

RENE GIRARD AND THE SCAPEGOAT MECHANISM

1. I would like to begin by giving some information about Rene Girard himself. He was born in Avignon on Christmas Day 1923. After studying Medieval History in Paris, he graduated in 1947 with the degree of archiviste-paleographe and a thesis on 'Private life in Avignon in the second half of the 15th Century'. Girard went to America where he received his Ph.D at Indiana University in 1950 for a thesis on the subject of 'US opinions of France 1940-43'.

He settled in the States, marrying an American and working in numerous Universities. He is now Professor of French Language, Literature and Civilisation at Stanford, the editor of and co-operator on several periodicals in the literary field. At the same time he lectures frequently in many places, regularly receiving awards and making both friends and enemies.

In 1953, he published his first articles, his first book appearing in 1961. From the outset, the very individual character of Girard's work is present, which was to deepen as the years went by. To date, there are 5 books and over 50 articles. Although the total volume is relatively small, the quality of the contents is tremendous, at least it has been for me.

Girard is now very well known in France, and recognized in the States. In other countries his name is becoming known. Some people are trying to extend the theory into other fields while yet others try to deepen our understanding. It is already clear that this theory is applicable to the fields of theology, psychotherapy, sociology, economics, peace studies, anthropology, history, art appreciation and literature, a.s.o. Much that is exciting is happening. Of course the result is adversaries who fight against Girard or prefer to ignore his existence; the structuralists especially, Levi-Strauss and his followers, are in the latter group.

Of his books, three have been translated into English in America, to my knowledge not particularly well; 'Deceit, Desire and the Novel' a translation of 'Mensonge Romantique' e Veritie Romanesque', Violence and the Sacred, the translation of 'La Violence et le Sacre' and the Scapegoat, the translation of fe Bonc Suisse. In addition, there is a collection of essays in English edited by Girard himself called 'To double business bound'.

2. In the exposition of the Scapegoat mechanism I will use three of Girard's books, representing the three main phases of his work which have led to the formulation of his central hypothesis. (The other two books are an excellent book about Dostoevsky (1964) and his last 'the Scapegoat' (1982) in which he takes on his opponents and in which he gives a marvelous exegesis of new testament texts.)
3. The first book was published in 1961; 'Mensonge romantique et vertie Romanesque', the romantic lie and novelistic truth' (Novel = le roman). This book describes what Girard discovered about the nature of modern man by making a very exact study of certain works of literature; Cervantes, Stendhal, Flaubert, Proust and Dostoevsky. In the introduction to the French Pocket Edition, the first sentence is, 'Man cannot desire

on his own'. This is the central thesis of the book which goes on to describe the consequences for our whole culture of this crucial fact.

- 3.1 Man cannot desire on his own. He always needs a model on which and through which to mould his desire. He is always mimetic. Plato already recognized this as true. The real consequences of this are however much greater than Plato either realized or wished. The most important requirement is the model.

Who is a model? On whom am I basing my wants? A very long time ago in history, God was the model, or at least the most important model. Where God is the model, people are looking together in the same direction and thus do not conflict with one another. The model always remains a model, because it is too far away to rival with. This is not the only important aspect God cannot be described exactly, as he has so many sides. In a sense, everybody has their own God, their own model. In this way, everybody being symmetrical, in the same time everybody is differentiated, and difference is one of the requirements for culture.

When God ceases to be the model, replaced by a human being, things change. That human being might be far away, a creation of our fantasy more or less, but nevertheless human. Don Quixote has a human model, the here of the romantic tales, Amadis de Gaul. Emma Bovary has the heroes of the romantic novels she reads who live in far-away Paris as models. Both characters are always convinced that their desires are their own. We of course know there it is not true and we know their ultimate destiny; they never reach their goals and find only death. Nevertheless, this is not the end of the process for modern man. Our models, the models on which we mould our lives are no longer far away. They may be in our neighbourhood. We are no longer subject to 'external mediation', the mediator being outside of our immediate world, but find ourselves subject to 'internal mediation', where the mediator is among us at the same time as we live between our mediators, being mediators ourselves. We desire that the other desires because he desires it AND VICE VERSA – he desires what we desire (in fact his own wishes become stronger) because he sees that we desire.

There have been examples of this for a long time. It becomes a theme in literature with the work of Stendhal; 'Le rouge et le noir' ('Scarlet and Black'). This book describes the game of desire, and the manipulation of these wishes to achieve certain goals – you wish to have this man as instructor for your children only because you think that your neighbour wishes to have him as well, or you conquer a woman by showing how much you desire your own image which she in turn mimetically desires ultimately surrendering herself to you.

In this case, the mediation still happens outside the family. The family itself is still safe. This is 'exogamic mediation'. In his novels, and particularly in his last work, 'the Brothers Karamazov' Dostoevsky describes the next step. Mimetic behavior intrudes into families. This mediation can be called 'endogamic'. Now every area of our life has become the playground of mimetic behaviour, of rivalry.

- 3.2 In the modern world, as we gradually lose transcendence, we are reciprocal models one for another. Thus we become at the same time rivals and/or obstacles for one another. As we desire for what the other has, he for that reason desires to have it more or even begins to value it for the first time. This creates a stronger desire in us and then in hum

until we and he becomes an obstacle to the fulfillment of my wishes. The reverse is also true.

An example of this can be seen in Dostoevsky's figure, the eternal husband. The hero of the novel cannot love his wife unless he is sure that she is desired by another, by a model who is worth imitating. Thus, he does his best to ensure that his wife will be unfaithful, thus assuring himself that she is worth loving. As a result he makes himself and everybody else miserable.

- 3.3 This is not our final destination. We all know that two people quarrelling with one another soon forget about the reason for their quarrel. The third dog runs away with the bone. At an early point, we are no longer fighting about an external issue – we are only fighting with each other. We see only one another, totally fascinated by the other. In fact the fight is to possess the other, to possess his being. In fact it is to be something yourself, somebody...

Girard shows already in his first book that phenomena which have puzzled us for a long time such as sadism, masochism, homosexuality, pseudo-homosexuality and suicide are quite understandable as soon as we see them from the perspective of what is going on between us. The book has a motor which for reasons unknown to me has disappeared from the American edition; 'L'homme possède ou un Dieu ou une idole'; 'Man possesses either God or an idol'. Modern Literature is making clear to us how disastrously true these words are.

- 3.4 Modern culture has thus become the fight of everybody against everybody; about everything and about nothing. This is more or less the same situation as at the beginning of culture itself. Paradoxically, our final destination is back at the beginning. I will return to this later.

The romantic lie – we have wishes we can call 'our own'. The world is divided into good and bad people, i.e. the world is manichean, an eternal fight between good and evil. The fighting must be done by the good hero fighting against the bad. Whether he win or lose, he will die blind, without achieving any truth. An example of this in literature is Victor Hugo.

The novelistic (Romanesque) truth – we are all the same. There are no heroes. The world cannot be divided into a good part and a bad part. We are subjects and objects in the eternal play of desire. At best we die understanding what we did with our lives, as did Don Quixote and Julien Sorel.

4. Beginning in 1961, Girard published several articles on literary questions. For the first time, there were several on Greek tragedies. In 1971, 'La Violence at la sacre' appeared from the text, it is clear that Girard entered new fields of reading and study in the intervening years; various areas of cultural anthropology, a still deeper understanding of psychoanalysis and Greek tragedy. The problem which Girard was aiming at was simply 'How did human culture (order) come into existence in the first place'?
5. How do we define this problem? Man is mimetic (wishing to have and to do what the other is having and doing as are all animals. The biggest single difference is that animals, although mimetic, are at the same time inhibited when confronted by another

of the same species; i.e. they are mimetic but they don't kill one another. They retain the ability to show the other that they intend to give up. The winner is then clear to everybody and nobody is killed or harmed in the future.

The problem for human beings is that we do not have these built-in brakes. We continue the destruction and the killing to the point of destroying the whole community and other human beings. Nevertheless, human culture did come into existence. How do we resolve this paradox?

It is clear that any answer must be found from within the conditions, as they existed at the time of foundation. This means that the answer lies within the conditions of human mimetism in which everybody lived, including the risk of destruction of all by violence. The only presupposition is that culture did not exist in any form at that time. After reading, reflection and using intuition, Girard came up with the following hypothesis;

- 6.1 Groups of human and pre-human beings emerge, wandering through the country. There is mimesis. At some point the hands of two, and very soon of several males reach for one female or for one piece of food try to grab a small area for shelter (the possibilities are endless). There is now no stop to the mimesis and the mimetic violence. Because everybody is mimetic, the situation gets worse until in the contagion the mimetic violence involves everybody. At times situations emerge where everybody is fighting everybody else. It becomes like a pub-brawl out of control.
- 6.2 It may have been the case that many groups destroyed themselves in this process. It is clear, however, that others survived. How was it possible, then that out of the total disorder of the fighting, some order came. There must have been numerous 'doubles' fighting against one another within the whole fight. This would correspond to the doubles we find in mythology or in Greek tragedy, or to primitive fears of twins.
- 6.3 The fight might take another turn, however. Two or three might suddenly fight against one person in the group. Because of mimetic processes, everybody stops fighting one another and starts aiming at that particular person. This happens because two people began concentrating on one other, which is enough to cause everybody to join in. This one person is not necessarily the one who began the fight, indeed probably not. All processes are circular; the marked individual is not particularly guilty, certainly no more so than the others. There is, however, a 'reason' of 'cause which distinguishes him from the others. This might be that he is lame, or has one eye, or a big nose..or..or..or..etc. all these motives can be found in myths and Greek tragedy.
- 6.4 At this point everybody becomes convinced that this individual is a very evil man, the devil himself, the cause of all difficulties and atrocities. He therefore has to be driven out. He is 'untouchable', dangerous and hence must be got rid of, driven over cliffs, stones etc., etc. There it is done.
- 6.5 In the process, the group has gone through a very important change. Before they found the scapegoat, all their feelings were directed against one another. Nobody agreed with anybody. It was, so to speak, hell. Now, having found the cause of their problems, their disagreements have miraculously disappeared. Everybody now agrees with everybody else. All feelings are now directed at the one who, for certain, is guilty, at the scapegoat, and the groups feelings are now parallel. When the scapegoat is got rid of, there is the great and awe-inspiring peace.

- 6.6 This bloody man, the cause of all disorder, which is itself the danger that all life would end, is in fact the bringer of this wonderful peace. He must therefore be something like God; the devil and God in one.
7. Because I am rushing through all these areas so fast, I can agree immediately that you might object that things cannot be so simple. In fact they can be. These things must have happened over and over again. Naturally the reasons given and the myths, which evolved, took place in an endless variety of forms. The pattern was always the same, however. We will find this pattern or parts of this pattern when we read myths, study ritual or read the bible (I will return to this below) or indeed when we observe our own experience of life.
8. Meanwhile history goes on. The group, which so unexpectedly found peace, has to ensure that it will not try to destroy itself again. What I will now try to describe in a few sentences, in fact took a very long time. The groups, which experienced the mechanisms, which we have identified above, did not have language. They developed language very slowly out of their experience. Words developed for events, as did signs for both experiences and words. There were further learning experiences and processes. This too was a long and arduous process, about which we have intuitions and about which there is much to be done, thought about, studied, e.g. the order of events etc.
10. The first step was the coming into existence of religion. The group, which had lived through the crisis, was of course extremely fearful of a repeat. They had experienced the awful violence of the devil, the bad man who they had driven out. At the same time, this had been a cleansing violence, a good violence. Here we might be reminded of Radolf otto's dictum; 'tremendum as fascinosum'. The sacrum, the sacred, is tarrying and dangerous and at the same time brings order; the sacrum thus brings both chaos and order – it is like violence; violence is the sacred.
11. On this basis, i.e. on the basis of denied or hidden violence, the group has to keep the peace and thus the possibility of life.
- 11.1 Myths explain about origins; about how society came into existence. They tell of very unusual man, the devil, an evil man, a hero or a god, who caused all the evil and at the same time came back to restore the world.

It is clear on this basis that society is built on violence which itself brings peace and on a lie about the scapegoat who was a man or woman as you or I but who became the evil and then the god of the group during the process of victimisation. This is the romantic lie. Society can function as long as the truth, that the scapegoat is innocent and the murder that was at the foundation of everything, is hidden. Adapted to the climate of the times, the myth is told and retold, keeping things in order. It is the 'narrative' of culture.

- 11.2 When a society is sliding into disorder or when it is feared that this will happen, the group replays what was once bitterly earnest in the form of rites or ritual; the chaos, the driving out of the scapegoat and the return of peace. Here, as in the case of myths there are an infinite number of variations, often amazing in scope, but the old pattern can

always be traced. In fact these rites are one of the most important parts of our highly diverse culture.

- 11.3 People are able to learn from their experiences. The original groups learned that there are many situations out of which contagious violence can emerge. Only if we are difference from one another can we live together. We thus have to take care that people are difference and have different positions within society. If individuals are too alike, they pose a threat. Hence the desire to avoid twins = no doubles! If two men desire the same woman, this may mean violence – hence there are exogamic laws. Blood too means violence. As a result, society fears menstruating women. etc.etc.etc. hence the laws, which always forbid violence. And the structure of society.
12. I suppose that it's difficult to imagine that we are here looking at the cradle of our entire culture. But by staying within the hypothesis and without mind-bending tricks we can explain the domestication of animals, the judicial system, our hierarchical systems and all the other manifestations of our culture. The same applies to our sciences, from ancient philosophy to all modern study. They all work on the basis of a cause and effect system, which was once learnt in this primordial experience. They continue to drive out parts of reality in order to come to some form of ordered peace; their results. (Modern medicine is finally expelling the whole living person in order to cure him.)
13. In 'Violence and the sacred', through reading anthropological analyses, the Greek tragedies, the debate over structuralism and psycho-analysis, everything finally falls into place and fits. Until now, religion appeared to cultural anthropologists as something curious and irrational and about which nothing could usefully be said. The structuralists tried to use the myths, but they used them entirely anachronically. Rites remained more or less a strange nonsense. For the first time, Girard sees the whole as a whole, diachronically. Religion now takes its true place; as the foundation of culture.
14. We are now living through the dying days of this system. We continue to deny the violence in ourselves, seeing only the violence of the others. We still drive our scapegoats, continue our myths and our very obsolete rites. In one sense the old cultural system is reaching perfection; with absolutely naked violence in the form of nuclear weapons which personify good and bad violence rolled into one intended to bring absolute peace. This is where we find ourselves. The nuclear weapons are the scapegoat. But now the scapegoat overpowers us, instead or the reverse.

At the same time, we are witnessing something else; the novelistic (Romanesque) truth about ourselves. And that is not the only thing...

15. In 1978, Girard published a third book: 'Des choses cachees depuis la foundation du monde' – 'Of things hidden since the foundation of the world'.

The book has three parts; basic anthropology (mainly a repletion of 'Violence and Sacred'), Judeo-Christian writings and interindividual psychology in which the psychological consequences and new opening are explored. Although this last part makes very exciting reading, we will confine ourselves to the second section on the Bible for the time being.

16. The similarity between myths all over the world and the biblical myths has long been recognized. There are the same descriptions of chaos into which everything disappears (the tohu webohu), the total of Babel, the deluge, Sodom and Gomorrah and the plagues of Egypt. There are also the brothers who are enemies or doubles and who we already know so well from Greek tragedy: Cain and Abel, Esau and Jacob, Joseph and his brothers etc., all signs of possible violence. It is also very clear that culture is pictured as arising out of scapegoating; an example of this is the ascription to Cain of the building of towns. There are numerous other examples also. At the same time there is a fundamental difference in these stories; in a myth, Abel would have been portrayed to us as a dangerous and guilty man; so dangerous in fact that it would have meant salvation for the community to get rid of him. In the Old Testament, it is clear that he was simply murdered. The same is true of the story of Joseph; the Old Testament clearly shows that he is a scapegoat. The angle of the story has changed. In the story of the flood, everything is seen through the eyes of Noah, the scapegoat. In the story of Sodom and Gomorrah it is Lot's point of view we are given. Most centrally of all, the story of the Hebrews as the scapegoats of the Egyptians is not only seen from their position, it is actually told by them.

The whole Old Testament is the story in which the religious experience, where the city is built on violence, on the murder of the innocent, is overcome more and more by a totally different vision of what happened and what is happening; now the innocence of the victim is seen in the violence brought to light. There are numerous examples of this process and the line of development becomes stronger and stronger culminating in the passages of Isaiah about the Son of God (Ebed Jahwe).

17. This was the situation of the Jews when Jesus is born and began working. They 'knew and didn't know', so to speak. They knew through history and through their experience of their faith about the scapegoat and about violence. Every year they celebrated the Passover, in which they recalled the violence of the Egyptians when they themselves were the scapegoats. They even sang the songs of the Ebed Jahwe. Nonetheless, by this time they had fallen into scapegoating again, blaming their ancestors for harming the prophets. They held themselves to be good; they would never do such a thing. Thus they assured themselves of their own goodness by making others, in this case their ancestors, bad; the romantic lie once more.

Jesus saw and knew about the violence on which our culture was built. He also recognized the wholly other direction shown by the Old Testament; that we put a stop to our violence and love one another without any pre-conditions or afterthought and thus build a new culture and a new life. He also believed that 'the time was complete' i.e. the old era was at an end and that the Jewish people were sliding into the final chaos, itself merely a repetition of the old chaos. Only the new way, already so clearly proclaimed in the Old Testament, provided a future; the old mechanisms were no longer applicable.

In this sense, the first half of the Gospels can be read as showing Jesus' optimistic period. Everything has become clear; there really is no other option to escape the horrors ahead except through the Sermon on the Mount. This period is followed by a new recognition; the Jewish people has made the choice to remain with the systems of violence and thus to be destroyed by them. First of all they destroy the very person who reveals their true natures to them, making a scapegoat of him – or rather, and here we

have an extremely important difference, trying to make him one in the hope of reuniting society. They were doomed to failure however; Jesus could never be made into the guilty scapegoat, because his innocence was and is unassailable.

The second half of the Gospel describes these changes taking place. By now, Jesus knew that the destruction of the Jewish people could not be prevented; nor could his own. Nevertheless, the violence could only result in his murder; it would never be able to make him a scapegoat. In fact, after his death it would never be possible to blame everything onto the scapegoat every again. Through his death, it becomes clear for all eyes to see that the scapegoat is not the culprit as portrayed in the myths but is only destroyed to allow violence to leave the rest of the group in peace.

18. In Jesus, and in what was done to him the scapegoat mechanism is exposed, but most fundamentally of all the religious foundations on which our culture is built, the culture in which we are still living in fact reaches its conclusion. We are now living, as theology has so often said, 'between the times'; between the time of Jesus and the first catastrophe, i.e. the first catastrophe of the Jewish people and the time of our own catastrophe, now that our culture is crumbling and the old differences are disappearing.

It is one of the greatest puzzles that it was possible for our sciences to go on so long without really having any possibility of 'sacrifice' in the real sense. Economics may provide us with some of the answers. Another is that we, the Western World, have had the opportunity to export our violence into other cultures. The possibilities are endless. All we are doing in reality is shifting the violence around, always trying to pin the blame on 'the other' thus preserving the peace for oneself – this has always been the other side of violence. As the clouds disperse, and we see more clearly, it becomes less and less possible to continue in this manner. The big lie about violence has become the universal lie.

19. One of the big questions which now arises is 'who is this Jesus?' The question obviously stems from another of at least the same centrality; 'who is God?'

One of the key aspects of Girard's work is to show that violence comes from human beings. I have already tried to show how in the scapegoat mechanism, the group tries to ascribe all violence to the scapegoat alone. This is the devil, the incarnation of evil. In the Old Testament the fact that violence stems from humanity becomes increasingly clear. Human beings are destroying each other and themselves through their violence.

The struggle for clarity continues throughout the Old Testament, and by its end full clarity is not yet achieved. Even in the songs of the Ebed Jahwe there is still a degree of violence of God.

In the Gospels, it becomes clear that the violence is the violence of humanity. In God there is no violence. God is love. He gives us the task of loving one another, finding all the violence in our hearts and of stopping pushing it onto others.

Jesus is the Son of God in that he does his will and knows everything of Him. We too are the children of God when we are doing as he did. I am sure that a lot of thinking still has to be done in this field. One of our biggest obstacles is that we share the only language we know; that of our culture which is a language of the sacrificial system.

Everything we say, whether we recognize it or not, is coloured by violence and by the consequences of violence. In fact we have to find a new language to describe and to live in the new world. Until we do, everything must be described as in the mirror which Paul spoke, in which we see dimly, not clearly.

20. The death of Jesus was not a sacrifice; it was never described as such in the gospels. Christendom very quickly began to translate what had happened into sacrificial terms, thus making sacrificial realities. We see this process emerging very early, and theology has functioned on this basis since then.

The consequences have been and are immense. Christendom became a sacrificial religion, like all religions; violence became honoured as the foundation of our faith and culture. Violence was used once more to defend this culture as in all other cultures. Anti-Semitism through the ages, the burning of heretics etc. all became possible for Christians. Violence towards other culture, even in order to make them Christian, was and is still in fact accepted.

Girard's theory is that through becoming a sacrificial religion, Christianity had the possibility of become a world religion, one which it might not have had it if had stayed faithful to itself. Now, however, we have come full circle, or almost. Christendom is arriving at the beginning; it is dissolving into chaos. The world as a whole is now in an analogous position to the Jews 2,000 years ago.

Girard himself is not wholly consistent about the Christian Church. In 1978 he wrote that it would have to disappear if the Gospel was to have a chance. I get the impression now that he is not so certain. Perhaps he sees some other options.

21. Whatever the case, Girard's central thesis is this; we, mankind of the twentieth century, have only two options. We can stick to our violence with obvious and entirely predictable results. The numerous little circles of violence out of which all culture emerged has now become one huge circle encompassing the entire world. If we don't break it, it will strangle the world. The other possibility is that we recognize the Judeo-Christian message made complete in the gospels in Jesus.
22. This is not the place to delve into the marvelous exegetical work which Girard provides in this book and in his next work, 'The Scapegoat'. Nor can we do justice to his explanations of the differences between the Greek and Johannine Logos', between philosophy and the gospels, between, in fact, violence and love.

One point of interest is the place of the Scapegoat hypothesis in Girard's scientific work and the place of Girard in the progress of Human sciences. Occasionally Girard confirms that he stumbled on the scapegoat mechanism without taking the Judeo-Christian scriptures into account. His scientific path followed the same order I have outlined above. It is however true that he realized much earlier that there were important things to learn from the Bible, and hints at this are at the end of 'Deceit, Desire and the Novel' in 1961. In 1974 he returned to this theme in an interview.

Nevertheless, he wanted to write 'Violence and the Sacred' without mentioning the Bible. He wanted to make it clear that the big lie about culture, the lie about violence and the innocence of the victim, can be found in culture itself. With the passing of the

years and the crumbling of the sacrificial system, the truth can now be found. It is Girard's conviction, that had he himself not found the system I have identified, it is certain that someone else, scientist or otherwise, would have come upon it in a short time. The circle is closing and the times re once again brought to completion – fulfilled. It was very exciting for him to discover his hypothesis; I have spoken to him about this. At the same time, the truth is that it was the only conclusion, which could be found.

Girard himself was born a Catholic, and was for many years a Nietzschean and a nihilist. During his scientific work, he became a Christian.

23. How should we react to his work from a theological point of view? I have already said that his exegesis is astounding. He also solves the problem of the relationship between faith and religion. In so doing, he subverts the roman Catholic dogma of nature and super-nature. Some time ago he said as part of a lecture that not to recognize any difficulties left only two options – the world with its violence where Christianity is a historical institution or the Gospels with the God of Love who is there with us when we are doing his will – for me this is the same God of Moses who is the father of Jesus Christ. Here we have as a by-product, true ecumenical theology.
24. Girard's hypothesis is a challenge to all scholars and scientists and to the whole of life. I will try and mention a few final points.
 - 24.1 Exegetically there is much to be done. Girard himself is active in this area. Old Testament scholars in Germany have also begun working on it. There is a lot to be done to deepen our insights and to differentiate our picture.
 - 24.2 Central points must be discussed. Is Jesus' death in no sense a sacrifice? What about the Eucharist? Is Girard's God the God of the Gospels? Is he love, only love? Is all violence only human? I think so but...
 - 24.3 We must further analyse our own culture. Girard himself is working on a book on Shakespeare. We must search into our own and other cultures, thus deepening our insights and creating new hypotheses.
 - 24.5 Girard has always said that he will immediately let go of his hypothesis for another which better explains everything we know. Even if this doesn't happen, the task for science of reintegrating this hypothesis, this knowledge is and will be enormous. Many people are now working on it in many places.
 - 24.6 And what is our task as we live in this world? There have been many discussions between Girard and peace people. We cannot provide simple answers. It may be that simple solutions have all to do with violence, driving out the devil with the devil. This is indeed an impression I have watching how peace people work.

In this field as in all other fields the question is addressed to us all is how do we live, have to live, at this time when the times are being fulfilled. There is much to be done with our heads, with our hands and with our hearts.

26/27.6.83