

The CENTURY MAGAZINE

Vol. 109

November, 1924

No. 1

The New Nobility

The Type of the Rustic and the Urbanite

BY COUNT R. N. COUDENHOVE-KALERGI

THE country and the city are the two poles of human destiny. Country and city both engender their peculiar type of humanity, the rustic and the urban.

The rustic and the urban type are psychological antipodes. Peasants of the most widely differentiated regions often resemble one another more closely in spirit than the city-dwellers of the neighboring metropolis. Country is separated from country, city from city, by space, but city is separated from country by time. Representatives of all the ages of history are to be found among the rustic types of Europe from the Stone Age to the Middle Ages, but it is only the metropolis of the Occident which has produced the extreme urban type which is the representative of modern civilization. Thus centuries, yes, even millenniums, often separate a metropolis from the country that surrounds it.

The urbanite man thinks differently, feels differently, and acts differently from the rustic man. City life is abstract, mechanical, rational; country life is concrete, organic, irrational. The city-dweller is rationalistic, skept-

tic, irreligious; the countryman is emotional, credulous, superstitious.

All the thoughts and all the feelings of the countryman crystallize themselves about nature: he lives in a symbiosis with the brute, with the living creature of God; he is an integral part of his landscape, dependent upon the weather and the seasons. On the other hand, the center of the crystallization of the urban soul is society, and this society lives in a symbiosis with the machine, the dead creature of man. It is the machine that renders the townsman as independent as possible of time and space, of season and climate.

The countryman believes in the power of nature over man; the townsman believes in the power of man over nature. The rustic is a product of nature, the urbanite a product of society; the one sees end, measure, and acme of the world in the cosmos, the other in humanity.

The rural human being is conservative, like nature herself; the urban human being is progressive, like society. All progress, in fact, proceeds from cities and from city-dwellers. The

city type is itself usually the product of a revolution within a rural family which broke with its rustic traditions, emigrated to the metropolis, and there began life upon a new basis.

The metropolis robs its inhabitants of the pleasures of natural beauty, but as a recompense it offers them art. Theaters, concerts, art galleries, are substitutes for the eternal and varying beauties of the landscape. After a day's work replete with ugliness, these institutes of art offer the city-dweller beauty in a concentrated form. In the country they are easily dispensed with. Nature is the extensive, art the intensive, form of visible beauty.

The relation of the urban type of man to the nature which he lacks is dominated by longing; while to the rural type of man nature is a constant fulfilment. For this reason the townsman's relation to nature is determined chiefly by a romantic, the countryman's by a classic, sense.

Social or Christian morality is an urban phenomenon, for it is a function arising from the herding together of mankind, from society itself. The typical city-dweller combines Christian morality with irreligious skepticism, rationalistic materialism and mechanistic atheism. The *Weltanschauung* which results from this is socialism, the religion of the modern metropolis.

To the rustic barbarian of Europe Christianity is little more than a new edition of heathendom, with an altered mythology and new superstitions; his true religion is faith in nature, in force, in fate.

Townsman and countryman do not know each other; for which reason they distrust and misunderstand each other and live in a state of tacit or open

enmity. There are many catches which serve to conceal this element of antagonism; the Red and Green Internationale, industrialism, agrarianism, progress and reaction, Judaism and Anti-Semitism. PAGE

All cities draw their power from the country; all country-sides draw their culture from the city. The country is the soil from which the cities renew themselves; it is the spring that feeds them, the root from which they flower. Cities grow and perish; the country is eternal.

§ 2

The flower of the rural type of man is the country nobleman, the squire, or junker; the flower of the urban type is the intellectual, the litterateur.

Country and city have both begotten their specific type of nobility: the nobility of the will stands opposed to the nobility of the spirit, the nobility of the blood against the nobility of the brain. The typical squire, or junker, combines a maximum of character with a minimum of intellect; the typical litterateur a maximum of intellect with a minimum of character.

It cannot be said that the country nobility was always and everywhere lacking in intellect, nor the town nobility in character. In the England of modern times as well as in the minnesinger period in Germany, the nobility of birth proved an excellent element of culture, while, on the other hand, the Catholic intellectual nobility of the Jesuits and the Chinese intellectual nobility of the mandarins evinced as much character as intellect.

It is in the squire, or junker, and in the intellectual that we encounter the most extreme antitheses of the rural and the urban type of mankind. The

typical vocation of the squire, or junker, caste is that of officer; the typical vocation of the intellectual caste is that of journalist.

The squire, or junker, officer remained standing physically as well as mentally on the level of the knight. Hard upon himself and upon others, faithful to duty, energetic, steadfast, conservative, and limited, he lived in a world of dynastic, militaristic, national, and social prejudices. In addition to a profound distrust of all things modern, of the metropolis, democracy, socialism, internationalism, he cherishes an equally profound faith in his blood, his honor, and the *Weltanschauung* of his fathers. He despises the city-dweller, especially the cosmopolitan or Jewish litterateur and journalist.

The intellectual hurries on in advance of his time. Without prejudice he represents modern ideas in politics, art, economics. He is progressive, skeptic, brilliant, versatile, volatile; he is a eudemonist, rationalist, socialist, materialist. He overestimates the intellect, underestimates the body and the character; and therefore despises the squire type as a retrograde barbarian.

The essence of the squire is rigidity of the will; the essence of the intellectual is mobility of the mind.

The squire, or junker, and the intellectual are born rivals and opponents. Wherever the squire caste reigns, the intellect must yield to force; in such reactionary times the political influence of the intellectuals is annulled or at least limited. When the intellectual caste rules, democracy triumphs over feudalism, socialism over militarism.

In a country, say, as Germany,

the hatred which the aristocracy of the will and the aristocracy of the mind feel for each other is rooted in misunderstanding. Each sees only the darker side of the other, and is blind to its virtues. The soul of the junker, of the rural type, remains a book forever sealed even to the most enlightened intellectuals, while nearly all specimens of the junker type fail to penetrate the soul of the urban intellectual. Instead of learning from each other, the youngest lieutenant looks contemptuously upon the leading figures in modern literature, while the veriest penny-a-liner is prone to express a supercilious contempt for the most distinguished officers. It was through this twofold misunderstanding that militaristic Germany first underestimated the resistant power of the city masses against the war, and then revolutionary Germany the resistant power of the rural masses against the revolution. The leaders of the country misinterpreted the psyche of the city and its leaning to pacifism, the leaders of the city misinterpreted the psyche of the country people and their leaning to reaction; thus Germany lost first the war, then the revolution.

The antithesis between squire and intellectual is based upon the fact that these two types represent the extremes rather than the summits of the nobilities of blood and intellect. For the highest visible form of the nobility of birth is the *grand seigneur*; of the nobility of the intellect, the genius. These two aristocracies are not only compatible; they are related. Cæsar, the most perfect embodiment of the *grand seigneur*, was the most gifted of Romans; Goethe, the highest type of genius, was among all poets the most perfect *grand seigneur*. Here as else-

where we find that the middle strata are farthest separated, while the peaks touch one another.

The perfect aristocrat is at once an aristocrat of the will and of the intellect, but neither squire nor litterateur. He combines vision with strength of will, judgment with power to act, intellect with character. If such synthetic personalities are lacking, then it behooves the divergent aristocracies of the will and the intellect to complete instead of combating one another. In Egypt, in India, in Chaldea, priests and kings (intellectuals and warriors) once reigned in common. The priests bowed before the power of the will, the kings before the power of the spirit. Brains indicated the goal; hands and arms cleared the way.

§ 3

Europe's nobility of birth and intellect created each its own specific type; England's aristocracy of birth the gentleman, France's aristocracy of mind the Bohemian. The gentleman and the Bohemian meet in the attempt to escape the desuetude and ugliness of petty bourgeois life; the gentleman overcomes it by personal style, the Bohemian by temperament. The gentleman opposes form to the formlessness of this life, the Bohemian color to its colorlessness. The gentleman brings order into the disorderliness of human relationships, the Bohemian freedom into their lack of freedom.

The beauty of the gentleman ideal is based upon form, style, harmony; it is static, classic, Apollonian. The beauty of the Bohemian ideal is based upon temperament, freedom, vitality; it is dynamic, romantic, Dionysian. The gentleman gives an ideal and a

style to his wealth, the Bohemian an ideal and style to his poverty.

The gentleman bases his attitude to life upon tradition, the Bohemian upon protest; the nature of the gentleman is conservative, the nature of the Bohemian revolutionary. The cradle of the gentleman ideal is England, the most conservative land in Europe; the cradle of Bohemianism is France, the most revolutionary land in Europe.

The gentleman ideal is the life form of a caste, the Bohemian ideal is the life form of personalities. The gentleman ideal can be traced beyond England back to the Roman *stoa*; the Bohemian ideal beyond France back to the Greek *agora*. The Roman statesmen approached the gentleman type, the Greek philosophers the Bohemian type. Cæsar and Seneca were gentlemen, Socrates and Diogenes Bohemians. The center of gravity of the gentleman lies in the physical-psychic, the Bohemian's in the intellectual. A gentleman may be a fool, a Bohemian may be a criminal.

Both ideals are phenomena of human crystallization. Precisely as the crystal is able to develop only in a free environment, so both of these ideals owe their existence to the English and French conception of liberty. The atmosphere necessary for this process of the crystallization of personalities was lacking in imperial Germany; for this reason it could develop no similar ideal. The German lacked the style necessary for the gentleman, and the temperament necessary for the Bohemian, and courtliness and flexibility for both.

Since the German found no suitable life form in his own actual life, he sought for ideal embodiments of the German nature in his poetry: the

physical-psychical ideal he found in the young Siegfried, the intellectual ideal in the old Faust. Both ideals were romantically untimely; reality distorted the Siegfried ideal into the Prussian officer, the lieutenant; the romantic Faust ideal into the German scholar, the professor. Mechanical ideals took the place of organic ideals; the officer represents the mechanization of the psychical, the rigid Siegfried; the professor the mechanization of the intellectual, the rigid Faust.

Of none of its classes was the Germany of the period of Wilhelm II prouder than of its officers and its professors. It saw in them the flower of the nation, as England saw this flower in its political leaders, and the Latin peoples in their artists.

If our German peoples desire to achieve a still higher development, then they must revise their ideals; their creative forces must burst the bonds of scientific dogma and enlarge themselves to the synthesis of the poet-thinker.

The nineteenth century bestowed two men of supreme greatness upon the German people, and it is in these men that we find embodied the demands of a higher and greater Germanism: Bismarck, the hero of action; Goethe, the hero of the spirit.

Bismarck renewed, deepened, and vitalized the Siegfried ideal, which had become tinged with tin-pot romanticism; Goethe renewed, deepened,

and vitalized the Faust ideal, which had become moldy.

Bismarck had the sterling qualities of the German officer without his faults; Goethe had the good qualities of the German scholar without his faults. In Bismarck the superiority of the statesman overcame the limitations of the officer; in Goethe the superiority of the poet-thinker overcame the limitations of the scholar. In both the organic ideal of personality conquered the mechanical, man the marionette.

By virtue of his great and inspiring personality Bismarck accomplished more for the development of Germany than by virtue of his founding the empire; by virtue of his Olympian life Goethe gave a gift to the German people greater than his own Faust; for Faust, like Götz von Berlichingen, Werther, Wilhelm Meister, and Tasso, is only a fragment of Goethe's humanity.

But Germany should beware of debasing and making meretricious its two living prototypes, of making a field-sergeant out of Bismarck and a schoolmaster out of Goethe.

The heirs of these two supreme spirits of German humanity can bestow new growth and fresh health upon Germany; from them it may learn active and contemplative greatness, power of action and wisdom. For Bismarck and Goethe are the two focal points about which a new German life form equivalent to other Western ideals may be built up.

Bolstering up the Business Man

BY RICHARD J. WALSH

Mr. Walsh here begins a brief series of papers in which the problem of "success in business" is subjected to a new and realistic analysis. We are moving into a time in which many of the copy-book maxims about business success will prove a delusion and a snare. It is obviously valuable for the man already in the midst of a business career and to the young man who intends to enter business to see the world of business as it is to-day, not as it was fifty years ago, when many of the adages and rules were formulated. Next month Mr. Walsh will consider "The Doom of the Self-Made Man."—THE EDITOR.

HAVE you noticed among business men what we may call, without malice, the new humility? Possibly not, for it is hardly discernible in individual business men when you isolate them. But if you look hard at the whole mass, you can trace a definite trend, a steady change in mood.

Think back five years. In 1919 you heard much more than you do to-day about being businesslike. We needed "more business in government." Business methods were going to be applied to our churches, our schools, even our homes. "Clever fellow, Jobson, but of course he 's no business man." . . . "If I ran my office the way this house [or this club or this town or this hospital] is run, I 'd go broke in a month. . . . What I like about the new minister is that he acts like a regular business man."

Such comment is less usual nowadays, and gets less agreement. The cult of business appears to be on the decline. And this is due not so much

to a revolt by the rest of the community as to a gradual discovery by the business group that its own jobs are not being very well done, after all.

Some critics are saying that business men have had their trial in public affairs and have been found wanting. Mr. Stanley Baldwin, as prime minister of England, did knock some chips off the idol of the business statesman. Mistakes made by our own dollar-a-year men during the war are still coming to light. There was a strong odor of business about some of the unhappy doings of the recent administration at Washington. Here and there great movements driven by commercial minds have run down to disaster.

These scattered instances, however, are not the causes for the new humility; they are merely surface indications. The truth is that business men have become so beset with and so puzzled by their own problems, and so busy trying to solve them, that they care less about offering advice to others.

The change in attitude dates from