestion, in the metabolism, how, from your point of view, the same truth has to be expressed....

“In the beginning was the Word.... [But] you can only have a divine spirit in you if the Word ... takes a special form inside of you. Otherwise you are not a child of God.... You are just a child of the devil, or the ... factory system ... or statistics.... The factory system wants people who do not speak, because in the face of the machine, speech is very troublesome.... On the whole, people are afraid of your having anything to say. So they try to talk you into the fact that you have nothing to say....

“Now in the circulation of thought ... the fact that you say [in your own words] what I have said is the beginning of this thought becoming real. If you have the power, and you even feel able to translate what I have said into your own terms, the thing begins to become real....

“We have these mass media today [*in 1954*] who have falsified the process of the circulation of thought. And people say that if a thing is repeated

10,000 times, then it circulates. This is not circulation.... Because it doesn't take anything out of your system [to put into the thought]....

"Take any brook. There's a source in the mountains. The water bubbles up. Then it comes down into the bed of this little brook. And immediately some soil must go into it. It's salty. It has minerals. It has some clay.... That's the goodness of the water. If it was rainwater, we wouldn't be able to drink it. Rainwater is not good for drinking. It's just good for washing, as you know, because it is so soft....

"This is the question of living thought, of living water, of any living substance: that it is able to undergo metabolism, that it is able to say the same thing, in this case, of speech, in a different way....

"So this is a great rule.... Things become truer ... by *not* being repeated literally. Gentlemen, that's against all mathematics, isn't it? In mathematics, the thing is true only when [it is] expressed the same way.... In the social sciences [that is, in the human social world vs. the natural world of the physical sciences], something is truer in the more various ways it is expressed.... Life is only mastered by multiformity, by diversity. A thing cannot live when it is monotonous. That's why we cannot have a world state. We cannot have a world government...."

One World

As happened often in Prof. Rosenstock-Huessy's classes, a chance verbal aside of his, such as this remark on world government, could shift the discussion dramatically for the balance of the class time, or a good part of it. The possibility of, the liberal hope for, a world government was much in the air in the 1950s, after two world wars in the first half of the century and the founding of the United Nations in 1945. The progress of society toward one world and one government seemed to be an obvious humane goal and a necessary precondition of world peace. One might assume that ERH would march in this parade. But always surprising and original, and sometimes just contrary, he had strong reservations.

Predictably, a good-willed student in the class took offense that the noble dream of world government was derogated. "Sir," he said to Professor Huessy, "why did you say that because there's one government, there can only be one speech, or one word, or regurgitation of the same thing?"

Rosenstock-Huessy replied: "One government, Sir, one government has only one fear: that it will cease to be one government. It has no longer to fear war, [so] it doesn't need an army for the outside. But it needs an immense FBI [for the inside], and the FBI will clamp down on every variety of speech.... That's very natural. If there is no enemy outside, you see, ... the fear from a conspirator [on the inside], or from civil war, or from disobedience, or the undermining of authority [becomes paramount]."

"You don't know this. We, you have lived here in this open club called 'the United States of America' with a million people a year coming into a vast country for the last 150 years. That's not a state. That's not a government. You are just now discovering who Mr. Edgar Hoover is, and going to be. You're just at the beginning of a state. There has never been government [here] in the true sense. Most of the actions of the Americans have consisted of breaking the laws.... But a world government that wants to last more than one generation has to use violence, and has to clamp down on any contradictions. It's just impossible [without such actions]."

In effect, ERH was arguing that the U.S. in 1954 and earlier was hardly a suitable analogy for what a world government would be like. Then followed another rule or law: "Power cannot be had ... without the fear of being overthrown.... You see the nastiness of any politics. That's why politics always must be nasty. You don't believe it, Sir, but just look into history.... This is very serious. I can only speak from experience.... It is not that I want it this way. You understand, I am not gloating over this. But that's the tragedy of such rule, of unity, of complete unity....

"[It has been the case] that all people who did not like it somewhere could always go elsewhere. I have left Germany.... Ask around how many people in this

country have left Europe because they didn't like it."

Imagine, Rosenstock continued, if there is one government from which there is no escape. "The explosive begins to be terrible. Now you have one state, one government, nobody can leave it. So all of the elements of injustice and upheaval, and rebellion, and youth, and regeneration, and creativity must ... heat up the tension.... You don't know how for the last 5,000 years, people have lived by their power to get away. This whole continent has lived by this fact. Don't you see that? And now you, as Americans, just say, 'world government.' That's tyranny. You would be the last who could breathe in such a world government...."

Rosenstock-Huessy was perhaps right that at least up to 1954, when this classroom dialogue ensued, the dominance of the Federal government was as nothing compared to what it would become in the next fifty years, as he foresaw. And the political polarization is now such, that gaining and holding on to power has become increasingly desperate.

Yet it seems to be a curious inversion of common experience when he argues that the absence of external threats, that is, when there is no longer war to worry about, will become the condition of *greater* internal suppression of liberties by those who are fearful of losing power to the dissenters. It has been more the American experience that external threats—Communism, or now militant reactionary Islam—can be used to justify the suppression of "rebellion, and youth, and regeneration, and creativity," a nice list of some of the forces ERH cared most about, no less than he valued preservation, tradition, and respect for the wisdom of the elders. Imagine world government any way one will, Rosenstock-Huessy was primarily concerned about the price of a certain kind of peace.

He had no illusions that power could ever be done away with, as in some utopian anarchy. Power, he said, is "a necessary evil." "You need power because not everybody does his duty. If you have murderers and thieves, you need police.... If you have treason, you need a secret police, you see. If you

have laziness, you need proctors. And on it goes."

Again a student responded: "So you need war, then?"

Rosenstock replied, "The more wicked people are, the more war you need, of course. War is a consequence of your sleep.... People are free agents in every generation; nobody can prevent you from going to sleep...."

"There has to be a moral equivalent of war. gentlemen. Formerly, people called this 'religion.' They called religion the equivalent of war, voluntarily suffered. But today, religion is just sugar [coated] raisins. It hasn't anything to do with suffering.... People wouldn't come to Sunday school [if it did].... Nothing is serious anymore in the world outside war. So God, since he must talk to us in some form, He talks to us through war. But if you have a world government, ... everybody will have to smash this tyrant. Even the most peaceful [person] ... would have to become a rebel, so that justice is restored, and vigor and life. You have great illusions about government, and about people.... You believe in the goodness of human nature."

Once more a student intervention: "This moral equivalent of yours is based on threat and fear."

"Oh no," Rosenstock-Huessy answered. "On voluntary sacrifice; it's the opposite. The moral equivalent of war means that if everybody at eighteen knows that for five years he has to be [i.e., he has to live] out in the cold and do the things that legislators and laws cannot do, then the world would probably be in a shape that no army would be needed, because all these people, you see, who have driven themselves, wouldn't need a policeman behind them, or uniform, to make them behave. But you don't serve."

Another student comment: "Is there no form of government by which you can have this freedom of expression and, second, some sort of driving force other than fear to motivate the people?"

Rosenstock-Huessy: "The government has the fear, not the people.... You don't obey the law from fear at this moment in this country.... Nobody does. [We

obey] because we feel it is just. But the government has fear. In this country, it's very lenient. Just the fear of the next election. But if you have world government, it's the fear that parts of the world will secede....

"You and I, law abiding people, don't fear. We obey. Although it isn't very fashionable to say, it's a great honor, gentlemen, to obey the law because it's just. [It] makes you into a righteous creature. But the government has all the time the fear that somebody might not obey.... There may be some laws you do not like, but the majority of the laws [are] right. However, the government always fears that there is somebody [else] who would like to govern. And that's the fear."

Student: "Sir, what if people took religion seriously, and we had a world government based on religious principles? Do you think there would be wars then?" It clearly pained the students in this class to relinquish their youthful ideals.

Rosenstock-Huessy: "State and Church are two different things. You can have religion, Sir, yourself, you see. But you can't have the world government from religion because," and here comes another ERH rule, "you only have so much government as the people may not have a religion. The State is a terrestrial power ... [and] always has to act because nobody is sure that all people have religion.... If everybody had faith, love, and charity, and hope, obviously we would all live in paradise. [There would be] no state. Now with every chance that you haven't enough religion, because you are lazy—laziness is the greatest power in the world, obviously, [and] most of us are lazy—so certain things are not done.

"For example, you do not clean your streets. So you have a public health service that says, 'There's too much litter on the street.' There the evil begins, because you get a police [force]. You get suspicion.... The mayor of the city says, 'I suspect that two-thirds of the students [at Dartmouth] throw around more litter in the streets than they burn up, or put away, or collect.' And that's true.... The litter that you and I put out far surpasses the cleanliness we produce.... [The] equilibrium, you see, is out of order, somebody else has to clean it up...."

Drawing an example from the history of Christianity, as he often did, Rosenstock then adduced: "Gentlemen, the greatest thing about the [Christian] Mass is that the priest has to wash and to clean the cup and the plate after the Mass. That's the greatest revelation. That's the greatest miracle, because the expenses of life there [in the Mass] are registered and really [recognized]. That's why the Christian cult is not a superstition, gentlemen, but the truth, by the simple fact that the priest has to clean the cup, which ... has become dirty, has been used, because who—think straight about this gentlemen—doesn't cause more litter, more dirt, you see, use more porcelain than he is willing to clean up? If you can get away [with it], you don't wash up.... The communion has the greatness that it illuminates *every* act in life."

Is it excessive, or at least strange, to say that the *greatest* thing about this ancient Christian rite is that the priest employs no servants to clean up after him? Hyperbole, maybe, but it also sets aside traditional theology, for which Rosenstock-Huessy had little patience insofar as it obfuscated what he considered to be the central, and to some degree forgotten, historical truths. The greatest "miracle" is not, for example, transubstantiation, which for some centuries in the history of the West could be a life or death issue, but it is Christianity as introduced and lived in an era when slavery and servitude were the norm. The ritual called for no servants.

"And that's the wisdom of the human race, to make this a part of revelation.... If you want to eat and to drink, you also have to clean the dishes. This to you seems very little, gentlemen, [yet] its tremendous....

"And this has all to do with world government, because, gentlemen, if everybody knew this, you wouldn't have to have a government at all.... Suspicion breeds government, you see; and faith breeds peace."

The reader may think, are we to abandon the productivity made possible by the division of labor? We all know that the employment of labor to do me-

nial tasks frees others to serve at a higher level. But the homely example points to the greater fact that around the globe, nations and corporations leave behind wreckage of many types that they never repair or take full responsibility for.

War and Peace

The importance of multiformity in the statement of great truths. The problem of world government that enforces uniformity. Our failure to accept responsibility for the messes we make, and what the consequences of that are. And now, war and peace. In this lecture, Rosenstock has been diverted from the subject of the course, but not as much as might appear. The topics are all related, and either in this class or another, he will not let them remain disconnected. Cleaning up after ourselves, in the largest sense, is a form of voluntary suffering and a prerequisite of true peace.

“When we don’t pay the price for peace out of the last war, when the cost of peace is forgotten, the next war breaks out.” That, too, is a Rosenstock-Huessy law. “War is nothing immoral, gentlemen. You are immoral. I am immoral. That’s why there is war. But to attack war and say, ‘Well, war is bad,’ is ridiculous. War is normal when we don’t behave as human beings. And who does? [Who] can say of himself that he doesn’t get more than he gives. You all want to get something for nothing. Anybody who gets something for nothing makes for war. Anybody! This country [*in 1954*] with all its oil, we get something for nothing at the moment....

“It’s the avowed policy of every party, of every group in this country to promise the electorate something for nothing. Therefore this country is constantly making for war, because you can’t do it.”

For most of the balance of the class time (ERH’s classes usually ran for 90 minutes), Prof. Rosenstock-Huessy returned to some of the main themes of his treatment of the “Circulation of Thought.” His listeners, fifty or more male college students, are at a stage of life, he tells them, where “play” is the norm. In various publications, Rosenstock-Huessy wrote ex-

tensively about the nature of play. It is among other things a state when thoughts have no consequences, when ideas are cheap because they are merely being tried on for size and no one is willing to die for them or to take responsibility for passing them on to one’s children. Alas, he characterized much of academe as a playground.

For students, college is also the stage of life when they are in the process of determining what is the rule and what is the exception, i.e., a stage of doubt. And once more, briefly, before the end of this February 19, 1954, class, with questions still lingering, Rosenstock-Huessy returned to the subject of war and peace.

“Is war the exception, or is war the rule? That’s the decisive question before this country.... Once you understand that war is more normal than peace, you see, you will think very differently about life than you have thought for the last fifty years in this playful country, where people were surrounded by peace, and abundance, and luxury, and didn’t know that they lived on the unreadiness of the rest of the world to begrudge and to envy the riches of this country....

“And it is very unnatural that the have-not nations should say, ‘We let the Americans have 50 percent of all of the goods of the world.’ That’s perfectly *abnormal*. Why should they? You take it for granted.... That’s by and large your dream, Sir, with your pacifism and world order. The natural thing is that the two billion people on the globe band together against us poor 160 million and say, ‘What they have, we can have, too. Let’s take it.’ That’s normal, that’s natural.... [You have to] wake up to the fact that peace is a miracle, and war is the law.... I’m all for peace, gentlemen, but you don’t know how difficult it is to have peace.... Peace is exceptional, and war is the rule. You say the opposite. I doubt your wisdom, and you doubt my cruelty. You say I am just brutal.... But I’m not just cruel, gentlemen. Reality is cruel.”



The Moral Equivalent of War

READERS OF THIS NEWSLETTER should have received in the past month the announcement of a proposed conference, scheduled for the fall of 2010, with the title, "Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy and the Social Representation of Truth: From William James to Camp William James and Beyond." ERH shared with the great American philosopher William James the belief that one cannot blithely condemn war itself as immoral. Everyone recommends "mere peace," Rosenstock-Huessy wrote, but "Do you know what will be lost if war is abolished and the serious values can no longer be measured by the amount of life a man is prepared to sacrifice for them?"¹

War may be immoral, but why is it, then, we may ask, following up on Rosenstock-Huessy, that war is also the ultimate metaphor for doing good, as in the "war against poverty," or the "war against cancer"? "War" means we are serious, that we are willing to make the necessary sacrifices to achieve the goal.

In his revolutionary essay, "The Moral Equivalent of War," which was first published a hundred years ago, in 1910, before the horrors of the 20th century, James wrote about the abolition of war. "I look forward to a future when acts of war shall be formally outlawed as between civilized peoples...." But, he continued,

I do not believe that peace ought to be or will be permanent on this globe, unless the states pacifically organized preserve some of the old elements of army-discipline. A permanently successful peace-economy cannot be a simple pleasure-economy. In the more or less socialistic future towards which mankind seems to be drifting we must still subject ourselves collectively to those severities which answer to our real position upon this only partly habitable globe.... Martial virtues must be the enduring cement; intrepidity, contempt of softness, surrender of private interest, obedience to command, must still remain the rock upon which states are built—unless,

indeed, we wish for dangerous reactions against commonwealths fit only for contempt, and liable to invite attack whenever a centre of crystallization for military-minded enterprise gets formed anywhere in their neighborhood.²

War, Rosenstock-Huessy maintained independently of James, "is the prime example of deadly earnestness, absolute earnestness. Any action in which I am prepared to risk my life resembles war.... The individual who makes war on society, who becomes a martyr, or who convinces others, is also conducting a war.... Everyone knows that this kind of war will also change borders, just as the hermits in the desert changed the boundaries of countries. Since the crucifixion we have a better idea than before of what man can do.... We must be aware of the fact that borders between peoples, borders between religions, borders between men, borders between sexes, or borders between generations, are serious only if they are final, if they can be changed only at the risk of life." (*Planetary Service*, pp. 5-6). Borders must change, but the condition for change is often mortal sacrifice. "Must all the current borders petrify, [since] only war could change them? ... What is missing is a powerful and enheartening means of changing borders without war. We are going to have to overcome borders without the bloodshed we have been used to in war." (*Planetary Service*, pp. 8-9).

There are no easy answers in any of the foregoing. Rosenstock-Huessy would be less worthy of our attention if there were. And we have brought into view here merely fragments of the expanse of his thought. Still, a few messages are clear. There will be no end to war until the virtues of the state of war, in particular sacrifice for the common good, or voluntary suffering, become the norm in peacetime. There can be no relying on the supposed inherent goodness of man. Nor can a satisfactory peace be achieved by the imposition of power, with a central government that, it may be feared, will constrain political change and will suppress challenges to the prevailing ways, enforce uniformity, and retard the privilege of each generation to remake the world.

1. From *Planetary Service: A Way Into the Third Millennium*, trans. Mark Huessy and Freya von Moltke (Argo, 1978), an abridgement of the original *Dienst auf dem Planeten—Kurzweil und Langeweile im dritten Jahrtausend* (1965). See also on war and peace, *The Christian Future* (1946), pp. 33-34, 43-57, 216-243, and many other works

2. William James, "The Moral Equivalent of War," reprinted in *American Youth: An Enforced Reconnaissance*, ed. Thacher Winslow and Frank P. Davidson (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1940), pp. 181-196. James's essay was first published in 1910, although he was lecturing on the subject already several years earlier. This volume edited by Winslow and Davidson includes as well a reprinting in English, under the title "A Peace Within," of Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy's "*Ein Landfrieden*," written in the winter of 1911-1912, which has ideas similar to James's, although Rosenstock-Huessy had not yet read "The Moral Equivalent of War." Davidson, it should be noted, just out of Harvard in 1939, was a key figure in the launching of Camp William James.



The ERH Society

THE CONFERENCE ON the "Social Representation of Truth," referred to immediately above, is one of the first initiatives of the Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy Society, founded only six months ago. We are eager to hear from those who may wish to participate in this gathering, at a time when discussions of voluntary service are widespread and in fact the object of recent government legislation. See: (<http://www.nationalservice.gov/about/newsroom/releases>).

The announcement of the conference and the call for papers is posted on the website of the Society under "Files." See: (<http://groups.google.com/group/ERHSociety/files>). The "files" include, among other items, a list of "Recent Publications Relating to the Work of Rosenstock-Huessy," a bibliography, covering the period from 1973 to the present, that is updated periodically.

The Society has attracted 61 dues-paying members (dues are \$20.00 per annum), which is a satisfactory beginning, and we anticipate the number will grow as the Society demonstrates its usefulness to those who wish to see Rosenstock-Huessy's thought receive far more attention than it has hitherto.

The Society is not a substitute for the work of the ERH Fund, which sustains Argo Books and other, sometimes costly, enterprises, such as translations and the work currently underway of converting the 450 hours of cassette tapes of Rosenstock-Huessy's classroom lectures into a digital format. The Fund is also supporting the processing and digitizing of the large corpus of Rosenstock-Huessy correspondence and other manuscripts that will be transferred to the Dartmouth College Library in 2010.

Those who paid dues to join the Society (in some cases, paid in advance for two or three years), will, we trust, also continue to support the Fund, which is a 501(c)(3) charitable organization, contributions to which are tax deductible. Dues paid for membership in the ERH Society are ordinarily not tax deductible. A letter of appeal from the Fund, sent annually, will be going out in November, and we hope for a generous response.



Publications

The Talheimer Soziologie

Rosenstock-Huessy's work on a "Sociology" treatise began early. We see in Lise van der Molen's *Guide*, under the year 1925: *Soziologie I. Die Kräfte der Gemeinschaft*, 264 pp., published by Walter de Gruyter in Berlin and Leipzig. From 1929, four years later, according to Van der Molen, some notes survive for 24 lectures on the subject, and from 1930 there is an outline for a larger work. Then, finally, between 1956 and 1958, ERH published a two-volume book under the title *Soziologie*, the first volume of 335 pp. subtitled, *Die Übermacht der Räume* ("The excessive power of spaces") and the second, 774 pp., subtitled, *Die Vollzahl der Zeiten* ("The full count of the times"). The publisher in that instance, of a work

that had expanded fourfold, was W. Kohlhammer in Stuttgart.

The history of that growth in thought has not, to our knowledge, been analyzed, certainly not in English—one more task for future Rosenstock-Huessy scholarship—but the task will be made somewhat easier because of still another edition, published just this year by Talheimer Verlag, this time in three volumes under the comprehensive title *Im Kreuz der Wirklichkeit: Eine nach-goethische Soziologie* (“Within the cross of reality: a post-Goethean sociology”), with the same subtitles as the 1956-58 Kohlhammer edition. The three volumes have been constituted not by the addition of substantial new unpublished material by Rosenstock-Huessy, but by the division of the 774-page *Die Vollzahl der Zeiten* volume into two volumes.

What is new is extensive annotation and indexing. The editors of the Talheimer edition of Rosenstock’s *Sociology* are Michael Gormann-Thelen, who over the years has made many contributions of scholarship concerning ERH; Ruth Mautner; and Lise van der Molen, the masterly ERH bibliographer. And there is a foreword to the volume by Irene Scherer, who is an editor at Talheimer. Ms. Scherer is clearly proud of the extensive annotation in the new edition and of the detailed indexing of persons and subjects.

Ms. Scherer writes in her foreword: “At the beginning of the 21st century, *Im Kreuze der Wirklichkeit* encounters a totally changed world. Labor and economic systems are organizing themselves globally. New communication technologies are making possible a global interchange between cultures, ways of life, and religions. Rosenstock-Huessy’s comprehensive work on Sociology, his support of ‘Thou’ as a recognized and acknowledged part of speech, his uncompromising humanity, find in the ‘One World’ discourse of civil society today their concrete forms in time and space, which point toward the future. The author’s credibility is literally based on the unvarying path of his biography. His decisive break

from Nazism, his steadfast rejection of Stalinist Communism, and his not insignificant influence on members of the Kreisau Circle give the present work its contemporary historical stamp.”

What we all wish to see ultimately, of course, is a translation of Rosenstock’s *Sociology* into English, which the Fund does intend to bring about sometime in the next few years.

Andragogy

“Andragogy,” meaning the extension of “pedagogy” to the world of adults, is not yet a common term, but it probably has a future. Rosenstock-Huessy invested decades of his life in the theory and practice of adult education, yet it is a subject in his biography that has been little commented upon. We were delighted, then, to learn that Svein Loeng, an associate professor of educational theory at Nord-Troendelag University, in Norway, has just published a book on the history of Adult Education that gives Rosenstock-Huessy deserved attention.

Professor Loeng writes about his book, *Andragogikk: En historisk og faglig gjennomgang* (Andragogy: An Historical and Professional Review): The work, published by Laeringsforlaget, is “about central persons in the development of the theory and practice of adult education. The book follows this development from Alexander Kapp, who in the 1830s was the first known user of the concept of andragogy, up to the present. It’s not a complete review, but the following persons are mentioned or discussed, in addition to Kapp: Rosenstock-Huessy, Eduard C. Lindeman, Heinrich Hanselmann, Franz Pöggeler, Dusan Savicevic, Tonko Tjarko ten Have, and Malcolm Knowles, the author of *The Modern Practice of Adult Education*.”

“Some of the pioneers,” Professor Loeng notes, “are insufficiently discussed in the literature of adult education, especially this applies to Alexander Kapp and Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy. The works of Rosenstock-Huessy reveal important connections to other considerable adult educators before and after World War II.”

As with so much else in Rosenstock-Huessy's work, his interest in adult education is connected to other social and economic concepts that were important to him. Andragogy broadens out to include, for example, the treatment of such endemic problems as unemployment and relates to his theories of the stages of human development.

ERH's thought is a web, with all of its parts, even seemingly isolated or incidental remarks, connected to central ideas and presuppositions. I am not sure that anyone has yet asked, let alone answered, the question of why Rosenstock-Huessy devoted so much of his time and energy to Adult Education, amidst much else. To be sure, however, there was a reason deeper than that of merely addressing, arbitrarily, one of dozens of diverse human needs in modern society.

The Christian Future in Chinese

The Institute for Sino-Christian Studies (ISCS) in Hong Kong has sponsored a translation of Rosenstock-Huessy's *The Christian Future* into Chinese (or at least into one of the written versions of Chinese), and the book is available for sale from the ISCS. The ERH Fund helped with a small subsidy. The translator was Prof. Xu Wei Xiang, from Tongji University in Shanghai, and the publisher is the East China Normal University Press. This translation—the first work by Rosenstock-Huessy available in Chinese—was long aborning. For several years the project was held up by government censors, and then, for a time, Professor Xu was seriously ill. The ISCS is a well-respected institution; so the book has appeared under excellent auspices. *The Christian Future* is a treatise of extraordinary richness and compression. It cannot be merely read; it has to be pondered on every page. Among other virtues, it seeks universality, and its contents include substantial references to Confucius, Buddha, and Laotse. The people of China are thus directly addressed in the work.



ERH as Writer and Lecturer

ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY'S WRITING AND LECTURING validate each other. His classroom lecturing, full of passion and urgency but also heavily anecdotal and digressive, does not ordinarily reveal the thoughtful, systematic reasoning behind his claims. His writing, too, is passionate and pressing, but necessarily it takes the time to explain and to reason more fully, to persuade by logic. The writing alone does not reveal the man; one cannot adequately know him from his books because they do not show his inner power of spontaneous creativity. Hearing him speak, you know you are in the presence of a unique genius, a man possessed by his message. One then must turn to his books in a search for the foundations of such inspiration.



News from Europe

THE DUTCH SOCIETY of people interested in Rosenstock-Huessy, called "Respondeo" after his motto ("Respondeo etsi mutabor"), is going through a phase of reorientation. There are several reasons, one of them being that members of the older generation, many of whom knew Rosenstock-Huessy personally, are passing away. A new generation has come to the forefront. Moreover, the members are asking themselves what activities the society should now undertake. In the course of several meetings, lists of options were drawn up, and priorities are being selected by a new board with the backup of a special committee. This board consists of Anneke van Ojen, Wim van der Schee, Harrie Lieverse, Otto Kroesen (secretary) Feico Houweling (chairman). It should be noted, too, that a new Respondeo website was introduced recently: www.rosenstock-huessy.nl.



INQUIRIES REGARDING the work of the Fund should be addressed by post to Mr. Mark Huessy, ERH Fund, 88 Old Pump Road, Essex, VT 05452, or by e-mail to: <mark@erhfund.org>. Comments on the contents of this newsletter may be sent directly to: <norman_fiering@brown.edu>



News

DR. ROSENSTOCK - HUSSY WILL LECTURE TODAY
INDUSTRIALIZED WORLD WILL BE SUBJECT OF EIGHT TALKS
Published On 1/4/1935 12:00:00 AM
NO WRITER ATTRIBUTED

"The Twenty-Four Hour Day of Machinery and Capital," will be the subject of the first speech by Eugen Rosenstock-Hussy, professor of Law and Sociology, in a series of annual public lectures sponsored by the Lowell Institute under the direction of President-emeritus Lowell. The lecture will be given at 5 o'clock today in Huntington Hall.

The series includes eight lectures, to be given on successive Tuesdays and Fridays. In the first four, Professor Rosenstock-Hussy will consider the "world of modern industry as a challenge to all our standards in family, education, government, art, and church." The latter four will deal with "possible answers and solutions in order to restore society in the New World."

Professor Rosenstock-Hussy has been appointed Kuno Francke Professor of German Art and Culture for 1934-35. He is also head of the Academy of Labor in Frankfurt and was vice-chairman of the World Association for Adult Education from 1929 to 1933. Since last October he has been conducting historical seminars in the University.

<http://www.thecrimson.com/article.aspx?ref=185505>