

Man was given a formative task. Now there is an aspect to our experience that we could call the technical formative aspect. So to our total experience there is always a technical formative aspect. Some times people have called that aspect of our experience the cultural aspect. Or what could be called the historical aspect. And to all of the world God has made... to our total experience of any single thing or any single plant or anything there is a technical formative side, sometimes called the historical side or cultural side. But it seems to me that we can run into problems in that everything that God has made is becoming, developing, or there is genesis conected, it's genetic. So everything, every person. every institution has a genesis. Just as everthing in the creation is changing, it has its genesis, it is temporal, and it never ceases to have a genesis or to be temporal. So there could be a danger, namely, there is obviously at the same time, and just as obviously as that, a technical formative side to our experience. everything that is moving along, becoming in the genetic process has slices which we could call the technical - formative technical.

Name of society resembles beaver formations, rock formations that rivers make, and we dont mean by formation; natural formation, or animal formation, or plant, or spider formation, we mean human formation. Technical formation is free formation, that is it is human. There are simalarities, but in no way is man simply an extension of an animal or a plant or a physical thing. So we are talking about technical mastery, formation. And all of society has that as a very fundamental thing, that technical formative aspect. And all of what we would call culture has that technical formative aspect as a condition to get it started. So in other words culture is always formed. Society is always formed. Now there are always divine guidelines for the way that society will go. And there are guidelines for technical formation also. And they lead us in the making of society.

Modernity has to do with an over exaggeration of the technical. And this whole idea of the individual as a building block. Building and engineering is a technical formative type of thing. When we talk about how is society built? That's the type of question that was asked. There was an intent to get at the bottom of society just as there was an attempt to get at the bottom of physical things, plants and animals.

To get at the bottom is usually a physical method, the method of physics, which is always the method of dissolving to smallest building blocks. And then building back up. So when you start with physics which is always a dissolving type of method and use that as your paradigm or model you get the question "How is society built up? How is culture built up from the bottom? What are the smallest cultural element? What are the smallest societal elements?" That method and that approach is very much dominant from the 17th century on. And that is because they are in love with physics, having been turned on the algebra, they do astrophysics even, physics of the stars, and geology, the physics of the earth, and geography - physical type sciences - very popular. And it was algebra that made them possible. And they then got the desire to break everything down to the smallest elements. Biology, it's the corpus. And in linguistics it's the phonine, the smallest unit the letter. And in society it is the individual. The individual is the social Adam. Break everything down to Adams. Once we then have these smallest elements we can then make a new type of society. We can bring a correction. So the contract becomes the model for all of culture and all of society.

So these little individuals who conceive to have free will; good or evil, and they are conceived to be adults, and even the child was modelled after the adults in those days, kids were little adults in those days, were free individuals. And there were certain things that were coming up in the 17th century that made them take as their paradigm, for the building up of culture and the building up of society, the free choices, what we mean by the word voluntary, the free choices of little individuals. They are sovereign individuals - sovereign to no one, answerable to no one, they can come in and they can join and they can leave, they can split. That is typical of a free or voluntary association. You start out with free adults, individuals, who are the starting point, the initiators. Then society is defined as that which is secondary and derived from these primary individuals who through their free actions develop what is culture. So there is not the same amount of worth given to what we call social structures, or culture, or society as was given to these original individuals who through their action, who through their speaking, or who through their thinking cause these other things to be. These other things are considered to be secondary and derived.

God is therefore ruled out as having any ordinances that would go in advance of these free individuals. The moment that they are free He is out of the picture. Freedom is always the freedom to come or not to come. Join or leave. And until you convened in a convention there was no reality of a social, a cultural, or moral kind. So there could not be any divine guidance ahead of time, in advance, because then these individuals wouldn't be free. So you have to see how radical the 17th century conceived freedom to be. God has to wait on the free decisions, the contracts, the covenants, and the agreements of sovereign individuals. God has to wait on them.

You can chart what free individuals do after they have done that. And after a while you can even start to maybe see a trend to free individuals. 'Free individuals will usually do this.' But there are no ordinances in Genesis 1 already that are going to be worked out and lead the development of human free formation. So when we talk about free technical formation. We are not talking about freedom in this radical Enlightenment sense. Get this now: for Locke you cannot have anything in the Bible that would prescribe for human life, because human life is always at bottom free individuals by choice entering into a convention, a congregation of individuals, a convention of individuals who then make an agreement, which is free will, entered into freely. That's the way covenant was defined in theology under the Scottish. And if you look at Gary North, he looks at the whole of history, even God's relationship to man, as such a covenant. This means that there cannot be any of what we call normative sciences. Science where human action are. But it means that you are committed to a physical model for what we call the humanities. It is a physicist model. The individual is the key to almost all ills in that sense. Because people don't realize that what we call individual interpersonal relationships are always already found in what we would call wee communities. Wee communities are the conditions that make interpersonal individual relations possible. We are all born into families, born into states, and baptised when we are little (most of us). In other words we are in those things, even though they are formed by other individuals, those social structures, and those social structures do not form themselves, they are not persons. They are the result of individuals who come together and form. There is what you call a voluntary moment in what is called

the cultural or social life. It is always human formation involved. But social structures are inherited. We are born into them. They become the very conditions for what we call personal relationships of every kind. And so consequently if you don't see that you make all of society and culture the result of free individuals. And we then abstract the individual person not only from his interpersonal relationships, but from these wee communities that we always find ourselves in to one degree or another.

And now we start working with an abstract view - abstracted from reality and thus able to be free from God's ordinances. That's the purpose there - man is now going to do it better than God. (17th century) Therefore we have to break God's universe as its been realized and formed from out of the past by sinful men but nevertheless inherited by the men of the 17th century. In reaction to the previous people they want to do better, but also they want to throw out any kind of authority from the outside. Thus by the method of physics they want to break it down to the smallest building blocks. And then conceive of the thing getting started from the free interaction, free activity of these sovereign individuals. So then society and social structures are always secondary and derived. And that is why evangelism is always getting to the individuals and then getting to the societal structures. And of course you never get to the societal structures because they are considered secondary and derived from personal conversions of human hearts. So you start with human hearts and then you are supposed to get to society. But human hearts were involved in the making of society. Society is what keeps human hearts in bondage. You never get to societal structures apart from human hearts and you never get to human hearts apart from societal structures. They don't exist apart - ever. So whether its social action or individual heart - you can never get in that dilemma.

Now then when we talk about culture and society there is this technical formative side. And I think it is probably dangerous to talk about a historical aspect or a cultural aspect. It seems that what we call history and culture are founded or have as their bottom line condition technical formation. And history, and culture and society are then to be looked at as broader ideas, but always the three have that in common - that they are all initiated by human technical formative activity. So consequently it is probably bad to talk about a cultural,

or historical, aspect, but rather to talk about a technical formative aspect. And then when you study society or culture you always have to get at that technical formative - it plays a big role in all of those three concepts. That is part of the problem that we have as a group of reformers or transformers. Because now we stand at a point in the middle of the 19th century toward the last third of the 20th whereby for the first time we are now as Americans very historically minded. Not the masses of American but a lot of what you can call the intellectual community are very much historically minded.

Europe has always been much more historically minded. If you go to Holland you see buildings that are there from the 13th century, and the 11th and 12th too. You couldn't see one from that era in this country. And so you can see that it is hard to estimate what a difference that makes on people when you never see buildings that are more than 16th or 17th century. Because that 16th or 17th century building is a modern building for Europe. And so they have been historical in their thinking a lot longer than we have. The becoming aware of what history is was really happening in the previous century - like 1840 - 1850.

That is what we would call for the first time the real modern historians. Now there develops a certain sin - an exaggeration of the role of history which is called historicism. And historicism is at first seen to be a very liberating thing because you can see how everybody is a child of their time. And that liberates you to do something new, because you can see how everybody else's idea came out of their own time and were fitted into their own time. So men feel that they are liberated from all the ideas that they inherited. Some of those that were considered to be eternal and so forth. But now they feel liberated. So the discovery of history comes first as liberation. Then not more than a decade or so after that it is experienced in a very pessimistic way, namely that history will bury any project ahead of time. You can figure where we are going to be as a movement 50 years from now and it will probably will be a discouraging thought. No, says somebody?! But the point is that if we go the way of all other movements and there is a high probability we will, then there probably won't be much around. And so you can start to see why historicism was called the grave digger of all culture. It no longer was looked as optimistically

but it becomes now the pessimism. So therefore, historicism has this technical formative moment in it and history is looked at as (since nobody's ideas are anything lasting, there are no eternal principles that hold, all things and everywhere always the same) powers that are vying for control in their own times. So history as it deals with these technical formations becomes now a battle or power struggle. For the first time then we are going to look at history as a power struggle and that leads to nihilism. And so just before the year 1900 Neitche and other people, Spengla talked about the decline of the west. It would decline for Spengla as a plant declines, it goes through certain stages, gets old and declines. And we were in the period, and Dooyeweerd has been very much influenced by Spengla and Burgson, these life philosophers and historicists who predicted the decline of the west and predicted the nihilism that would come upon us. Now if there is anything that we are all aware of its the disaster mania suggested again recently by Hal Lindsey's film, but all sorts of science fiction as Time Magazine pointed out in this little article on disaster mania, a review of Hal Lindsey. We are feeling ourselves very much in an animal house world. Saturday Night Live. Nihilism. We are experiencing it not in the way the French experienced in 1907 just previous to the first world war, or that the American intellectual community experienced it between the two WWS in this country, or that the Europeans again experienced it in Germany after the reconstruction of WW II. But we are experiecing it^{after}, the 60's in this country which is probably the biggest revelation of meaning that the world has ever experienced. Everything we can see the end of. Everything that is going to be further investigated was started to be investigated and unveiled in the 60's. In other words we can see the coming of the Lord. It is like staring us in the face.

The coming of the Lord to western civilization is eminent. But that is not the last final coming. But you can see the end of western civilization. And that is not a mechanical thing, but it is a pretty sure thing to bet on if you are a money borrower or lender. The decline of the west is not to be looked at as a plant. But the signs of decline are everywhere. And the thing about them is that

they are interconnected. It was the very strength of the new left that it connected up a number of things. And it said of everybody else that they didn't understand because they didn't see the connection. And for them, to a very great degree, the connection of all these things was corporate capitalism. That is capitalism in its last corporatistic stage was to be seen as the connector of all the different things that were tearing apart and fracturing at the end of the 60's and early 70's. Now that has become pretty well universaly a part of western civilization. The feeling of decline and the feeling of nihilism is never been so great. It is even greater now than it was after each of the WWS.

And so Neitche, for instance, is very popular in having renaissance on campuses right now. And he is the guy we ought to be studying.

This also means that there is an tremendous interest in American history and American development. And it also means that then there is a searching for roots. Not only Alex Haley's roots, but the roots of our perdiciment. And therefore the word enlightenment is very much a bad word-a mod word in the sense that people say 'hey the enlightenment really screwed us up.' The enlightenment is very popular - you find it in a lot of books. Another word that is very popular is modernity. The process of modernization has brought all these ills. And let's study cultures where modernizations hasn't come. Or culture where modernization is just starting to come. All this kind of stuff is burgeoning with books on this topic just now. Most of them aren't worth reading. But that term Modernity and modernization is in the air and we are all aware of and thus Americans are becoming historically sensitive. And it is only been since I used to go over the boarder to Canada that its happened. Americans weren't that way 8 years ago. They were not. I remember that we used to get over the boarder and breath a sigh of relief because America was so pulverized over the hair issue which symbolized it. As soon as you crossed the boarder you felt like you were with people who were sane. Now you go over the Canadian boarder and the Canadians appear to you insane and the Americans are more serious. In that short time there has been a big flip over.

There is nothing more materialistic now than the Canadians. They are living like there is no tomorrow because they only have 10 years of the progress that the Americans had for 50. And they are going to get it all in in 10. You know that if you live in Canada that the money situation up there is worse just about than it is here. So Canadians are living one of the most desparately materialstic bings I've ever seen. And they are blinded just as bad as any American's ever been blinded. Only they are a little better at it because they are English and they are a little more sophisticated at this materialistic blindness. But it is a sick situation in Canada. And that has ^{not} only been my opinion, but I have had that confirmed by a number of people in articles that I've read. That is what has happened to Canada in a very short time. And I think that they are going to be in for this feeling of crises and nihilism.

The word crises comes from the Greek word crinema which means to judge. A crisis is a time when the word of God or the coming of God which is a coming down always since God is high up, and the prophet is the bearer of the word. And when the prophet comes, the Lord comes, the judgement comes, the crisis comes. So the 42 months, the 1260 days or the times, time and $\frac{1}{2}$ a time that are in the book of Revelation are three and a half years of prophetic presence where the thing is brought into crisis under judgement. Namely, when God comes there is no more delay. The decision had to be made one way or the other. No more escape. So the prophet comes. Confrontation comes. Judgement comes. Crisis comes. The crisis is felt in all sorts of ways. And the book on Progress and Capitalism that is going to be coming out by Erdman's sometime this year, probable around the Fall, starts off, this is by Bob Goldsword who is going to be touring North America promoting this book, and I think that is probably the most important book next to the Bible and Relational Learning and Scriptual Religion and Political Task by Runner that has ever been produced on this side of the Atlantic, this analysis of modernity is to talk about how is the state a number of the things that every body feels; pollution, the recking of families, the strain on the individuals, all these barriers are being broken. And all these points of strain he unites and shows how they have their roots in modernity.

what we call progress which has its root in the renaissance; the autonomous man trying to go it on his own and how that history develops, and so he sketches it. The thing that is interesting is that all the problems are interwoven with each other. And we could say that the left is very much to the point and right on, namely, that you have to see these crisis phenomena as part of a general crisis and that very much part of that general crises is this last stage of capitalism called corporatism which is making pleasure a universal, legal, international right of all men. And pleasure ties up with man as first of all a go getter and an inquisitive animal who is free to expand his acquisition, wealth, conquerors nature - nature looked at as supply and material for his production. Man produces and expands himself, self realization, self production by conquering nature. So man is seen to be in a struggle with nature. And now there are iron-clad laws that govern deistically, because there is not a trinitarian ~~deistic~~ covenant God, the laws of exchange, and supply and demand. Now man is a free man and he produces himself and proves himself by conquering nature. All people are looked at as going somewhere. Bunyan is going somewhere, getting somewhere, to the Celestial City. It is a trip he is on. And he is not going to be stopped. So men are looked at as on the move to get somewhere and to get something. They are go getters. That is the very basic flaw along with the fact that the dominant view of man is that he is made up of a soul which is an intellect and rational thing, and has a physical, biological body attached. The needs come out of the body part. Material needs come out of the body part. And then rational freedom, moral freedom is in that intellectual part. And rationality is said to be common to all and there is then an equality doctrine because we all have reason and the mortal soul is the place where that rationality and freedom is housed. And man learns the dominant view of learning in the 17th century is that man knows empirically. Locke, the philosopher of the 16th and 17th century represents this perspective well when he says that by starting with a blank tablet our senses receive the world that is out there and then registers it on this blank mind. And then mind, by inner laws of association builds up a network of concepts which we then hope correspond to the world outside. But the world outside we know, being good physicists, is odorless, colorless, and composed of indivisible and invisible atoms. So now what are colors and odors? And what are concepts?

And how do we know about the outer world? That was the problem of the 17th/18th century which shows that what I am saying is right; that man was conceived of being made up of basically two worlds- a rational world and the rationality which tends to make him good which then made him like the gods, was housed in an entity that we could call the soul. And the reason that it is called a soul is because when men die that entity could go to heaven and they still wanted to stay Christians of some sort. And then there is another world that holds the senses, the body. So that body-soul was the basis for this theory of knowledge, namely that all knowledge starts with itty-bitty things called sensations. Just as all physical things come from itty-bitty things called atoms, and that language comes from itty-bitty things called letters, and that biological things come from itty-bitty things called corpuscles, they concluded that society comes from itty-bitty things called individuals and so then talked about knowledge coming from itty-bitty things called sensations. That is the view of man that lays at the root of the idea of a free market - what we call laissez-faire economics.

So if you want to deal with somebody who is into laissez-faire economics, and everybody who believes in the welfare state, and welfare economics which is the American economics is also a believer to some degree in laissez-faire. That is because laissez-faire brings welfare economics. This is the thesis of StanCarlson in a paper he has given for CJL to get at the basis for a Christian social policy in Canada. He traces the fact that welfare always comes because its a savior for the compassionate side to a laissez-faire idea of economics and a laissez-faire view of the market. And the one entrenches the other. And the more laissez-faire the less social harmony you have. In other words the market doesn't bring the ultimate social harmony. If you leave it alone the market will bring the best in social harmony, the ultimate society - that is what people champion. But we know that it brings the ultimate chaos. In this autonomous idea of free individuals, each motivated, self movers, driven by self interest, they have the power and they are not going to be satisfied, their needs and their body compulse them and they dont have any control over it, and so they drive man in such a way that man has to

get things to satisfy those needs. He has to get. So he is an inquisitive animal. And there is a famous book on man as inquisitive. That is he acquires. So Locke is talking about merit as the fundamental rule. How much you merit is dependent on how much hard work you do. How much you then get or acquire. So wealth is the sign of how much you get. And you are driven to that by your bodily needs. So therefore the body is involved. Their view of rationality is involved. And therefore the more people who go in the market, the more buyers and the more sellers, the more producers and the more consumers, the better and more perfect the market. And the laws of the market are for keeping things small and forbidding monopolies. But these individuals are thought to be in a kind of relationship of collision; Newtonian atoms all having their own force within, not being pushed by something else, but having their own self movement, are clashing - not competition which will come into effect in the 1860s around the biological and zoological model of Darwin. Namely that we are in a war of all against all of animals. Homo lupis lupis. That's an additional thing that the capitalists pickup - that competition is a war. And in that sense an animal war. The right of the stronger will prevail. But originally the picture is of Newtonian atoms in a free field. And they have the ability to equalize field. So thus you have the early capitalist concept of equilibrium and the price mechanism. That is the equilibrium that you would have if there are many buyers and many sellers and many exchangers in the market. So the more exchangers you have the more perfect competition, the more neutralization and God, by these deistic laws will make sure that it all works out for the best. So each pursues vice and self interest, but the system comes out with the maximum social harmony. Well that doesn't happen, so consequently you have the ultimate almost maximum disintegration of life. That causes a tremendous state for the purposes of helping the poor, the old, and the oppressed and all the people who are left behind in this industrial free market. And so laissez-faire, hands off, just let these interests of free individuals run things brings welfarism. The more laissez-faire the more welfare. They are dialectical. They can't live without each other they can't live with each other - like man and wife.

9 That process then which we experience today is so complicated due to the imput of evolution, due to the imput of increasing technology, due to the skill to use capitol and to develop credit and all this stuff, has made it so complicated that people realize that they are being driven by the machine and by the system and by the organization and the organization is always technical in character, the organization says to get the skill in order to put it together in such a way that the very disperant things are pulled together or centralized. Centralization and decentralization have to do with technical formative types of things. Well the more technology that is put in there along with economic freedom in that licentious way of self interest in the market that will lead us to the land of material abundance as our very gods. And the wealth of nations is a part of it to - not only individual aquisition of wealth but nations have self interest. "In our national self interest..." did you ever hear that? Thats the line of Henry Kissenger..."It is not in our national self interest." And every revolutionary country that's poor has self interest so there is a battle of self interest - it's a power struggle of self interest. So now reconciliation is one of power struggles. It is like nations have big bodies with big needs and they have to have those needs satisfied. So resources then are something we fight over and threaten eachother with until we get it worked out.

That whole process then leads more and more to the feeling of crisis, the feeling of nihilism, and now men in western civilization have become what we call moderns in the sense that they are aware that the problems had an origin. And the problems originated around the Enlightenment and around the French revolution. So modernity now is the study of that. And everybody is studying that and it is very important. And none of us are ahead of anybody else in that. We all have to study that an awful lot. And keep studying that all the time. It is in and through that study that we are going to solve a lot of the problems that beset us. And that is what I want to get into now.

One of the things that people have perceived at the end of the 60s in America is that socialism, and this a typical American perception and this has been very excellent, has the same problems as capitalism in that they are both polluters and they are both

highly industrial. They both live for 'happiness is the aquisition of things.' So they are both thing centered. They are both industrialists. They are both polluters. And they are both capitalists. One is a state capitalist - the state is the entrepreneur in Russia and we have more the individual. Now with corporatism there is a convenient elimination of competition in the hands of a few big powers. That kind of competition leads toward state capitalism. The state is conceived of as the manager of the economy and the big corporations are involved and you develop this big general what we would call corporatism which the new left pointed out is in every church and in every labor union and in every big business and in every state so that the mofia is corporatistic, the state, the church, the labor unions, and the big businesses. So there is a lot to that theme of corporatism. I just read through a paper by Arnold DeGraff called the Canadian Way of Life. It is his speech given at Niagra two or three years ago. And that comes on me with new force. It is a very good speec. And at the time I thought it was a very good speech but I still don't think that he is positve enough to offset what he is saying. And there are things added to that and they bring it up to date. And it is in this study course called World View. All of you should get that and one of the papers in there is this one on the canadian way of life. And he talks about that corporatism as the key to understanding the Canadian way of life. So that is fudamentally received by everybody. And so everybody has their view of multi-nationals, but everybody thinks about multi-nationals. And that is a king-pin in your modern life evaluation. That is what the new left brought out. And that is pretty well excepted as a fundamental factor is looking at modernity.

Now the uniqueness, is that the Americans, because of the cold and McCarthy, could never buy into socialism. The socialist movement has never been able to get power in this country. Partly because of what Stalin did. He ruined and in many respects set back the socalist movement. And so the socialists big bugaboo is Stalin. 'What think ye of Stalin?' So the socialists have this splintered - like protestantism has done over the last 300 years - in the last 40 years you have almost as many socialists as you have protestants. And they don't even talk to each other. They are like the protestants 5 years after the church

split. They still don't talk yet. But 10-15 years after they do. There isnothing that has impressed me more than how split the socialists are among themselves. And so it is not that there is not any socialism moving in the world. There is. But the socialism that you see moving in the world is opportunistic. Just as capitalism has got opportunistie so socialism has got opportunistic and they then call up from within themselves crities on themselves. And one of the critiques that arises simultaneously from both the socialist camp and the capitalist camp is what we would call the critique on pollution. The critique on industrialism. The critique on modernity. And that is what I have meant by anarchism.

Anarchists are always both on the left and the right. Socialism is always on the left. Capitalism is always on the right. Anarchism is found on both sides. And because anarchists are on both sides, they can be a middle way. They can be a third force. And thus they have become slowly on, first in the Catholic worker movements which brought the unions to this country to some degree, the rise of unionism and the reform on the industrialism at the end of the last century. And then through the pacifist movements that got in with the unionist movements. And then the feminist movements. These are three areas where you have anarchists both in capitalist country and in socialists.

And then with the first WW was an occasion to bring a lot of differnt pacifist groups. But then with WW2 the anarchists were really thrust into the foreground in the protest against the state and against corporatism. So the anarchist idea was spread from being against the state which was the traditonal doctrine of anarchism, to being against corporations of any kind. Corporatism became like a universal enemy. The state is behind everything or the big businesses are benind everything and they almost amount to the same thing. so now with the war on and the industrialists - weapons have always been - only the state can make war. So therefore if you eliminate the state you eliminate war - that's pacifism. So consequently with the war in Viet Nam all the pacifists that ever existedcame out and are all now a part of the renaissance of pacifism. And pacifism is generally an anarchist movement. So the war in VietNam brought this third way between socialism and capitalism out in the lead. Then the environmental movement

underscored industrialistic modernity as destroying and coming out of mans faustian desire to expand himself unlimited and don't care about the limits of nature. There are many anarchists in that movement. So one of the things that I am getting at with these comments is that anarchists never get together. But now they are together in a very unique way. Because there are anarchists on the right, anarchists on the left, anarchists in the union movement, and they don't even know about each others exsistence, but now there is a big block of anarchists. And where these anarchists have come together.....

.... Giantism. All these anarchists have come together around a critique of giantism, corporatism. And they have made this merge together to call for life as if people mattered. Or what we would call according to the human scale. And not corporatistically shrunk out of size. So anarchists have been the champions of the small. Small is beautiful. Historically they have always been for what is small. Anarchists are not for big of any kind, because soon as anthing gets big it gets bad. And so they have been historically champions of small. And it takes an army to make war. You can see then why the small principle. And intimacy - being that anarchists (and this is a thing that you have to keep in mind) are into small groups, because in small groups you can keep trust. You can count on people. You can get to know them. So the lack of intimacy that the industrial revolution brings and the need for intimacy as a reaction to the victorian age, and as a reaction to the impersonality of corporate life and the role of technique where the bigger the thing gets the less questions you ask. And the role of the consultant is to get the objectives out there so that we don't have to keep asking questions. Whereas in the Bible we have man in the image of God and that is man who can question. Not to question God's authority and His law order. But in the measure that we are able to question and let our children question in that measure we are free. But in the measure that the technocratic industrial religion of material abundance dominates with its consultants then in that degree we can't question anymore. The discipline is to take the steps to the targets as fast and as effeciently as possible and then we will get somewhere and we will get something done. But if we open the thing up to questions we can't get anywhere. We can't get anything

done. And that is what propagandism is - James Jonesism. Whenever somebody comes the first thing that they want to do is, 'well, its nice you're globalizing, you're theorizing, but now lets get things pinned down a little bit.' So you set down goals and objectives. And then set up time tables and ways to get to those objectives. But soon as you do that the assumption is that you stop thinking about where you are going and now you know where you are going. You have decided where you are going. And thus you can't undecide it. And thus you can't question it!

And that is the feeling of enslavement, the programization of American education that Carlson and these guys get at. They are on one big James Jone trip. They have been on it for 50 yrs. And we have mass suicides - 60,000 teachers get beat up in urban schools, as Sixty Minutes said last Sunday night. And they have battle fatigue. And it is a new phenomenon of teachers in urban schools. They have really what you have when you are on the battle front. And they can't dare to go out of the house. And now they are bringing in consultants in technology to figure out how to get the guy so that he can go back to school.

The more this giantism goes the more propagandism is seen. And the more that this propagandistic-technocratic systems analysis is working at setting targets, setting objectives, the kinds of things' that you have in what they call marriage encounters for instance, where this ten minutes is the most important time of your life, you write a love letter every day of you life all the way until the grave. That type of thing. You're on a program now and you are not supposed to question the program. Over against that you have the Biblical emphasis of man questions everything - everything that he can question and is able to be question and is legitamate. Every question is legitimate once in the Bible. And questioning God as to what He wants you to do, and questioning why he has taken so long to get done what He has promised to do, this is what shocks first of all, the pietists, then the dispensationalist Hal Lindsey, every Victorian, everybody. Namely the psalmist who questioned, 'Lord, how long?' The chewing out of God for holding out on coming through with His promises. That type of thing has to be slowly on - the conditions in

family and marriage and in school have to be set so that those kids can question, question and question. Now a good teacher is not going to let you question all the time. You have to learn to get discipline and questioning technique and dialogue. In order to ask good questions you have to learn things. You have to memorize things. You have to stop questioning in order to ask good questions. So when you question and how you question is always determined by the teacher. God says let nobody on earth be your teacher - I'm your teacher. But teachers who have been given authority are always concerned with getting the person to the point where they are able to ask a certain ^{proper} type of question. Because in and through questioning we learn what the norms are, what the commandments are that are going to be our salvation. And we are going to know what the will of our heavenly Father is.

Just look at what is the nature of a question. Think about that and look at the scriptures in that way and you'll see that everything that God does is educational in nature; sin, the cross, the devil. It is all for our education as a human race. And it is done in order that we might question what was done. Things like the exodus. When your children come along in the years to come and ask why these motsa balls, why this unleaven bread? Say to them this. And so you set up a liturgy that makes them curious and they ask these questions. That's the teaching occasion then. Everything is a teaching occasion. That's what the Bible means by the word law. Torah is teaching. Law in the Bible is not a legal statute. It's Torah. And the whole OT is called the law of God. Not just the books and the law of Moses. It is called the law. It is sometimes called the law, the prophets and the psalms. Sometimes the ten commandments are called the law. Sometimes the law of Moses. Sometimes the first five books are called law. But in many places that Whole OT is called the law. And the law is the Torah. And it is set up so that the people might question.

Over against that modernity is a slow technological fixation on certain goals, the goal of pleasure, which is now an international legal right; Buick is to enjoy, life is to enjoy, going out every weekend to a nice place - not a McDonalds - every week, 52 times a year. Your parents used to go out 5 times a year. We have now got everybody

working at that pleasure and the services. And we need consultants on weekends for our licentious time, free time, for the planning of our leisure. Can you believe it.

So anarchists being on the right and on the left can pull up the need for intimacy for one thing, whcih is left out of because of the gigantic impersonality of life, the corporatism. So intimacyism is one of the things that is involved in the break down of marriages and families. And small means more intimate. So small now becomes a rallying cry for the intamacy that has been built out of modern life. So that anything that brings intimacy we are for;whether its homosexuality of male or female variety,we are all for small groups, we are all for community, anything that is intimate. But you see that we fail to realize that intimacy is always found in a wee community. You don't have intimacy in general. Your have family intimacy, marriage intimacy, intimacy of friends, you have a progress into intimacy through acquaintances, social politenesses, and differnt compacting, and different kinds of contacting which means that even contacting is always done in a kind of wee community. But when you now talk about intimacy - period - what do you have in mind? You always have to ask the question, 'what kind of intimacy please? ' Otherwise I don't want to get involved. Because the kind of intamacy that doesn't ask,'what kind?' is out to destroy all the old types of intimacy.

Now that is tied up with the popularity of anachism too. Because small means close. And intimacy has to do with closeness to people. And we get insulated and isolated and alienated. And thus we need the closeness. But you cannot understand the problems in marriage, family and friendship and the confusion of that today without this intimacyism. If you talk about power structures everybody knows you mean the big three. If you talk about intimacy it is a functionalism. When you start with the general thing, intimacy, and don't regard where intimacy is actually found in our experience, namely always tucked under, tucked in families, marriages, and friendships and this typical type of intimacy is not being dealt with. It is never just a general intimacy.

This functionalism of an ethical kind we could call intimacyism. It's a sure break down. And there are all sorts of techniques to get more intimacy, to break your resistance down so that you let it all

out and so you are freed now. In an anti-Victorian way you are freed from the boudaries in which intimacy has been brought up and developed. So this small theme means that anarchism can become a small middle force between capitalism which has got more opportunistic and decadent and socialism which has gotten more opportunistic and thus the river bed of opportunism means that economic cooperation and SALT talks can go on because they are both opportunistic, or pragmatistic. Anarchism becomes the new way of humanity, of small scale, the way of intimacy, the way of community. Now it is the way of peace because it is not the way of big arms race, and not dangerous risks of nuclear power and all sorts of stuff like that.

I came on the scene over the last two years doing what I felt was necessary and turned around to see the ranks, and I'm saying that I thought I was in front, and I looked behind and saw what I detect as anarchy all over the place. That is, anarchistic influences all over the place. So I now have to think about what is now going on. And it comes at me in and around the word community. And so I thought about it and read about it. And struggled and argued and argued and argued and found that nobody could be against it. It's like motherhood and apple pie. You can't be completely opposed to that. But there is nothing more destructive than anarchism. It's known for its terroristic destructiveness. It's known for its commitment in the face of utter folly. But the guy goes right into the teeth of other folly and everybody says what an ass, but boy, you sure had guts. And that commitment has what has made anarchism famous. The commitment of somebody who is an anarchist is exactly what makes it contagious. I think that it is perhaps the greatest example of commitmentism. And the word commitment has been very popular over the last ten years. Nobody used the word ten years ago. Everybody uses the word commitment today. To be committed is the biggest thing in the world because our society makes it impossible to be committed. And what it tries to get you committed to is some little technique or gimick with a certian methodology and with objectives and you have to be committed to that otherwise the thing doesn't work. You have to do it an unquestioned committed way. So commitment usually means these little goals and little programs. Commitment comes up with the notion of programs.

That's what people mean by commitment. Commitment to a goal. Commitment to a target. Commitment to a program.

Commitmentism has a great historic example always with the anarchists. And that is another attractive thing. So what I did was fall into the probable big sin of the reformatory movement, the reformers and transformers movement, started in with Kuyper and Groen is to become what I call anti-synthetic. That's a new -ism. We know that everything in our lives is a result of synthesis. Every tier comes from taking the Christian faith and combining it with non-Christian ways of life and thought patterns. And behind that is the dragon and his sabbatizing angels, or demons or devils. We know that's the case of all the tiers. But you see it's also the most Biblical thing perhaps that Vollenhoven ever said that before you can criticize something you have to have the answer. It is irresponsible to critique someone unless you have the answer worked out. So if you have the answer worked out you lead with the positive. Then the person who is in synthesis will say, 'hey, that's neat! I'd like to get that. That's nice - that positive.' "How come we don't get that?" And then you say, 'Because you've got, like I had before I saw it that positively, these other influences on you.' And then that guy says, 'hey, man, we'll have to get rid of those other influences; but then there's people here who are in synthesis say at that point, 'I don't want that.' And then they carry on and they point the finger at that future, that positive postulate. And that drives the people who are in synthesis to grab on to you that much faster and see that's the Biblical way. Always led with the positive. Then the synthesis is shown not to be synthesis. Then the people in synthesis are called forward to either get rid of the synthesis or hold back and become what you call apostate. They have to make a decision. When they get apostate then the vultures start circling. Where the people refuse to hear the word of God the vultures start to gather around their carcasses. And that's how you know.

What I was doing was to have a speech against anarchism. So I was leading with a critique. And now I look back and I see a big split all over the place. People can't get together. And I mean to heal that up right now. And what tempted me to speak about anarchism

in that way and what was lacking in me that cause me to fall into the temptation was first the urgency of the phenomenon. Because there is a norm of urgency that Goudsworth underlies at this conference for International Justice along with a guy from the Netherlands. They talked about norms for the international economic order. And those norms, one of which is always in a more complicated situation, prefer the old over the new. All things being equal, the untied is not to be prefered over the tried. Don't remove ancient landmarks said the Bible. And another thing is the norm of urgency with the increased complexity, speed and rapidity, rapidation they call it, of change, comes upon us. And where there is a norm of urgency the old is to be preferred, the tried and the true, because it's been experienced and its been through the mill and its come out as a pretty good way to go. The oldest is to be preferred - that's a Biblical Norm.

I have become aware of those two norms in anew way. And that is going to be very helpful to us I think. And another thing is that starting back as long as a year ago at a corporaters meeting of CES 15 corporaters, and one of them is Tom Malcolm, and he was telling me that Arn-old Degraff was with Jim Oltihus and a number of the professors are doing, namely moving from out of suburbia to downtown Toronto and starting to build a community. Now I said to Arnie when he came down a year ago to the last Educational Conference is, 'Gee, you guys come down here and start talking in a big way about community - we've had community for five years in Penna. already. We've been struggling. We have these communities and we have all sorts of problems with communities.' And he was talking about community as an unqualified good. And I knew that there was anarchism in every bloody community. I could see it as clear as the idea in my face. And I didn't want to put myself in a place of being against community because everybody was for community. That had me in a pickle right then and there. But in the process, a couple moths afterward when Malcolm was down here, the explanation came out of what they mean by community. And that is an extremely important thing. Because I had the feeling that they wouldn't be doing community in any kind of a traditional way. And they weren't. And what they were doing is this;

Community is of a certitudinal or confessional quality.

Communities always deal with the out working of what we would call a world and life view. That is the first sense in which I am going to use community. The world and life view is something that we work out. And that is first of all, a bad term because our world and life view always involves God. So world and life view is something that came with modernity. Namely they left out God and they talk about a view of this world view. And you have to keep that in mind. God is very important you see, in our thinking. So when you say world view every humanist would be for that. So there is something bad about the term world view. That's a critique of Talyard and this new book of Polished Lenses makes of Dooyeweerd. That term world view you see, Dooyeweerd restricts science to the world. He says you can't do any science about God. And Talyard says uh-un that's wrong, you can do science about God. And they start to argue in that book. And in that book is a critique from Vollenhoven's point of view on Dooyeweerd. History is going to bury Dooyeweerd. I can see it more and more. And that is not historicism. There is much that we can use of Dooyeweerd, but one of the things that Dooyeweerd is not aware of enough is what we call Genesis, the genetic. That is; when do marriages first come, when do families first come, were Adam and Eve created married or were they friends who got quickly married because there wasn't much choice, then got quickly family because wasn't much choice, or what? And when did churches begin? When do schools, when do nation-states arise? All these genetic type questions you can't find answeres to in Dooyeweerd. But those are teh questions that we are now into as Americans, namely how the hell did we get this way?

Looking at this problem then I was tempted instead of being for something, a ressurectionary, I fell right into a reactionary type position. A ressurectionary always leads with the positive. I led with an anti-anarchism thing, instead of leading with a pro-community. But the whole question is that I didn't understand what was going on in this community thing enough that I could really feel comfortable to lead out forward for community. And now I do. And the reason I do is the result of listening a lot more to what Malcolm and these guys were talking about. Community has to do with the response of a number

families and singles to the worship, which includes the singing, the congregational praying and the preaching, and the response is what we call community. And that community is really a confessional thing. That is, we get together then in response to the sermon and say what does that sermon mean for our economic sharing, our life, and what does it mean for citizenship, and here we confess our sins, and we work that out. That should be done liturgically on Sunday, in a root way. But it can be done all week long. So the children get to witness the struggle, the seriousness, the earnestness of their parents together with other parents, and that is a kind of intimacy - a federation of parents - and in that sense a covenant- to work out the doctrine of the scriptures, the Torah, the education of God, the whole Bible being called law now. This is not a world view now, it's God's education. And we ask, 'what does that education mean in terms of a framework? How does it bear down on our economical, our political, our life as families, in the neighborhood. In other words that is a kind of intimacy and in that kind of context you can pray about all sorts of small things. But in the context of a public worship service we can't bring all those small things because worship can be with 1000 people. Everybody knows that's the truth of Episcopalian and Roman Catholic Cathedrals. You can worship with big groups and then you have one guy that speaks forth, and he speaks forth something that nobody can deny. That's what preaching is. When you are ready to preach you don't have any doubts. If you do, people won't receive you preaching. And the preaching is just like when God comes, because nobody has any doubts anymore. Or when the prophet comes he brings the 42 months - he brings the $3\frac{1}{2}$ years - he brings the crisis. So preaching does that. There is a room and a rule for preaching. That's the truth of the protestant reformation.

But the history of the church is that it gets corporatistic and formal. Big and in every way formal. And then we have these groups called 'prayer groups' Bible studies" intimacy groups, and we just feel less and less a part of the big thing. But feel more in the informal, and personal thing. And the church is the very legitimate thing. And so consequently they start their own denomination. Underground church movement was a good example of it. Every church, then needs to have the worship side, the preaching side, and the response.

Every church has more than one preacher. That's another thing. One maybe who is more dominant. There should be one preacher at a time. But there should not be necessarily one preacher. There could be a leading preacher. He could maybe preach broader in a whole territory. And the other guys would just preach locally and more situationally. But those gifts will come out. They'll come out in the small groups. The intimate community response to the preaching. In other words, preaching without the response has the effect of frustration. It's like capping off dynamite. It'll blow sooner or later. So Nashua is a history of one guy blowing his steam off Sunday after Sunday and the rest of them can't stand it. And the more polite don't come to church. Because you have in Nashua the systematic frustration of what is exactly necessary to say, 'What does that sermon mean?!?' And then I say to the minister, "Get down to cases or get the hell down off that pulpit!" At least show me in a couple of examples how the word of God comes down. And the word of God is always timely, it's situational. It is a sword that pins something down. But it is not the ministers job in the first sense to pin to many things down. It is the congregation's responsive job to pin things down.

Neighborhooding is therefore a condition for community. You then have to get close enough that you can meet enough to work out the response to that sermon. You can't do it over a long distance telephone. You have got to be able to either bike or jog to them, or have a telephone number without a one in front of it. That's a neighborhood. That's a condition for community. Community is of a confessional, certitudinal nature. It's church, we might call it.

Now the church in that sense is a sharing community. It has got to be an example of what sharing is. We share our sacred fortunes, our children. We develop intimacy, we correct each other, but above all we submit to one another. So no matter how many differences we have - and I am eternally grateful for Dave Frenchel having shown me this, for never giving up on it - because now I see how you can work out all the different traditions that, all the synthesis that breaks people apart. The church is the example where all the differences from out of the past can be overcome by the fact that we don't go forward without understanding why, and the wherefore of what one person is doing. That's not consensus, but its being accountable. That has to be worked

out in a paradigm way. Because the community, as a response to the public worship, to the public preaching, and public prayer, and public singing is the other half of what we call the institutional church. But we have a history of the institutional church being at war, polarized around intimacy-small groups and big impersonal worship services.

So every movement; the separatists, the brethren, the Methodists, the pietists, the dispensationalists, the Darbyists and the Plymouth brethren are all separating from the church of England. They are all protesting against these big national/state churches with their big cathedrals that took a million dollars to build and you have six women - the size of this crowd every Sunday. And they are so dead that they reek. Everybody - separatists, Puritans- everybody that has come from that reaction don't have that kind of liturgy. And the church is exactly the two of them; the preaching and the reaction or response to the preaching. So liturgically you have to make room for it. You have got to start at 10 o'clock, have a short sermon of 15 or 20 minutes, divide into natural groups of people who know each other and work though that, and conclude with one big song sing. Have a couple of reporters tell what they have come up with. And then have a worship to cap it off with and then maybe a meal and a sacramental meal to cap it off...something like that is in the direction of the norm.

That's what they are doing in Toronto. That's what they mean by community. That is the pre-condition for Christian citizenship, Christian schools, then you have the kids already knowing what this world view-this frame work is from the Bible, with the Bible's education directing it. Then you can have what we would call sphere sovereignty in all these other aspects worked out. The church in that sense mothers us. If we don't have that we break down. We get more bureaucratic than we need to be. We try to resolve things with more kinds of technocratic types of solutions. We want to have business meetings where no discussion goes on but we come, we get it over with, and we go home. And that is the mentality of the technocrat. And that breaks down cause people don't want to go to those kinds of meetings. They like arguments. Arguing should go on everywhere, but not to the where it is an undisciplined type of arguing. But the fundamental

world view that is then going to be worked out in all the other areas of life; in family, in marriage, in friendships and state and aesthetics, is a paradigm, a central one, where the sharing goes on. And the kenetion for that is to move closer. Getting to the point where you have got friends to work that out with. Otherwise preaching can't mean a thing. Preaching is only preaching if it is responded to by God's people. Preaching is not preaching to their needs otherwise. And they have a responsibility to say these are my needs. And calling the word of God, bending it closer and closer to them. And having other people helping them do it and helping each other.

And so that is why millions of people go to intimacy groups; prayer groups, Wednesday Bible studies, etc. And these are not to be looked down on. These are the salvation of God's people. from the bureaucratic type of thing. That is what I think we mean by community a certitudinal community where we work out a framework from God's Torah which is then going to be the basis for the outworking and directing and correcting of the way we are now presently living in all sorts of other areas of life. We are not able yet to be good public witnesses. And the sum and substance of - and goal of that type of community is the whole body working together - witnessing.

The norm of urgency and the norm of old is beautiful need to be looked at once again. I think that the secular freedom motive; that is to be free from bureaucracy, from giantism, from technicism, from scientific abstract theorizing, has got more and more conservative-istic. So freedom people today are not necessarily as wild, escapist type people. But freedom has tried to find a home in the world. Not an imaginationists world or home. Instead of fleeing this world in flight - imaginative flight, they have tried to bring freedom back down to the earth. The first attempt was marxism, the second group was small groupism/anarchism. These are both social views of existentialists, of freedom people. Existentialist sociology is first of all neo-marxist, secondly it's anarchism. The play principle is very dominant in existentialism. It's the aesthetic aspect. It has been opened up in the 60s in a way it has never been opened up. By the existentialists in 1917, yes, but all through the 20th century, particularly in the 60s the aesthetic has been opened up. That means

that the Bible for instance, you could have a field day interpreting the Bible because there are so many beautiful studies that get at the fluidity and the many meanings of OT words in the Bible, and their OT backgrounds. That's very helpful. We should use that to straighten out a lot of our thinking. And that's why we need these intimacy groups. That's what we need neighborhoods for, with community going on in that sense...sharing around the word and working it out. Because it is such an aesthetic opening up of.

Now the big fight among us-why Hal Lindsey is so much on our minds, when you hear of his film and everything, why when you try to talk about the future this thing is so explosive. And why on the other hand there is another new whole legalism coming out. Rush Dooney and these guys say lets restore capital punishment for 26 different reasons. And lets get back and have norms that come right out of the Bible, and not these Toronto type norms that aren't found in the Bible. LET's get back to the bible and back to law and order in the chaos of the industrial revolution. Those two movements are growing and growing in importance.

In the measure that marxism has helped us realize that the goal is a heaven on earth...see I find this mistake in everybody in Toronto, they talk as if the goal is heaven - away form the earth. And that the secular idea is to have it on earth. The Biblical view is heaven on earth. And the marxists just secularize it and talk about a humanistic heaven on earth. But there is no such goal as a heaven away from this earth. And therefore never say a heaven on earth in that bad sense, 'he's looking for a heaven on earth.' That is an utopianistic sense, an unreachable type of thing.

The role of futurology, the role of the computer, the role of technique, and the ability to extropolate has brought the whole idea of history to millenialism. Every time we come to a thousand year turn, since we are coming to the year 2000, people go nutty in their thinking. That is part of the reason why everybody has gotten so futuristic. And everybody now sees how modernity has brought so many problems that they are hoping for a new world. And so everybody now is talking about the new earth. And I was absolutely the first one in North America that made the new earth famous. And I would have

been a millionaire now if I'd have published then. Because everybody who knows me knows why Earl Calimine calls his kid, Terra Nova - the new earth. Because that is where I started preaching sermons around the Chicago area. And I have just seen everybody and his brother come behind me on that point, the importance of the new earth. But the words like ideology and utopia - Manheim made those famous. The marxist says, 'our ideology, our religious things are tools to manipulate people and to hold them down. They are not meant to lead us to an new earth, but they are fabricated, imaginative notions, pictures to hold power over poor people.' That's what ideology means - manipulative tool to keep your power position. And that's the way marxism wants to expose everything that capitalism does. All the religions and churches of america are all lackies of capitalists. And so the word utopia and ideology gets very famous, very popular. And that's what it meant. And the computer with this look to the future and the fear of going back, futurism you might say, and the marxist idea of a heaven on earth means that everybody is an end - ecology, which is to say that we just came to screw up the earth. You can see how the Bible starts to come alive to show us the pictures - the pictures of Revelation are the positives. See the Bible puts the picture of the new earth out there, the picture of the 144,000 saints, the picture of the liturgy, its in the worship, the public worship that we see the destination of all God's creation ordinances. And we are able to keep from being deceived from the deceiver. And then we don't turn into anti-synthesis or anti anything, reactionaries. It is only by keeping in mind the Torah, the picture of the prophets, the spirit of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy, that we can avoid becoming a reactionary and stay thetical resurrectionary. And that's not utopia. We are the only people who aren't utopianists. And we have to expose by being positive, all these other positions as being utopian. And that's as being ideological in that marxist sense.

The existentialist has been frustrated in carrying out both his socialism and his anarchism. So neo-marxism and anarchism are about finished. But what has just begun - and this is the new way to the future- existentialism is now trying to use the past to be revolutionary. To rebuild a city, take all the plaster off and expose it all, the brick underneath, and you can't make brick, and it all of a sudden

becomes very valueable. You see houses that have been restored and you say, "How beautiful!" The idea to get before the industrial revolution, before the modernity, before the forward stampede started... the the one dimensional, technological, economical and scientific god thatis now falling us. If we could go back

So conservatism has gotten to be revolutionary today. The freedom people are going conservative. There's a drift back to the old. Old is tried and true. The old is valuable because it is not' cheapened by the capitalistic industrial revolution. So you have got people now who are going slow. They are doing things right. "I'm going to do it right." When that starts being said you've got the whole idea. I'm going to start slowing down, take a lot of time. You see what that does is become nihilistic. Because it violates the norm of urgency. As the creation gets more complicated, the need to be effecient, and stewardly, is increased. There is an urgency. We should then in that situation prefer the old above the new. Not that we don;t want to go forward. Of course we want to go forward. And new is important. But the urgency to make the decision - we guard against revolution and disaster by preferring the old.

That adrift with the complexity that this one dimensional society has brought is to find solutions fast, because there is an urgency built up because of the overdevelopment of the west. Now the freedom side of humanism is using this norm of the old is to be preferred in an urgent situation to capture the development and capture the primacy. Because within humanism you have a primacy between domination through technology and freedom from that domination. And onw of the poles is always going to get. So the secular freedom people are using the old as the way to get the lead away from the technology people. In other words, the slow down is to bring up things and start doing things that haven't been done for a long time. And take into consideration all those types of things.

You might not recognize it, but it is everywhere the case that the conservatives, particularly the neo-conservatives, that is Borek Russell Kirk, the classical - you mark my words that classicism is going to start coming back - Latin and Greek and all these rich things that we just didn't have time for the last 150-200 years are going to come. And it is a great slow down. And the next thing is that all you people

are going to end up being conservatives if you don't watch out. Because we need to go slow. And whatever is conservative is at the same time aesthetic. There's nothing that exemplifies this more than what we call English. Anything that's English is nice. It's slow down. It's varigated. English letters, poetry, drama, particularly literature - fantastic! That's why the Episcopalian church is so attractive. Because it represents that. You walk in there and it's like walking into merry old England and it takes you years to accustom yourself to it. And it is very nice. It is very good for us. And I keep saying to get into some tradition whatever it is, because we need to have tradition to stabilize this bloody forward stampede.

Well the word Englophile, the lover of all things English, that is very much the spirit - and where is the freedom, the punk rock - the nihilismis coming out of England but also the new freedom ideal, coservativism. And this freedom ideal is something that everybody can get involved in, young and old. Just as they can get involved with small, but small is too committed. YOU have to go to Conncticut and demonstrate against the nuclear submarine. Well, who's got the money? Anarchists don't live nice happy lives. So Anarchism doesn't have a future. But conservativistic enjoyment of things has a terrific future.