Dear Dr. Bouman,

On behalf of the Secretary-General, I would like to thank you for your letter of 6 October informing him of the publication of your book “Dag Hammarskjöld, Citizen of the World” and expressing your wish personally to present him with a copy. I spoke recently to Mr. Arjan Hamburger, Deputy Permanent Representative of the Netherlands to the United Nations in New York regarding your request and promised that I would also be in touch with you directly.

Please accept my apologies for this late reply to your letter. I trust you will understand that a very heavy calendar of official commitments makes it impossible for the Secretary-General to meet with you in the foreseeable future. I would nonetheless wish to assure you that your kind words for the Secretary-General and your respect for his office, as well as your scholarship on Hammarskjöld, are much appreciated.

With best wishes for the success of your book,

Yours sincerely,

Kevin S. Kennedy
Principal Officer
Chief, Scheduling Office

Dr. Monica Bouman, Ph. D.
Heemskerk
To Mr Kofi Annan, Secretary-General of the United Nations
Via the Netherlands Mission to the United Nations
235 E 45 Street, New York NY 10017, USA

CC: Mr A.J. Hamburger, Netherlands Mission to the United Nations

Heemskerk, 6 October 2005

Excellency, dear Mr Annan,

With great respect to the dignity of your Secretary-Generalship of the United Nations, I have the pleasure to announce the coming in October of my book ‘Dag Hammarskjöld, Citizen of the World.’ Regarding the launching of the book I would like to ask you a favor. I would regard it a great honor, if you would be willing to accept the first copy of my book personally.

In the book, based on my Ph.D. thesis, written in 2001, I focus on the texts of Hammarskjöld’s speeches ‘International Service’ and ‘The World and the Nation.’ These messages to the world, from 1955, have a high relevance to our world today. They are a call to international service, urging world citizens to really strive for maturity of mind. My text analyses give the reader deep insights in Dag Hammarskjöld’s ethics and spirituality and his trust in the United Nations as an instrument of faith.

The book will be launched around 18 October by Ten Have Publishers, The Netherlands, with a preface written by Ruud Lubbers.

This summer, Sir Brian Urquhart showed much interest in my approach, when I met him in the Radisson Hotel in Malmö, Sweden. I stayed there for the Dag Hammarskjöld Centennial Celebration, 29 July, at Backåkra. Actually I was hoping to meet you there, handing over the manuscript of my book to you personally, but you, unfortunately, could not come. There, the other day, I discussed the contents of my book with Sir Brian, to whom I gave two copies of the manuscript, one for you and one for himself.

Dear Mr Annan, for your information I also send you the manuscript of the book by post. Your support to this legacy of Dag Hammarskjöld is very important, also for your own message to the world. I hope very much that there can be a possibility for you to receive the first copy of the book from me personally. Then, I will come to New York on the day that best convenes you.

With highest regards, and looking forward to hearing from you soon,

Very sincerely yours,

Monica Bouman, Ph.D.

Bachstraat 94, 1962 BE Heemskerk, The Netherlands
Tel.: (+31)(0)251 650701 / Email: monicabouman@hotmai.com
Below please find a response from the Office of the Secretary-General.

Sincerely,

Vincenzo Pugliese
Communications and Speechwriting Unit
Executive Office of the Secretary-General
United Nations
Tel. (917) 367-6025

Dear Ms. Bouman,

I write on behalf of the Secretary-General to thank you for your letter of 29 July, and for sending a copy of the manuscript of your book, “Dag Hammarskjöld – Citizen of the World.” This is indeed a laudable subject.

Above all, I thank you for your support and commitment to the goals and principles of the United Nations. I wish you the best for the publication of your work.

Edward Mortimer
Director of Communications
Executive Office of the Secretary-General
United Nations
Dear Mr. Mortimer,

Enclosed is a letter to the Secretary-General of my compatriot Ms. Monica Bouman. Ms. Bouman is the author of "Dag Hammarskjold, Citizen of the World", a book to be launched in The Netherlands around October 18. In her letter, Ms. Bouman requests the Secretary-General to accept the first copy of this book personally, for which she would travel to New York at a date convenient to the Secretary-General. A copy of the manuscript is also enclosed.

We hope that her request, in this time of the Dag Hammarskjold Centennial Celebration, can be considered favourably.

With highest regards,

Arjan Hamburger
Deputy Permanent Representative
Netherlands Mission to the United Nations
PREFACE

Dag Hammarskjöld was, as Monica Bouman describes in this book, an extraordinary man. A gifted diplomat certainly, but one rooted in theology, philosophy, literature, words; someone rich with varied and interesting reflections. His world of diplomacy was different from that of the United Nations today and the diplomatic language he used varied from the UN’s language as we know it today. His was also a diplomacy that differed from the diplomacy as taught and practised by Henri Kissinger. His spirituality, integrity and capacity to offer respect were unusual. On and off duty he maintained his diplomatic discretion. Only after his death did we learn – in particular from ‘Markings’ - about his roots in words and reflections.

Born in 1939, one generation after Dag Hammarskjöld, I had the privilege to be in his audience one summer evening in Geneva. This was during an Ecosoc meeting in which I participated as an observer on behalf of Pax Romana, an NGO based on the Roman-Catholic faith. Although I was to become a UN staff member only forty years later as High Commissioner for Refugees, Dag Hammarskjöld was important to me from the outset. In 1982, when I became Prime Minister of the Netherlands, rather young and under difficult circumstances, I was very nervous and unsure. You could say I was ‘in a cold sweat’. And, like Hammarskjöld, I needed words and reflections. Speaking about all that to Queen Beatrix of the Netherlands, she gave me her personal copy of ‘Merkstenen’ (Markings). This valuable book kept me going and brought me the harmony that I needed so badly.

As I write this preface in 2005 I am well aware that we live in a different world to the one Dag Hammarskjöld experienced during his tenure as Secretary-General. Those were the days of decolonisation and the Cold War. The UN is now celebrating its 60th birthday and over the decades the number of member states has grown substantially. More impressive however, has been the growth of non-governmental organisations; the so-called NGO’s. During the nineties of the last century, the first decade after the end of the Cold War, we saw a whole series of summits during which the presence and impact of NGO’s became striking. This began with the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro. A promise was made there to work on a paradigm-shift from economy to ecology. Indeed in 2005, after intensive consultations with non-governmental organisations and religious leaders, the Earth Charter came into being. In our present era of globalization the driving forces of business, politics and the media are all short-term oriented. Therefore the existence of the Earth Charter as an ethical framework for connecting and inspiring all those who want to accept responsibility for generations to come, and who want to live in harmony with Mother Earth, is especially crucial now. The spirituality connected with the Earth Charter is in line with Dag Hammarskjöld’s thinking. Since 2000 we have been speaking of the Millennium Goals. To achieve these, efforts are needed that go beyond governments and the United Nations. ‘We the people’ have to move forward inspired by the Earth Charter.

At the very beginning the UN was very much rooted in the Four Freedoms, with its global aspiration – ‘all over the world.’ Unfortunately, after the Cold War we did not witness the birth of a multi-polar world. A crucial difference with fifty years ago is that the USA has become the super-power, lacking much respect for the UN. The US sees it as its mission to prevail against terrorism and against proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. However, step by step the concept of humanitarian intervention is becoming more accepted and practised. Though still weak, the tribunals and International Criminal Court are the beginning of the end of the era of impunity for human rights violations.

Another breakthrough is needed to give the UN an effective supranational mandate for controlling nuclear technology. In Hammarskjöld’s day, President Eisenhower spoke eloquently of the use of Atoms for Peace and Development. In 1955, Hammarskjöld, inspired by Eisenhower’s words, set up the first truly international UN conference on the ‘Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy’ in Geneva. Alas now, fifty years later, there is still a stalemate when it comes to effective nuclear disarmament and prudent use of atoms for peace and development. The world badly needs an Agenda of Hope. As an ‘homage’ to Dag Hammarskjöld I highlight here the Earth Charter and a UN-based supranational authority to
ban nuclear weapons and to prevent proliferation of nuclear knowledge for arms, substituting this with the peaceful use of atomic energy.

This year 2005, the sixtieth anniversary of the UN, also happens to be the year in which Dag Hammarskjöld was born one hundred years ago. Monica Bouman's book offers us an excellent opportunity to re-think UN aspirations in a new context inspired by Dag Hammarskjöld.

R.F.M. Lubbers.
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INTRODUCTION

Concerning men and their way to peace and concord -?

This year, 2005, is the centenary of the birth of the former Secretary-General of the United Nations (1953-1961), the Swedish diplomat, Dag Hammarskjöld, who was killed in an air crash in Africa in 1961. At the time of his death he was on a diplomatic mission to the Congo. The Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation and the Swedish Foreign Ministry have drawn up an extensive jubilee programme.

Besides commemoration ceremonies in Sweden, Africa and at the United Nations in New York, a travelling exhibition forms part of this programme. This exhibition which is simple and modest but very beautiful, was at the Peace Palace in The Hague, the Netherlands, for a week in June. It consists of a transparent 'room' in which photos and films in black and white of Hammarskjöld's life are projected onto two walls. What makes the exhibition so impressive is the way in which it is designed. Images of Hammarskjöld's public life as Secretary-General are projected on to one wall - and, joining this wall at right angles, is one on which the images of his private life are projected. They are not running at the same time; the public images are still while the private images are being shown and vice versa. It has the poignant effect of emphasising how much both lives hinged on each other, and it has the added effect of making you feel that you are in the picture - an onlooker at the events which were taking place in the world at the time. And all the while a narrator on a dvd is reading fragments from Hammarskjöld's diary, Markings. For those who are familiar with the texts from Markings, the combination of these three elements which are brought together in the exhibition gives a three-dimensional portrait of this remarkable international servant. We see him on diplomatic missions, addressing the United Nations General Assembly, shaking hands with world leaders while still on the other wall he is resting during a trek in the mountains. To hear his voice saying 'I shall remain at my post' was particularly moving for me. Seeing the Hammarskjöld I have grown to know and value - I could even say, love - putting into action the maturity of mind which he had struggled to achieve by means of his reading and writing and which was an all important spur to his willingness to serve, had a deep effect on me.

Where did my interest in Hammarskjöld originate? Hammarskjöld crossed my path in the form of a street name - the street where I moved to in my home town: the Dag Hammarskjöldlaan. I am not of the generation that has personal recollections of Hammarskjöld but his name excited my curiosity and so I read biographies of him and studies of his international work. I got to know him particularly from the texts of his public speeches and his spiritual diary Vägmarken - in Dutch, Merkstenen. This volume went everywhere with me. It was then a very small step to making Hammarskjöld's Markings as well as his speeches the subject of my thesis when I was completing my Doctorate in Theology at the Catholic University of Nijmegen in 2001.

I took as my starting point Hammarskjöld's argument that international service is based on maturity of mind and by analysing his texts, I looked for an answer to the question: 'What was Hammarskjöld's ethical message and how did he substantiate his argumentation?' I analysed his speeches 'International

---

1 Brian Urquhart, Sven Stolpe, Henri P. van Dusen, among others. For the English translation Manuel Fröhlich, Karl Birnbaum among others.
2 Mark W. Zacher, O. Schachter, Joseph P.Lash, among others.
3 Wilder Foote and Andrew Cordier ed.
5 Monica Bouman, Internationale dienstbaarheid als vrijheid en plicht, De levensweg van Dag Hammarskjöld, Kok, Kampen, 2001: (International Service as a choice and a duty. The Path of Life of Dag Hammarskjöld).
Service6 and ‘The World and the Nation’7. At the same time, in order to get a picture of
Hammarskjöld’s own growth towards maturity of mind, I analysed the structure and dynamics of his
inner dialogues from Markings around ‘maturity’ (mognad in Swedish) and in the following chapters I
will show you how Hammarskjöld’s attitude of service was the product of his striving for maturity of
mind.

Feeling that Hammarskjöld has a universal message and that the texts from Markings could help
people to come to grips with the many stresses of life today, I have been giving workshops and
readings on a regular basis during the past few years. Each time it seems I come to his texts anew and
read even more into them than the time before. It is as if they unfold again and again with an ever
deeper message.

When we consider world politics now, we realise that Hammarskjöld’s texts are just as topical today
as in the years when he was Secretary-General. We could say that history repeats itself, but
Hammarskjöld didn’t see it quite that way. Every problem is different or as he said himself: ‘You
never return. A different man finds a different city.’8 Though not the same, the problems facing
political leaders now are nevertheless very similar to those in Hammarskjöld’s time. Studying his life
and work strengthens the realisation that he has presented us with ways to steer the changes in
international relations in the direction of a world order, instead of allowing the world to descend into
chaos. To do this, we need to develop an inner strength to deal with the complex questions of our day
in a mature way. Reason and intelligence are not sufficient for this; emotional and moral maturity are
essential and Hammarskjöld has shown us the way.

For the United Nations, 2005 is also a very special year. The world organisation is entering into its
seventh decade with, according to the present Secretary-General, Kofi Annan, ‘the most sweeping
overhaul of its 60-year history.’ ‘World leaders’ he says ‘must recapture the spirit of San Francisco’9
and forge a new world compact to advance the cause of larger freedom.’ Therefore he has placed a
blueprint before the world’s governments for a new era of global cooperation and collective action.
His report, entitled ‘In Larger Freedom,’ calls on states to use the summit of world leaders that will be
held at UN Headquarters in September 2005 to strengthen our collective security, lay down a truly
global strategy for development, advance the cause of human rights and democracy in all nations, and
put in place new mechanisms to ensure that these commitments are translated into action.10

Mr Annan has put his report together on the basis of two wide-ranging reviews of global challenges:
one from the 16-member High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, and the other from
250 experts who undertook the UN Millennium Project. The Millennium Declaration, signed by 147
representatives from 191 countries at the General Assembly of the United Nations in New York in
2000, is a further elaboration of the Charter of 1945, making it applicable to the problems of the
twenty-first century. By putting their names to this document, the countries declared their
responsibility to support the principles of human dignity, equality and justice, at a global level. The
Millennium Declaration sets out goals to be reached in the areas of development, peace and security,
combating poverty, environmental protection and human rights. It pays special attention to
implementing democracy and good government, child protection, support for Africa and strengthening
the United Nations - making the organisation more effective. Eight of these goals set out an ambitious
programme, particularly in the field of development and poverty eradication. They specifically aim to
achieve universal access to primary education, emancipation of women, and a considerable reduction

6 'International Service', Address at John Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, June 14 1955, in Wilder
7 'The World and the Nation'- Commencement Address at Stanford University, Palo Alto, California, June 19,
Hammarskjöld.
8 Translated from Vägmärken into Dutch and then into English, M. Bouman and A.M. Smit-Ryan.
9 The UN Charter was signed in San Francisco on 26 June, 1945.
of extreme poverty and hunger. Making considerable headway in the fight against AIDS, figures prominently in these goals. There is to be a special effort to realise these particular goals by 2015.

Implementing the Millennium Declaration will only be possible if the Member States make a serious effort to do this. Human rights violation on an immense scale, human disasters resulting from conflicts, systematic subordination of women, loss of sympathy for cultures and religions due to international terrorism, failure to honour trade agreements by developed countries and failure also - with impunity - to respect international treaties; all this requires a different course of action. ‘There is an urgent need for a renewed engagement to work collectively in accordance with the Charter, which would mean honouring decisions taken collectively and displaying great determination to carry them out’. **11** There is need of ongoing commitment as well as an awareness of international responsibility to achieve this end.

The question of how this awareness can be intensified brings us to Dag Hammarskjöld and his view of the aims and functioning of the United Nations. From the texts of the public man, in particular the two speeches, important for the content of this book, I will progress to the texts of the inner man. Following Hammarskjöld in his texts, we ourselves reflect on our identity and actions in life as world citizens. My line of argumentation will be:

In Chapter 1, I will discuss Hammarskjöld’s life and work, in particular his work for the United Nations. In 2001 in a commemoration speech in Uppsala, Kofi Annan called Dag Hammarskjöld a figure of great importance, not only for Mr Annan himself but also for other Secretaries-General.

In Chapters 2 and 3, we follow Hammarskjöld’s argumentation in the ‘World and the Nation’ and ‘International Service’. These two speeches contain pointers for us as to why it is important to undertake the duty of international service on a personal level and on a state level. He gives serious consideration to the objections of opponents to this idea, but places the reasons for the objections in a broader and deeper context, which supports his call to international service. In his ethical argumentation he calls on our capacity to strive for maturity of mind. Dialogue with others is important – at least as important as the inner dialogue.

In Chapter 4, I will go into more detail about the exceptional influence which the works of Martin Buber had on Hammarskjöld. He shared with him a strong spiritual relationship. They met a number of times and at these meetings Buber’s book *Ich und Du* (‘I and Thou’) drew them together in a very special way. They recognized in each other’s work the same international humanism.

In Chapter 5 and 6, I will introduce *Markings* as Hammarskjöld’s spiritual diary and show you how Hammarskjöld took on a spiritual and serving leadership. Analysis of the inner dialogue from *Markings*, of which the text *When love has matured* is a part, will peel away the layers until we get to the religious core.

In Chapters 7 and 8, I will treat with the many reasons why the texts *Respect for the Word* and *The mystery is a constant reality*, from 1955, are particularly significant and go into detail about the basic attitude formulated in these texts.

The adherence to the programme ‘In Larger Freedom’ which the United Nations asks for, is an implicit call to ‘Larger Maturity’. Because public discussions on faith and morals are usually dominated by the ranting of religious fundamentalists and material rationalists, there is a wordless area which Hammarskjöld invites us to enter. I would like to show you Hammarskjöld’s dedication and the relevance of his moral guidance.

---

**11** Kofi Annan, in an interim evaluation of the Millennium Declaration, September 2003.
CHAPTER 1

Dag Hammarskjöld
A Swedish World Citizen as Secretary-General of the United Nations.

It was still dark in the early morning of 18 September 1961 when continuous drumbeat spread the news across the area around Ndola, in what was then Northern Rhodesia, that in that night a great leader had died. As a boy, this had made a deep impression on the man who told me his story forty years later in Switzerland. He is one of the many who have recounted to me how the news of Hammarskjöld’s death had reached them and what a lasting impression it had made on them. When the world press published the news that the Secretary-General of the United Nations had died in a plane crash in Africa, millions of people were shocked and incredulous at the death of a world leader who had represented for them hope for a better world. He had given the Secretary-Generalship, the Secretariat, and the United Nations itself, a new status. According to Brian Urquhart, his Under-Secretary and biographer, Hammarskjöld ‘provided the most dynamic and striking leadership an international organization had ever had, and he personified the ideals of the Charter in action in a way that made a profound impression on hundreds of millions of people all over the world.’ Urquhart adds: ‘In the end he carried this implicit challenge to national sovereignty further than some of the more powerful states were prepared to tolerate.’

The cause of the accident has never come to light, although there are different interpretations of the circumstances of the crash. Was it an emergency landing in a wooded area? Had it to do with sabotage by mercenaries from Katanga? Was the FBI behind it? Even sabotage by Belgian industrialists was not ruled out. However, there was too little evidence to substantiate any of these theories.

Did Hammarskjöld have a presentiment of his death? He had certainly been warned of a possible attack on his life. An employee of the Swedish Embassy in Egypt at the time, told me that when Hammarskjöld on his last mission to Africa, touched down in Cairo, as he often did, to visit the embassy there, President Nasser warned him that he was possibly going to his death. Furthermore, the letter which was found with his diary in his flat in New York after his death, showed that he had taken into account that this was a manuscript of a life lived and indicated a presentiment of his death. Not that he seemed at the time to be overly stressed or burnt out. In spite of the pace of his life in this top function, constantly dealing with political opposition and exhausting negotiations, at that point in time he was not tired of life. I deduce this from the fact that he had accepted to translate one of his favourite books into Swedish, Martin Buber’s, Ich und Du (I and Thou). His wish to make Buber’s work accessible to Swedish readers was on its way to being realised since he had signed a contract with a Swedish publisher a few weeks earlier. On his last flight he had this book with him and had already translated some pages. Starting such an ambitious enterprise is most unlikely and difficult to comprehend if he was entertaining any idea of dying.

Hammarskjöld’s death in Africa, far from the world where he had grown up, was uncanny in the light of the bond which this West-European felt with the destiny of the African continent. Forty years later, in September 2001, Hammarskjöld’s life and work, as well as his significance for the world today, was commemorated in Uppsala, the city of his youth. In his memorial speech on this occasion, the present U.N. Secretary-General, Kofi Annan said that Hammarskjöld was a figure of great importance for him, as he must have been for other Secretaries-General in the past. ‘There can be no better rule of thumb for a Secretary-General, as he approaches each new challenge or crisis, than to ask himself, “how would Hammarskjöld have handled this?” What particularly appealed to Annan about Hammarskjöld, was “his wisdom and modesty, his unimpeachable integrity and single-minded devotion to duty.” Annan continued by saying that “These characteristics which are very difficult to emulate, have set a 1

standard for all servants of the international community, which is simply impossible to live up to.\textsuperscript{3} In a similar way, in 1961, Archbishop Erling Eidem of Sweden had said at Hammarskjöld’s funeral in Sweden, that ‘Death, which is so unexpected and for us all so poignant, fell upon him, our friend and companion: death forces us to face the old and always so disturbing question of the meaning and the fulfilment of our life on earth. The answer may be expressed in one word, ‘serve’ - so immeasurably simple, yet so overwhelmingly filled with significance.’

\textit{Childhood in Uppsala, Sweden}

Dag Hammarskjöld was born on 29 July 1905 in Jonköping, in Sweden, as the youngest of four sons of Hjalmar Hammarskjöld and Agnes Almquist. He passed his childhood years in Uppsala where his father, who had been Prime Minister of Sweden during the First World War, was Governor of the District of Uppland. In a Canadian radio programme in 1953, Hammarskjöld spoke of the influence of his parents: ‘From generations of soldiers and government officials on my father’s side I inherited a belief that no life was more satisfactory than one of selfless service to your country - or humanity. This service required a sacrifice of all personal interests, but likewise the courage to stand up unflinchingly for your convictions. From scholars and clergymen on my mother’s side, I inherited a belief that, in the very radical sense of the Gospels, all men were equals as children of God, and should be met and treated by us as our masters in God.’\textsuperscript{4} In later chapters, I will demonstrate that Dag Hammarskjöld integrated in his personality these influences from both his parents. When choosing fields of study during his student days he was guided on the one hand by his interest in the Humanities and on the other hand by the technical and analytical approach to how one can influence the workings of society.

\textit{Student years in Uppsala and Stockholm}

At 18, Hammarskjöld graduated from secondary school and enrolled in Uppsala University. There, in 1925, he completed, with honours, a Bachelor of Arts degree, majoring in Linguistics, Literature and History. During these years he laid the basis for his command of English, French and German and for his stylistic mastery of his native language. He continued his studies for two more years at Uppsala and completed a Bachelor of Laws degree in 1930. During his student years and thereafter, Hammarskjöld’s main intellectual and professional interest, was political economy. In 1933 he received his PhD from the University of Stockholm, where he was made Assistant Professor in Political Economy, defending his thesis entitled ‘Konjunkturspridningen’ (The Spread of the Business Cycle). Because of his doctoral thesis he became identified with the group of brilliant young economists who were known as the ‘Stockholm School’. It is said that these economists, arguably, developed Keynesian economics before Keynes. The main members were Gunnar Myrdal and Bertil Ohlin, who both received the Bank of Sweden Prize in Economic Sciences in Memory of Alfred Nobel. These ideas were very novel in the 1930s.

It is no coincidence that Hammarskjöld was associated with the Stockholm School. In 1927 he had attended Cambridge University in England, where he studied under John Maynard Keynes (1883 - 1946). There can be no doubt that Keynes had an influence on Hammarskjöld’s thinking. In his book \textit{The Economic Consequences of the Peace} (1919), Keynes prophesied that the war reparations Germany had to pay would keep the country impoverished and ultimately threaten all Europe. These predictions were borne out when the German economy collapsed in the hyperinflation of 1923, with only a small amount of reparation ever being paid. The rise of the Hitler and National Socialism in Germany was made possible by this blunder of the politicians. The lesson learnt led directly to the Allies setting up the Marshall Plan after World War II.

\textsuperscript{3} Ibid.
Civil servant in Sweden

Hammarskjöld was no stranger to civil service. His family had worked in the Swedish civil service since the seventeenth century - and this civil service had a firm basis in law. And, as we shall see, he believed that it was not just desirable but also possible to have an impartial civil service and he worked hard to realise this goal during his term of office as Secretary-General of the United Nations. Before he joined the United Nations in 1953, Hammarskjöld had a relatively long record in public office. He was only thirty, when he was given the post of Secretary of the National Bank of Sweden in 1935. At the age of 31 and after having served a year as Secretary in the National Bank, he was appointed to the post of Permanent Under-Secretary of the Ministry of Finance under Secretary of State Ernst Wigger. This was then one of the most gruelling jobs in Swedish Government service. At the same time his brother Bo Hammarskjöld was Secretary of State for Social Affairs. It is said that together the two brothers were responsible for working out all the financial and technical details of the Swedish Welfare State.

Although he never joined any political party, regarding himself as an independent, Hammarskjöld served in a number of Swedish Government posts. He concurrently served as Chairman of the National Bank’s Board, from 1941 to 1948. Six of the Board’s members are appointed by Parliament and the Chairman by the Government. This was the first time that one man had held both posts, the Chairmanship of the Bank’s Board and that of Under-Secretary of the Finance Ministry. In 1947 he exchanged the Ministry of Finance for the Foreign Office, where he became Under Secretary - later Secretary - of State and played a leading role in drawing up Swedish foreign policy. He was a delegate to the Paris Conference in 1947, which was a key event in the launch of the Marshall Plan. This plan was the brainchild of the US Secretary of State, George C. Marshall, to pump money into the European economies so that Europe, especially the aggressor, Germany, could recover economically from the devastation of the Second World War. Europe would then be a strong buffer to the Communist East. It was not completely altruistic on the part of the Americans, as goods and services would be bought from them with this money. The Keynesian lesson had been learnt. Hammarskjöld’s year at Cambridge studying under Keynes must had given him insights into this way of (political) economic thinking.

As his country’s chief delegate Hammarskjöld attended the Paris Conference of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC) held in 1948. It is interesting to read that Paul Hoffman, then Secretary of USCA, noted that Hammarskjöld was never hot tempered and had a great talent for solving very complicated problems. He was often able to find compromises by which disputing parties could find common ground. For some years Hammarskjöld served as Vice-Chairman of the OEEC Executive Committee. During these negotiations foreign diplomats discovered that Hammarskjöld had great technical and diplomatic qualities. In 1950, he became Chairman of the Swedish Delegation to UNISCAN, established to promote economic cooperation between the United Kingdom and the Scandinavian countries. When he joined the Swedish Cabinet as Minister Without Portfolio in 1951, he became, in effect, Deputy Foreign Minister, dealing especially with economic problems and various plans for close economic cooperation. In all these functions, he became known more as a technical expert than as a politician.

World politics in 1950 were dominated by the Korean question. Interference in the Korean conflict by the United Nations was fiercely criticised by the Soviet Union. The Norwegian, Trygve Lie, who was then Secretary-General of the United Nations, felt obliged to resign. To break the deadlock, it was decided to choose a successor from a small neutral country, someone who was known for his bureaucratic skills and not for his political interpretation of how the job should be carried out. In the spring of 1953, Hammarskjöld was approached for the function. He said ‘yes’ and took up his post as Secretary-General on 10 April of that year.

Secretary-General of the United Nations

From his years of public service in Sweden, Hammarskjöld came to the task of General-Secretary of the United Nations with some strong convictions about the integrity of the international civil servant. The UN Secretary-General and the Secretariat had to be beyond reproach in order to win the confidence of the Member States in the impartiality and international character of the staff of the Secretariat. Without this, the Secretariat had no chance to serve the business of peace. His own impartiality and objectivity in his negotiations with government leaders and diplomats was an important premise for him. And being the intelligent and compassionate person he was, he gave a special dimension to this task of international service. During his work for the United Nations he was also to show how pragmatic he could be, in combination with his strong commitment to the ethical principles of the Organization. He sought to increase the influence of the Organisation's decisions by seeing to it, that the moral values which are stated in the Principles and Purposes of the Charter were upheld in international relations. This Charter was, after all, the nearest thing to a constitution which had ever yet been formally recognised by the nations of the world.

Hammarskjöld was elected Secretary-General in 1953 for a five-year term and re-elected in 1957. It was during his second term that he met his death. In this eight-and-a-half years of office, world politics were centred around the reconstruction of Europe, the Cold War between the Western Powers and the Communist Block and the decolonisation of Africa and Asia. In the management and prevention of conflicts which threatened to put world peace at grave risk, Hammarskjöld strove to carve out an active role for the Secretariat of the United Nations. He did this in his own inimitable and dynamic way. The world went from one serious crisis to another. I will go into detail about some of them now, but deal with others in another context later.

At the end of 1954, a crisis arose between America, the United Nations and Communist China. Fifteen American fliers who had been serving under the United Nations Command in Korea had been captured by the Chinese authorities and held on suspicion of spying. Hammarskjöld undertook a journey to China to negotiate with the Foreign Minister, Chou En-lai, about their release. His 'quiet diplomacy' led to the release of the whole group in August of that year. The success of this mission considerably increased the prestige of the United Nations Organisation and consequently the UN got more room in which to operate.

Another inflammatory issue which came to a head at this time was the Suez Crisis, which broke out in November 1956. President Nasser of Egypt nationalised the Suez Canal and Great Britain, France and Israel retaliated by carrying out an armed invasion of Egypt. By using intensive diplomacy and setting up the first Peace-Keeping Force (UNEF) under the command of the United Nations, Hammarskjöld was able to prevent an escalation of the conflict.

The crisis that developed in the early summer of 1958 posed a further serious threat to peace in the Middle East with the danger of big power involvement. The confused relationships of the Arab states, plus the Western Powers' suspicion of President Nasser after the Suez debacle, transformed the outbreak of civil war in Lebanon into a major international confrontation. The situation was clouded by misinformation, rumour, and preconceived ideas and demanded an objective and disinterested go-between, together with some realistic and unbiased fact-finding. Such a role, although unlikely to be popular, was vital if the Lebanese crisis was not to develop into something more serious. Preventive action was urgently called for. With the approval of the General Assembly Hammarskjöld set up a UN Observation Group in Lebanon and a UN Office in Jordan. Once these institutions were in place he then saw to it that the American and British troops, who had been sent there, withdrew.
What he himself later coined as 'Preventive Action' in his Introduction to the Annual Report 1959-1960, was a set of new instruments which he developed to offset military conflict. One aspect of this was preventive diplomacy. The success of this approach bolstered the position of the United Nations in international conflict-management. When explaining about the application of Preventive Action, he said that it 'must in the first place aim at filling the vacuum so that it will not provoke action from any of the major parties. Temporarily, and pending the filling of the vacuum by normal means, the United Nations enters the picture on the basis of its non-commitment to any power bloc, so as to provide to the extent possible a guarantee in relation to all parties against initiatives from others.' In the many situations which Hammarskjold was confronted with during his terms of office, the effectiveness of Preventive Action was to be amply tested.

Hammarskjold occupied himself intensively with the problems which followed on from the new independence of former colonies. It is interesting to note that a similar pattern became evident in each region that was decolonised. On the withdrawal of the colonial power, underlying differences which the colonial administration had covered up, emerged. The fear of the instability which might fill the vacuum was a spur to Cold-War powers to intervene in the different regions to assure their separate influence. Regional instability in South-East Asia at the end of the nineteen-fifties demanded delicate handling on the part of Hammarskjold and the Secretariat, and he applied again his concept of Preventive Diplomacy. The collapse of French Power in Indo-China (Laos, Vietnam, Cambodia) and France's withdrawal from the region after the Geneva Conference in 1954, revealed the basic instability that the French Empire had masked for nearly a century. In 1959, when problems arose in Laos and again between Cambodia and Thailand, Hammarskjold sent personal representatives to the region. Unfortunately this diplomacy only had a temporary effect. Nevertheless, diplomacy and preventive action on the part of the U.N., increased the tendency further to make the Secretariat, headed by the Secretary-General, the executive for operations for peace.

The next problem which presented itself was to cost Hammarskjold his life and arose when the Belgian government handed over political control of the Belgian Congo to its people, confident that it would eventually regain economic control. On June 30, 1960, Joseph Kasavubu and Patric Lumumba became respectively President and Prime Minister of the former Belgian colony. However, the administration, which had been run efficiently when in Belgian hands, now broke down and in the chaos which followed a large proportion of the white population fled. What made the situation extremely complex was, that this was not only an international conflict, but also a national one. Belgium threatened to intervene militarily while, at the same time, the new government was faced with a mutiny in its army and secession of its province of Katanga. It appealed to the U.N. for help. In response, the U.N. sent a peace-keeping force to the Congo, Operations des Nations Unies au Congo (ONUC), with Hammarskjold in charge of operations. He understood the task of the ONUC to be an integration of politics, military and technical aid, with a common goal which was the restoration of peace and order. Possibilities to allow the Congolese to decide their own fate under a government of their own choice had to be created. The mission came up against great difficulties which, in the Autumn of 1961, became insurmountable. Once again, Hammarskjold set off from New York for Africa with a view to finding a diplomatic solution to the crisis. This was to be his last trip.

The basis of his political attitude

What made Hammarskjold so sure of himself in chartering his course of action? To answer that, we must consider where he came from. Culturally and politically he was a West European, which he himself summed up as 'Athens, Jerusalem, Rome'. By this he meant that Athens represented Freedom of Thought, Jerusalem represented Faith and Rome represented Justice. It follows then that his values were deeply rooted in his Christian faith and his knowledge of Western history and philosophy. He believed in the equality of all people and that social justice was ethically desirable. Furthermore, he had the conviction that Western values of freedom of thought and social justice were not only valid in
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the West but should apply to all people and all groups. He considered himself to be a citizen of the world.

As we have seen, with his background and education, Hammarskjöld had a great respect for the rule of law and considered it to be an integral part of Western civilization. However, he was anxious that it should be applied world-wide. Without that, there would be no order and citizens would be exposed to the fickleness and manipulations of the leaders of society. One of his goals as Secretary-General was, therefore, to develop a code of international law. Hammarskjöld’s legal training led him to scrutinise how results were achieved and what impact actions would have on the legal development of the United Nations. A reliable and just world order, in his opinion, could only be built pragmatically by creating precedents and by case law. In this way, when new regulations appeared to work, they were incorporated into the standard body of United Nations’s laws. Hammarskjöld hoped that by building up such a body of laws, the UN would gradually change from a bureaucratic institution into a constitutional instrument, subject to growth and adaptation. This constitutional instrument would hopefully be recognised and respected by all governments. It was, therefore, very important that this process was not disrupted by the strong powers, out to serve their own interests. He realised that he could only prevent this from happening by adhering strictly to the Principles of the Charter, believing that this instrument would give new status to the function of Secretary-General, the Secretariat, and to a certain extent, the United Nations itself.

We have seen an example of Hammarskjöld’s leadership in the way he handled the Suez crisis. However, this crisis also led to another step towards his goal of drawing up a code of international law. To supervise the truce, the Canadian Prime Minister, Lester Pearson, proposed to the General Assembly that an international peace force be set up. The Assembly agreed to the proposal and immediately requested the Secretary-General to lay down the legal basis for such a force. Within 24 hours Hammarskjöld had drawn up a legal basis for the peace force and its actions, which he submitted in the form of a resolution to the General Assembly. The resolution was passed on 7 November and Hammarskjöld was delegated to carry out the organisation of an Emergency Peace Force (UNEF) under the UN’s mandate. This was the very first force ever mobilized by an international organization.

Coming from a small state himself, Hammarskjöld gave particular attention to the protection of the independence of small states. He felt that they could offer a counterpoise to the big nations in the General Assembly and, in this way, could play a significant role in keeping the peace. Furthermore, as well as respecting the right to freedom and neutrality of the newly independent African and Asian states, he saw the U.N. as an institution through which these states, who had little or no political clout as yet, could, just like the small, long-established states, bring their wisdom and expertise to bear on the world scene. He guided and coordinated this process in a very natural manner, often in the face of vigorous opposition on the part of the big powers. The precedents created in this way, further extended the body of international law.

Hammarskjöld’s experience in the building up of the economies of Europe after World War II, made him realise that economic deprivation was a significant threat to world peace. Therefore, he saw it as a major role for the United Nations to promote the economic development of the new and less-developed countries. Further, he considered it to be crucial both to the ultimate success of the decolonisation process and to the foundation of a more stable political order in the world. In the same way that he had worked hard for the social and economic development of post-war Sweden, he now applied himself internationally to facilitating the economic development of the new and less-developed countries.

On handing on the sceptre of the Secretary-Generalship of the United Nations to Hammarskjöld in 1953, Trygve Lie had said ‘Welcome to the most impossible job on earth!’ In the last months of his life Hammarskjöld experienced just how impossible his job was. Under the burden of criticism of his policies he was feeling very alone and exposed. It is therefore ironical that shortly after his death the appreciation of, and reward for, his untiring efforts to do the best job possible, was acknowledged by the awarding of the Nobel Prize for Peace posthumously to him. When the Swedish Ambassador to
Norway, Rolf Edberg, accepted the Nobel Peace Prize on his behalf, on 10 December 1961, he said about Hammarskjold: ‘My compatriot was much concerned with the awakening and fermenting continent which was to become his destiny. He firmly believed that the new countries have an important mission to fulfill in the community of nations. He therefore invested all his strength of will, and at the end more than that, to smooth their way toward the future. Africa was to be the great test for the philosophy he wished to see brought to life through the United Nations.’ Edberg concluded his speech with the words: ‘My fellow countryman became a citizen of the world. He was regarded as such by the people from whom he came. But on that good autumn day of falling leaves when he was brought back to the Uppsala of his youth, he was ours again, he was back home. Shyly he had guarded his inner world, but at that moment the distance disappeared and we felt that he came very close to us.’

Seven years before his death, Hammarskjold had praised Count Folke Bernadotte in a speech he made at the re-dedication ceremony of the memorial plaque to Bernadotte on 24 July 1953: ‘He died as he had lived – gallantly, unselfishly – in the service of the highest ideals of humanity. He served with a true humility of spirit which ennobled his work. No human life was too mean for his compassion, no obstacle was too great for his effort, no risk was too high – if the end was to give another measure of relief to a suffering and war-torn humanity.’ How eerie and yet how fitting that these same words were used again during the memorial ceremony after his own death – but now to describe Hammarskjold himself. Like Bernadotte, Hammarskjold’s life and death had been in service to the world.

What was it that underpinned this attitude of service? Where did it originate? What were its inner dynamics? Hammarskjold himself gives us the answer to these questions: ‘We bow before an ideal of life, and an example of profound faith, faith in the dignity but also in the good sense and fundamental decency of men. Without this ideal and this faith, who would seek to follow the course of patient negotiation, of ceaseless effort to conciliate, to mediate, to compose differences, to appeal to men’s reason in order to build agreement? He goes on to say that this has to do with the ideal of public service and the belief in the eventual triumph of good-will. ‘This ideal of public service and this faith in the ultimate triumph of good will are a living reality. They are the foundation upon which the United Nations itself is built.’ For many, and I count myself one of them, Hammarskjold himself demonstrated this ideal of life and of public service and is thus an example of profound faith in the dignity, the good sense and decency of men. And when he says in one of his speeches that the United Nations has been built on the foundation of public service and faith, we would want so much to be able to turn to him and say: Please tell us about this ideal of public service which we need so urgently at the beginning of this new millennium. Tell us about your faith; how it was awakened, thrived for some time, then disappeared, only to come back again, reinforced - because we need this faith and someone to guide us.

A man of faith

With the publication of Markings, the manuscript of which was found in his apartment in New York after his death and was published first in Swedish in 1963, a side of Hammarskjold came to light which not even his friends had been aware of: his inner faith. No doubt, his Swedish friends knew that he was brought up in the Swedish Lutheran Church, though he was not a regular churchgoer, and that he was active as a youth in the social movement started by Archbishop Nathan Soderblom (1866–1931). However, nobody could ever have guessed that Hammarskjold drew the inspiration for his public service from a very personal faith. The texts from Markings and the way in which personal reflections, quotations from the psalms, prayers and meditations succeed each other, drew the astonishment, disbelief and bewilderment of some readers. For others, Hammarskjold’s personal diary was a valuable document, that invited deep study and interpretation. As well as the biographies of his pub-
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7 Rolf Edberg, Swedish Ambassador to Norway, on the occasion of the award of the Nobel Peace Prize in Oslo, December 10, 1961.
8 Dag Hammarskjold, Public Papers, vol., EL, p.78-80. Just like Hammarskjold, Bernadotte was born in Sweden and again like Hammarskjold he was working for the United Nations as a mediator when he lost his life during a peace mission on 17 September 1948.
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lie life, studies of his spiritual diary appeared soon after his death, among which Henri van Dusen’s *Dag Hammarskjöld, The Man and his Faith* (1966) and Gustaf Aulin’s *Dag Hammarskjöld’s White Book* (1969). It emerged that Hammarskjöld had also talked profoundly about his faith in the Canadian radio programme ‘This I Believe’ at the beginning of 1954.

Besides the Lutheran Church, Hammarskjöld’s parents had a great influence on him spiritually. It was they who showed him, that to devote yourself to the service of your country and to others was a worthwhile way of leading your life. In later years he drew inspiration from both Albert Schweitzer and the writings of the medieval mystics. And so we can see that it was a living faith which was the drive for his attitude of service to others. In the last years of his life, he was inspired by, on the one hand the Bible and Eastern philosophy, and, on the other, the work of Martin Buber, with whom he had personal contact. From *Markings* we learn that the man who appeared from the outside to be a model of mature international service, had gone through a life-long process of inner transformation. *Markings* was particularly important for Hammarskjöld’s attitude of international service, and so to learn more about his faith we must read this book.

*A man of culture*

Hammarskjöld had a great love of (world) literature, with a particular preference for the poetry of the German poet and writer Herman Hesse and the American poetess, Emily Dickenson. In 1954 he became a member of the Swedish Academy which awards the annual Nobel Prize for Literature, and in that capacity he put forward the names of the French/American poet, Saint-John Perse and the Jewish philosopher, Martin Buber for the Prize. He carried on a busy correspondence with writers and artists, among whom John Steinbeck and Djuna Barnes and loved to translate foreign literature into Swedish. In this regard he translated Eugene O’Neill’s unpublished play ‘A Long Day’s Journey into Night’ and this had its premiere at the Royal Theatre in Stockholm in 1956. He had a great knowledge of art, including modern art. On his arrival in New York, he went to see the director of the Museum of Modern Art with the intention of borrowing paintings for his offices in the United Nations Building. The Director of the MOMA was so impressed by his wide knowledge of modern art that he thought that Hammarskjöld was the director of the Royal Swedish Museum.

Hammarskjöld had a special bond with the British sculptress, Barbara Hepworth (1903-1975), with whom he corresponded regularly. He admired her and loved her work. So much so, in fact, that he asked her to design a sculpture to be placed in front of the United Nations Building in New York. Hepworth went to work on this by first carving a walnut form (1961), which shortly after his death she named ‘September’ – the month of his death. A large model in bronze (1961) was given the title ‘Single form’ and stands as a memorial to Dag Hammarskjöld in Battersea Park, London. The final version of ‘Single form’ in bronze was unveiled as a memorial to Hammarskjöld in 1964. It got the place designated by him - in front of the United Nations Building in New York.

Music was also one of his many passions and it was Hammarskjöld who was responsible for instituting the annual United Nations Concert. He chose the music, the orchestra and the soloists and in the intermission, he addressed the audience in a short speech. In the course of his address in October 1953, he said that the Charter of the United Nations was a symbol of ideas that should be ‘recognized as an attempt to translate into action a faith – the faith which once inspired a Beethoven in the Ninth Symphony to his great profession of freedom, the brotherhood of man, and a world of harmony’. It was for this reason that he found that ‘music, and what only music can express’ belonged to the celebrations of the United Nations Weeks.

To be invited to one of his dinner parties in his New York apartment must have been, not only convivial, but an inspiring and enlightening experience as well. His guests included people from many different walks of life: Among others were Carl Sandburg, the (John) Steinbecks, the (Pablo) Casals, the (Fritz) Kreislers, the (Leonard) Bernstein, political analysts George Kennan, Barbara Ward and Walter Lippmann. Among the stage and screen artists were Lotte Lenya and Greta Garbo.
Not all Hammarskjöld’s pursuits were intellectual. From his childhood, he was a keen athlete and loved skiing. One of his favourite past times was hiking in the mountains in Sweden. This gave him time to reflect and contemplate which was very important for him especially in his busy public life. It is not surprising to learn that even in this field he used his talents as an administrator and served for some years as President of the Swedish Alpinist Club.

Priest of a secular church

In the vision which Hammarskjöld propagated in his address to the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches, the United Nations was a secular church of ideals and principles, and both he, as its Secretary-General, and the Secretariat of the U.N., were seen by governments as representatives of this church. To put it in his own words: ‘we cannot mould the world as masters of a material thing. But can influence the development of the world from within as a spiritual thing’. And further in the same speech: ‘We can help in the movement toward those ends that inspire our lives and are shared by all men of good-will – in terms very close to those of the Charter of the U.N. – peace and freedom for all, in a world of equal rights for all’. Hammarskjöld came back to this point again in an address to the World Council of Churches in 1954 when he said: ‘The United Nations stands outside - necessarily outside - all confessions, but it is nevertheless an instrument of faith. As such it is inspired by what unites and not what divides the great religions of the world.’ Nowadays we need this perspective in order to bolster our faith in humanity against the background of polarized fundamentalism in many religions.

In the Preamble to the Charter the United Nations declare their faith in the dignity and worth of the human person and pledge to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours. Hammarskjöld says, that this sentence as having the same meaning as the first of the Ten Commandments which calls us to love our neighbours as ourselves. Because the organisation functions particularly as a centre for political consultation and negotiation it is not suitable, as a means to influence the basic attitudes which are decisive in the struggle for the hearts of the people. A war which has to be fought in the hearts of people can only be carried on by those who can speak directly to people. Hammarskjöld saw here an important task for the religious communities and for all people of good-will. He held that people of good will display the inner strength which arises from the courage to approach others with trust and saw this trust as something that the world of his time very badly needed. Today, trust is at a premium and we can join Hammarskjöld’s and Kofi Annan’s appeal to government leaders of the Member States to use the United Nations as an instrument of faith, if they have confidence in its true international spirit, loyalty and powers of judgement.

Message to the world

In speeches given on many different occasions Hammarskjöld brought the work and goals of the United Nations to the attention of his audience. He was convinced of the importance of winning over public opinion, since this played a vital role in international relations. It was said, that Hammarskjöld didn’t really like speech-making, but he considered it an important part as his duty as Secretary-General. He only accepted to speak when he could think out and prepare his own speeches. So we see
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14 The texts of these speeches, press conferences and introductions to the Annual Reports were published after his death in the series ‘Public Papers of the Secretaries-General of the United Nations’ which were selected and commented on by Andrew Codier and Wilder Foote. These appeared between 1972 an 1975. The most significant of these texts were published earlier under the title The Servant of Peace in 1962. Wilder Foote ed., The Servant of Peace, A selection of the Speeches and Statements of Dag Hammarskjöld, The Bodley Head, London, 1962.
that each world-crisis prompted an important speech. He wanted acceptance by the general public of
the on-going consequences of the interdependence of the world of the twentieth century and he set out
to convince his audience of the necessity of give-and-take and reaching compromises in international
politics.

In the attention which is given to Hammarskjöld’s role as Secretary-General, the interest in his
speeches has been limited. Brian Urquhart criticized Hammarskjöld’s speeches in his biography of him,
saying that their delivery was negligible, adding that Hammarskjöld’s own efforts and achievements
brought his goal much closer, than all his speeches.\(^\text{15}\) I think this criticism is unjustified. In his
speeches Hammarskjöld puts into play one of the weapons of the Secretariat, which is mature powers
of judgement. He was of the opinion, that mutual understanding should be enhanced and improved,
and collaboration broadened, not through bombs but with words. Especially in his speeches we see a
demonstration of his moral leadership. Now fifty years on, the same moral leadership is called for to
solve world problems, which are, unfortunately, not very different from those faced in 1955. With his
report 'In larger freedom', Kofi Annan plays a leading role in this respect. In fact, today the problems
have deepened and opinions have become even more polarized.

In 1955, the tenth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, Hammarskjöld was acutely
aware of the suspicion and fear within countries and between countries, which the Cold War and re-
cent decolonisation had brought about. He had this in mind when he made many of his addresses. He
felt the urgency to help people develop self-knowledge and the ability to deal both mentally and spiri-
tually with this changing world. There was great need of spiritual and moral leadership. As Secretary-
General of the United Nations, Hammarskjöld felt he could not visibly assume this spiritual leadership
himself. Because of that he wrote a letter to Albert Schweitzer on 21 July 1955. Schweitzer had re-
cently received the Nobel Price for Peace, and Hammarskjöld admired his combination of contempla-
tive reflection with an active working life.

In his letter he asked Schweitzer with great insistence ‘to send forth an essential message to the world’
which ‘absolutely needs an ideology which can confer a valid meaning to the efforts of all nations and
give fresh and solid bases to the principle of co-existence’.\(^\text{16}\) The letter shows how much importance
Hammarskjöld placed on the formulation of such an ideology. However, I am quite surprised that he
requested this of Schweitzer. He himself had made two speeches on 14 and 19 June of that year, in
which he had set himself this particular task. We now see from his letter that he is passing this task on
to Schweitzer. Was he disappointed about his own limitations in designing such an ideology? Was he
unhappy about with the lack of response to his speeches? Or were the difficulties which he had come
up against, when trying to develop such an ideology, so great that he realised that only a theologian of
Schweitzer’s calibre could bring the project to fruition? In fact, he knew that Schweitzer had much
more room for spiritual manoeuvre than he himself had and that this would enable Schweitzer to apply
the strength which was needed to make a world ideology heard. In his own position as Secretary-
General of the United Nations, Hammarskjöld had to keep within the limitations imposed on him by
the neutrality of the Organization. If he did have a certain ideological enthusiasm, he had to temper it.
This is a likely explanation of the fact that he gave this remarkable task to Schweitzer. An ideology
was needed which was powerful enough to activate people to undertake international service, a new
and unknown adventure in world solidarity.

The speeches *International Service*\(^\text{17}\) and *The World and the Nation*\(^\text{18}\) will now get my full attention
in the next two chapters.

\(^{15}\) B. Urquhart, 1972, *Hammarskjöld*, p. 84.
\(^{17}\) Dag Hammarskjöld, *International Service*, address at Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore Maryland, 14 June 1955,
Commemoration of the Tenth Anniversary of the United Nations.
\(^{18}\) Dag Hammarskjöld, *The World and the Nation*, address at Stanford University, Palo Alto, California, 19 June 1955,
Commemoration of the Tenth Anniversary of the United Nations.
CHAPTER 2

The World and the Nation
Text and interpretation of the speech

In 1955 Hammarskjöld made two important speeches on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations: The World and the Nation and International Service. Sixteen new nations had joined the UN bringing the total number of members up to seventy-six. Inevitably, this meant a crisis of identity for many people; old nations feared loss of sovereignty and erosion of their influence and new nations felt their voice would not be heard. Hammarskjöld found it was the moment to appeal for solidarity and generosity on all sides. He used the occasion of the speeches not only to address his physical audience, but also the world community, setting out to encourage them to look beyond their own lives and own nation. His speeches were not real monologues, but gave the impression that he was entering into a dialogue with his opponents.

In this chapter I will deal with the speech The World and the Nation which he gave at Stanford University on 19 June 1955. I invite you to read the entire speech through before following my analysis of its parts.

Commencement Address at Stanford University, Palo Alto, California, 19 June 1955.

Nationalism - internationalism. These abstract words, so often abused, so often misunderstood, cover high ideals and strong emotions, reflect modes of thought and action which shape our world. We often see the word 'nationalism' used in a derogatory sense. The same is true of the word 'internationalism'. When nationalism connotes, for example, a 'go-it-alone' isolationism, and internationalism an outlook which belittles the significance of national life and nations as centers of political action and spiritual tradition, the words become contradictory and the attitudes they describe irreconcilable. From such interpretations of the words comes the tendency to think of nationalism as in fundamental conflict with an internationalist attitude.

But other interpretations lead to a quite different result. Nationalism and internationalism, when understood as meaning recognition of the value and the rights of the nation, and of the dependence of the nation on the world, represent essential parts of the mental and spiritual equipment of all responsible men in our time. Everybody today, with part of his being, belongs to one country, with its specific traditions and problems, while with another part he has become a citizen of a world which no longer permits national isolation. Seen in this light there could not be any conflict between nationalism, between the nation and the world.

The German poet and philosopher Friedrich von Schiller, conscious of the importance of his message of freedom and brotherhood, said that he would find it a miserable idea to write only for one nation. A philosopher could not limit himself to but one fraction of mankind. This nation or that national event could inspire him only in so far as it was of importance to all mankind. In his biography of Schiller, Thomas Carlyle criticized this attitude. He feared that a feeling which extended to all mankind was too diffuse to operate as it should for individual life. The world idea would not provide the necessary guidance for personal conduct and lead to anarchy. Schiller's own enthusiasm, he felt, would move us more strongly, if he had directed himself to a narrower field.

In a speech on the 150th anniversary of Schiller's death last spring Thomas Mann dealt with this conflict between the idea of the world and the idea of the nation as represented respectively by Schiller and Carlyle. He felt that in our time the narrow field, the nation, was sinking back into the past. Everyone should realize that no problem, be it political or spiritual, could any longer be resolved on the basis of Carlyle's approach. Our world of today in his view needs a universal vision – indeed, our
I anguished hearts demanded it. Mankind as an ideal was not too weak a guide for our conduct. It was necessary, more necessary than ever, to seek in it an inspiration for all our actions.

We may well feel that there is truth both in the attitudes of Schiller and Mann and in the attitude of Carlyle, but that these great authors in their own personalities reveal that the concepts of the nation and of the world to which they have given expression, are, each one, incomplete and one-sided. Are they not firmly rooted in a national tradition, and yet, do they not belong to all mankind? Are they not internationalists in truth and spirit, and in being so, have they not served their own peoples? The question is not either the nation or the world. It is rather, how to serve the world by service to our nation and how to serve the nation by service to the world?

The dilemma is as old as mankind. There has always been the problem of how to harmonize loyalty to the smaller group, inside which we are working, with loyalty to the larger unit to which this group belongs. However, in our time this problem has taken on new significance and new proportions. It has also developed aspects unknown to previous generations.

For vast multitudes this is an era when, for the first time, they have fully sensed the rights and responsibilities of free peoples and sovereign nations. It is also the era when freedom and sovereignty for the first time have been actually within their reach. Parallel with great social and economic revolutions within many countries, we witness now a world revolution from which peoples, long dependent of others, begin to emerge as strong dynamic national states.

In the pride of self-realization natural to these states we should welcome the constructive element. A self-assertion like that of a young man coming of age, conscious of his powers, eager to find his own way, to make his voice heard and to render his contribution to progress. We should meet this new enthusiasm with understanding, in full appreciation of the rich gifts it may bring to a world of many nations and peoples in friendly competition. In world affairs such an attitude, which is in line with the great traditions of this country, may be regarded as an expression of true democracy in international life.

I have spoken about the positive aspect of the nationalism of a young state. Let us not forget that these positive elements can be turned into an explosive force if repressed or unguided. It is a sign of true statesmanship, both in the new countries and in the older nations, so to direct national policies as to avoid collisions developing out of unwise reactions to the new forces. History places a burden on our shoulders. The creative urges of the emerging nations are tinged with strong emotions from the past. It is for all of us, denying neither the good nor the ills of that past, to look ahead and not to permit old conflicts to envenom the spirit of the creative work before us.

We have to face also another kind of new nationalism, which is a strong force in every state. It is a commonplace that recent technological changes have created a new kind of interdependence among nations and brought all peoples much closer to each other. For reasons which lie outside the political sphere, practically all mankind today must be regarded as a unit in important economic, technical and political respects. Economic changes tend to sweep over all the world. New inventions influence quickly the lives of all peoples. Because it is more difficult to limit wars to a single area, all wars are of concern to all nations. Not only construction, but also destruction may today be global.

It is natural that this new situation should provoke a resistance, inspired by the fear that our own private world might find itself submerged in some global development. And so we find people trying to find ways to isolate themselves from general trends and to build up closed, protected units. We can understand or even sympathize with such a reaction, but we must recognize that if it represents a resistance to change, it is doomed to failure. Such self-sought isolation may persevere for some time. It will not endure forever, and the longer the change is resisted and adjustment shirked, the more violent will be the final reaction when the walls collapse.

The reply to nationalists who wish to remain aloof in such vain efforts at self-protection is that the way to safeguard what they rightly want to defend is not isolation. The way is a vigorous and self-confident
development, in free contact with the world, of the special qualities and assets of their nation and their people – a development which should give them their just weight in the international balance. Giving thus to the world what is specifically ours, we could manifest and protect our national character, while accepting change and opening our minds to the influences of the world.

It has been said that in our world of today, united in an outward sense by technical developments, international organization has ceased to be an utopian idea and has become a practical necessity. But what do we mean by international organization? The term seems to cover a vast range, from agreed cooperation, freely entered into by all nations or by a group of nations, to various kinds of federal arrangements involving varying degrees of surrender of sovereignty. We undoubtedly need world organization, but we are far from ripe for world government. Indeed, even modest attempts at regional ‘integration’ have met with considerable difficulties, not because of any superstitious respect for national sovereignty, but because the peoples want to know in whose hands they put their fate, if they are to surrender part of their self-destination as nations. Further: how often have we not seen those who most eagerly plead for integration among other countries themselves shrink back from even the slightest discipline of their own sovereign rights?

Discussion about international integration, world organization and world government throws much light on the problem of the nation and the world. I would not regard the widespread and often vocal resistance to anything which might be construed as tending to limit national sovereignty as a new upsurge of nationalism. It should rather be regarded as a symptom of how heavily faith in national self-determination weighs in the scales in every effort to reconcile the nation and the world. Such expression of national feelings is just both an asset and a liability. It is an asset to the extent that it reflects the determination to shape one’s own fate and to take the responsibility for it. It is an asset as a brake on immature experiments in international integration. But it is a liability when it blinds our eyes to the necessity of that degree of international organization which has become necessary to national life.

So far we have considered the question of the nation and the world in what I may call pragmatic and practical terms. The problem has also an ideological aspect. Every nation has its heroes, its martyrs and its saints. The world also has its heroes and saints. One who long ago spoke among a small, oppressed people for the brotherhood of men, was sacrificed as a danger to the safety of his own nation. Western civilization has aspired for nearly 2,000 years to follow the life and teachings of this apostle of peace. But all through those 2,000 years nationalism in the narrow and dangerous sense of the word has remained a major force. In the light of history, one might well ascribe to mankind the words of Milton’s Lucifer: ‘For only in destroying I find ease for my relentless thoughts.’

The cynic might well ask: where in the political and national histories of this period do we see a reflection of the creed professed by sovereigns and peoples alike? The cynic may also say that as the past has been, so will the future be. It is my belief that he is wrong on both scores. Whatever doubts history may cast, I believe that the hope for a world of peace and order, inspired by respect for man, has never ceased to agitate the minds of men. I believe that it accounts for the great and noble human spirit behind the ravaged exterior of a history whose self-inflicted wounds have become more and more atrocious. I believe that at the point we have now reached in our technical development, our creed may gain new possibilities to shape history. A faith like that which has inspired the spiritual life of the West could seem only a dream to the leader of the people of a powerful nation which can dominate others, or considers itself untouched by their actions. There is a new situation the day you have to recognize that you cannot dictate to other nations and that you are not independent of the actions of other nations. It is more difficult to see your brother in a slave or a master. It is easier to see him in somebody with whom you have to live without giving or taking orders. Looking back into the past we see how peoples have been oppressed – and how peoples have accepted oppression – in the name of God. May we not be approaching a time when in His name they will instead be giving and accepting freedom?
This week we will celebrate here on the West coast and all over the world the 10th anniversary of the signing of the United Nations Charter. It will be an occasion for fresh thinking about the problems and the challenge of our world. The United Nations is an expression of our will to find a synthesis between the nation and the world, overcoming the one-sidedness reflected in the words of Schiller and Carlyle. It is an attempt to provide us with a framework inside which it is possible to serve the world by serving our nation, and to serve our nation by serving the world. Whatever may be the past shortcomings of this experiment in world organization, it gives sense and direction to the efforts of all men who are striving towards a better world. The Organization was born out of the cataclysms of the second World War. It should justify the sacrifices of all fighters for freedom and justice in that war. I remember the bitter lines of a great Anglo-American poet who writes in an ‘Epitaph on an Unknown Soldier’: 

‘To save your world, you asked this man to die, Would this man, could he see you now, ask why?’

It is our duty to the past and it is our duty to the future, so to serve both our nations and the world as to be able to give a reply to that anguished question.

Analysis of the speech ‘The World and the Nation’

In his speech Hammarskjöld is reacting to the opinions which had been voiced in some nationalist and internationalist circles that service to the world is impossible to combine with service to the nation. This implies that they misunderstand the work of the United Nations. By using rational means Hammarskjöld wants to convince a critical audience to adopt the standpoint that we have to serve both our nations and the world.

For my analysis of the speech I took as one of my starting points the pragma-dialectic theory of argumentation. This theory states that argumentation is a complex speech act, the purpose of which is to contribute to the resolution of a dispute. When I began my analysis I was struck by the fact that Hammarskjöld not only ‘expressed very personal thoughts and beliefs’ as Wilder Foote said in his introduction to the speeches, but that he had a definite strategy, using his argumentation as a means to convince his opponents.

The theme of the ‘World and the Nation’ is the relationship of the world to the nation and of the nation to the world in the accepted understanding of the concept but also in Hammarskjöld understanding of it as Secretary-General of the United Nations. Hammarskjöld sketches the perspective for cooperation which is fruitful for both international and national life and for which the United Nations Organisation offers an important framework. The question as to whether the UN can actually play a significant role in this, also depends on the extent to which its goals and principles are accepted by government leaders. Hammarskjöld opens his speech with the sentence: Nationalism / internationalism. These abstract words, so often abused, so often misunderstood, cover high ideals and strong emotions, reflect modes of thought and action which shape our world. In his vision, nationalism and internationalism complement each other, but this is not usually an option for nationalists and internationalists. With this argument he wants to show the tenability of his point of view and to convince both the nationalists and the internationalists of a possible synthesis. He is seeking to find common ground with their ideas and interpretation of reality and show which values they represent. He then demonstrates that these interpretations of reality show deficiencies and are intrinsically contradictory. A reinterpretation of this dilemma creates new possibilities: Nationalism and internationalism, represent essential parts of the mental and spiritual equipment of all responsible men in our time. ... when understood as meaning recognition of the value and the rights of the nation and dependence of the nation on the world.

---
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With his reference to all responsible men in our time, Hammarskjöld indicates that he has in mind a fundamental ethical attitude - the self-awareness of individuals and their disposition to put themselves at the service of others. An essential part of this is both the recognition of the value and the rights of the nation and the recognition of the dependence of the nation on the world. Hammarskjöld concludes that, seen in this light, there should be absolutely no conflict between nationalism and internationalism, between the nation and the world and illustrates this by using an imaginary debate between Thomas Mann and Friedrich von Schiller on the one hand, and Thomas Carlyle on the other hand.

Thomas Mann (1875-1955), was the German essayist, cultural critic, and novelist, who was awarded the Nobel prize for Literature (1901). ‘Der Zauberberg’ (The Magic Mountain 1924), one of his major works, depicts a fight between liberal and conservative ideas, enlightened civilized world and non rational beliefs. Friedrich von Schiller (1759-1805) was a leading 18th century dramatist, poet and literary theorist. Schiller’s mature plays examine the inward freedom of the soul. Aesthetic education is necessary, he argues, not only for the proper balance of the individual soul, but for the harmonious development of society. Among Schiller’s best known works is ‘An die Freude’ (Ode to Joy), later set to music by Ludwig van Beethoven in his 9th Choral Symphony. Thomas Carlyle (1795-1881) was a Scottish-born British historian who was a leading figure in the Victorian era. Carlyle believed in a leader, a hero, whom people must recognize and worship. ‘On Heroes and Hero Worship’ (1841) was one of his famous books.

By means of an imaginary debate Hammarskjöld introduces recognisable positions in a common (Western) history. As the fourth voice in this debate, Hammarskjöld shows where he himself stands on the subject. There is truth both in the attitudes of Schiller and Mann and in the attitude of Carlyle, but these great authors in their own personalities reveal that the concepts of the nation and of the world to which they have given expression, are, each one, incomplete and one-sided. Are they not firmly rooted in a national tradition, and yet, do they not belong to all mankind? Are they not internationalists in truth and spirit, and in being so, have they not served their own peoples? The question is not either the nation or the world. It is rather, how to serve the world by service to our nation and how to serve the nation by service to the world? This can be seen as Hammarskjöld’s invitation to world leaders to investigate how both the world and the nation can be served from different standpoints.

In his argumentation, we recognise the premise that everyone today with one part of his being belongs to a particular country, while with another part of his being he has become a citizen of a world which no longer allows for isolation. Here Hammarskjöld introduces assumptions about the importance of the inner dialogue of each individual — a point he doesn’t go into in any more detail in this particular speech but which he does elaborate on in his speech International Service and even more so in his own spiritual diary Markings. In this speech, The World and the Nation, he interprets the moral experience of the nationalist whom he confronts with the moral experience of the internationalist and then goes on to put these experiences into a new framework. He sketches a world view which has elements for further self-knowledge. The philosopher, Paul Ricoeur expresses the same idea when he says that, by giving the inner structure of a world view, the reader/listener enters into dialogue with himself and this enables him to expand the view he had of himself and of his world and arrive at a deeper understanding of himself.3

As already discussed, in the process of the advancing decolonisation of the time there had been shifts in international relations between the old nations and the new states. Hammarskjöld shows how his rhetorical question Are they not internationalists in truth and spirit, and in being so, have they not served their own peoples? clarifies their position and puts it into perspective. He begins with a sketch of the new nations, and uses for this the metaphor of a young man who becomes an adult. The use of this metaphor has two effects. In the first place he introduces the concept of growth towards maturity as an intrinsic aspect of being in the interest of the nation. On their path to maturity, the coming-of-age phase of the young nations, is a phase with its own tasks and difficulties. Their development takes

---

place within international relations, which move them towards a new balance. Within this spectrum, old nations take the position of the more mature man, who has the task of guiding the younger man during the course of his development. By using this metaphor, Hammarskjöld brings in a new perspective: that a relationship which is possibly antagonistic can change into a collaborative one. The perspective growth towards maturity gives criteria for judging the powers at work: are they creative and constructive for the growth towards maturity or are they negative and destructive? He refers to concrete historical bonds between the old countries and the new and points out the responsibilities of the leaders to use the constructive powers consciously and carefully and not to allow creative work to be sabotaged by destructive powers.

Hammarskjöld again applies the comparison with the development of an individual person in his description of the reactions of the older states. He observes a certain resistance to change in the older nations and a tendency to isolation. He sees the positive significance of the individual, independent character of the nation, but argues that by isolating themselves, they cannot secure what they would desire. Dialogue and mutual relations are indispensable for the growth towards maturity: Giving thus to the world what is specifically ours, we could manifest and protect our national character, while accepting change and opening our minds to the influences of the world. With the metaphor of 'the way', Hammarskjöld brings in again the perspective of growth to maturity: The way is a vigorous and self-confident development, in free contact with the world, of the special qualities and assets of their nation and their people - a development which should give them their just weight in the international balance. The aspect of growth to maturity can also be heard in his observation that we are far from ripe for world government. Applying the brake to immature experiments is also necessary in his opinion. He thinks that nationalism can fulfil that role.

Finally, Hammarskjöld broaches the subject of the function and task of the United Nations: The United Nations is an expression of our will to find a synthesis between the nation and the world, overcoming the one-sidedness reflected in the words of Schiller and Carlyle. It is an attempt to provide us with a framework inside which it is possible to serve the world by serving our nation, and to serve our nation by serving the world. Whatever the past shortcomings of this experiment in world organization might be, it has given meaning and direction to the efforts of all men who are striving towards a better world.

In the second ideological part of his argument, Hammarskjöld expands the historical context to 2000 years of Western history. While in the first part of his speech he went into the positive aspects of nationalism and an international attitude, in as far as these serve the life of a nation, in the second part he focuses on the limited and dangerous side of nationalism. Now, he also mentions the international attitude which represents the brotherhood of men. He shows how both the international attitude and the limited and dangerous nationalistic attitude have remained effective forces in history. Every nation has its heroes, its martyrs and its saints. The world also has its heroes and saints. One who long ago spoke among a small, oppressed people for the brotherhood of men, was sacrificed as a danger to the safety of his own nation. Western civilization has aspired for nearly 2,000 years to follow the life and teachings of this apostle of peace. But all through those 2,000 years nationalism in the narrow and dangerous sense of the word has remained a major force. In the light of history, one might well ascribe to mankind the words of Milton's Lucifer: 'For only in destroying I find ease for my relentless thoughts.

At this point, Hammarskjöld introduces a representative of the international attitude. Without mentioning his name, he refers to Jesus of Nazareth. The patron of the brotherhood of all men is not someone from Western history after the Enlightenment, as we might expect, but from 2000 years ago. As Secretary-General of the United Nations Hammarskjöld has to be neutral with regard to the religions of the world. However, within the context of his argument he is obliged to add the theme: creed. Observing existing reality does not help us to achieve a better world and the brotherhood of all people; belief in an ideal is essential. In his speech, Hammarskjöld goes into the historical fact that there have always been people who have worked to realise the ideals they are passionate about. By their efforts some have built bridges towards the progress of humanity. Together with the writer, Davenport, to whom he
refers in his speech International Service, Hammarskjöld is of the opinion that the dignity of man is not given enough value if only outward achievement and success is emphasised. What is needed is spiritual maturity and an attitude of international service. He found that in Jesus. Hammarskjöld was very diffident about using the name of Jesus. One reason was that from the point of view of his role as Secretary-General of the United Nations it would put too much emphasis on Christianity. Coming as he did from a Christian tradition, Jesus was his inspiration for the path he wanted to travel. Jesus is the personification of the ideal of the brotherhood of all men, which, in turn, is a manifestation of maturity of mind. Jesus was Hammarskjöld's ethical role model – his hero, his martyr and his saint. However this Apostle of Peace who appealed for the brotherhood of all men was sacrificed as a danger to the security of his nation. In two ways this event had a sequence in the two thousand years which followed: nationalism in the limited and dangerous sense of the word remained a strong force. While Western civilization strove to emulate His life and follow His teachings, we can wonder how much progress has been made towards the brotherhood of man in the 2000 years since Jesus preached it.

The way in which Hammarskjöld brings up the subject of the relationship between faith and history in his speech, can be seen in the light of the vision of the Protestant theologian, Reinhold Niebuhr, whose book Faith and History Hammarskjöld had in his book collection. Niebuhr says that the Christian Gospel as an answer to the problems of both individual life and the whole human history has not been proven true by rational analysis, but that we have to accept it as an act of faith - accepting it as true beyond the limits of reason. From his speech we understand that Hammarskjöld, like Niebuhr, is realistic with regard to man’s inclination to evil as well as good. On the one hand, man contributes to the positive development of society, and on the other, he struggles for power and the subjection of others. As Niebuhr puts it so aptly ‘Man’s capacity for justice makes democracy possible, but man’s inclination to do injustice makes democracy necessary.’ There is one difference between what Niebuhr says and what Hammarskjöld says. Niebuhr is talking about democracy while Hammarskjöld is referring to the United Nations, although both views complement each other.

Hammarskjöld does not share the outlook of the cynics that two thousand years of Christian teaching have not been very effective. In our analysis of this part of the speech we must keep in mind, that the United Nations had been founded in response to the trauma of World War II. This in itself was a great act of faith, which brings us to the three acts of faith which Hammarskjöld pronounces here in response to the cynics. These acts of faith are almost in the form of a prayer. In spite of our experiences of the past, Hammarskjöld believes in the first place, that mankind, inspired by respect for man, has always hoped for a new and better world. He believes in the great and noble human spirit, hidden behind the dark side of history and the dark side of man. His third act of faith is, that although we think that our technical developments give us the possibility to shape our world, it is through our creed that we will be given the maturity to shape history: Whatever doubts history may cast, I believe that the hope for a world of peace and order, inspired by respect for man, has never ceased to agitate the minds of men. I believe that it accounts for the great and noble human spirit behind the ravaged exterior of a history whose self-inflicted wounds have become more and more atrocious. I believe that at the point we have now reached in our technical development, our creed may gain new possibilities to shape history.

In his speech Hammarskjöld mentions the limits as well as the disadvantages of both one-sided nationalism and one-sided internationalism and suggests the possibility of finding a fruitful synthesis between both attitudes. In this way, he puts the truth of his faith into perspective. We can state that in his speech he harmonises reason and faith. By doing this he does justice not only to the spirit of the Gospel but also to political wisdom, and honours the intuitions of both. The duty of international service which he calls on everyone to perform, is an imperative for political love.

He closes his speech by remarking on the fact that the United Nations, in spite of all its shortcomings, gives sense and direction to the efforts of all people who are striving for a better world. The question 'how to serve the world by service to our nation and how to serve the nation by service to the world?' gives the framework within which the United Nations Organisation operates; it has declared that it wants to strive for a synthesis between the nation and the world. Hammarskjöld’s own activities as
Secretary-General are directed towards this and it is good to look at some examples of how he interprets his own task in particular and international service in general.

*From the abstract to the concrete*

The moment has come to go from the abstract to the concrete and look at how Hammarskjöld put into practice what he formulated in his speech. As Secretary-General of the United Nations, he noticed increasing tensions between rival states at quite an early stage and foresaw that these conflicts would pose a serious threat to world peace. With the mandates which he received from the General Assembly when he drew attention to this situation, he could fully exploit the possibilities for observation and mediation which his position made possible. In the rival parties he tried to stimulate the political will to find feasible solutions to their conflicts. In practice this amounted to bringing about cease-fire agreements, legal settlements and other forms of practical legislation. His part in this consisted of preparing and creating an atmosphere in which negotiations could take place and offering a strong legal basis for these negotiations.

Hammarskjöld was a good listener and an expert in formulating objective and subjective bases for the agreements to be reached. We can illustrate this as follows: he saw it as a function of the Secretariat to form as complete and as objective a picture as possible of the goals, motives and difficulties of the Member States. In his statements to the press on arriving for the first time at the airport in New York in April 1953, he already displayed particular interest in the goals of those he wanted to help. 'The public servant is there in order to assist, so to say, from the inside, those who take the decisions which frame history. He should - as I see it - listen, analyze and learn to understand fully the forces at work and the interests at stake, so that he will be able to give the right advice when the situation calls for it. Don't think that he - in following this line of personal policy - takes but a passive part in the development. It is a most active one. But he is active as an instrument, a catalyst, perhaps an inspirer - he serves.'

Hammarskjöld believed that the basic principles of the Charter and international law embodied the long-cherished values of the large majority of people and offered both the moral and the legal imperatives for international life. Oscar Schachter, Director of the General Legal Division of the United Nations during Hammarskjöld's term of office, explained it this way: 'Faced with conflicting national demands and expectations, he relied on these principles and on other generally accepted legal concepts as a manifestation of the long-range major policies to which all governments had committed themselves.' However, although Hammarskjöld was very strict in advocating the adherence to the principles of the UN Charter, he could nevertheless be flexible in his dealings with particular problems of a country or a group. His thoughts on this can be read in the text from *Markings*, August 1955, in which he says that you can only hope to come up with a lasting solution to a conflict between countries or groups, when you take an objective view of their problem, but understand their difficulties in a subjective way.

In the way in which Hammarskjöld expressed this very personal approach, we can regard him as a moral politician. According to Immanuel Kant, the moral politician does justice both to the ethics and the particular character of politics. For him politics has real meaning when it is putting legal doctrine into practice. His knowledge is not exclusively ethical; it is also prudent, in the sense of wise. He takes historical circumstances and possibilities into account. The actions of the moral politician take place within the field of tension between the reality of the human inclination to evil and war and the ideal of eternal peace. For the moral politician, history is the place where morality must and is prepared. True politics only progress if tribute has first been paid to morality. In Hammarskjöld's case we see that the creative and innovative way in which he dealt with the ideals and principles of the UN Charter shows us how he measured up to the image of the moral politician. In making attempts in new directions,
Hammarskjold always was conscious that he was nurturing an organic growth, not designing an ideal pattern. He did not, therefore, attempt to set law against power. He sought rather to find within the limits of power the elements of common interest on the basis of which joint action and agreed standards could be established. The following statement made by Hammarskjold also typifies him as a moral politician: 'In international politics the right road is to defend to the best of your ability the interests which you are called upon to represent, but always in ways that uphold the principles which you want to see realized in the world of tomorrow.' The Hammarskjold that emerges here, sought to find, within the limits of power, the elements of common interest on the basis of which joint action and agreed standards could be established.

The Common Denominator

This aspect of Hammarskjold explains a lot to us about why he was so successful in bringing about the agreement between parties, which he calls 'finding a balance between service to the nation and service to the world.' During a later speech in New Delhi, on 3 February 1956, he summed up the considerations by which he is guided. 'What, then, you may ask, is the political function of the Secretariat, if it is not to compete with the activities of the governments, if it is not to give guidance in public sense and not to serve as a mediator? Its function is to find and to keep alive and to broaden whatever may be the common denominator in the foreign policies of nations.' The political scientist, Mark Zacher, gives us a look behind the scenes at this side of Hammerskjold. He describes Hammarskjold's assistance in bringing about the terms of a cease-fire between Israel and its neighbours in the spring of 1956, when Hammarskjold travelled back and forth between the capitals of Israel and its four Arab neighbours from 6 April to 6 May. When reporting on the results of his trip a few days later, Hammarskjold announced that all the five parties involved had agreed not to violate the cease-fire provisions of the General Armistice Agreement. Zacher attributes the success of the negotiations to Hammarskjold's personal skills as negotiator and quotes General E.L.M. Burns, who was then the head of the United Nations Truce Supervisory Organization as follows: 'The great burden of this negotiation was undertaken by Mr Hammarskjold himself. Throughout this gruelling programme his stamina was astonishing; he never seemed weary, nor did his perceptions flag. His name had become synonymous with diplomatic skill, and he deployed his great resources throughout the four weeks of his mission. Eventually, by dint of great persuasiveness, moral force, and persistence, Mr Hammarskjold got the agreement of all parties to the principle that the provisions of the cease-fire article must always be observed, unless the opposing party broke them first.'

At the end of his trip Hammarskjold was noticeably pleased with the results which had been achieved and reflected on the nature of the influence which the Secretary-General, backed by the Security Council resolution, could bring to bear on such a problem in the future. In a statement upon his return to New York Hammarskjold said: 'The assignment has shown that the United Nations can be directly helpful to member governments in their wish to re-establish order and maintain peace; helpful, not by imposing its will, but by bringing out what is common ground for agreement to the parties in a conflict and crystallizing it in a way which gives the governments a firm point from which they can move forward.' In order to find common ground Hammarskjold applied his own principle, by collecting as much information as possible, about the problem itself and about the perspectives of the parties involved.
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Hammarskjöld believed that faith was each individual's personal dedication to God, irrespective of what religious classification he falls under, as I will show you in the text about the United Nations Room of Silence (1957) in a later chapter. In the speech "The World and the Nation", Hammarskjöld advocates equal rights and economic opportunities for everyone and calls on us to exercise solidarity, which requires good leadership. He considered the theme of leadership in a later speech, which he gave at the University of Lund, on 4 May, 1959: 'It appears evident that no nation or group of nations can base its future on a claim of supremacy. It is in its own interest that the other groups have opportunities equal to those it has had itself. To contribute to this is an act of solidarity which is not only good for the whole, but in the long run, redounds to the advantage even of those who take the action. It means that leadership is substituted for power - leadership both in giving other peoples their chance and in assisting them, without issuing commands, to find the best way to develop their spiritual and material resources.'

Hammarskjöld himself was an example of the leadership which he describes in his speech. He saw that the problems of poverty, security and human rights had to be addressed comprehensively in order to assure the security of the world. The UN's most important role lay in the economic development of the new and less-developed countries. This was crucial both for the ultimate success of the decolonisation process and for the foundation of a more stable, political order in the world. In a speech for the meeting of ECOSOC (Economic and Social Council) in Geneva in July 1955, he talked about the organization's goals in the area of economic development and human rights. He regarded the achievements of the Council as very positive, but warned against becoming complacent. There was still a lot of work to be done in the fields of reducing unemployment, improving sanitation, irrigation and infrastructure. A spirit of entrepreneurship would have to be created, modern technology introduced and economic, social and political institutions formed, in order to create a modern market economy in the less-developed countries. And further Hammarskjöld says: 'We have by now gained considerable insight into the problem of bridging a gap which may emerge between effective demand and the capacity to produce in developed countries. We have yet to acquire adequate experience and wisdom, however, in the matter of closing the large divide between productive capacity and human requirements in underdeveloped countries. This is the major long-term economic problem facing our generation, the greatest economic challenge to nations, both individually and collectively. As I have said on other occasions, it defines the major task of the UN. It calls for all the collective wisdom, patience and earnest desire for mutual assistance which the nations of the world are capable of mustering. Above all, it calls for flexibility of mind and realistic examination of problems.'

Reading the above, we cannot help but be struck by Hammarskjöld's prophetic insights. The speech to the ECOSOC could be delivered today without changing a line of it. Hammarskjöld called on leaders of the world to assume their responsibilities. The same leadership which he called for then, is necessary now in 2005 to achieve the Millennium Development Goals. Hammarskjöld's actions and words leave us in no doubt as to where he stood with regard to serving the world and the nation. His own service was the fruit of long soul-searching and inner dialogue and his success in bringing about rapprochement between rival countries and groups, often against great odds, is a lesson we can certainly use in our contemporary world. We must all assume our responsibilities and become leaders. I will close this chapter by translating a quote from Hammarskjöld into a message for ourselves: 'Know yourself, - Know your country - Know your world.' This is directly linked to the famous classic maxim. As always, and in all contexts, such knowledge of oneself can widen the understanding of the world of others 'Know your country' means both 'Know yourself' and 'Know your world.' Thus interpreted, the slogan excludes just as emphatically both an empty internationalism and a narrow isolation within the limited confines of the homeland.

---
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CHAPTER 3

International Service
Text and interpretation of the speech

We know from Hammarskjöld's biographer, Brian Urquhart that because of his hectic round of duties, Hammarskjöld was very selective in accepting invitations to speak. It is also so, that when he did accept such an invitation, it was not an idle gesture. There was something which he urgently wanted to impart, not only to his chosen audience, but the world at large. As he insisted on writing his own speeches we can assume that every word was weighed - the result of deep reflection. In the case of his speech *International Service* it is no coincidence that he chose this topic to address to this audience of academics, desperately appealing for them and all intellectuals to wake up, see what was going on and accept the responsibility of their privileged position to do something about it. The problem is common to us all in all walks of life, he says, significant especially to those, like you, are engaged in intellectual activities or are planning a future which will bring you in contact with the civilizations, traditions and interests of many countries. His deep respect for the word - written or spoken - meant that we must not dismiss anything he says as unimportant. I therefore invite you, as in Chapter Two, to read the entire speech through before following closely my analysis of its parts. As with the speech *The World and the Nation*, if this speech *International Service* were given today it would not sound out of place.

Address at Johns Hopkins University Commencement
Exercises, Baltimore, Maryland, 14 June 1955.

*At this time of great ideological conflicts and violent clashes of interests, technological and economic developments have, as never before, brought us together as members of one human family, unified beyond race or creed on a shrinking globe, in face of dangers of our own making. In such a situation many ethical problems take on a new significance and our need to give sense to our lives exceeds the inherited standards. True, our duties to our families, our neighbours, our countries, our creeds have not changed. But something has been added. This is a duty to what I shall call international service, with a claim on our lives equal to that of the duty to serve within those smaller units whose walls are now breaking down. The international service of which I speak is not the special obligation, nor the privilege, of those working in international economic corporations, in the field of diplomacy, or in international political organization. It has become today the obligation, as well as the privilege of all.*

*Is it not, you might ask, paradoxical to strive for truly international service in a divided world? Is it not even more than paradoxical – is it not impossible? It is said that nobody can serve two masters. How is it then possible that anybody can serve – or even should serve – a world community that is split in fractions, demanding loyalty to divergent ideas and warring interests? In such a situation, will not international service require abject self-surrender, leaving us empty of personal convictions? Will it not emasculate our will and strength to fight for ideals and interests which we hold dear and to which we are bounden?*

*My reply to these sceptical questions is a 'no'. International service requires of all of us first and foremost the courage to be ourselves. In other words, it requires that we should be true to none other than our ideals and interests – but these should be such as we can fully endorse after having opened our minds, with great honesty, to the many voices of the world. The greatest contribution to international life that any one can render – be it as a private citizen or as one professionally engaged in international work – is to represent frankly and consistently what survives or emerges as one’s own after such a test. Far from demanding that we abandon or desert ideals and interests basic to our personality, international service thus puts us under the obligation to let those ideals and interests reach maturity and fruition in a universal climate.*

*If this is the essence of international service, such service will expose us to conflicts. It will not permit us to live lazily under the protection of inherited and conventional ideas. Intellectually and morally,
international service therefore requires courage to admit that you, and those you represent, are wrong, when you find them to be wrong, even in the face of a weaker adversary, and courage to defend what is your conviction even when you are facing the threats of powerful opponents. But while such an outlook exposes us to conflicts, it also provides us with a source of inner security; for it will give us 'self-respect for our shelter'. This is, as you may remember, the privileged position which Epictetus grants to the Cynic when he, true to his ideals, sacrifices all outward protection.

In the flourishing literature on the art of life there is much talk about that rare quality: maturity of mind. It is easy to circumscribe such maturity in negative terms. In positive terms it is difficult to define, although we all recognize it when we have the privilege of seeing its fruits. It is reflected in an absence of fear, in recognition of the fact that fate is what we make it. It finds expression in an absence of attempts to be anything more than we are, or different from what we are, in recognition of the fact that we are on solid ground only when we accept giving to your fellow men neither more nor less than what is really ours. You yourselves can complete the picture. Maturity of mind seems to me to be the very basis for that attitude which I have described here as the essence of international service. It is by striving for such maturity that we may grow into good international servants.

We are now ready to return to the question whether international service is possible without split loyalties in a divided world. The problem as posed here is to my mind unreal. We are true to this or that ideal, and this or that interest, because we have in openness and responsibility recognized it as an ideal and an interest true to us. We embrace ideals and interests in their own right, not because they are those of our environment or of this or that group. Our relations to our fellow men do not determine our attitude to ideals, but are determined by our ideals. If our attitude is consistent, we shall be consistent in our loyalties. If our attitude is confused, then our loyalties will also be divided.

In the world of today there is an urge to conformism which sometimes makes people complain of a lack of loyalty in those who criticize the attitudes prevalent in their environment. May I ask: who shows true loyalty to that environment, one who before his conscience has arrived at the conclusion that something is wrong and in all sincerity gives voice to his criticism, or the one who in self-protection closes his eyes to what is objectionable and shuts his lips on his criticism. The concept of loyalty is distorted when it is understood to mean blind acceptance. It is correctly interpreted when it is assumed to cover honest criticism.

The question to which I have just referred has attracted special attention in discussions concerning the attitude of those who work in international organizations, the policies in which in some cases may conflict with that of their home countries. Again I would say that the problem is unreal. The international civil servant who works for an organization with members of different ideologies and interests remains under the obligation that applies to all of us — to be faithful to truth as he understands it. In doing so he is loyal — both in relation to the organization and to his country. In doing so, he must, of course, subordinate himself to rules of good order, as all of us should do. Nobody should use his position in an international organization for attacks on his own country or its policies, however strongly he may feel that he is right. Nor should anybody, as a national, attack the international organization for which he is working, and thereby place himself outside the discipline and the procedure established for the maintenance of that organization. But it is equally true that nobody should suffer, either as a national, or in his position in the international organization, for faithfulness to ideals of truth and justice, provided he observes the laws of his country as well as of the organization which he serves. There cannot be, and there should not be, any real conflict between international service and international civil service, between the way of life we have been considering and the duties of someone engaged in professional work for the international community.

It may seem to you, that this problem of loyalties is one of limited interest, relevant only to those who have chosen an international career. That is not so. I have brought it up here in relation to international organizations because those organizations present the problem in a clear-cut form which has attracted some public attention. However, the problem is common to us all in all our walks of life, and of significance especially to those who, like you, are engaged in intellectual activities or are
planning for a future which will bring you in contact with the civilizations, traditions and interests of many countries. In fact, it is a national problem, and a problem within whatever group of friends and associates you may be working, just as much it is an international problem. The essence of international service, and the problem of loyalty as it presents itself in the light of such service, is the essence of all service to fellow men, and it is the problem of loyalty as we face it everywhere.

The attitude and the way of life which I have tried to describe as being the very essence of international service is more than a mere pattern of behaviour. Implied in it is a positive ideal. We hear much about freedom and the blessings of freedom. We hear less about the obligations of freedom and the ideals by which freedom must be guided. Every individual prefers freedom from constraint and freedom from intervention in his personal pursuit of happiness. But, as we all recognize, such freedom is possible in a world of order only when the individual replaces outward limitations on his freedom of action by self-imposed laws which may be, and frequently are, no less severe. An individualism carried to the extreme where you neither accept restraint imposed on you by society, or by your fellow men, nor submit yourself to the laws of a mature conscience, would lead to anarchy. This is true no less of international life than of life within your own country.

The attitude basic to international service places the pursuit of happiness under the laws of conscience which alone can justify freedom. In accepting such a way of life we recognize the moral sovereignty of the responsible individual. In the fight for freedom which puts its stamp so strongly on present-day life, the final issue is what dignity we are willing to give to man. It is part of the American creed, part of the inherited ideology of all Western civilization, that each man is an end in himself, of infinite value as an individual. To pay lip-service to this view or to invoke it in favour of our actions is easy. But what is in fact the central tenet of this ideology becomes a reality only when we, ourselves, follow a way of life, individually and as members of a group, which entitles us personally to the freedom of a mature individual, living under the rules of his conscience. And it becomes the key to our dealings with others only when inspired by a faith which in truth and spirit gives to them the value which is theirs according to what we profess to be our creed.

In a stirring and provocative book recently published in this country its author, a man of intelligence and great moral integrity, raises the question whether we can justify our faith in freedom in a world of materialistic thinking unless we are willing to depart from standards of value which measure success primarily in terms of outward achievement. He never got a chance to elaborate his reply, as his work was interrupted by death. But from what he had already written, it is apparent what he wanted to say: that the dignity of man, as a justification for our faith in freedom, can be part of our living creed only if we revert to a view of life where maturity of mind counts for more than outward success and where happiness is no longer to be measured in quantitative terms. I doubt whether the author, had he been given the chance to complete his work, would ever have found it possible to go far beyond this point, because the final reply is not one that can be given in writing, but only in terms of life. There is no formula to teach us how to arrive at maturity and there is no grammar for the language of inner life. His study, like the effort of every single individual, finally led him to the doorstep where the rest is silence because the rest is something that has to be resolved between a man and himself. The rest is silence — but the results of the inner dialogue are evident to all, evident as independence, courage and fairness in dealing with others, evident in true international service.

You may be surprised by an approach to international service and to the problems raised by present-day developments in international life which, like mine today, is concerned mainly with problems of personal ethics. The so-called realists may regard what I have tried to say as just so many fine words, only tenuously related to everyday life and political action. I would challenge this criticism. The thoughts I have shared with you about international service are conclusions from a most practical experience. Politics and diplomacy are no play of will and skill where results are independent of the character of those engaging in the game. Results are determined not by superficial ability but by the consistency of the actors in their efforts and by the validity of their ideals. Contrary to what seems to be popular belief there is no intellectual activity which more ruthlessly tests the solidity of a man than
politics. Apparently easy successes with the public are possible for a juggler, but lasting results are achieved only by the patient builder.

What is true in a life of action, like that of a politician or a diplomat, is true also in intellectual activities. Even a genius never achieves a lasting result in science without patience and hard work, just as in politics the results of the work of the most brilliant mind will ultimately find their value determined by character. Those who are to be called teachers or leaders may profit from intelligence but can only justify their positions by integrity.

Analysis of the speech International Service

Hammarskjöld structures his argumentation as follows:

In his opening he gives the background of the challenges and dangers for the family of men in 1955, ten years after the founding of the United Nations in San Francisco. He presents and advocates his theme 'International service as a duty' against the prevailing viewpoint that international civil servants cannot be neutral, because there is a contradiction in terms between international service and loyalty to one's own ideals and interests. In his argumentation, Hammarskjöld points to the value and dignity of the individual, his freedom of thought. He argues that we all have a duty to strive for maturity of mind in order to become good world citizens. In concluding his speech he appeals to the (future) leaders and teachers in his academic audience to take into serious consideration the need for maturity of mind in their lives.

The language which Hammarskjöld uses to begin his speech has a strong ring to it - a 'wake-up call' would be today's terminology. He refers to the ideologies that were tearing the post-war world of 1955 apart, Western Capitalism, Russian Communism and Chinese Communism. In the name of these ideologies, Great Powers were vying with each other to fill the vacuum left in the newly formed states after decolonisation. This gave rise to multiple clashes of interest. At this point, he softens his tone. He points out that, at the same time, the human race has entered into an era of great and rapid technological and economic advances. No doubt he is referring here to the development of nuclear energy, the groundwork which was being laid at that time for space travel, early computer technology, the faster and more advanced airplanes, television, etc. He couples this technology with economic advances which have been taking place. This period was seeing the effects of the re-fuelling of European economies with Marshall Aid, economic cooperation between groups of nations in Europe and other parts of the world, the setting up of welfare states under the influence of the Keynesian theory of economics. All of this contributed to a more even-handed distribution of opportunities and wealth and the protection of the rights of the individual. The world was emerging from the dark period into a future where all peoples of the world would be one big family and differences of race and religion would carry no stigma.

And then Hammarskjöld hits home. The same technological advances, in particular nuclear power, in the wrong hands and used for the wrong reasons could destroy this bright future - a danger of our own making. The genie of nuclear energy is out of the bottle and it can never again be put back - to echo the sentiments of Oppenheimer after the dropping of the atomic bombs on Japan. Hammarskjöld’s fear of the abuse of nuclear know-how and technology was uppermost in his mind at this time. The USSR had already developed a hydrogen bomb. Britain had announced the ability to make the hydrogen bomb in February of that year. The USA had declared that they would use their own nuclear and hydrogen power to defend Great Britain against an attack from the USSR. The lines of defence were being drawn and the weapons were all-destructive. Hammarskjöld’s responsibility as a world leader outside of all politics, weighed heavily. So much depended on averting what he saw as a looming danger to mankind. In fact as he was making this speech, preparations were under way for an international conference for the peaceful use of nuclear energy to be held in Geneva in August of that
year. In the light of the threat of the annihilation of humanity, ethical problems would have to be reassessed, and we would need new reasons to give sense to our lives besides the historical ones of duty to families, nations and creeds. Therefore, it was imperative that the duty of international service should be added to this list. And here he emphasises this should be a commitment for all thinking people and not just those working in the diplomatic field and international organisations - the obligation, as well as the privilege of all.

In a world where there are so many divisions it is impossible to try to perform real international service without having to sacrifice our national interests. He uses the rather strong words abject self-surrender. Then he goes on to pose the questions which he has heard posed by the sceptics: Is it not, you might ask, paradoxical to strive for truly international service in a divided world? Is it not even more than paradoxical - is it not impossible? It is said that nobody can serve two masters... will not international service require abject self-surrender, leaving us empty of personal convictions? Which sceptics was he addressing here? Which countries felt that it would be such a sacrifice of their national interests if they were to apply themselves to international service. Was it the USA? Or the European countries? Israel is a good candidate. The former colonial powers? The newly decolonised states? Much had already happened in the international arena in 1955 up to the time of his speech in June. On February 4, the Baghdad Pact had been signed by Britain, Iraq, Turkey, Iran and Pakistan with the aim of strengthening regional defence and preventing the infiltration of the Soviet Union into the Middle East. Israel had carried out a retaliatory attack on Egyptian posts in the Gaza Strip on 28 February which brought the tension in the Middle East to boiling point. The Bandung Conference had taken place from 18 to 25 April. Attending the conference were 29 African and Asian nations. They considered how they could help one another in achieving social and economic well-being for their large and impoverished populations. Their agenda addressed race, religion, colonialism, national sovereignty, and the promotion of world peace. Despite the pragmatic premise for such a meeting, it would take on monumental importance for the shaping of future Cold War and identity politics, bearing important lessons for political struggle today. The strategy of militant Afro-Asian states was to strengthen their independence from Western imperialism while keeping the Soviet bloc at a comfortable distance. The strategic bloc which evolved from the Bandung Conference, was supposed to be independent from the superpowers. It was the beginning of what came to be known as the "non-aligned" movement of the Developing World. John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State of the USA at the time was vociferously disapproving of this conference. No country should be non-aligned. A moral stand had to be taken. If you were not for the USA then you were against it. On the other hand, Hammarskjöld as Secretary-General of the UN thoroughly approved of the independent stand of these countries, drawing the open wrath of Dulles down on him.

And now we hear Hammarskjöld's own point of view - his refutation of the objections raised by the sceptics. His answer is a loud and clear 'no'. We see him now reassessing the point of view of the nationalists, transforming it and making it more acceptable. He shares their view that the courage to be ourselves and to be true to our ideals and interests are very important values. But these very values are a first requirements for international service. This does not mean that we must stick to our ideals against all argument. We should first listen to and take into consideration the different points of view which are being expressed and after mature consideration we must then take our own standpoint. Far from demanding that we abandon or desert ideals and interests basic to our personality, international service thus puts us under the obligation to let those ideals and interests reach maturity and fruition in a universal climate.

He continues: To represent frankly and consistently what survives or emerges as one's own after such a test is the greatest contribution to international life that any one can render. In saying this he formulates the three maxims of the Enlightenment which are essential for the freedom of thought in the Western tradition: (1) Have the courage to think independently (sapere aude). (2) In order to arrive at a general point of view, try to get into the mind of the other and experience what he/she is thinking.

1 Statement at the opening of the International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atom Energy, Geneva August 8
Having applied the first and second maxim, you must take your own stand after having considered all points of view (the consistent way of thinking). The contribution to international life, which Hammarskjöld mentions in this respect is twofold: Firstly, coming to a mature judgement and secondly, communicating this judgement to others, for which we need independence, courage, honesty in intercourse with others, as well as international service. In this way, international service requires intellectually and morally, courage to admit that you, and those you represent are wrong, when you find them to be wrong, even in the face of a weaker adversary, and courage to defend what is your conviction even when you are facing the threats of powerful opponents. Such service will expose us to a lot of criticism, but if we stand firm in the face of this criticism we will be rewarded with an inner security in the form of self-respect. Inner security and self-respect are the manifestations of maturity of mind, which in turn is necessary for good world citizenship. He urges us to work towards achieving this kind of maturity. Hammarskjöld has expanded Immanuel Kant’s call to us ‘to think for ourselves’ by insisting that we should also have the courage to be ourselves – broaching a subject which is very close to his heart: the need for ‘integrity’ in all walks of life.

There is no question about Hammarskjöld’s own integrity. In the face of the criticism which had been levelled at him, particularly by the Americans, that he was being too pliable in his negotiations with Chou En-lai, Prime Minister of the People’s Republic of China, he stood firm and in the interest of the negotiations for the release of 15 American fliers which were still in progress, he resisted the temptation to defend himself. A few days earlier on 9 June, when delivering an address at Iowa State University, US Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, had questioned Hammarskjöld’s integrity when he criticised Hammarskjöld’s approval of the independent voice of the non-aligned countries: ‘neutrality has increasingly become an obsolete and except under very exceptional circumstances, it is an immoral and short-sighted conception.’ Hammarskjöld must have been painfully aware of Dulles’ disapproval but although the criticism had cut deep he felt that he had come out of the situation much stronger because of this test. Indeed we may wonder at what sustained Hammarskjöld’s under these difficult circumstances. When we read his Markings of that year, we can see that it was from his faith that he drew his strength. Hammarskjöld finishes this paragraph by making the point that our ideals and interests do not have to be abandoned if we are to take on a duty of international service. On the contrary, they should be maintained and in the universal climate of international service they will come to maturity and fruition.

Standing our ground and sticking to our ideals while performing international service will put us in the line of fire. Once we have committed ourselves, there will be no slipping back into the old patterns. We will be called on to have courage: courage to see our own mistakes and courage to point out the mistakes of others, even when we encounter weaker adversary. Pointing out the mistakes of strong opponents when the situation dictates it, will require a lot of courage and in the face of threats from these powerful opponents, you will have to show great strength of mind. When reading his speeches today, we have put them in the context of the situations of the 1950s. However, it goes without saying that Hammarskjöld’s references were far from lost on his audience. The academics he was addressing were well aware of the ‘game’ that was being played out on the international stage. Without a doubt, Secretary-General Kofi Annan would also recognise the situations Hammarskjöld often found himself in when taking the ‘road less travelled’.

Hammarskjöld has expressed how important it is to acquire maturity of mind in order to perform international service. In fact, maturity of mind makes us see the necessity of international service. Here he continues with this theme saying how difficult it is to define maturity of mind, but that we can recognise immediately those who have acquired it. They will stand out for their moral courage, will not be intimidated and will take their fate into their own hands. These people will have no pretensions because they will be conscious of who they are and will be full aware of their own value. Striving for this type of maturity will make us good international servants.

Having put forward the arguments of the sceptics and defined what was necessary to perform international service – maturity of mind – Hammarskjöld now presents his counter-argumentation. He
defuses the argument of the opponents by pointing out that there is no real conflict. We adopt our ideas and interests not out of consideration of the opinions of our peers but after mature consideration, because we have in openness and responsibility recognized it as an ideal and an interest true to us. He turns the argument around saying that our relations to our fellowmen do not determine our ideals but vice versa. If we are consistent in our attitude and sure of ourselves, then we will be consistent to our loyalties. If we are confused in our attitude, then our loyalties will be confused. In other words, he advocates integrity.

In the world of 1955, one is expected to conform to one or other ideology (liberalism, communism, nationalism) at the risk of being considered disloyal if one digressed from this norm. He reiterates here that the person who is really true to the group, will point out the faults and weaknesses in the ideology instead of slavishly adhering to the group’s ideas out of self-protection. This is distorting the meaning of loyalty and does the group a disfavour. The concept of loyalty is distorted when it is understood to mean blind acceptance. It is correctly interpreted when it is assumed to cover honest criticism.

The public debate continues: does loyalty to one’s country preclude loyalty to the international organisation one serves and vice-versa. For Hammarskjöld as Secretary-General this is a salient point. His view is that if one has personal integrity, integrity to the organization will follow: "I would say that the problem is unreal. The international civil servant who works for an organization with members of different ideologies and interests remains under the obligation that applies to all of us — to be faithful to truth as he understands it. In doing so he is loyal — both in relation to the organization and to his country. In doing so, he must, of course, subordinate himself to rules of good order, as all of us should do." Hammarskjöld elaborates further on what he sees as a matter of perception. There is and should not be any clash of loyalties when it is recognised that one has — to be faithful to truth as he understands it. In doing so he is loyal — both in relation to the organization and to his country. I will elaborate on his views on the integrity of the (international) civil servant and the Code of Behaviour which he had drawn up to safeguard this integrity in more detail below.

Hammarskjöld now puts the arguments on the subject of integrity on personal level. He brings home to his audience that what has been said up to now, contrary to the impression they might have got, is directly related to the everyday life of the international servant and to political action. He is referring, of course to the criticism levelled at the United Nations Organisation in general and at Hammarskjöld as Secretary-General in particular, because of the neutral course the UN is steering. The problem which needs to be aired is the integrity of the international servant. The enormous pressures of political blackmail require high standards of integrity. Taking popular decisions is not the issue. Achieving long-lasting results is the goal. The essence of international service, and the problem of loyalty as it presents itself in the light of such service, is the essence of all service to fellow men, and it is the problem of loyalty as we face it everywhere.

Implied here is the value and dignity of the individual, the ideals of freedom of thought and democracy, tolerance and living with plurality. Freedom and the ideals of freedom must be guarded. To make freedom of action of the individual possible in a regulated world, the individual needs to accept that he has to adhere to the self-imposed laws of a mature conscience. Such freedom is possible in a world of order only when the individual replaces outward limitations on his freedom of action by self-imposed laws which may be, and frequently are, no less severe.

Hammarskjöld points the finger at individuals and admonishes them to live under the rules of their conscience. He refers to their Western creed and ideology, when he says, that each man is an end in himself, of infinite value as an individual. These ideals and values are the inherited standards of Western civilization which have to be realized, nowadays even more on a shrinking globe. Therefore it is not enough to only pay lip-service. We have to strive for maturity of mind as a way of life and we need the inspiration of a faith that acknowledges the other in his infinite value as an individual. Hammarskjöld has in mind, that in international life this would mean respecting the value and dignity of representatives of the non-allied countries from Africa an Asia. It would also mean, welcoming the sixteen new candidates for UN-membership. And it would mean stopping the McCarthy witch hunt of
Hammarskjöld feels that the question of the spirituality of human rights and liberties needs to be looked at more closely. And he does that in this paragraph. The author he is referring to is Russell W. Davenport. This is a subject which needs more elaboration which I will do below. There is no formula to teach us how to arrive at maturity and there is no grammar for the language of inner life.

This is a summing up of Hammarskjöld’s arguments. He has not said just so many fine words. Everything he has been saying was said with a reason. He has personal experience of the problems of international service. What he and the UN Secretariat have achieved has not been by playing games. It called for hard work and tenacity – a strong sense of duty and commitment. It has been tough. Contrary to what seems to be popular belief there is no intellectual activity which more ruthlessly tests the solidity of a man than politics. Apparently easy successes with the public are possible for a juggler, but lasting results are achieved only by the patient builder. Hammarskjöld again speaks directly to his audience. They have a duty to international service as they are the future leaders and teachers. The future rests with them. Maturity of mind is called for.

The integrity of the international civil servant.

Hammarskjöld leaves us in no doubt in his speech as to where he stands on the subject of the integrity of the international civil servant. This will be beyond question if he/she keeps to the principles of international service and to the rules of good conduct which are laid down by the Organization. After all, Hammarskjöld himself had played a big part in drawing up those rules. When he took office in 1953, the McCarthy witch-hunt by which all suspected communists were being rounded up, was in full swing. No one could escape from the tentacles of the FBI and inside the very buildings of the United Nations in New York, Hammarskjöld was confronted with FBI agents who were hounding down possible communists among UN personnel. Joseph Lash, the writer and biographer, describes how explosively political the administrative problem was. 'That secular priesthood known as the UN Secretariat, whose holy writ is the Charter and whose Church is the UN Organization, had become a badly moralized body as a consequence of the U.S. loyalty investigations. The concept of an international civil service, impartial, independent and objective, whose members during the time of their appointment served not the states of which they were nationals but only the UN, was a relatively new one. The heyday of the McCarthy era was 1953, when U.S. pressures were posing a major challenge to this concept of a truly international service.' Hammarskjöld put an immediate end to the presence of the FBI Agents. Then he drew up a code of conduct for the UN Secretariat, by incorporating decisions in individual cases into a body of rules, thus creating a kind of common law. This code of conduct was subsequently passed by the General Assembly. By creating an objective instrument for testing and judging the functioning of the staff, Hammarskjöld was able to promote the independence of the Secretariat as this gave him a weapon to use for the prevention of outside interference in the day-to-day business of the United Nations. The line that was followed was one of 'stricter criteria for the conduct of the staff-member, combined with increased checks and controls on the way in which the Secretary-General exerts his powers. The revised staff regulations made more explicit the prohibitions on activities that might reflect adversely on a staff-member’s “integrity, independence and impartiality,” increased the curbs on political activity and enlarged the Secretary-General’s power, under certain safeguards, to terminate permanent appointments.'

Lash goes on to say that when the Staff Committee made objections to his proposals, Hammarskjöld explained that he could not successfully defend the truly international and independent position of the Secretariat against attacks from any quarter, unless every staff-member fully lived up to the standard.

---

4 Ibid., p.50.
of strict impartiality as well as to the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity laid down in the Charter. In a message to the Geneva UN Staff, Hammarskjöld explained that the highest standards and absolute independence of the Secretariat were important because they were its only weapons. ‘Countries are arming in order to be able to negotiate from a position of strength. The Secretariat, too, has to negotiate, not only in its own interest, but for the cause of peace and a peaceful development. The weight we carry is not determined by physical force or the number of people who form the constituency. It is based solely in trust on our impartiality, our experience and knowledge, our maturity of judgement.’

The Staff Regulations, as this code of conduct was called, provided the Secretariat with criteria for the impartiality, independence and objectivity of its international servants.

These qualities of the international servant were not only a contentious issue at the beginning of his career as Secretary General, but also at the end. In 1953 he had to deal with the mistrust of the Americans and eight years later with that of the Russians. In the case of the latter, his own position of Secretary-General was being disputed. In that year, during a meeting of the General Assembly the Soviet representative proposed a resolution to replace the post of Secretary-General by a triumvirate which would be representative of the three great powers. This resolution was not accepted by the General Assembly. The following remarks which were made by Soviet Party Chairman, Khruščev with regard to that dispute were recorded in an article by Walter Lippmann: ‘While there are neutral countries, there are no neutral men. There can be no such thing as an impartial civil servant in this deeply divided world; the kind of political celibacy which the British theory of the civil servant calls for, is, in international affairs, a fiction.’

In his reaction to these remarks in a speech at Oxford University on 30 May 1961, Hammarskjöld reacted to the Soviet point of view by arguing that: ‘(The international civil servant) is not requested to be neutral in the sense that he has to have no sympathies or antipathies, that there are no interests which are close to him in his personal capacity or that he is to have no ideas or ideals that matter to him. However, he is requested to be fully aware of those human reactions and meticulously check himself so that they are not permitted to influence his actions. This is a question of integrity, and if integrity in the sense of respect for law and respect for truth were to drive him into positions of conflict with this or that interest, then that conflict is a sign of his neutrality and not of his failure to observe neutrality – then it is in line, not in conflict, with his duties as an international civil servant.’

You can see how much integrity meant to Hammarskjöld. It was one of the essential characteristics of maturity of mind and a sin against integrity could make him very angry. He never missed an opportunity to get his message across. Here we meet it in his speech on The International Civil Servant (1961), but it is a thread which runs through many of his writings, speeches and statements. He had already voiced the high valuation he put on this essential quality in 1951 and 1953 while still in Sweden. In 1951 he aired his views about the great necessity for integrity of people in public office, which would certainly not be out of place in today’s world. This article appeared in the Social Democrat periodical ‘Tiden’. His friend, Sven Stolpe, describes Hammarskjöld’s aim in writing the article and the circumstances in which it was written, as follows:

In a brochure, The Civil Servant and Society, he wrote a study which we can understand to be a sort of defence, aimed at all those who had made the observation that he had worked for a political party with which, in principle, he did not have very much in common. In this article he emphasised that in the first place the civil servant should serve society as a whole and not a particular group, and that he, as a civil servant, may not work for his own personal political ideals. He said that the civil servant ‘may only advance his own political views as being more important than his duty as civil servant when he
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5 Ibid., p.50.
8 H.P. van Dusen, p. 105-107
9 In his Dag Hammarskjölds Andliga Väg (Dag Hammarskjöld’s Spiritual Profile).
considers that the views which he holds are of such significance for society that opinions about them, considered objectively, do not conflict with each other.' Above all, Hammarskjöld held the opinion that the civil servant who is a specialist at his work can by his expertise influence the politics of the time anonymously and invisibly. A strong political passion can change the situation within the administrative environment and exercise influence on parties without the civil servant neglecting his duty to objectivity and efficiency. This was further evidence of Hammarskjöld's admirable maturity of mind. When he became Secretary-General of the United Nations he applied this principle with great skills and with excellent results.' Stolpe elaborates further about the apparent contradictions in Hammarskjöld's attitude. Hammarskjöld had illustrated that he had a great respect for historical growth - the result of generations of effort to solve problems. This was a distinctly conservative trait. On the other hand he felt that the civil servant can influence politicians in such a way that political policy is governed by respect for the individual. This implies that Hammarskjöld acknowledged the right of the individual to demand as much freedom as possible to shape his own life in his own way, and at the same time, to demand social justice, in the form of equal rights and equal chances for all. You can see here the mixture of liberal and socialist elements in Hammarskjöld's ideas.

The speech which Hammarskjöld gave at Oxford on 30 May 1961 is particularly interesting with regard to his ideas about the civil servant's freedom of movement within his function. This speech was given against the background of mounting political tensions. In the summer of that year, tensions threatened to boil over. A world crisis seemed to be very close. The struggle around the decolonisation of the former Belgian Congo, which had been going on for more than a year, but which seemed to have quietened down, flared up again when the big powers continued to strive to extend their sphere of influence. A further aggravation of the situation was that the former colonial powers did not want to give up their privileges, while at the same time, the African nationalists and freedom fighters were calling for the right to exercise their autonomy. From the very beginning of the crisis, the United Nations had been diplomatically active and had stationed a United Nations' Peace Force (ONUC) in the Congo. When the neutral status of the force which operated under the UN flag was called into question, it led to great upheaval in the General Assembly. On 8 September, nine days before his fatal journey to the war zone, Hammarskjöld addressed his staff. Sadly, they were to be the last words he said to them: 'In a situation like the one now facing all the peoples of the world, as represented in this Organization, it is understandable that staff members should sometimes feel frustrated and even depressed. In that, they are not different from their fellow beings in other positions influenced by the trend of world events. There is only one answer to the human problem involved, and that is for all to maintain their professional pride, their sense of purpose, and their confidence in the higher destiny of the Organization itself, by keeping to the highest standards of personal integrity in their conduct as international civil servants and in the quality of the work that they turn out on behalf of the Organization itself. This is the way to defend what they believe in and to strengthen this Organization as an instrument of peace for which they wish to work. It is false pride to register and to boast to the world about the importance of one's work, but it is false humility, and finally just as destructive, not to recognize — and recognize with gratitude — that one's work has a sense.'

Ideology and A Way of Life

Hammarskjöld's premise for the duty of international service is the belief in the moral sovereignty of the responsible man, who is led by the laws of his conscience in his search for happiness. Immanuel Kant, the philosopher of the Enlightenment, calls 'duty' the awareness of unconditional obligation which as a general norm or law is an imperative for all people in the same way and which gives the essence of morality. The attitude basic to international service places the pursuit of happiness under the laws of consciousness which alone can justify freedom. In accepting such a way of life, we recognize the moral sovereignty of the responsible individual. The consciously chosen limitations

10 D.Hammarskjöld, Last Words to the Staff, in the General Assembly Hall, 8 September 1961, in The Servant of Peace, 376-378.
11 Translated by translator from I.Kant, Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten.
which the responsible individual imposes on himself serve his human freedom. He allows himself to be guided by the categorical imperatives (1.) to act as if a general law lies at the basis of his individual’s actions, (2.) to act in the consciousness that the dignity of your own humanity and the humanity of others is a goal and not just a means, (3.) to act in such a way that his own will can be a general, judicial will. In this regard, maturity of mind means: realising that the pursuit of happiness must be guided by the laws of conscience. Hammarskjöld refers to the importance of a way of living, when he says: The central tenet of this ideology becomes a reality only when we, ourselves, follow a way of life, individually and as members of a group, which entitles us personally to the freedom of a mature individual, living under the rules of his conscience. And it becomes the key to our dealings with others only when inspired by a faith which in truth and spirit gives to them the value which is theirs according to what we profess to be our creed.

The Inner Dialogue

In his speech, Hammarskjöld refers to two people who propagated a philosophy of life in which maturity of mind played an important part. Those were Epictetus and Russell Davenport. Epictetus was one of the later Stoics, and he advocated a continuous development of self. Hammarskjöld had in mind a continuous learning process on the path of life, when he pleaded for the pursuit of maturity of mind. The second person that Hammarskjöld mentions is Russell W. Davenport, whose unfinished book *The Dignity of Man* had made a deep impression on Hammarskjöld and whose ideas were very much in line with his.

In his book, Davenport was reacting to the similarities between the ideology of the West and the ideology of the Communist Block, both of which are based on liberty – equality – fraternity. Both ideologies were striving for the realisation of external, material success. Western ideology is vulnerable and contradictory because of the fact that it does not take into account the inner relationship of the individual to the world, in spite of the attention which this ideology pays to the dignity of the individual. For this inner relationship to occur there is more needed than empirical scientific knowledge alone. The knowledge which is needed for this must be sought, among other things, in religion and in psychoanalysis and is characterised by the concept of ‘truth’. Davenport appeals, therefore, for the re-appreciation of the dignity of man in Western ideology in the light of the pursuit of maturity of mind. Hammarskjöld agrees with this insight of Davenport’s when he says that maturity of mind is the basis of international service. Hammarskjöld’s deliberate course of reasoning in his speeches and in his *Markings* corresponds to Davenport’s third way. The following quotes are from Davenport’s *The Dignity of Man*.

‘Must we not choose between two irreconcilable views: the view of science that the spiritual reference is not really important, that it is indeed a sort of illusion that has no bearing on things as they really are; or on the other hand, the spiritual view? Our time has wholly failed to resolve this conflict, and the failure leads us back again to that darkness that characterizes our lives. The question goes far beyond the question of any particular religion; it is a question of our concept of man. We may even say that what is sometimes described as the ‘failure’ of the churches, is not a failure in the ordinary sense of the word. In his search for truth mid-century man has followed the sciences, which take no note of the spiritual, and the result is that he cannot see in the church what the church has to offer. It has been ousted from the world of thought, relegated to the world of feeling. Mid-century man has been told by ancient documents, and by all the great art and literature of the past, that there is a spiritual reality, and of it he has, like the blind man – certain intimations. But he cannot see this reality; it is something distant from him, something transcendental, alien to the nature of the world in which he lives. He can, therefore, only refer to it, as something which he knows about but cannot know. It has become not a reality but a reference. He who would inquire into the inner world has three
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choices to make. He may return to the churches and seek to reanimate into himself the deep convictions and insights which they represent and through which they molded Western civilization. If he cannot bring himself to this, he may follow the path of science into the field of psychiatry and content himself, chiefly, with the therapy that it has to offer. Or, refusing both of these, he may strive to give the word ‘spiritual’ a content capable of revealing the realities of the inner world, to himself and to others in living terms. Yet he who is willing to forego all three must virtually give up searching at all, and must make the best he can of the inner uncertainties, the inner darkness, into which he has fallen. It is my belief that twentieth-century man cannot extricate himself from this darkness unless he can give a content to his spiritual references, which they do not now possess. The word ‘spiritual’ means something and he who would understand the inner world must learn what that meaning is. I would further contend that what the church has to offer, on the one hand, and what science has to offer, on the other, are by no means so contradictory as a superficial examination appears to indicate when that to which so many now refer as the spiritual is rightly understood. It will be found to contain the means of reconciling, in a profound and satisfying way, those two conflicting impulses of twentieth century life. They are questions which on the whole, have never been answered.\textsuperscript{14}

As we will see later, the writer of Markings reveals the realities of the inner world, to himself and to others in living terms. In this speech given to an academic audience, Hammarskjöld brings both conflicting impulses of twentieth century life to the fore, when he links international service to maturity of mind. For this way of life Hammarskjöld does not give any grammar or formula in his speech. However, he does show the inner dynamics of the efforts to achieve maturity, when he describes Davenport’s work as follows: His study, like the effort of every single individual, finally led him to the doorstep where the rest is silence because the rest is something that has to be resolved between a man and himself. The rest is silence – but the results of the inner dialogue are evident to all, evident as independence, courage and fairness in dealing with others, evident in true international service.

Let us pause by the use of the term ‘doorstep’. The idea of ‘doorstep’ points to a frontier situation. Just as the confrontation with death represents the frontiers of a human life, in the same way, the individual efforts of all people have their limits or frontiers. This has to do with an existential human fact that experiences at the frontier of human existence, continually summon up denial, resistance and struggle. Between the inner struggle and self-surrender the individual has to find him/herself. If he can accept the frontier-experience as being part of human existence, he will accept his fate and by doing so, take it into his own hands. He will have to open himself to silence and let this silence in. This frontier-experience will be for him the experience of a threshold area. Hammarskjöld has this meaning in mind when he writes: .. the doorstep where the rest is silence because the rest is something that has to be resolved between a man and himself. The rest is silence – but the results of the inner dialogue are evident to all. The example of Davenport’s inner dialogue is the point of departure for Hammarskjöld to introduce the dynamics of the inner dialogue into his argumentation. The dash ‘-‘ in his argument has therefore got a special function, in respect of both content and dynamics. Within a life story, Hammarskjöld presents an inner dialogue - a dialogue of a person with him/herself, which leads to where silence begins. What he wants to say about the inner dialogue and silence is included in his expressed in his argument - as silence. He uses the dash to represent both the inner dialogue and the silence at which it arrives. Form and content strengthen each other: the public ‘speaking about’ is here an invitation to the inner ‘speaking to’. In this movement inside, in which silence says something different to each individual, Hammarskjöld takes his audience and his readers with him. He invites the individual listener and reader to execute this movement inside. By this act he places himself in a dialogical relationship with each person in his audience, because he grants the other the possibility of (inner) speech and initiative.

What strikes us is that in his text Hammarskjöld makes no statement about what actually constitutes the inner dialogue, while, at the same time, he grants this a fundamental place as part of human dignity and the pursuit of maturity of mind. Not speaking about the inner dialogue is a conscious choice for

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid. p. 249-253
Hammarskjöld. Whatever way we would fill it in, it would miss the meaning and effect of the inner dialogue which is the privilege of the responsible individual person. It is an area which requires its own inner space.\(^{15}\) How much value Hammarskjöld attached to silence and the inner dialogue, appears from the care he gave to the creation of the United Nations Meditation Room, located off the public lobby of the General Assembly in New York. He personally planned it and supervised its every detail. He even wrote the text for a leaflet for visitors, regarding the religions of the world.\(^{16}\) We get a well-defined view of Hammarskjöld’s attitude to world religions. The text begins by talking about inner silence: ‘We all have within us a center of stillness surrounded by silence’. And continues: ‘This house, dedicated to work and debate in the service of peace, should have one room dedicated to silence in the outward sense and stillness in the inner sense.’ He then points out that the meditation room is meant for the many who from different religious convictions are in search of ‘a place where the doors may be open to the infinite lands of thought and prayer.’ The stone in the centre of the meditation room is explained as follows: ‘We may see it as an altar, empty not because there is no God, not because it is an altar to an unknown God, but because it is dedicated to the God whom man worships under many names and in many forms. ‘There is’, this statement affirms, ‘something common to all religions in spite of all differences’. With the symbol of the stone and also the wall painting Hammarskjöld gives further thoughts for meditation and prayer. In this way the shaft of light striking the shimmering surface of solid rock is according to Hammarskjöld, a symbol of ‘how the light of the spirit gives life to matter.’ And so he offers the following questions to a meditate on: From what inspiration do we work? How can we keep endurance and faith in our endeavors? If choosing, do we choose for construction or destruction? How are we to use the wealth we have inherited on this earth of ours? Towards what harmony, freedom and balance are we striving? Hammarskjöld closes the text with the words: ‘There is an ancient saying that the sense of a vessel is not in its shell but in the void. So it is with this room. It is for those who come here to fill the void with what they find in their center of stillness.’

To conclude:
Hammarskjöld’s message from June 1955, that we have a definite duty to international service, was directed to an academic audience, through whom he addressed the whole world. Now 2005, fifty years later, his address could have been given to us, because there is more than ever an urgent need for good leaders and teachers. The attitude of international service demands maturity of mind which includes integrity. In his speech Hammarskjöld applies these qualities to the work and attitude of the international civil servant, who should be an example to all of us. He went into further detail about what he considers to be maturity of mind. He felt the need to emphasize this at that particular time and draws on other sources to back up his statements. We see how that Kant, Epictetus and Davenport influenced his thinking in this respect.

In the following chapters of this book, we will see that Hammarskjöld in writing ‘Markings’ created a record of his inner dialogue, his path towards maturity of mind, the basis of his international service. This theme emerges again at the end of the speech, when he appeals to his academic audience: Results are determined not by superficial ability but by the consistency of the actors in their efforts and by the validity of their ideals. Those who are to be called teachers or leaders may profit from intelligence but can only justify their positions by integrity. Hammarskjöld’s call to international service, is at the end of the day also an appeal to the integrity of all world citizens who feel they have been called to be leaders and teachers. Maturity of mind and integrity are synonymous in this speech.

\(^{15}\) J.Derrida, 1997, How not to Speak. The philosopher, Jacques Derrida, in his (…) How Not to Speak shows that here it has to do with motives of the secret, the promise, the place, points of contact of the hidden with the public, of the secret with the known as representative of ‘the other’ in the reference context of the language in which we communicate.

CHAPTER 4
Dag Hammarskjöld and Martin Buber

It is clear that in his public actions Dag Hammarskjöld applied much of what he had learnt from reading Martin Buber’s works. Buber’s influence can also be seen in many references in Markings. It is important, therefore, that we examine closely the relationship between Hammarskjöld and Buber and how they influenced each other.

Martin Buber, philosopher, storyteller and pedagogue was born in Vienna in 1878. That made him 27 years older than Hammarskjöld. However, he outlived Hammarskjöld by four years. As a child Buber went to live with his grandparents in Galicia, a country which is now split between Poland and Ukraine. He later studied at Vienna, Berlin, Zurich and Leipzig. As a young man he became involved in the Zionist movement, but disagreed later with their definition of “Zionist” and broke with them in 1904. He went back to Galicia and studied Hasidism, an Orthodox sect of Judaism which among other things, celebrated the ordinary, everyday things of life, and which stressed the value of relationship to God and between people. We see much of this way of looking at life in the ideas he later developed. He worked as Professor of Jewish and Religious History at Frankfurt University, but was relieved of his post by the Nazis. From then on, life in Germany became more and more difficult under the Nazis and in 1938, like many of his Jewish friends, he moved to Palestine. There he took up a post as Professor of Sociology at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem.

Buber wrote over 800 books and articles and the thread running through them was the idea that concrete meetings between persons was the most important thing in being human. ‘When I meet a man, I am not concerned about his opinions. I am concerned about the man.’ Buber had said. His inclination was to meet people. But just meeting them was not enough. What was very important for him was the manner in which he met others; the quality of each relationship was vital to him. In his own words: ‘I think no human being can give more than this. Making life possible for the other, if only for a moment.’

Sven Stolpe writes that from as far back as 1930, Hammarskjöld and he had talked a great deal with each other about Buber’s book Ich und Du (I and Thou), published in 1923. One of Hammarskjöld’s close colleagues at the United Nations, Andrew Cordier, emphasises Hammarskjöld’s interest in Buber’s Ich und Du, when he writes that a text in Markings from 1955 had been inspired by Ich und Du and that he, Cordier, had had many deep discussions with Hammarskjöld about this work. It is also so, that Hammarskjöld acquired Buber’s collected Chassidic stories in 1955. His interest in Buber was
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1 Martin Buber, Ich und Du.
to receive a new impulse in 1957 when he was given a copy of Buber’s *Pointing the Way*. He attached great value to this book. It comes then as no surprise that when they had a personal meeting in New York in 1958, Martin Buber made a big impression on Hammarskjöld. They remained in touch by correspondence and Hammarskjöld visited him twice in Jerusalem where Buber was then living. Both men were convinced of the importance of cooperation and consultation between peoples. They agreed with each other that with many people the basic attitude for working together is, to a great extent, absent and are deeply concerned about this. How can mutual suspicion be broken down? When Hammarskjöld received an honorary doctorate at the University of Cambridge in 1958, he gave a speech of thanks under the following title: *The Walls of Distrust*[^2], about how we should resist the general existentialist distrust which was prevalent at the time. He ends his speech with what Martin Buber had said about the same subject in 1952[^3].

The message from *The Walls of Distrust* we can see as one which Hammarskjöld and Buber both wanted to give the world. We can sum up, their plea as follows: There is an urgent necessity to come to discussion and cooperation at the level of world politics. The prevailing distrust among men is seriously obstructing dialogue. Distrust that puts into doubt the inner integrity of existence itself, has become existential distrust. And this is even more serious if this existential distrust is mutual as, in this case, talk become mute, sense becomes nonsense. We must push back this existential distrust first and foremost in ourselves, which is an important responsibility of each one of us. For this we must look for the separation between the human and the sub-human in ourselves and work on that. Only when distrust has been dealt with, can we make a valid contribution to turning back the tide. Behind Hammarskjöld’s and Buber’s message lies both their visions of how we realise ourselves as mature human beings. Although they have developed their insights independently of each other, they both arrive at the same conclusion. Both attribute great value to the personal integrity of each person. Faith in the integrity of the other is inextricably bound up with one’s own personal integrity. An open, compassionate approach of one person towards another and the realisation of real contact is essential.

Just as in his speech *International Service*, in *The Walls of Distrust*, Hammarskjöld points out the importance of maturity of mind for solving political problems. ‘We may well rejoice in having taken the first steps towards the establishment of an international democracy of peoples, bringing all nations – irrespective of history, size or wealth – together on an equal basis as partners in the vast venture of creating a true world community. But we have only taken the first steps, and they have often proved painful. There is a maturity of mind required of those who give up rights. There is a maturity of mind required of those who acquire new rights. Let us hope, that to an increasing extent, the necessary spiritual qualities will be shown on all sides.’[^4]

Hammarskjöld draws attention to the fact that the process of decolonisation in which Western civilization is caught up, is driving some people to despondency, but that this is not necessary. Instead, with the following words, he suggests that Western civilization can perhaps establish ‘spiritual leadership’ and maintain it: ‘The dividing line goes within ourselves, within our own peoples and also within other nations. It does not coincide with any political or geographical boundaries. The ultimate fight is between the human and the sub-human. We are on dangerous ground if we believe that any individual, any nation or any ideology has a monopoly on lightness, liberty and human dignity.’ If we should let go of our distrust, it would become possible ‘to re-establish full human contact and communications across geographical and political boundaries and to get out of a public debate which often seems to be inspired more by a wish to impress than by a will to understand and to be understood.’

Appealing to a belief in the independence of the spirit and the right to free speech, he says: ‘But all of us, in whatever field of intellectual activity we work, influence to some degree the spiritual trend of

[^2]: Andrew Cordier, *Paths to World Order*.
[^4]: Ibid.
our time. All of us may contribute to the breakdown of the walls of distrust and towards checking fatal
tendencies in the direction of stale conformism and propaganda. How can this be done better or more
effectively than by simple faithfulness to the independence of the spirit and to the right of the free man
to free thinking and free expression of his thoughts? So, attitudes, in line with the liberal tradition of
this University emerge as a deeply significant element also in our efforts to develop to master the
political difficulties.\textsuperscript{5}

Hammarskjöld finishes his Cambridge speech with the words: ‘Deep-rooted conflicts which have run
their course all through history, and seemed to reach a new culmination before and during the second
World War, continue. And destructive forces which have always been with us make themselves felt in
new forms. They represent, now as before the greatest challenge man has to face.’\textsuperscript{6}

\textit{Hammarskjöld about Buber}

What drew Dag Hammarskjöld to Martin Buber? Hammarskjöld himself called it Buber’s ‘humanistic
internationalism’. In 1959, he introduced Buber as a candidate for the Nobel Prize for Literature. In
his recommendation to the Swedish Academy, Hammarskjöld drew attention to what he called Buber’s
‘unique position in modern Jewish thought,’ and added that Buber was ‘scarcely accorded the status
which an outside observer would think he should merit’. In this argumentation Hammarskjöld refers as
follows to Buber’s Jewish background:

‘With his 81 years, Martin Buber is becoming more and more active as spokesman for what could be
called a humanistic internationalism which is based fundamentally on Jewish religious thinking, as
explained in his earlier religious and philosophical writings. For a long time, he has played an
important role in theological circles but also in Judaism and he has a unique position in modern Jewish
thought. He has a great name, but has been scarcely accorded the status which an outside observer
would think he would merit. There are many reasons for this. First and foremost, he has never
identified himself with the nationalistic line which left a very strong mark on Judaism after the war.
On the contrary, he is one of the people who has promoted for example Israeli-Arab friendship on the
grounds of their common historical legacy and as an expression of what he sees as an essential feature
in Jewish and Muslim thinking. Another explanation is that the religious and philosophical line which
he, in general, represents, is alien to modern Judaism. The personal mystique – the term can be
accepted even if it is scarcely adequate – which Buber has developed under the influence of not only
Chassidism but also of the Medieval mystics, distinguishes itself to the same degree from the rational
materialism which is the personally distinctive for Ben Gurion as well as from the formalistic
orthodoxy and religious intolerance which is often found in Israel. Although for this reason Buber’s
position in Judaism is full of contradictions, for those who study his work in depth, he emerges as a
brilliant interpreter of some of the principal and purest elements in Jewish tradition and Jewish
intellectual life. While Ben Gurion and his predecessor continued the legacy of an strident nationalism
as a feature of historical Israel, it can be said of Buber that he has revitalised essential features of its
prophetic legacy.\textsuperscript{7}

In Chapter 3, we have seen that in his speech \textit{International Service}, Hammarskjöld turns to the
thinking of the Enlightenment, without actually embracing rational materialism. And although he
gives an important place to ‘faith’ in his approach to international service, this does not mean that he
goes along with formalistic orthodoxy and religious intolerance. His own position is different. In his
own faith experience, he puts deep value on a ‘personal revelation’. We also find elements of this in
his speech \textit{International Service}. In his nomination of Buber for the Nobel Prize for Literature,
Hammarskjöld goes on to say that the small book \textit{I and Thou} written in the twenties, is a key work in

\textsuperscript{5} D. Hammarskjöld, \textit{The Walls of Distrust}.

\textsuperscript{6} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{7} D. Hammarskjöld, \textit{Dag Hammarskjöld on Martin Buber}: Hammarskjöld’s recommendation of Martin Buber for the Nobel Prize
for Literature for the year 1959 in the \textit{Judisk Tidskrift}, 39 (1966): 2, translated by A.M. Smit-Ryan from the Dutch (also a
translation from Swedish).
Buber's philosophical oeuvre. He calls this book ‘an interpretation of the Kantian thesis about man in a way which gives new human warmth and richness to this thesis.

The link which Hammarskjöld makes between Kant and Buber, is essential for our understanding of the international service which Hammarskjöld was thinking of. We can argue that in his speech International Service Hammarskjöld introduces the Kantian thesis about man. To what extent is the essential element of 'humanity in its warmth and richness' already present in this speech? How far can we go in speaking of a qualitative difference in approach in 1955 when he gives this speech, to what he writes in his nomination of Buber in 1959? We will answer this question in a later chapter.

For now it is sufficient to remark that Hammarskjöld creates space for the emotional life of man, parallel with man’s rationality and morality, in the way in which he deals with the theme of integrity and introduces the inner dialogue.

Ich und Du – I and Thou

On 23 August 1961, Martin Buber had written to Hammarskjöld from Jerusalem ‘It is for me, even more than what you said in your first talk, a token of true (...) understanding – rather a rare gift in this world of ours. Were I asked, which of my books a Swede should read first, I should answer: 'The most difficult of them all, but the most apt to introduce the reader into the realm of dialogue, I mean I and Thou.'

On 12 September Hammarskjöld was able to reply to Buber that he had found a publisher and had begun the translation: ‘I am certain that I am reading you correctly if I see reflected in your reply a silent ‘Aufruf’ that I try a translation of this key work, as decisive in its message as supremely beautiful in its form. This decides the issue and, if I have your permission, I shall do it, even if it may take some time. I am, in fact, today getting in touch with the main Swedish publishing firm asking them whether they would accept my offer. (...) If this all works out, may I tell you how much it would mean to me also by providing me with a justification for a broadened and intensified contact with you personally.’

This was the last correspondence which Buber had with him. On 12 September Hammarskjöld left by air from New York for the Congo. Among the literature he took with him was the copy of Ich und Du which he had just received from Buber. He spent the night before he left in the home of Sture Linner, head of the United Nations mission to the Congo, where he left a copy of the German original Ich und Du behind him, as well as the first dozen pages which he had translated into Swedish. Almost his last word to Linner was that they must discuss it together on his return. Apart from the political developments Hammarskjöld was also occupied with this translation project. When recommending Buber as a candidate for the Nobel Price for Literature in 1959, Hammarskjöld wrote the following brief summary and discussion of this book.

'A key work in Buber’s philosophical production is the little book, Ich und Du, from the twenties. Earlier he had presented the same line of reasoning, which is developed in this book, and later he took it to a much richer form. Buber distinguishes two types of relationship to reality: I-Thou and I-It. The first relationship is between subject and object, the other relationship between two subjects communicating with each other. The I-Thou relationship, which is for him the decisive reality-dialogue, becomes the most important of all spiritual life forms in the life of man and culture, and is defined by the ability to enter into such a dialogue in contact with reality. Without testing the logical feasibility of his formula in all the possible applications which Buber wants to give, man can accept it as an expression of a very fruitful vision of life and can understand the influence which could emerge from it. It has the characteristic of a mystical pantheism, which nevertheless keeps the dualistic pregnancy and drama of the relationship with God. With regard to man, it is, at the same time, a
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8 H.P. van Dusen, Dag Hammarskjöld, The Man and his Faith, 222-223.
9 Ibid., p. 169.
translation of the Kantian thesis on man in a way which gives warmth and richness to the new reality.  

I and Thou belongs to the body of mystical literature. Kees Waaijman writes: 'In this, an integration takes place from the life of experience into a faith experience, which is explained in a systematic way within a mystical-philosophical system in the sphere of the spiritual doctrinal discussion.' He adds: 'that Buber, through all this and in all this, the living relationship with the eternal ‘Thou’ wants to articulate, makes I and Thou into a primary mystical writing.

The maturity of Hammarskjöld’s insights was the result of a search of many years for an attitude to life in which he could be freely himself while, at the same time, being at the service of the other. His daily experiences formed both the material and the reason for his written self-reflections. He was to keep these texts as the marking stones on his path through life. In this inner dialogue with himself and with God – he is inwardly transformed in God’s love. The change in dynamics is perceptible and can be typified in the distinction which Martin Buber makes between the prime or ground words I-It and I-Thou. It is not surprising then that Dag Hammarskjöld and Martin Buber finally found the joy of recognition in their discussions about Buber’s book I and Thou. Hammarskjöld was unable to complete his translation of I and Thou into Swedish, but with his Markings he has left behind a living witness of the same dynamics.

The Single One and his responsibility

On 17 August 1961, Hammarskjöld wrote to Martin Buber: ‘The last few days I have been reading some studies of yours which I had not seen before. (...) After having finished reading these studies, I feel the need to send you again a greeting after far too long a time of silence, understandable only in the light of the pressure of circumstances. In what you say about the ‘signs,’ about the ‘questions’ and the response and about the ‘Single One’ and his responsibility, with reference also to the political sphere, you have formulated shared experiences in ways which made your studies very much what you would call a ‘sign’ for me. It is strange – over a gulf of time and a gulf of differences as to background and outer experience – to find a bridge built which, in one move, eliminates the distance.'

In turn, Buber must have had the experience of a bridge over time when he received Hammarskjöld’s last letter, an hour after the message of Hammarskjöld’s death had reached him. This letter will also have been a deciding factor in his message, when he read how much his book I and Thou had meant for Hammarskjöld and he must have recognised that what Hammarskjöld had read about the Single One was very personal.

During his first talk with Hammarskjöld, Buber had perceived something which he couldn’t explain. ‘something inescapable which in some way or another corresponded with this period of world history - with his function in it.' The definition of a great character which he gives somewhere else is certainly applicable to Hammarskjöld in this regard. ‘I call a great character one who by his actions and attitudes satisfies the claim of situations out of deep readiness to respond with his whole life, and in such a way that the sum of his actions and attitudes expresses at the same time the unity of his being in its willingness to accept responsibility.'

Wholeness and unity are the core terms here. A deep readiness to dedicate his whole life gives this character the possibility to comply with the demands of the moment. At the same time, the unity of his being manifests itself in all his actions. Martin Buber calls this ‘The Single One’. The Single One can enter into relationship with the other as a self from his own complete self. ‘Only the man who has become a Single One, a self, a real person, is able to have a complete relation of his life to the other self, a relation

10 D. Hammarskjöld, Dag Hammarskjöld on Martin Buber.
12 H. van Dusen, Dog Hammarskjöld, The Man and his Faith, p. 221.
13 Radio talk for the Swedish radio.
14 M. Buber, M., in M. Friedman, Martin Buber: The Life of Dialogue, p. 94.
which is not beneath but above the problematic of the relations between man and man, and which comprises, withstands, and overcomes all this problematic situation. A great relation exists only between real persons. It can be strong as death, because it is stronger than solitude, because it (...) throws a bridge from self-being to self-being across the abyss of dread of the universe.15

Discussing Plato’s letter

Hammarskjöld and Buber discussed the subject of the dignity of man during their meeting in Jerusalem at the beginning of 1959. In that discussion the central theme was the tragedy of the failure of thinking man in his actions in history. Both men knew this tragedy in their own lives. Together, they had attempted to get to the bottom of its meaning. Their dialogue brought them to the insight that this ‘failure’ could also be overcome. Plato’s letter, which Buber referred to in this discussion, is very likely the letter to the relatives and friends of Dion (Seventh Letter):

‘...As I observed these incidents and the men engaged in public affairs, the laws too and the customs, the more closely I examined them and the farther I advanced in life, the more difficult it seemed to me to handle public affairs aright. For it was not possible to be active in politics without friends and trustworthy supporters; and to find these ready to my hand was not an easy matter, since public affairs at Athens were not carried on in accordance with the manners and practices of our fathers; nor was there any ready method by which I could make new friends. The laws too, written and unwritten, were being altered for the worse, and the evil was growing with startling rapidity. The result was that, though at first I had been full of a strong impulse towards political life, as I looked at the course of affairs and saw them being swept in all directions by contending currents, my head finally began to swim; and though I didn’t stop looking to see if there was any likelihood of improvement in these symptoms and in the general course of public life, I postponed action till a suitable opportunity should arise. Finally, it became clear to me, with regard to all existing communities, that they were one and all misgoverned. For their laws have got into a state that is almost incurable, except by some extraordinary reform with good luck to support it. And I was forced to say, when praising true philosophy that it is by this that men are enabled to see what justice in public and private life really is. Therefore, I said, there will be no cessation of evils for the sons of men, till either those who are pursuing a right and true philosophy receive sovereign power in the States, or those in power in the states by some dispensation of providence become true philosophers.16

In this letter the writer pleads for virtuousness and unanimity in thinking. Buber and Hammarskjöld found this unanimity during their meeting. Plato’s letter confirmed their efforts. For them it was all about the integrity of their commitment and the quality of their actions, as Hammarskjöld expressed it into words: What distinguishes 'the elite' from the masses is only their insistence on 'quality.' This implies a responsibility, to all for all, to the past for the future, which is the reflection of a humble and spontaneous response to Life- with its endless possibilities, and its unique presence which never comes twice.17

Buber on Hammarskjöld: the radio talk.

In the talk already referred to which Buber gave about himself for the Swedish radio, he looked back on the meetings he had had with Hammarskjöld.18 Both men had been imbued with the meaning of real meeting and real dialogue. In their lives and their work, although in their own field and independent of each other, they were both directed towards the dialogue between people – the dialogue with the other. They were both very aware of the dangers which were associated with

15 M. Buber, Between Man and Man, 'The Education of Character,' p. 116
16 From Plato’s Seventh Letter (Translated by J.Hardward), Plato to the Reiletavis and Friends of Dion. Welfare.
17 On 2 September 1959, Markings, p. 173
18 Martin Buber, ‘Erinnerung an Hammarskjöld’ in his Nachlese
fundamental distrust - a distrust which they witnessed all around them, and which hampered every real discussion and any kind of close cooperation. When they met each other in New York for the first time, they put into words this concern. In the form which their conversation took, they then enjoyed everything which real dialogue brings with it: coming to themselves under the eye of the other and in the mirror of recognition, they experienced the deepest core of their self-realisation. Their affinity was to go so far, that Martin Buber in his radio talk would use this story about himself in order to speak about Hammarskjöld. Theoretically, he had worked out this thought many times: that nobody exists alone and that he needs the other to see and be seen in the dialogue, to address the other and be addressed, to come to himself and to become a true Self, because the deep core of his humanness is becoming a person as reflected in the face of the other.

‘We were both equally tormented by the hypocritical language full of a fundamental, mutual distrust of the representatives of countries and blocks, for whom it was an unchanging routine to talk randomly at cross purposes to each other. We both hoped - believed - that just on time before disaster struck, loyal representatives of the people would recognise their true task and would arrive at true discussion - would really negotiate with each other - by which it would become abundantly clear that the interests which were common to people, were much stronger than those which divided them. Real consultation in which it would be obvious that preference must be given to cooperation – I don’t say co-existence, that is not enough, I say and mean cooperation, in spite of all the immense difficulties – above destruction of society. Because there is no third way, only one of these two: realising together the big social interests which they have in common, or the end of everything that people are in the habit of calling human civilization.

In January 1959, Hammarskjöld visited me in Jerusalem. Central to our discussion was the problem which has occupied me again and again in the course of my life: the failure of thinking men in their actions in the course of history. To give an illustration of what I meant, I mentioned one of the biggest and best-known examples for us: the failure of Plato’s attempt to establish his just state in Sicily. I felt, and I was sure that Hammarskjöld felt the same, that we had also been recipients of the letter in which Plato tells of his failure, and of his victory over this failure. In August 1961, Hammarskjöld wrote to me about his impression of some of my philosophical works which he had read. He wrote that he wanted to translate one of those books into Swedish: ‘to bring you closer to my fellow countrymen’, he added, and asked me also which book I considered was most suitable for this. In my reply I advised him to translate the book *Ich und Du (I and Thou)*. He started work on it right away. In the letter in which he told me that, he called the book ‘a key work, decisive in my message’. I received that letter an hour after I learnt of his death via the radio. I was told later that he had worked on the translation of *Ich und Du* during his last flight.19

---

CHAPTER 5

*Markings, Hammarskjöld’s inner dialogues*

In this chapter, we will take a close look at how the inner transformation, which Hammarskjöld’s progress towards (spiritual) maturity brought about, was experienced from the outside. We will also see how Hammarskjöld’s diary about his inner dialogue with himself and with God (*Vägmarken* or *Markings*) was instrumental in this transformation and how it came to be published. The title itself says much about the contents: *Markings* on his path. It was not an easy path, marked as much by regression as by progression. I will talk about Hammarskjöld’s continuous search for answers to the questions which arose, often going deep inside himself for answers. Further, I will discuss the application of the theories of a few important psychologists to the various aspects of Hammarskjöld’s dialogue and in particular to his development towards maturity. Those are the cognitive psychologists, Herman and Kempen and the psychoanalysts Erik Erikson and Martin Buber.

At that point I will touch on the hermeneutic interpretation of spiritual texts and following on from this, I will use a spiritual hermeneutic approach for the interpretation of Hammarskjöld’s texts. We can see a link between Hammarskjöld’s writings and those of Saint Augustine. We will note the influences on the themes in *Markings* of Herman Hesse. Throughout the chapter, I will analyse some key texts from *Marking* and reconstruct Hammarskjöld’s inner dialogues.

**Hammarskjöld’s transformation as experienced from the outside**

Sven Stolpe was a close friend of Hammarskjöld’s and could observe him at various stages of his life. Reading below what he has to say about the change which gradually took place in Hammarskjöld, we see the evidence that Hammarskjöld did, in fact, travel a spiritual path and finally achieved the maturity of mind which he had longed for so much. ‘Well into his adult years Dag lived with his parents; as an obedient son he respected the routine of the house, even when he had a high official position. Although I don’t wish to touch upon a delicate subject, it must be said that some connection can be suspected between on the one hand Dag’s attitude to a devoted, much-loved and demanding mother and a strict, withdrawn superman of a father and, on the other hand, the fact that his whole life he remained not only unmarried but also, as far as is known, did not have the slightest contact with the female sex. He released the one woman he loved and with whom he had felt a bond when he learned that one of his friends was also in love with her. Later he became one of the loyal friends of this family. (It seemed that his sacrifice had been made without the slightest effort.) But, after that, whenever he met the couple people always saw that he consistently addressed his conversation to the husband and not to the wife.’ Stolpe certainly admired and valued him. But they were very different. Dag Hammarskjöld had lived a sheltered life. According to Stolpe, the only thing which might have seemed a problem was Hammarskjöld’s mother fixation. Stolpe felt that Hammarskjöld knew nothing of what he, Stolpe, had been through. He admired Hammarskjöld and always hung on his words. ‘I thought he spoke so sensibly, so well-considered. But it was as if he was speaking through a plate of glass; I often thought that that glass could be broken, if he once fell in love with a really impossible, charming and egocentric woman, or if he fell very ill or had a series of set-backs. Now, however, he seemed to me in some way to be lifeless - in spite of his perfection.’ Dag Hammarskjöld threw himself intensively into his work - but never had a ‘home’ in the usual sense of the word. It seemed that in spite of all his loyalty, all his camaraderie he lived alongside life.

Once Hammarskjöld had said ‘Yes’ it was as if he changed completely. ‘He could write to his friend and former boss, the highly talented and honourable Minister of Finance, Ernst Wigforss, that he was

---

1 Sven Stolpe points to the moment when Hammarskjöld’s accepted his Secretary-Generalship of the United Nations, April 1953.
very happy now, words which I suspect he would never have used in the past - unless perhaps at the summit of a Swedish mountain. In fact he now undertook duties for which you could say that his complete early schooling, which was unusual, or in any case exceptional, was ideally suited. He was free of everything that holds back or ties down most people, such as family life and warm, emotional relationships. He often wrote about the cool atmosphere of friendship, which it is true did not have as much to offer as the atmosphere of love but which, in any case offered a lot more freedom. He was very well aware of the fact that he could never have carried out his function in the same way as he was now able to do if he had felt obliged to give his most tender attention and his deepest feelings to a family. Be that as it may, he had found his ideal job, gave it everything he had and was suddenly liberated. You could see it in his look which had lost the shyness and reserve which in his young years people were used to seeing and which had now become warm and steadfast. Actually he now felt for the first time the true measure of his ability; everything - his energy, zest for work, loyalty, character, celibacy, loneliness - was now very helpful to him. When Stolpe thinks of Dag Hammarskjöld as he was in his later years - warm, loving, open, radiant - he is astonished at Bartels' psychological construction of Hammarskjöld as a 'miserable, deficient aesthete and intellectual, who realised that 'love for others was not for him'2. Remarkably enough, the opposite is true. After his call to serve, Hammarskjöld opened up, his armour shattered, he had tender, friendly contacts, also with private people, in spite of the fact that his principal shyness never disappeared - a light and, in my opinion, a exceptionally charming veil. No, you cannot regard the Hammarskjöld of the later years as an aesthete who is attracted by refinement, a painful Narcissus and a despairing man. He had thrown off his refinement, had broken with his narcissism, he was not at all despairing, but, on the contrary, he was filled with a new certainty, a new love. Those who knew him can bear witness to this.3

Signposts along the way

The transformation which Sven Stolpe describes above could not have come about without the inner dialogue which Hammarskjöld had committed to paper during most of his adult life. After his death this unpublished manuscript was found in his apartment in New York, addressed to Leif Sjöberg, a Swedish friend. The document contained his notes, dating back to 1925. In the accompanying letter Hammarskjöld characterised the notes in this manuscript as 'a sort of Whitebook concerning my negotiations with myself - and God'.3 These notes form the record of Hammarskjöld’s quest for maturity of mind. Belfrage had Hammarskjöld’s permission to publish the manuscript and in 1963 it was published in Swedish under the title Vagmarksen. Very soon after that it was published in an English translation by the English poet, W.H. Auden in collaboration with Leif Sjöberg. The English translation was called Markings. The book takes its name from the trail marks (Swedish: Vägmärken) or marking stones which mark paths in the mountains and is a reference to a verse in the book itself.4 Looking back on his life, Hammarskjöld realised that what had first been a search for fixed points, turned out to be the path of his destiny. Whoever reads his inner dialogue disc is the valuable legacy of Hammarskjöld’s inner life.

In his biography of Hammarskjöld, Brian Urquhart calls Markings the ‘logbook of his search for maturity of mind.’ Urquhart says that the quest for maturity of mind was the source of Hammarskjöld’s inner strength and the necessary basis for the fact that he successfully bore public responsibility. In Urquhart’s opinion, this search had a practical and essential significance for Hammarskjöld. ‘The Secretary-General, for all his eminence, in reality enjoys few of the normal attributes of power or authority. The strength of his office resides first of all in his own strength of character, ability and moral courage. Without these qualities the Secretary-Generalship can be little more than an empty shell of high sounding aims and principles and of good but largely unfulfilled intentions. Hammarskjöld’s concern with personal ethics, maturity of mind, and spiritual strength was

---

2 The Danish diplomat Eyvind Bartels was of the opinion that Hammarskjöld constructed a myth of his mission. He was very shocked. Gustaf Aulen and Hjalmar Sundén responded to his criticism, in demonstrating that Bartels interpreted texts from Markings without taking into consideration their respective contexts. They also pointed that the way of following Jesus, is a Christian way, and not as a personal idiosyncrasy.

3 Gustaf Aulen, Dag Hammarskjold’s White Book.

4 Markings, p. 144.
thus far more than the personal idiosyncrasy of a good and high-minded man. It was also the concern of the athlete to be in the best possible condition for the race – a race that in his case, as he himself noted when he was re-elected in 1957, turned into a marathon. 

Sven Stolpe, who had written a spiritual profile of him, also came to the same conclusion as Urquhart: 'From the very beginning I had a strong feeling that this young man was perhaps purer than any other person I had met. Dag Hammarskjöld made a very strong impression on me - of maturity, Christian maturity.'

The pivotal question: 'Do you choose your self?'

Hammarskjöld starts his speech ‘International Service’ by saying that international service demands of us first and foremost to be ourselves and he ends with the conclusion that international service is the fruit of inner dialogue. Implicitly and explicitly his argument can be summarised as follows: We only do full justice to our value as human beings when we strive for maturity of mind. With maturity of mind we are not driven by fear and we realise that our destiny is not done to us but that we can play an active part in it. To do this, we must know who we are, no more and no less. Further, we become aware that we can only stand on firm ground when we have the knowledge that we cannot give our fellow men more or less than what we ourselves possess. In the deepest sense this is something between each of us and ourselves because it is not only our ideals which mature in a universal climate but also it is we ourselves that mature. In an inner dialogue each of us can explore our boundaries as far as the point where the rest is silence. The fruits of inner dialogue, says Hammarskjöld, are courage, honesty in our relations with others – and – an attitude of international service. In other words, Inner dialogue leads to international service and takes as its starting point the requirement to be ourselves – each and every one of us. When does the question about being yourself first arise in Hammarskjöld’s Markings? When was he first aware of the tension that, in his opinion, exists between ‘being yourself’ and ‘international service’ and in what way does he feel they go hand in hand? For this, we must turn to Markings, starting with a text from 1945:

> Body and soul contain a thousand possibilities out of which you can build many I's. But in only one of them is there a congruence of the elector and the elected. Only one – which you will never find until you have excluded all those superficial and fleeting possibilities of being and doing with which you toy, out of curiosity or wonder or greed, and which hinder you from casting anchor in the experience of the mystery of life, and the consciousness of the talent entrusted to you which is your I.

Dialogue with myself

Hammarskjöld wrote about a dialogue with myself. What did he mean by this and how did it work? In order to interpret this we turn to the concept of ‘dialogical self. The cognitive psychologists Hermans and Kempen consider the self as a multi-voiced self in an inner mind space. Not only can the world, but also the self be conceived as a mind space. The I moves in an imagined landscape from one position to another in such a way that dialogical relationships in a multi-voiced self become possible. Dialogue is the activity of co-construction of reality, in which at any moment in time one party is more dominant than the other. The more symmetrical the dialogue is, the more it provides an opportunity for mutual influence; the more asymmetrical it is, the more it constrains the views and experiences. We can be opposed to ourselves, be close to ourselves, take a large distance from ourselves, or be overwhelmed by the emotions in ourselves. If we say that we are involved in a self-confrontation, we see ourselves as having a position somewhere in front of us, two positions being in a state of tension.

5 B. Urquhart, Hammarskjöld, p. 18.
6 Translated from S. Stolpe, Dag Hammarskjöld Spiritual Profile, p. 45.
7 Markings, p. 19
9 Ibid.
In the concept of ‘dialogical self’ the notions of inter-subjective exchange and dominance as the main features of dialogical relationships are applied to the self, considered as a multiplicity of I-positions. In Markings we see that Hammarskjöld also gives a voice to the ‘weaker’ I-positions.

I have analysed Hammarskjöld’s speeches as having an argumentative line of reasoning in a critical discussion, aimed at solving differences of opinion and convincing his audience. With the concept of the dialogical self, we can now understand Hammarskjöld’s Markings as a collection of discourses in which he carries on argumentative discussions with himself which are aimed at solving inner differences of opinion by argumentation. He formulates convictions and inner doubts, which can be understood as expressions of the I-positions, he then confronts these I-positions with each other, expresses their explicit points of views and examines the tenability or indefensibility of the opinions concerned. In order to follow this discussion, it is important that special attention be paid to the different points of view of the I-positions and the spoken and unspoken arguments of each I-position. In Hammarskjöld’s inner dialogues it is important to make explicit information explicit, by including presumed doubt, concealed arguments, undisclosed conclusions, etc. Although the outcome of his inner dialogue is open, we still see how Hammarskjöld very gradually finds a deeper basis for the opposing I-positions in a more mature synthesis.

With regard to mature synthesis as mentioned above, I would like to refer to Erik Erikson’s theory of psycho-social development theory. The psychoanalyst, Erik Erikson (1902-1994) was one of the representatives of the psychoanalytical tradition who presented a theory about the good man in the context of modern society. In his psycho-social development theory, Erikson distinguishes eight phases of life. On his road through life, a growing person is confronted with a psycho-social core crisis in each new phase. The core crisis is the first phase of life - the baby period - is that of trust versus distrust. When the young trust of the baby (in relation to himself and another) is boosted, this is good for his psycho-social growth and he can actualise himself in that. When distrust predominates, that is an obstacle to his further development. This then remains as a latent core crisis for him, until it is solved in a positive way. When a core crisis is solved in a positive way, the person gains in moral strength. The consecutive virtues are: hope, will power, purpose, competency, fidelity, love, loving care, wisdom. The basic relationship of a person to himself/herself is formed between the exigencies of fate and the inner core crisis of his phase of life.

The core crisis of the adult phase is that of ‘care versus stagnation’. The virtue of the mature woman and the mature man is expressed in their taking care of others. For generativity and care to occur, modalities of trust and hope, autonomy and will, initiative and purpose, as well as more complex capacities such as industry and competence, identity and fidelity, intimacy and love, must come together in one grand synthesis, whereby one finds one’s highest fulfilment and most commanding sense of meaning in the establishment and care of succeeding generations. Unless the high in man somehow includes and restates the low, the high is weak, anaemic, and unstable. Hence, generative man (Erikson’s normative vision of man) is at once more mature and more childlike, more civilized and more primitive, more human and more animal.

Hammarskjöld’s inner dialogue in Markings shows us how he experienced the challenge of the generative crisis. I will show that Hammarskjöld’s generativity is a delicate synthesis. Through his inner dialogue he learned whom and what he could take care of, and how to increase, by whatever means he had, the good will and higher order in his part of the world, from his position as Secretary-General of the United Nations. On the basis of text analyses from Markings, we will follow Hammarskjöld’s questioning and how he sought to achieve spiritual maturity in his dialogue with himself and with God. In this he can hold a mirror to us or, as Erikson expresses it: ‘The life history of an historical figure must take account, above all, of how his life hung together even as he also kept a section of his world together. His person, then, in all its uniqueness and yet also in its conflictedness

10 E. Erikson, Identity and the Life Cycle.
11 Don S. Browning, Generative Man: Psychoanalytic Perspectives, p. 196.
and failures, must be seen, for better and for worse, as prototypical for his time and as fulfilling specific needs in the lives of those who follow(ed) him.  

Dialogue with God

It would certainly not be doing justice to Hammarskjöld or to the depths of meaning in his writings to ignore his wide learning and extensive study of the works of philosophers and mystics. Therefore, I propose to deal with the subject of Hermeneutics in this connection. Further, we will look at the writers and thinkers who had a significant influence on Hammarskjöld’s texts.

Hermeneutics is a theory of reading and interpreting. Whoever reads a text is forming an image while reading. *Markings* must be counted as one of the spiritual hermeneutic writings. On this subject, the theologian, Kees Waaijman, has written the following: ‘Hammarskjöld’s *Markings* should be included with the texts in which spiritual people work out in writing their commitment to the Absolute. This type of text is characterised by exposing one’s inner self completely and with all honesty and sincerity. Nothing is held back. A commitment to the Absolute occurs while writing; in fact, the aim of writing itself is to communicate with the Absolute. This way of writing is a form of reflection - a consecration in writing – in which one places oneself in a relationship with the Absolute.’  

Spiritual hermeneutics tries to get beyond the meaning and make visible the dynamics which as such permeate the text. The text is permeated by double dynamics: the active turning of God to man and of man to God. The speaking is ‘set in motion’ by God’s love. *Markings* is Hammarskjöld’s spiritual diary in which he gave his day to day account of his search for God. In spiritual autobiographies the important thing is God’s working in someone’s life. This ‘working’ is interwoven with the events of life, an interwoven-ness which can be so close that the events become the alphabet of God’s speech. In that case God’s story can no longer be distinguished from one’s own life story. Often, though this experience of faith is all-determining and all-pervasive, there are no words for. Dag Hammarskjöld noted in his *Markings*: I don’t know Who – or what – put the question. I don’t know when it was put. I don’t even remember answering. But at some moment I did answer ‘Yes’ to Someone – or Something. From that hour I was certain that existence is meaningful, and that therefore, my life in surrender, had a goal. Martin Buber and Dag Hammarskjöld both show us how intimately spiritual transformation is interwoven with one’s autobiography. Exposing the dynamics which permeates the text as such, is a goal which we will pursue in analysing the text.

Extremely important are the empty spaces in a text. A text contains a number of empty spaces and in this way creates openness of meaning. For the philosopher Paul Ricoeur these spaces are spaces of spirituality. He mentions in particular three empty spaces: When the author's authority withdraws from the text, the text escapes from the finite horizon in which the author lived. When the immediate context, the concrete world in which the communication occurs, has withdrawn from the text then an empty space comes into existence. The living use of language is always directed to people and the text escapes the restriction of the vis-à-vis. Where the people who are being addressed withdraw from the text, when the text is set out in signs next to and after each other. There is space in the signs, between the signs and in the margins and that when all figures in the text and the texture as a whole have the status of a sign. When interpreting Hammarskjöld’s texts we will include these open spaces in our analysis, all the more because Hammarskjöld employed a very compact and sober style in his spiritual diary. In fact, his style developed further in this direction and took the form of haikus in 1959.

Two basic words

As we have seen in chapter 4, Hammarskjöld had a great affinity with the work of Martin Buber, in particular with Buber’s book *I and Thou*. In this work, Martin Buber sketches the ‘basic’ or ‘ground
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words' I-It and I-Thou (sometimes translated as I-Thou) as the two relationships in which man can connect with the world. 'The world is twofold for man in accordance with his twofold attitude. The basic words are not single words but word pairs. One basic word is the word pair I-Thou. The other basic word is the word pair I-It; but this basic word is not changed when He or She takes the place of It. Thus the I of man is also twofold. For, the I of the basic word I-Thou is different from that in the basic word I-It.'

Hammarskjöld explains it further as follows: 'A key work in Martin Buber's philosophical production is the small treatise I and Thou from the 1920s. Buber makes a distinction between two sorts of relationship to reality, I-It and I-Thou. The first relationship is that between subject and object, the other relationship is between two subjects in communication with each other. The I-Thou relationship is for him the deciding contact with reality. It denotes the relationship to the divine and to humanity but also to material reality. The dialogue, therefore, becomes the most important of all spiritual forms of life and, in the life of man and of culture, it becomes defined by the ability to carry on such a dialogue in relation to reality. Without testing the logical feasibility of this formula in all the different adaptations which Buber wants to give it, man can accept this as an expression of a very fruitful view of life and can understand the influence which it exercises. This has the character of a mystical pantheism which, nevertheless, keeps the dualistic succinctness and drama of the god relationship. At the same time, in relation to people, it is a translation of the Kantian premise about man in such a way that it gives new warmth and richness to the premise.'

In Markings we find examples of both basic words. Hammarskjöld writes his dialogue with God in the basic word I-Thou. We will see that particularly by saying the basic word I-Thou Hammarskjöld is moulded in maturity and international service.

Saint Augustine

Hammarskjöld was familiar with the writings of Augustine (354-430) and was inspired by them. The presence of a French edition from 1949 of Augustine's City of God in Hammarskjöld's book collection in the Royal Library in Stockholm indicates that Hammarskjöld had renewed his interest in Augustine at this time. We can regard the Confessions of Augustine as a similar collection of notes to Hammarskjöld's Markings. Hammarskjöld calls his white book My dialogue with myself and God. Augustine's Confessions are written as his dialogue with God. Both men write about their path of life, which they question, explore, choose, although they write very differently. Just as in Markings, we find descriptions in Augustine's work, which paint an inner landscape. 'Great is the power of memory, a fearful thing, O my God, a deep and boundless manifoldness; and this thing is the mind, and this am I myself. What am I then, O my God? What nature am I? A life various and manifold, and exceeding immense.' In this fragment he poses the question about himself: 'What sort of person am I?' This question arises when he paints the inner landscape of his multiplicity, that is to say, the inner landscape of his memory. He can move about in it and is fascinated by the immeasurability and limitlessness of his memory, but, at the same time, it baffles him. He questions on and wants to penetrate to its very essence. This confronts him with enigmas. Although he can wander around in the limitlessness of his own memory, he knows that the mind cannot comprehend itself. There is more present. His longing goes out to that. He longs for a presence which he addresses as Thou and my Lord. This presence he knows to be higher than himself. He calls his God 'abiding' - 'sweet light'.

His longing for what is abiding, for the light, is a driving force in him. This yearning gets more powerful the more he experiences his own boundlessness as an inner discord, an unending turmoil, lacking in clarity. 'Thou knewest what I suffered, and no man. For, what was that which was thence through my tongue distilled into the ears of my most familiar friends? Did the whole tumult of my soul, for which neither time nor utterance sufficed, reach them? Yet went up the whole to Thy hearing, all which I roared out from the groanings of my heart; and my desire was before Thee, and the light of

17 M. Buber, I and Thou, translated by W. Kaufmann, Edinburgh 1970, p. 53
18 D. Hammarskjöld, Dag Hammarskjöld about Martin Buber. Dag Hammarskjöld's text of nomination of van Martin Buber for the Nobel Prize for Literature for the year 1959, Judisk Tidskrift, 39, 1966: 2, translated AMS.
19 In Hammarskjöld's book collection at Backåkra there is an edition from 1910 of selections from Augustine's Confessions.
mine eyes was not with me: for that was within, I without: nor was that confined to place, but I was inten on things contained in place, but there found I no resting-place, nor did they so receive me, that I could say, 'It is enough,' 'it is well': nor did they yet suffer me to turn back, where it might be well enough with me.' Augustine experiences a vast contrast between his inner life and the world outside him and realises that he has to turn his attention inwards, if he is to get a further insight into himself. That which holds his attention outside himself cannot give him the fulfilment which he is looking for. He has to let this go.

An Inner Path: a closer look at the texts in Markings

When you pick up Markings and browse through it, you will see that the whole book is a series of beautiful and inspiring texts. For the purpose of this book, however, I have selected texts which signpost very poignantly the course of his spiritual journey. These texts show that his journey is a learning process. He says to himself: 'Let me read with open eyes the book my days are writing – and learn.'

By highlighting these texts and their associated texts or co-texts, you will get an insight into this learning process. Each of the dialogues I have selected shows a movement from an inner conflict to the development of a new insight. The curve or movement within the texts brings him to a deeper sense of balance. You will see that themes often repeat themselves; dilemmas arise in similar ways again and again, and by sorting all this out Hammarskjöld makes progress in his search and grows towards maturity. The selected texts describe a life situation in which the relevance of Hammarskjöld’s search for maturity of mind becomes particularly significant for him. In 1953 he has found a measure of maturity, which, in subsequent years, he has to activate and to develop as a basis for his international service as Secretary-General of the United Nations. I have already said that Hammarskjöld saw his spiritual path as a journey through an inner landscape. The first and last texts which bookend his Markings distinguish themselves particularly in this way. The final text reflects and echoes the first one. Both poems encompass 36 years of written texts and form an inclusion. The poem which opens Markings was written in 1925, when he was only 20 years old. The final poem was written in August 1961 when he was 56 years old, three weeks before his death.

Hammarskjöld’s opening poem in 1925 gives us images of an unknown land, the ground, the air, the wind. This is the landscape for the path he is setting out on. He is uncertain where it will lead him and questions if he will ever arrive at the point he would like to reach. He also realises that this questioning will never stop. Reading his last poem, we find that his early questioning whether he would indeed get there has been answered. This final poem breathes the traveller’s deep wonder at having arrived. There is a similar atmosphere, the same sensations here as in the first poem. We get an image of movement, a passing through time, which responds to a personal inner order; one which only really reveals its direction and its goal when the movement has ended. The point of departure for this movement in time is suggested spatially in both poems.

When we read the first poem closely, we see his commitment to the Other, echoing the I-Thou relationship. His activity is a passive one. He is driven on, is aware of himself, and at the same time, focused on the world that he is entering. His senses are heightened, especially his hearing. This world has now revealed itself to him - he has been touched by it. To interpret the inner experience of this touch Hammarskjöld uses the image of the strings of a musical instrument - an instrument that has the capacity to resonate when it is touched. The images which Hammarskjöld uses in this poem interpret a mystical experience. In his orientation towards the Unnameable, he has experienced a touching to the very depths of his soul, so that in the whole direction of his life from then on, he would long for and continue to look for the touch of the Other which had produced this clear pure tone in him, in silence. From this point he could not remain the same.

21 St. Augustine, The Confessions of St. Augustine, Book VII.
22 Markings, p. 131.
23 Markings, p.5.
In 1950 Hammarskjöld writes the poem ‘The longest journey / is the journey inwards.’ Whatever life has brought him he views and accepts. For him this means that he has to embrace the feeling of isolation and loneliness as part of him. This also means for him that he has to complete this quest for the source of his being - no matter how uncertain that is. It will further separate him from others. They will not be able to follow him. It is as if he lives outside their world - no longer takes part in it. This distance is a fact that he has to live with. He can no longer bridge the gap between them and, in fact, he longs less and less for this. He sees it as a farewell. The farewell becomes a dominant factor in the poem. It has meaning: he becomes dedicated to the loneliness which is the final lot of all - in other words, to himself? The way he expresses his dedication suggests to us a sacrifice and an unquenchable yearning for love - for the love of God. He has managed to penetrate into his deepest self, his own essence.

Although Hammarskjöld writes his poem in the third person, we assume that he is writing about his own deepest experience. In his poem we see reflected words from the Gospel of Saint John ‘Among you stands one whom you do not know’. On Jesus’ return from the desert, he made known to John the Baptist with these words that he, Jesus, wanted to be baptised by him. The line in Hammarskjöld’s poem gives the direction of his dedication in this way. A journey inwards, would be the same as a stay in the desert. The meaning of such a desert experience would not lie in the rejection of the world but in the creation of the possibility to return in a new way - a purification in order to become what he was destined to be. The question of who he is, lies at the basis of his journey inwards. Who is he in his innermost self?

This brings us to another line of questioning: the problem of his own inner identity. This problem also forms the theme of the stories of Herman Hesse. Hammarskjöld had been an avid reader of Hesse’s works since 1922. These works included Weg nach Innen (1932) and Die Morgenlandfahrt (1945). In Markings he included several of Hesse’s quotations. It shouldn’t come as a surprise to us that Hammarskjöld had a Swedish translation of Die Morgenlandfahrt which had been published in 1950. He was to write his own poem The Longest Journey also in 1950. Herman Hesse’s story and the theme of Hammarskjöld’s poem show similarities. The protagonist of Hesse’s story, looks back on his early adult years, the ideals which he had then and the life journey he had undertaken with others. He observes that the others he set out with, have given up and that very little has remained of the initial ideals of that journey. Then, however, he meets one of his earlier fellow-travellers again, the one who had been the least conspicuous of all his friends but who had distinguished himself particularly by his willingness to serve. This person, Leo, confronts him with the fact that the journey as such is still going on and that he, Leo, is still just as dedicated as ever. The protagonist realizes that it is he who has changed so much in his attitude to life and that he has not been a ‘fellow-traveller’ for a long time. That is the stage he is at now. He has failed to adopt the attitude to life by which he would be willing to serve. The narrator ends the story with this insight: ‘He turned out to be big, I small’. Two themes from this narrative are relevant for us. Firstly, the journey inwards is undertaken to remind himself of who he was and who he still is deep down and secondly, this memory puts him on the track of a life of service.

We see this inner stirring in two series of texts with which Hammarskjöld concludes 1949. These texts contain the overture to a new period in his life. Here we see again how Hammarskjöld’s portrays his own state of mind by sketching a landscape - a nature experience. He remembers his feeling of sadness and grief and he becomes silent. The bitterness has left him. In the peace which he experiences, he feels an affinity with the surrounding landscape. But he cannot exclude the social world which is so different from this world of nature. He will have to involve his social world in his feeling of peace. The text which follows this, shows that he feels vulnerable in his functioning in the social world. Criticism of his work hurts him more than he would like to admit and he recognises a certain ambivalence in this. What will show him the way? Now we see that by referring to a Bible text from the evangelist Matthew he sees as a norm for himself the attitude of a Servant of the Lord.

Gospel of St John, 1, 26
'In the district of Caesarea Philippi, Jesus spoke to Peter: 'If any man would come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me. For whoever would save his life will lose it, and whoever loses his life for my sake will save it.'

This fundamental attitude which the evangelists had heard many times in the words of Jesus, and which they had seen gaining more and more significance in His life, made a very decisive impression on Hammarskjöld in the closing period of 1949 under the influence of Albert Schweitzer's extensive Jesus study. The relativity of life in the sight of death could take on new meaning for him in this fundamental attitude. From this time onwards he will place his writing under the title 'Night is drawing Nigh'. It is a line from a hymn by Franz Michael Franzén (1772 - 1847) which his mother used to read for them on New Year's Eve. (Sven Stolpe).

If you read through the last two series of texts from 1949, you will see in them the expression of a tense emotional life, keen self observations, inner contradictions, dissatisfaction with himself, great ambitions. He poses questions about himself to himself and realises that he will have to work with all the different sides to himself and acknowledge them. These notes will be an aid to him in this process of becoming aware. They represent his inner journey.

---

25 Gospel of St Matthew, 16, 13-18
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CHAPTER 6

When love has matured

Markings 1955
Analysed and interpreted

When you have reached the point where you no longer expect a response, you will at last be able to give in such a way that the other is able to receive, and be grateful. When Love has matured and, through a dissolution of the self into light, become a radiance, then shall the Lover be liberated from dependence upon the Beloved, and the Beloved also be made perfect by being liberated from the Lover.

Introduction

This text was written in 1951 as one of a series of texts on maturity of love. To get full value of the power of these texts when following my analysis, please open Markings. The texts run from page 74 to 78.

Who couldn't apply this beautiful text on maturity of love to his or her own life? Such wisdom and consolation! From what depths of emotion did it emerge? For me, this is one of the core texts in Marking, not only because the maturity of love expressed here is a central theme and one which runs as a golden thread through Hammarskjöld's dialogue, but because the faith-experience described, forms the basis of his further international service. In this chapter, I will therefore pause by these words and examine them in the light of other references Hammarskjöld made to the same theme.

Even as a student, he had got insights into the meaning of unselfish friendship and was already aware of the relationship between friendship and loneliness. He had also learned how one could experience God's presence in friendship and love.

Hammarskjöld's notes in the period 1950-1953 show a man who is very critical of himself and, although he is socially successful, he has doubts about the value of this success. He is unhappy about how he relates to others and finds that he fails when it comes to the emotional commitment of friendship and love. For this reason it is quite remarkable that we come across the text about maturity of love which opens the chapter. He describes here an experience which expresses the maturity he is trying to achieve but for which he still has a long way to go. Therefore, we can read this text as a looking forward to reaching the maturity which he is seeking.

As we have seen, Hammarskjöld expressed in his dialogue in 1951 the confusion he felt about his loneliness and his puzzlement that friendship could be related to loneliness. This relationship comes up again now, in the opening text here. In their letters to each other in the late twenties, Dag Hammarskjöld and Jan Waldenström had already philosophised about this theme and saw that there was a relationship between love and faith. Both Hammarskjöld and Waldenström recognised that within their friendship they were experiencing something deeply religious. Waldenström refers to this in a letter to Hammarskjöld on 12 July 1927: 'Now we not only experience ... a responsibility to ourselves, for our attitude to life, but also a responsibility for the attitude of a friend. For this reason I believe that my friendship for you brings me closer to a religious concept of life than anything else in this life. Do you not think that what in the past was called the Divine, reveals itself to us in the struggle of another for the highest value in life... Taking into account just how important this aspect of my conviction about life is for me, and wanting to be sympathetic to your attitude, I was unspeakably happy to realise dur-

1 Markings, p. 76
ing a walk with you, which you no doubt remember, just how much we resemble each other in our attitude to these things. I have always believed that I, because of my down-to-earth attitude, had been robbed of faith, which you, in spite of clear criticism, have always been able to uphold. But then I saw to my joy that you understood me and that the difference between our attitudes was more in the form than in the content. It was undoubtedly one of my happiest evenings. ...”

In his reply, Hammarskjöld confirmed that what his friend had written, was ‘true in an unheard-of way’. The expression ‘unheard-of’ is a translation of the Swedish ‘oerhört’ and one which had a special significance for Hammarskjöld. We see him using it, not only in his correspondence, but also in Markings. Hammarskjöld went on to explain to Waldenström what he saw as the common elements in their faith. This brought him to the conclusion that, in spite of all the difficulties in understanding what exactly the terms meant, they had both experienced and were still experiencing ‘God’ and immortality. When studying this correspondence, Karl Birnbaum established that Hammarskjöld had made a lot of effort to translate his concepts of faith into rational. In another letter to Jan Waldenström in 1928, Hammarskjöld made a link between altruistic love and faith, by referring to the sacrifice of Jesus: “And we, who want to be considered right by others when we ourselves think we are right, we who see the criterion for our inner value in the other’s opinion of us, it is we who should understand just how much love of life He has who dies the death of a criminal out of loyalty to the Living. From the time that this actually took fashion. It doesn’t require much effort to travel a road that has already been laid out for you.”

Hammarskjöld was familiar with the works of the medieval mystics. In his radio talk This I Believe (1953) he says: “Faith is a state of the mind and the soul. In this sense we can understand the words of the Spanish mystic, St. John of the Cross: ‘Faith is the union of God with the soul.’ The language of religion is a set of formulas which register a basic spiritual experience. It must not be regarded as describing, in terms to be defined by philosophy, the reality which is accessible to our senses and which we can analyse with the tools of logic.” The basic spiritual experience which Hammarskjöld is referring to here means no more than the rediscovery of his old faith on the basis of ‘experience and honest thinking’. He says about this: ‘I was late in understanding what this meant. When I finally reached that point, the beliefs in which I was once brought up and which, in fact, had given my life direction even while my intellect still challenged their validity, were recognized by me as mine in their own right and by my free choice. I feel that I can endorse those convictions without any compromise with the demands of that intellectual honesty which is the very key to maturity of mind.’

At the frontier of the unheard-of

The text about maturity of love with which I opened the chapter, is one of a sequence of eight texts. They are part of an inner dialogue which begins with a text in which Hammarskjöld reflects on three dreams that have made an indelible impression on him. These dreams show us Hammarskjöld’s progression through a mystical experience and we see the deep insight they gave him into maturity of love. Looking back on the three dreams, Hammarskjöld realises with deep wonderment in which way and to what extent he himself was involved in them. He opens the introductory text with the question: ‘Where does the frontier lie? Where do we travel to?’ The dreams took him on a journey which turned out to have a profound significance and a fundamental reality; so real in fact that they lived on in his memory as ‘the memory of a memory’. He was travelling through an inner landscape, from one position to another, in images in his mind, an inner dialogue. In his first dream the dreamer sees big, exhausted birds in a high, imposing landscape in the glow of the setting sun just before night falls. They turn their heads to look. Looking is a silent reaching out – a waiting. The dreamer experiences an

---
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warm affinity with the way this big, far-off world enters into night and he feels part of the words ‘spoken or unspoken’ as they die away. ‘Now it is too dark for us to find the way back.’ underlines that this is a very dark moment, from which he has to find a way to go on.

In the dream about night the dreamer is performing the action. The situation in which he finds himself is one of darkness. Life is reverberating around him. However, he has the sensation that everything is cloaked in darkness and hidden from him. Then he hears the call of a solitary bird. Responding to this call he goes ‘up there’. The ‘reaching out’ - the movement - in this dream, is the going ‘up there’ and is, as it were, initiated by the other side - something beyond. He is pulled by something outside himself, by an Other - a something other. From the position in which he was standing, there is now a movement of turning around – of ascending.

In the third dream Hammarskjöld experiences an emerging into light - meeting and being met - a palpable touching. ‘Emerging from the ravine where a brook runs under a canopy of leaves, I walk out onto a wide open slope. Drops, sprinkled by swaying branches, glitter on my hands, cool my forehead, and evaporate in the gentle morning breeze.’

When commenting on the dreams, Hammarskjöld describes his feelings and the deep awareness which this experience has given him of his reason for living and his commitment to life. His feelings of alienation have disappeared and it is as if he has plumbed the very depths of his being.

Now. When I have overcome my fears - of others, of myself, of the underlying darkness:
At the frontier of the unheard-of.
Here ends the known. But from a source beyond it, something fills my being with its possibilities.
Here desire is purified and made lucid: each action is a preparation for, each choice an assent to the unknown.
Prevented by the duties of life on the surface from looking down into the depths, yet all the while being slowly trained and molded by them to take the plunge into the deep whence rises the fragrance of a forest star, bearing the promise of a new affection.
At the frontier-

In this series of texts written in 1951, Hammarskjöld discovers the laws of inner life and of action in his own life and recognise their significance. That is clear from the lines with which he follows his commentary on the dreams. He mentions there the everyday discharge of his duty by which he has acquired great skill and expertise. He sees these tasks in another light now, with a wider and deeper meaning and formulates his mission and new life task as ‘bearing the promise of a new affection’. Here again, however, we see that the English translation does not do justice to the semantics of the Swedish word. Auden translated the word ‘samhörighet’ with the English word ‘affection’ and in doing this he missed the depth and the promise which is contained in the Swedish word. My choice of translation is ‘bearing the promise of a new solidarity’. When translated this way, the promise is linked to the work Hammarskjöld was subsequently to do for the United Nations as well as to the deep insight he had into his mission in life. We could interpret these lines as follows: At the frontier of the unheard-of he experiences how deep life is and how deep the promise of a new solidarity is. Living superficially, fully occupied by the daily routine, he does not see this, but he knows that he is sufficiently trained and well-prepared to take a plunge into the deep. When the promise of a new solidarity reaches him like the fragrance of a forest star, he will venture to take the plunge.

We see Hammarskjöld using the term the ‘unheard-of again here and perhaps it is a good moment to say more about it. When he uses this word he is referring to a basic spiritual experience. Nowhere does he describe this experience in so much detail as in this text from 1951. As I have already explained, the English ‘unheard-of’ is a translation of the Swedish expression ‘det oerhorda’. However, according to the Swedish diplomat, Kai Falkman, a better translation of the expression would be ‘the be-
yond”7. In my opinion, the double-layered meaning, ‘unheard-of’ and ‘unprecedented, express that from the beginning, Hammarskjöld very consciously placed his faith-experience in the context of his life in society. Actually, Hammarskjöld received what he did not have before, in such a manner that he knows: it has been given to him. In the language of the Bible: ‘Those who wait for God will receive strength in exchange.’ This experience of intense presence goes together with experiencing the meaning of life and the meaning of his life in this world.

Martin Buber expresses this in his I and Thou, when he answers the question: What is it that is eternal: the primal phenomenon, present in the here and now, of what we call revelation? ‘Man receives, and what he receives is not a content but a presence, a presence as strength. This presence and strength includes three elements that are not separate but may nevertheless be considered as three. First, the whole abundance of actual reciprocity, of being admitted, of being associated while one is altogether unable to indicate what exactly that is with which one is associated, nor does association make life any easier for us – it makes life heavier, but heavy with meaning. And this is second: the inexpressible confirmation of meaning. It is guaranteed. Nothing, nothing can henceforth be meaningless. Any question about the meaning of life has vanished. But if it were still there, it would not require an answer. You do not know how to point to or define the meaning, you lack any formula or image of it, and yet it is more certain for you than the sensation of your senses. What could it intend from us, what does it desire from us, being revealed and surreptitious? It does not wish to be interpreted by us – for that we lack the ability – only to be done by us. This comes third: it is not the meaning of ‘another life’ but that of this our life, not that of a ‘beyond’ but of this our world, and it wants to be demonstrated by us in this life and this world. The guarantee does not wish to remain shut up within me, it wants to be born into the world by me.’8

Most people who have commented on Markings see in the texts of 1953 the first time that Hammerskjöld says ‘yes’ as this was the time that he accepted his appointment as Secretary-General of the United Nations. On the basis of my analysis of his inner dialogue, it is my opinion that in 1951 he had already made a commitment which was binding for life. He assumed then the inner identity of one who had a mission or vocation. At that moment he was accepting a life task. On Whitsunday 1961, he looked back on this time with the words: ‘I don’t know Who – or what – put the question. I don’t know when it was put. I don’t even remember answering. But at some moment I did answer ‘Yes’ to Someone or Something- and from that hour I was certain that existence is meaningful and that, therefore, my life, in self-surrender had a goal.’9

We can hear the same sort of commitment in Hammerskjöld’s radio talk from 1953 when he speaks about ‘the laws of inner life and of action’. From his own experience and by thinking it out independently, he knew ‘the laws of inner life and of action’, but he only really understood the full meaning of this by reading the writings of the medieval mystics. He talks about this also in his radio talk: “...the explanation of how man should live a life of active social service in full harmony with himself as a member of the community of the spirit, I found in the writings of those medieval mystics for whom ‘self-surrender’ had been the way for self-realization, and who in ‘singleness of mind’ and ‘inwardness’ had found strength to say ‘yes’ to every demand which the needs of their neighbours made them face, and to say yes also to every fate life had in store for them when they followed the call of duty, as they understood it. Love- that much misused and misinterpreted word - for them meant simply an overflowing of the strength with which they felt themselves filled when living in true self-oblivion. And this love found natural expressions in an unhesitant fulfilment of duty and in an unreserved ac-

7 The Swedish diplomat, Kai Falkman, commented on Auden’s translation of the expression ‘det oerhorda’ as follows: “The English ‘unheard-of’ does not cover the spirit of the original Swedish text. The term ‘beyond’ would be better and closer to the spirit of the meaning.”Kai Falkman, Signposts in the wrong direction, W.H.Auden’s misinterpretations of Dag Hammerskjöld’s Markings, The Times Literary Supplement, September 10 1999

8 Martin Buber, I and Thou (Ich und Du), p. 158, 159.
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ceptance of life, whatever it brought them personally of toil, suffering - or happiness, know that their discoveries of the laws of inner life and of action have not lost their significance."

According to those who write about it, one aspect of a mystical experience is that a person has the overwhelming impression that they are filled with God’s love and that this love is working in them. That the initiative for this inspiration comes from the Other, is obvious from Hammarskjöld’s own words: ‘from a source beyond it something fills my being with its possibilities’ and especially from the text on maturity of love which follows it.

*When you have reached the point where you no longer expect a response, you will at last be able to give in such a way that the other is able to receive, and be grateful. When love has matured and, through a dissolution of the self into light, become a radiance, then shall the Lover be liberated from dependence upon the Beloved, and the Beloved also may be made perfect by being liberated from the Lover.*

Hammarskjöld writes about the maturity of love as an inner transformation in love. The mediaeval mystic, St. John of the Cross, calls transformation in love ‘the highest state attainable in this life’. The peculiar nature of transformation in love is that love prompts God and man to rest completely in each other: ‘Love produces such likeness in this transformation of lovers that one can say each is the other and both are one.’ In the transformation in love three distinct perspectives stand out: a) the soul’s outgoing movement toward God who draws it into himself; b) the movement of God towards the soul to take up residence in it; c) the intimacy of the Spirit who holds sway between the two, a reality which is called ‘spiritual marriage’. Because the transformation in love can in no way be effected by the soul itself, ‘the only thing that can prepare for this transformation is to pacify and silence the senses, the intellect, the will, and the memory, so that the Beloved can give himself without form.’

According to John of the Cross, God communicates himself to the soul ‘without intermediaries, without angels, without people, without forms, without figures’.

However, it is particularly in his text about maturity of love that he describes how the love of God works in him and fulfills him. To this end he uses the image of ‘the light’ in a way in which John of the Cross writes about ‘transformation in God’: ‘Transformation in God is something that resembles the union of the light of a star or a candle with the light of the sun, for what then sheds light is not the star or the candle, but the sun, which has absorbed the other lights into its own.’ What strikes us here is that Hammarskjöld’s love of God reveals itself when he himself is capable of selflessly desiring the fulfillment of this love and does not consider his own interests as more important. In this way, he expresses here the insight that desiring ‘the Beloved may be made perfect’ is an extension of the religious experience and coincides with it. We have already met this unprecedented insight in correspondence in Hammarskjöld’s youth, and we see it again here in 1951. His inner dialogue also treats with it In 1955. We will go into this in detail in Chapter 8. The task which Hammarskjöld is accepting in these texts is one of love and service. This we also find in a passage from 1951 where he is reflecting on the task which Jesus of Nazareth understood to be His and which he subsequently passed on to his disciples: ‘A new commandment I give unto you: that ye love one another’.

To sum up, we can say that the text about maturity of love is a core text in Markings. It is part of Hammarskjöld’s inner dialogue, in which he describes a deep religious experience, interpreted and
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anchored in his personality. We see in these texts the inner dialogue which he refers to in 1955, in his speech *International Service* when he says: ‘There is no formula to teach us how to arrive at maturity and there is no grammar for the language of inner life. The rest is silence – but the results of the inner dialogue are evident to all, evident as independence, courage and fairness in dealing with others, evident in true international service.’ Hammarskjöld discovered the laws of inner life and of action in his own religious experience – by which his ‘Yes’ to the unknown, would be the basis of his faith and service. The opportunity to put his faith into practice came on 4 April 1953 when Hammarskjöld received the news of his nomination as Secretary-General of the United Nations. His nomination means that from then on he will place his personal life at the disposal of the mission of a world organization. In order to be as fit as possible, spiritually and mentally, for the task which is before him, he will have to keep striving for maturity. All important to him is to fulfil his vocation through the inspiration of a living faith. The first form of maturity, ‘not to hide one’s strength’, means for him to be himself and, at the same time, to be at the service of others. His inner strength comes from a deep source and having been slowly trained and moulded by the duties he has performed in life, he is available to take the plunge into the deep. The second form of maturity which he describes, is the openness you achieve when you have become ‘entirely indifferent to yourself’. This openness comes from the acceptance of his fate, by which he can be himself, and, at the same time, can be indifferent to himself. In the I-Thou relationship to God, in whose hands he has placed himself, he opens himself to God’s love. From a new unselfconsciousness he is free to meet people with openness, communicating from subject to subject. The third form of maturity is being ‘surrendered’. In this period Hammarskjöld finds again the facility of self-abandonment which he had known in his childhood. In 1953, he finds a maturity by which he can be completely himself in his contact with others and can experience a sense of solidarity with them.

We will close this chapter with a text from *Markings* from 1954, in which Hammarskjöld describes in images the maturity which is the basis of his attitude to International service.

> With all the powers of your body concentrated in the hand on the tiller,  
> All the powers of your mind concentrated on the goal behind the horizon,  
> You laugh as the salt spray catches your face in the second of rest  
> Before a new wave –  
> Sharing the happy freedom of the moment with those who share your  
> responsibility.  
> So – in the self-forgetfulness of concentrated attention – the door opens  
> for you into a pure living intimacy,  
> A shared, timeless happiness,  
> Conveyed by a smile,  
> A wave of the hand.

> Thanks to those who have taught me this. Thanks to the Days which  
> have taught me this.

> Then I saw that the wall had never been there, that the ‘unheard-of’  
> is here and this, not something and somewhere else,  
> that the ‘offering’ is here and now, always and everywhere –  
> ‘surrendered’ to be what, in me, God gives of  
> Himself to Himself.”

---

19 *Markings*, p. 76.  
20 *Markings*, p. 96.
CHAPTER 7

Respect for the word,

Markings 1955
analysed and interpreted

Respect for the word is the first commandment in the discipline by which a man can be educated to maturity – intellectual, emotional, and moral.

Respect for the word – to employ it with scrupulous care and an incorruptible heartfelt love of truth – is essential if there is to be any growth in a society or in the human race.

To misuse the word is to show contempt for man. It undermines the bridges and poisons the wells. It causes Man to regress down the long path of his evolution.

"But I say unto you, that every idle word that men speak... " (Mt 12.36)³

When discussing his speech, International Service, we wondered at what sustained Hammarskjöld in the difficult course he had chosen to follow in his public life. The answer to this question was that Hammarskjöld felt he was performing a task which had been given to him by God. This steadfast belief had come to him - and was constantly renewed - in his dialogues with himself and with God. Time then to follow his dialogues of 1955 with a view to discovering the dynamics of his conviction.

From the limited number of texts I have permission to quote, I have chosen the one above as a key text to letting you share Hammarskjöld's inner struggle on the path to achieving maturity of mind, the basis of his international service. In this chapter I will explain the content of a series of texts from Markings of that year, in which he admonishes us to have respect for the word, analysing closely the above text which is the last in the series and the conclusion Hammarskjöld has arrived at after all his reflections. I will treat with the many reasons why this text about maturity and the date on which it was written are particularly significant and go into detail about the basic attitude formulated in this text which has both an depth perspective (the sources) and a width perspective (the bridges).

Respect for the word

Hammarskjöld message to us in this text is that if we respect our humanity and human dignity we have a duty to educate ourselves rationally, emotionally and morally for maturity. This holds good for the individual as well as for society and humankind in general. And it is only from an attitude of respect for the word that it is possible to reach full maturity. Respect for the word is therefore the first commandment in the discipline by which we can grow to maturity and in respecting the word we express our respect for man in his evolution. After all, it is by means of language that our position in life is communicated to us and by means of language that we communicate our position to others; by means of language we are given and we take responsibility, and in this way, express our commitment. It is by means of the word that we find the spiritual sources of our evolution - our inner identity - and by this means we connect to our fellow men. The words: 'it undermines bridges and poisons wells' are used by Hammarskjöld as metaphors which can be interpreted on different levels: those of society, evolution and spirituality. It is because of this that we have the duty to use the word with scrupulous care and an incorruptible, heartfelt love of truth.

³ Markings, p. 112.
On the other hand, abuse of the word and the contempt for humanity which this manifests means an enormous regression on our long path to evolution as human beings. Insurmountable conflicts and loss of fundamental values are the consequences - bridges are undermined and wells poisoned. Whosoever offends against the commandment of respect for the word will have to answer for it. Or, as Jesus said, according to the Gospel of Saint Matthew: 'I tell you, on the day of judgement men will render account for every careless word they utter; for by your words you will be justified, and by your words you will be condemned."

'Respect for the Word' formulates a moral criterion that Hammarskjöld arrived at after an inner dialogue which had started twelve texts earlier. In the way Hammarskjöld formulates this moral criterion it has the character of a universal moral principle, obviously influenced by Kant's philosophy. In his *Duty and Moral Worth*, the philosopher, Philip Stratton-Lake defends the following concept: Immanuel Kant's view of duty, allows the interpretation that duty demands respect for the moral law as a fundamental attitude and that with this the 'virtuous agent' may be responsive to concrete particular considerations. When Hammarskjöld talks about maturity of man in the above text, he introduces an ideal which requires of us to act responsibly in particular contexts.

An even deeper source of his moral criterion, respect for the word, is the First of the Ten Commandments: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and thy neighbour as thyself.' He sees respect for the word as respect for the word of God and respect for people as the image and likeness of God. Therefore, I see the text from Markings quoted above about having respect for the word, as also referring to this First Commandment of the Bible. This I conclude from other allusions which he made to this same Commandment on three occasions. Firstly, when he was once asked why the name of God was not written into the Charter of the United Nations, he explained that the phrase: 'to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours' represented for him God's name in the Charter. Secondly, he winds up his argumentation for his moral principle with a line from the Gospel of St Matthew in which Jesus warns against breaking the First Commandment. Thirdly, we can see Hammarskjöld's text as the conclusion of an inner dialogue which, as I have said, began twelve texts earlier with the line 'And God spake ....'

In my opinion, all the thirteen texts were written as one inner dialogue under the date: 1 August 1955. What is the significance of the fact that he wrote these particular texts on this particular date? To answer this, we must consider what had taken place between 10 December 1954, when he wrote 'And God spake...' for the first time, receiving and accepting a task from God, and these texts of 1 August 1955 - also beginning with 'God spake'. Hammarskjöld's actions in the intervening eight months were the fruits of his own education to maturity - a coming together of everything he had reflected on in his dialogue with himself and with God. It is no coincidence either, that in this period, he made his two very significant speeches, *The World and the Nation* and *International Service.*

So what exactly had happened? On 1 August 1955, the curtain fell on a series of events which had brought the world to the brink of war. We have referred to these events in another context earlier in this book. However, I will now go into more detail about this episode because the way in which Hammarskjöld averted the crisis and the strong reactions, both positive and negative, which his actions evoked, gives us a better understanding of the subject matter of the texts he wrote on 10 December 1954 and again on 1 August 1955. Further, it puts into context the two key speeches mentioned above which he made during this crisis.

Relations between China and the United States had been very tense for some time. Since 1949, the United States had continuously vetoed any attempt of the People's Republic of China to become a member of the United Nations. In fact, this situation was to continue until 1971, when China was finally admitted as a member. The friendly relations which the United States maintained with the Island

---


of Formosa (Taiwan) were a thorn in the side of Mainland China. Formosa, formerly part of China, had broken away and declared its independence. With the outbreak of the Korean War in 1950, US President, Harry Truman ordered the 7th Fleet into the Strait of Formosa to prevent a possible Chinese attack on the island. The USA considered Formosa as a buffer against Communist expansion in the region and was supplying it with money and military supplies.

James Lash says the following about this crisis: ‘The antagonisms between the two countries were especially acute near the end of 1954 as a result of the Chinese Communist bombardments of the island of Quemoy, the recent ant-communist Manila Pact Conference, and the negotiations which were taking place between the United States and Nationalist China concerning the signing of a Mutual Security Pact. They were heightened too by Secretary of State Dulles’ strategy of ‘brinkmanship,’ which constantly seemed to put the Far East on the verge of a serious war. 4 As a result of these hostile relations the honour and political resolve of the two countries became stakes in the struggle over a group of fliers in what became a major incident in the Cold War.

In 1954, China arrested fifteen American flyers, who were under the command of the United Nations in Korea, when they flew into Chinese airspace. Eleven of the pilots were convicted and given prison sentences under Chinese national law. Against the remaining four, a case was being prepared. This was seen by the US as a gross provocation on the part of the People’s Republic of China, and they retaliated by signing a mutual defence pact with Formosa in March 1955. This was very bad timing as we will see, because, at that very time, Hammarskjöld was conducting delicate negotiations for the release of the flyers,

The United Nations became directly involved because the pilots had been working for the United Nations at the time of their capture. On 19 December 1954, Hammarskjöld was given a mandate by the General Assembly to plead for their release.5 However, he took the initiative to request a personal interview with the Prime Minister of the People’s Republic of China, Chou En-lai. This was accorded, and Hammarskjöld flew to China at the end of December 1954, where he carried on intensive negotiations with Chou En-lai until 11 January 1955. Upon his return to the United States in January 1955, Hammarskjöld announced to the press that: ‘The door that has been opened can be kept open, given restraint on all sides’. After Hammarskjöld left Peking, he continued negotiations in secret with Chou En-Lai in a series of personal communications via the Chinese Embassy in Stockholm. Contrary to the image which Western propagandists had presented of Chou En-lai, Hammarskjöld found him to be a highly educated and cultivated man and an intelligent negotiator. Their negotiations culminated in the messages on 29 May and 1 August, respectively, announcing the release of groups of four and of eleven airmen. According to Chou En-lai, he had timed the release of the remaining eleven prisoners as a way of maintaining his personal friendship with Hammarskjöld and as a 50th birthday gift to him. However, the gesture can also be seen as a recognition of Hammarskjöld’s quiet diplomacy as Secretary-General as well as a subtle rejection of the political manoeuvres of the United States who were trying to force a military confrontation.

In January Hammarskjöld wrote a personal letter to Uno Willers about the Peking mission: ‘The mission to Peking was not only unique in a diplomatic history but also unique as a human experience... What is so appalling is the basic lack of realism as to the assumptions on which very much of Western policy is built. And now I am thinking not only of the situation in China, but of China’s role in Asia and of the position of the present regime in Peking. It is a little bit humiliating when I have to say that Chou En-lai to me appears as the most superior brain I have so far met in the field of foreign politics. Of course, that does in no way mean that I have found a wider area of agreement than I anticipated, but it does mean that policy making without taking into account his personal qualities is likely to lead

5 On 10 December, the General Assembly passed a resolution which was sponsored by sixteen nations, including the United States. It declared that the imprisonment of the fliers violated the Korean Armistice Agreement, and condemned their trial and imprisonment by the People’s Republic of China. It also requested the Secretary-General to ‘make continuing and unremitting efforts’ to seek their release.
to disaster. As I said to one of the Americans: Chou is so much more dangerous than you imagine because he is so much better a man than you have ever admitted.6

The history of the crisis indicates that Hammarskjöld had considerable influence not only in securing the release of the American fliers but also in preventing war in the Far East. His mission established a channel of communication between the conflicting parties, winning important time and forestalling military action. Had his actions not given hope that there would be a peaceful settlement, it is quite likely that armed conflict might have broken out. Hammarskjöld's talks with officials of both governments added a voice of reason and objectivity to the policy-making dialogues within each government. Several people have mentioned that Hammarskjöld looked upon this mission as one of the most important which he had performed - from the perspective of both international peace and the development of the United Nations.7

Acting in Faith

On the day on which Hammarskjöld received the mandate from the General Assembly, 10 December 1954, he wrote in his spiritual diary: 'God spake once and twice I have also heard the same: that power belongeth unto God; And that thou, Lord art merciful: for thou rewardest every man according to his work.' (Psalm 62.22, 12)8 He underlined 'God spake once' because he understood God's voice in what he would have to do. He knew that he would derive his strength from the Other, no matter how uncertain the task was or how limited his action could be.9 In fact, Hammarskjöld acted in an independent and unprecedented way. During his first talk with Chou En-lai, Hammarskjöld said that he had come to China out of his constitutional responsibility for the general aims of the Charter, which applied equally to member states as to non-member states of the United Nations. So, he took as the legal basis for his visit not the vote of 10 December in the General Assembly, but the Charter of the United Nations. He termed his approach to the negotiations as the 'Peking Formula' and defined it as: 'acting in his role as Secretary-General under the Charter of the United Nations and not as a representative of what was stated in the General Assembly resolution.' He made this distinction also in other contexts when, as he put it, he wanted to: 'distance himself from undiplomatically formulated resolutions.' As we have seen earlier, the success of the Peking mission in one stroke increased the prestige of Hammarskjöld as Secretary-General and of the United Nations as a world organisation.

The inner dialogue

Throughout all the activities of the first half of 1955, Hammarskjöld appeared outwardly calm and self-assured. And yet, when we read his diary, Markings, we realise that he was anything but calm. In fact, inwardly he was in turmoil. A process was taking place within in which he was going through a whole gamut of emotions: doubt and hope. It is this process which I would like to take you through in his ongoing dialogue of that year. To follow the line of my analysis, please turn to the dialogues on pages 108 to 112 of Markings, written in 1955.

On 1 August 1955, he again quotes the line 'And God spake' from Psalm 62, the same words he had used in his dialogue in December 1954. However, this time he leaves out the time clause 'once'. The quote shows how he interprets the actual circumstances around his diplomatic trip to China. Hammarskjöld saw the work of God in the task he had been given, the way the mission had gone, the things which had happened around it and the release of the prisoners. When he had accepted his task it was in obedience to the voice of God - the voice which he now heard again when he learnt Peking's decision. By quoting these lines of the psalm, he puts into proportion the weight which should be given to human actions in achieving a solution. It is to the Other that we have to give the honour, not

6 From Hammarskjöld's letter to Uno Willers, 31 January, 1955, in Urquhart, p.117.
7 Mark W Zacher, Dag Hammarskjöld's United Nations, p.61, 62.
8 Markings, p. 102.
9 See chapter 4.
to ourselves. In his dialogue, we witness Hammarskjöld’s struggle with his confused feelings. It was true that the outcome of the Peking mission had been in his favour and had been very flattering to him. Yet, in spite of this, or because of it, he was troubled and had the feeling that he was not on firm ground. He examined his ambivalent reactions and found that Psalm 62 threw light on and gave expression to his mixed emotions. I will give here the part of psalm which he quotes:

‘Men of low estate are but a breath,
men of high estate are a delusion;
in the balances they go up;
they are together lighter than a breath.
Put no confidence in extortion,
set no vain hopes on robbery;
if riches increase, set not your heart on them.
Once God has spoken;
twice have I heard this:
that power belongs to God;
and that to thee, O Lord, belongs
steadfast love.
For thou dost require a man
according to his work.’

His inner distress could be dispelled if he would only take the advice given in the psalm ‘if riches increase, set not your heart on them.’ But this is not easy. He cannot shake off his sense of confusion and on reflection realises that he doesn’t have to look far for their cause. He sees that once again he is being plagued by his old weakness: vanity. If he glories in the success of his mission it will diminish the value of the moral strength he should be drawing from his independent handling of the crisis. Coupled with this, he feels inside a deep resistance to accepting unquestioningly the call of his destiny. He recognises with fear that his ambitiousness is eroding his integrity. His faith has deserted him and he berates himself for not being steadfast in what he knows destiny to be – his international service. He scolds himself for his judgemental attitude towards those who are guilty of the same type of conceit as he is - after all, no different from them!

We witness him swinging back and forth between self-admiration and self-degradation. The pattern of reactions which he observes in himself is not new and he questions if it is necessary to go that road again. If this has nothing to do with his vanity, what is it then about? Why would he want to be praised? Having expressed all this self-doubt, he now questions the purity of his intentions behind his self-examination in first place. Was this not in itself a form of self-indulgence? And then he is niggled by a further doubt about his motives: When he self-righteously admonishes others in public, is this not a way of making himself more important at the expense of another? We can see that he doesn’t spare himself.

Dedicating his life to God is not enough; he must place himself in God’s hand and in his actions be guided by Him and nothing else. This is essential for his striving to reach maturity. To trust in God is to love God. But he is full of pettiness - superficial conversation, boasting, - a soul-destroying trait. How can he live a life in which his intentions are pure? At this point, God enters the picture and he realises that he can only do this through God. Now his inner struggle gives way to loving the Other. Free of his limiting I-involvement, he goes in search of the I-Thou relationship with the Other. How this relationship can take shape and what it should look like, he doesn’t yet know. He only knows that he must reach out to the Other and that this orientation is a movement of love. From division he reaches out to pure, clear, absolute unity. The quote from Meister Eckhart in his dialogue gives expression to his yearning. ‘But how then am I to love God’ ‘You must love Him as if He were a non-God, a non-Spirit, a non-Person, a non-Substance: love him simply as the one, the pure and absolute Unity in

10 Psalm 62: 9-12.
which is no trace of Duality. And into this One, we must let ourselves fall continually from being into non-being. God helps us to do this.\footnote{Meister Eckhart, Pr. 83, renovamini spiritu (Eph. 4.23)}

When Hammarskjöld lets go of his inner I-involvement in his dialogue and examines his I-It involvement, he realises that his work for the United Nations is taking place in a world which is still capable of descending into barbarism. (He has many examples in mind of atrocities being committed in the new decolonised states.) In the alienation which this evokes in him, he experiences a yearning for the reality of the Other. He is looking for the way in which the Other effects him and realises how the Other wants to work through him in the world. He acknowledges that he is dedicated to this task in everything that he is; he has offered up his life which is a form of human sacrifice. Hammarskjöld has a dream that the world will be raised above its barbarism, by the promise of a new solidarity via the United Nations. No matter how limited his work among men may be, he must give everything that he is for this dream for the sake of that which alone gives it reality.

In the next part of his dialogue, Hammarskjöld uses the analogy of Jesus when he says: ‘He broke fresh ground’. That he is referring to Jesus I deduce from the similarities of this text to one he wrote in 1951, in which he writes: ‘An adamant young man who walks the road of possibility to the end without self-pity or demand for sympathy, fulfilling the destiny he has chosen - even sacrificing affection and fellowship when the others are unready to follow him - into a new fellowship.’\footnote{Ibid., p. 68, 69.} He himself had been travelling this road of possibility in the same way and realises now that with his Peking mission he has broken fresh ground. The road was lonely and he had to put up with mockery and incomprehension but he shouldered his responsibility and kept going. The courage to go on was based solely on his faith. And now, while he is writing, a change comes over him. His confusion dissolves and he feels a resurgence of his faith. After having been imprisoned in himself, he now has the feeling that he has broken out of his isolation.

He notes that what he is now experiencing, is different to what he was feeling when he talked about his troubled spirit in the text discussed above. He no longer has the sense of confusion. He has moved on. Now, his heart and head are in step with each other and he feels ‘a contact with reality, light and intense like the touch of a loved hand.’ He receives, and what he receives is not a content but a presence, a presence as strength. ‘In sun and wind, how near and how remote.’ The mystical experience makes itself known to him in all its vast richness as a reciprocity with the Other, as he was to write later: ‘Thou / Whom I do not comprehend / But Who has dedicated me / To my fate / Thou - ’\footnote{Markings, p. 215.}

He feels whole and from this sense of wholeness he sees clearly before him what his ‘duty’ is. He knows that he can only fulfil the responsibility he has undertaken by choosing sincerely to be bound by his duty both in word and deed. Here is where his integrity lies. In order to behave irreproachably and be incorruptible, he will have to make severe demands on himself.

The year 1955 had been a watershed for him. He had learnt many valuable lessons from the whole series of events from December 1954 to August 1955 and feels that it is important for him to make up the balance. What gives his style of conduct steadfastness and consistency? Which demands will he have to make on himself in the future? He has learnt that when acting as Secretary-General of the United Nations, he must develop the power to really see and hear. He has also learnt that it is important to have the strength of will to stick to your guns even though this might also entail making some concession in the interest of the negotiations. But this is not enough on its own. What is even more important is that he can trust his own mature powers of judgement when he has to judge people or situations. He has to be able to empathise with others and from deep within himself to understand their difficulties.

And, following on from this, we see him in the next part of the dialogue reflecting on his need to know about suffering in order to be able to enter into the sufferings of others. Those who are able to do this,
are those who have been ‘scarred by suffering’ themselves. It would be very educational to penetrate the consciousness of the sufferer, which has been purified by the difficult school of life. He doesn’t need to undergo the same fate first hand. But this knowledge would enhance his effectiveness in his task at the United Nations – a task which is focused on preventing armed conflicts and helping victims of war and violence.\(^14\)

He writes further that we can also learn by observing the scientist and the explorer. They are free in the subjects they choose to investigate and write on. What inspires their choice is the uniqueness of what they see and investigate, as well as the recognition that this knowledge will be valuable and educational for themselves. Here we hear Hammarskjöld’s great respect for the independent spirit of scientists and their professional integrity, coming through. They can teach us so much and we should be guided by them. The people who break new ground are happy to leave the trivial details to those accompanying them. However, from both the leader and the led, integrity is demanded.

What did he see that was unique and which he thought he should have registered? And what in his experience was so unique that he thinks he should keep it alive in his memory so that others can be guided by it? He reflects now on how exhausting it was to have to play a double role during the events in 1954/5. He could not report on the secret negotiations he was carrying on and had to act another role for the outside world. He complains here about the social conventions which require him to play one role while his work requires him to be something else. What has a deep personal meaning for him has to remain hidden and what only has a derivative, obscure function can be displayed. The division which he notices inside himself can be traced back to this.

This train of thought evokes more self-questioning? How can he be an incorruptible person under the specific circumstances of his role? What is he to focus on in his efforts? How can he plug in to this society as a person and in the way he fulfils his task? How can he acquire consistency in his style of behaviour? Can the public man and the inner man be in step with each other, faithful to the ideals and principles of the Charter, and faithful to God? The perspective which opens up to him now is the function of the word in relation to the road of our evolution as human beings as he sees that the sincerest way to act must be in respect of the word. And now we almost hold our breath as Hammarskjöld expresses a deep thought: respect for the word means care for the space of the word as of a meeting place, the between where the word can be spoken and heard. The way he understands the duty, which he now relates to his integrity, requires of him that he is a human being and that this aspect must play a significant role in the fulfilment of his task. Between his duty and his humanity there is no tension. They are in the same perspective: growth to maturity.

Respect for the word is the first commandment in the discipline by which a man can be educated to maturity – intellectual, emotional, and moral.

Respect for the word – to employ it with scrupulous care and an incorruptible heartfelt love of truth – is essential if there is to be any growth in a society or in the human race.

To misuse the word is to show contempt for man. It undermines the bridges and poisons the wells. It causes Man to regress down the long path of his evolution.

"But I say unto you, that every idle word that men speak... " (Mt 12.36)\(^15\)

Lessons for quiet diplomacy

\(^{14}\) Markings, p. 111
\(^{15}\) Markings, p. 112.
The text 'Respect for the word', shows us how important the integrity of the spoken work was for Hammarskjöld. His quiet diplomacy in 1955 would never have succeeded without this. We see him reflecting on this subject in a text written on the night of 19-20 November. Integrity of the word is the only way to peace and agreement, and yet we violate this daily by the way in which we behave: 'Concerning men and their way to peace and concord -? It is a simple truth, that is daily being 'denied by our behaviour.' His quiet diplomacy meant that in spite of the pressure which he had been put under, particularly by the Americans, he had kept to the rule he had formulated in his text in 1953. Now that he has shown its power, the new instrument of 'quiet diplomacy' is there to be used effectively by the United Nations in the future. Hammarskjöld, the teacher, leader and efficient administrator, never left much to chance. And so he lists the rules of behaviour if one is to practice quiet diplomacy as a standard UN tool. We can see the influence of Martin Buber's philosophy clearly in his method.

1. 'It is more important to be aware of the grounds for your own behaviour than to understand the motives of another.' In the way in which I relate to the other, it is important that I have contact with my own reality and be myself. The honesty in my association with myself, permits me to approach the other as other.

The texts from Markings express Hammarskjöld's journey inwards and his quest for an inner identity, which would form a basis for his commitment to God and to life. His international service is the fruit of this inner dialogue.

2. 'The other’s ‘face’ is more important than your own.' If while pleading another’s cause, you are at the same time seeking something for yourself, you cannot hope to succeed.' The face of the other reflects his dignity and his subjective reality. If I am looking for the face of the other, I place myself in the I-Thou relationship to the other.

Hammarskjöld requested a meeting in Peking on the basis of his role of Secretary-General of the United Nations and not because of the resolution of sixteen, including the United States, in the General Assembly. They called the detention of the airmen a ‘violation’ of the Armistice Agreement, condemned the trial and conviction of the prisoners detained illegally, and requested the Secretary-general to make continuing and unremitting efforts to bring about the release of the airmen 'by the means most appropriate in his judgement. Hammarskjöld chose a face-saving strategy.

3. ‘You can only hope to find a lasting solution to a conflict if you have learned to see the other objectively, but, at the same time, to experience his difficulties subjectively.’ If I can experience the other side, I can experience his problems from the inside out. If I am focused on permanent solutions, experiencing the other side is a first requirement for me, besides the general information about the problems.

Andrew Cordier says in an article that Hammarskjöld was deeply moved after a meeting with a distinguished world scientist with whom he discussed the intellectual and spiritual qualities to be brought to bear upon diplomatic negotiations, if the processes of mediation and conciliation were to succeed. The scientist said that the whole matter finally comes down to a short, simple word, ‘love.’ Hammarskjöld discussed the matter repeatedly with Cordier thereafter. In the same article, Cordier says that they read and discussed together selected portions of I-Thou, relating to that factor in negotiations. Cordier saw Hammarskjöld’s thinking in this regard reflected in Markings, where he states: 'You can only hope to find a lasting solution to a conflict if you have learned to see the other objectively, but at the same time, to experience his difficulties subjectively.'

4. ‘The man who ‘likes people’ disposes once and for all of the man who despises them.’

This is a vision of Martin Buber and can be explained as follows: The basis of man’s life with man is twofold, and it is one – the wish of every man to be confirmed as what he is, even as what he can become, by men; and the innate capacity in man to confirm his fellow men in this way. Actual humanity exists only where this capacity unfolds. This mutual confirmation is best illustrated by speech. Genuine conversation, like every genuine fulfilment of relation between men, means acceptance of otherness, making the other present. This means to ‘imagine’ the real, to imagine quite concretely what another man is wishing, feeling, perceiving and thinking. It is through this making present that we grasp another as a self, that is as a being whose distance from me cannot be separated from my distance from him and whose particular experience I can make present. This event is not complete until he knows himself made present by me and until this knowledge induces the process of his inmost self-becoming. Experiencing the other side is the essence of all genuine love. The eros of dialogue means the turning of the lover to the beloved ‘in his otherness, his independence, his self-reality,’ and with all the power of intention’ of his own heart. He does not assimilate into his own soul what lives and faced him, but he vows it faithfully to himself and himself to it.17

5. ‘All first-hand experience is valuable, and he who has given up looking for it will one day find – that he lacks what he needs: a closed mind is a weakness, and he who approaches persons or painting or poetry without the youthful ambition to learn a new language and so gain access to someone else’s perspective on life, let him beware.’

His visit to Chou En-lai gave Hammarskjöld the chance to study the Chinese perspective of life through Chou-En-lai. It was because of their direct contact, that it was possible for Hammarskjöld to experience the ‘other side’. ‘Experiencing the other side’ was a term used by Martin Buber, ‘to feel an event from the side of the person one meets as well as from one’s own side. It is an inclusiveness which realizes the other person in the actuality of his being, while being oneself.’18 By means of this attitude, Hammarskjöld was able to keep the door open both to Chou en-lai and to President Eisenhower at the same time. This is the very attitude that Senator McCarthy called Hammarskjöld’s weakness, whereas it was, in fact, his strength.

6. ‘A successful lie is doubly a lie, an error which has to be corrected is a heavier burden than truth: only an uncompromising ‘honesty’ can reach the bedrock of decency which you should always expect to find, even under deep layers of evil.’ Courtesy gives the encounter with the other a firm basis. Courtesy expresses respect for humanity and respect for the word. It is directed towards real contact. Contact with reality is only possible from an honesty without compromises. It can even cope with deep anger. On the other hand a lie is the denial of reality. A lie which works is a reality which denies reality and is therefore a double lie. But a mistake which unintentionally does not do justice to reality, weighs more heavily than truth when it is redressed.

7. ‘Diplomatic ‘finesse’ must never be another word for fear of being unpopular: that is to seek the appearance of influence at the cost of its reality.’ Public debate and dialogue differ from each other, not only in their form and content, but also in their outcome.

Hammarskjöld was able to experience first hand what the power of dialogue meant in a political context. Many months had passed between his journey to Peking in January, 1955, and the release of all the American fliers on 1 August. For the sake of his integrity, he had been obliged to be very reticent when talking to the press, while in the background he was bringing all possible diplomatic means to bear to reach an agreement. Quiet diplomacy, demanding deep respect for the word, was one of these instruments. In 1956, he was to use this instrument many times in a part of the world where up to then had not set foot – the Middle East.

17 Friedman, p. 82, 88.
18 Ibid., p. 81.
CHAPTER 8

The mystery is a constant reality,

Markings 1955
analysed and interpreted

The 'mystical experience.' Always here and now – in that freedom which is one
with distance, in that stillness which is born of silence. But – this is a freedom
in the midst of action, a stillness in the midst of other human beings. The mys-
tery is a constant reality to him who, in this world, is free from self-concern, a
reality that grows peaceful and mature before the receptive attention of assent.

In our era, the road to holiness necessarily passes through the world of action.

'Il faut donner tout pour tout'.

Quietly at home during Christmas, 1955, Hammarskjöld has the leisure and time to look back on the
year which is ending and take stock of his progress towards maturity in what he has learnt from
the events that have marked the year. He reflects on this in a series of texts written on Christmas Eve and
Christmas Day – dialogues in which he unravels and re-weaves his reality. Remember this has been
the year of the China crisis, which taught him so much about independent action and respect for the
word. Taking the risk of making powerful enemies, he has steered a diplomatic course through the
minefield of the manoeuvrings of international politicians. He has also been strengthened in his con-
viction that it is necessary for every world citizen to be ready to perform international service. The
success of his actions – his Peking formula – means that the year has seen the dawn of a new respect
for the role of the United Nations and its significance in solving very sticky international problems.
This has gone hand in hand with widespread recognition of and respect for the expertise of Ham-
marskjöld himself. It should not be forgotten that in this year also, Hammarskjöld has turned fifty – a
time to make up the balance of his life and draw up his goals for the period to come. So, it is no won-
der that, being who he was, he felt the necessity to enter into dialogue with himself and God and re-
fect on his own attitude at this moment in time. To fully appreciate these lovely texts and my analysis
of them, please open Markings for December, 1955.

Hammarskjöld opens his reflections on the mystical experience (page 122) by declaring 'always here
and now'. In the way he formulates this, we can hear his perception of the reality of the moment and
his surrender to it. What we also hear is the I-Thou relationship to the world. He describes what the
mystical experience means for him but does not, however, explain what this mystery contains. Instead
he describes how he attunes his attitude to the mystery in stillness and distance. Although it sounds
like a contradiction in terms, Hammarskjöld believes that we can achieve silence and distance when
we are engaged in activities and are in the company of others. And this is very important for him. He
doesn't need to look for the mystical experience in a life removed from the world but can, in fact, enter
into the stillness which envelopes the mystery even when he is engaged in activities and surrounded by
people. The inner freedom which he associates with the mystical experience is a freedom he can also
feel in the other circumstances. This would explain the freedom he felt to act on his own intuition
when performing his tasks as Secretary-General and at the same time carrying on negotiations with
Chou En-lai.

The attitude which goes hand in hand with being attuned in this way, is described by Hammarskjöld in
Swedish as 'fri sig self'. Literally translated this would be 'free to be yourself'. However, W.H.

1 Markings, p. 122.
Auden chose to translate it as ‘free from self-concern’. I would prefer the literal translation, because in his speech International Service, Hammarskjöld himself says: ‘international services requires of all of us first and foremost the courage to be ourselves.’ The mystery continues to be reality to those who are free to be themselves in the world. ‘Free to be yourself’ Hammarskjöld has understood to mean ‘being yourself’, containing in it the Auden’s meaning - being ‘free of self concern’ or ‘true self oblivion’. In other words, ‘Free to be yourself’ involves, on the one hand, being free of immoderate self-concern and, on the other, being free to give of yourself in the I-Thou relation to the world. As Hammarskjöld sees it, whoever is free to be himself in the world bears in his attitude the distance and stillness of this inner freedom, even in the midst of action. The distance he refers to, supposes participation in a society without complete identification with that participation. In other words, distance keeps one free from an immoderate I-It involvement and creates space for the meeting with reality. Stillness is the preparatory attitude for the meeting. In stillness he can come to himself and it is in stillness that he is open to receiving the reality of the other. The mysticism of the encounter is at the same time a gift and a mystery.

The mystery he perceives as a reality that grows peaceful and mature. This description of reality evokes the image of a goal he has set himself - one which gains in fullness and fulfilment. How should we understand this type of reality? The text which follows supplies the answer: ‘a reality before the receptive attention of assent’. The mystical moment lies in the mystery of the meeting. The basis for this attitude is the assent - the moment of saying ‘yes’. In the Swedish text this is ‘bejakelsens uppmärksamhet’ and expresses that without reticence, Hammarskjöld enters into an I-Thou relation to the world. By saying ‘Yes’ he becomes attentive and receptive. When he attunes his attitude to the Other, reality shows itself to him in a quiet maturity, here and now, as a constant reality. The attitude to meet reality, can, in fact, itself be called maturity. Its aim and fulfilment are not contained within it, but because it makes contact possible, it leads to the achievement of maturity and fulfilment. The open orientation towards the other will take form, not in words but in deeds. In the time in which we are living the road to holiness describes a course of life in which responsible action is sanctified.

The Swedish theologian, Gustav Aulen regards this declaration most crucial for Hammarskjöld and for Markings and he explains this as follows: Hammarskjöld’s faith can be defined by his commitment to life on the one hand and his commitment to God on the other. To be united with God, to be in his hands, means to Hammarskjöld to rest in his stillness, to receive strength and inspiration from Him, to be liberated by Him and live in freedom. But union with God always means at the same time union with man, and union is to be realised in the service of man. This entire emphasis is accentuated most strikingly in the declaration that, in our era, the road to sanctification of necessity passes through action. During a meeting with the press on 19 April 1955, Hammarskjöld himself had explained this attitude. When asked by a journalist if he shared the insight that things would get better, which President Eisenhower maintained his sixth sense gave him, Hammarskjöld replied that he did not trust his sixth sense, but that if he were to act on what his other five senses told him, he would say that a challenge was hanging in the air for those who were working for peace. Answering a further question from the journalist about the area in which the United Nations Organisation could make itself most useful in this respect, Hammarskjöld replied: ‘I must say that I regard the phrase ‘challenge in the air’ as a kind of challenge at the very doorstep, first of all, of the Secretary-General’s office. He really has to see to it that he uses all the possibilities he can possibly have in his direct current contacts. That does not mean that he forces either himself, his office or this organization on the Governments for this and that kind of action. It means a kind of intensified availability, a kind of openness, a kind of willingness to cooperate, to catch the opportunity and to come in when there is a demand for it or when we feel that it would serve an immediate purpose. Translating the word “challenge” in those terms, you can see that it

2 Vägmärken, p.97.
3 See Markings, p.76 and his radio talk.
4 G. Aulen, Dag Hammarskjöld’s White Book.
is much more a question of an attitude than something which I would be ready to spell out in terms of this or that specific action. But it is an attitude out of which action easily grows.\(^5\)

*Inner dialogue, Christmas Eve 1955*

In imagery and dynamics, the text with which we open this chapter, is similar to the texts on maturity of love from 1951. On Christmas Eve 1955, Hammarskjöld again dwells on the themes of 'nearness' and 'independence of the Beloved'. This, with the two texts of Thomas à Kempis which frame the texts of the following day, 25 December, refer to the effect of love. Christmas is traditionally a time when loved ones get together and Hammarskjöld must have felt very alone at this particular Christmas. Being alone is part of the price he has to pay for having said 'Yes', but nevertheless his dialogue has a very nostalgic ring at this time. He opens the text with a verse from the psalm: 'O God, thou art my God in a barren and dry land where no water is. Thus have I looked for Thee in the sanctuary, that I might behold thy power and glory.'\(^6\)

The introduction to the text which follows the psalm, states that he has only just understood the meaning of two experiences from the past. He then expresses his experiences very delicately in the form of a poem, and uses the language of the I-Thou relation for their interpretation.

From the choice of words and the structure we can deduce that the realisation and scope of these feelings were being voiced for the first time. At a moment in the past, Hammarskjöld had been affected by the meeting with a beloved other, and was deeply touched by 'the look a shy caress/ As their eyes met in complete understanding.' The moment of real encounter was fragile but had the meaning and intensity of a touching to his deepest being. In the eyes of the other he saw that, at the same time, the other was encountering him – and he knows that he is acknowledged and loved. It is in the loving that his existence is confirmed in the deepest sense. The poem speaks about a presence far off. And we see that in its origins and dynamics, the experience passes beyond what can be perceived with the senses, giving the effect is that of nearness.

After the poem, Hammarskjöld goes on to a new line and writes only one word ‘And’. The rest of the text continues on a fresh line. The ‘and’ joins two realities together, which are linked to each other in the tension of a polar relationship. Apparently in opposition, apparently incompatible, apparently each other’s denial, they exist beside each other and complement each other. ‘The Lover desires the perfection of the Beloved – which requires, among other things, the Liberation of the Beloved from the Lover.’ The ‘and’ joins a reality of meeting in love with the reality of letting go of love. Here we find Hammarskjöld expressing the same insight again as he did in *Markings* in 1951 (pages 74 to 76).

The lover is focused on the fulfilment of his beloved. He himself withdraws. But in the vacant space which is left behind, he can give from a deeper source than when he were to give from his limitations. In this he himself is fulfilled. In the text written on 24 December 1955, we can also see a reaching out and, at the same time, a letting go or liberating, and this double movement contains within it the possibility of the maturity of love. Reaching out to the other and giving of himself in his relationship to the other are learning moments on Hammarskjöld’s inner path, particularly because he felt himself to be so limited. Overcoming this reticence would become a necessity for him. In the texts from 1952, we also witness him struggling with this fact. What was at stake was that he had to get back his feeling of contact with reality.

This longing for the other is the glimpse from the past which Hammarskjöld is referring to and which he finds again in 1955. However, living with this revived feeling of longing is for him also living with the pain of the absence of the loved one. He knows that the fulfilment of the other is what he should desire, but, at the same time, he knows that he falls short in this respect and finds it very difficult to let

---

6 Psalm 63:1-3
go of his beloved for the sake of the lover’s independence and fulfilment. His yearning for the other has to be purified. Neither fear or desire should be allowed to close off this openness. Encountering the other in love and liberating the other out of love are two movements which belong together. It is not dependence which binds the lovers but that they are independent in their own development and wish only for the independent fulfilment of the other. The final loneliness of each person lies behind this thought. Hammarskjöld is very aware of this kind of loneliness. He knows all about the meaning of waiting.

The dissertation on the relationship between two lovers leads on to one about the relationship between God and Man. He also perceives this as being a love relationship in which the independence of the lover and of the beloved is essential for the encounter. The description starts from the perspective of God: ‘God desires our independence’. This perspective is linked to Hammarskjöld’s mystical experience: God has come to meet him from the beyond and he knows himself to be caught while making a deep existential fall. He had not sought the mystical experience – the initiative for it had come from the Other and it had touched him just as he was experiencing the abandonment and loneliness of independence. In this night of the ‘fall’, God came to meet him from the other side. It is the mystical meeting by which the fall becomes a falling back into God’s love. Only in independence from each other can this meeting be realised. We see in this text the same tense relationship as in the earlier text between meeting the other in love and liberating the other out of love. The experience and the possibility of the ‘fall’ is the price of independence. In independence and freedom, man has to come to his fulfilment, in order to become truly man. Only in independence and freedom can his surrender in love become a love-response and implies that we stop searching for the ‘fall back into God’s love’. If we are looking for the Other from desire or to suppress our fear, we cannot meet the Other in his otherness. At most we can only meet ourselves. On the other hand, our openness to the true encounter with the Other will be hindered if we put too much emphasis on our independence.

The mystical encounter takes place in the lonely openness of purified desire. This cannot be arranged: the meeting is set in motion from both sides by which we can expect the initiative to come from the other side because God comes to meet us when we have achieved inner freedom. The paradox of a love which at the same time, meets and lets go, becomes comprehensible when we see the dynamics of loving and being loved from the point of view of the independence of man: the beloved was loved by God long before he himself could love. These basic dynamics – that man in becoming independent is loved by God – is Hammarskjöld’s intimate experience. From here he can make that same movement towards the other in freedom. He expresses the purification and fulfilment of his longings - the longing to be free and at the same time the longing to be close to the other.

The inner struggle to keep his desire alive can be heard echoing in Hammarskjöld’s recitation of lines from Psalm 63 of which I will give you the actual Bible text here.

Oh God, thou art my God, I seek thee,
My soul thirsts for thee;
My flesh faints for thee,
As in a dry and weary land where no water is.
So I have looked upon thee in the sanctuary,
Beholding thy power and glory.

The Catholic theologian, Kees Waaijman writes of this Psalm: This hymn of thanks allows us to witness the inside of the whole event. The psalmist makes us participants in the intimacy of his desire. He makes the loneliness and abandonment he feels intensely palpable for us, robbed of every form of legal assistance or support – lost and left to the mercy of the desert. But in the deepest part of his being that flame was glowing which allowed him to exist, as was also his thirst to be allowed to take his rightful place. This thirst brought him inside into the protection of the temple. That is where the flame of searching became the flame of witnessing, peering into the night, yearning for a word of mercy or forgiveness. This was a process of deep purification. Gradually this witnessing became purified into a seeing; a seeing of the Almighty who will protect him; a seeing of love. This affection penetrated into
the very core of his being; a satisfaction which is bigger than any other satisfaction which life can bring him. And it is this satisfied desire which he takes with him into life; as strength which helps him to support his life in society. In this deep flame which feeds on the affection of the Almighty and in which the meaning of his name glows, he will be renewed every night. He will recall: ‘you were there for me! Your wings are spread over me.’ We witness the inside of a watching over. This gives the psalm a soul. A deep glow, the flow of yearning, the yearning as part of a deepening process: the longing that is awakened in emptiness, is purified in contemplation to a point where there is an ability to see, a seeing that can be satisfied by kindness and can bear fruit in the life of the community, a longing too, which will be renewed again and again in the loneliness of the night. People continued to experience the depth of this yearning in this hymn. 7 The line of the psalm, as also Hammarskjöld’s texts which follow it, refer to this ‘purification of desire’.

An inner dialogue, Christmas day 1955

The following day, Christmas Day 1955, Hammarskjöld once more sits at his typewriter and reflects. The text series of 25 December begins with a quote from Thomas à Kempis. It is from the chapter, ‘That to him who loves God is sweet above all things and in all things’. 8 ‘But when in this way they taste God, be it in Himself or in His works, they recognize at the same time that there is an infinite distance between the creature and the Creator, time and eternity. Enlighten my soul that she may find her life and joy in Thee, until, transported out of herself by the excess of her happiness, she binds herself to Thee with all her powers and in all her motions.’ In the quotation the writer sketches the difference between the created and time on the one hand and the Creator and eternity on the other. The longing for a permanent alliance can be heard in this. His soul finds enlightenment, life and joy in the Other, an ‘excess of happiness’. But ‘tasting’ God in this way does not suspend the alterity of the Other nor one’s own freedom. The difference continues to exist.

Hammarskjöld then explores this area of tension between, on the one hand, freedom and, on the other, the connection which characterises the I-Thou relation. The mystical experience deepens his commitment. However, he realises that achieving a permanent deepening demands a constant attuning of his attitude. In the inner dialogue he examines the positions which demand the re-evaluation of his attitude. Let’s follow the texts from Markings of that day.

Hammarskjöld is filled with the aesthetic perception and the meaning of what he is experiencing. He reaches out to beyond his time and experiences the other as a reality which is actually present. The activity of the Other makes all things have meaning and beauty. Further, he experiences that the Other is working in him and through him. When he then describes his dream of the night in images and sensations, he takes us with him to ‘that space beyond time and where Thou art’.

In his dream Hammarskjöld is aware of the presence of the God, who enters into the deepest part of existence with him. In one long sentence Hammarskjöld paints the reality of this place of being - a reality which opens out further and further before him and in which he is swept along in one movement, surrounded by presence, beyond a crossing into an infinity which the plural ‘we’ in one continuous movement comes to rest. He is left with a searing inner pain as if he has been burnt. However, he realises that the dream is a generous gift from the where the giver is. The burning feeling that it leaves behind is proportional to the size of the gift the giver can afford, but it is also proportional to the limits of his power to receive. He rails against himself and draws a contrast between the scorching of the hot flame and his own self-satisfaction, worldly coolness. He is confronted with his own inability to give wholly of himself. His ability to give is decisive for the ability to be able to receive a gift. Each feeling of reluctance blocks the act of receiving and is a rejection of the gift. No matter how small the gift you offer is, the gesture of giving should be an indication of your will to give your whole self.

7 K.Waaijman, Psalmen over recht en onrecht (Psalms on justice and injustice), Kok, Kampen, p.109-109.
8 Thomas à Kempis, Imitation of Christ. Ch.XXXIV.
It costs Hammarskjöld a lot of trouble to accept that God is interfering in his life. What assumption gives the Other the right to do this? And where does he himself fit into the picture? He can see through his own irritation and is aware of the quality of his own pretensions. In that light he states that: ‘it is just as it should be that he increases while you decrease.’ The image that Hammarskjöld uses comes from The Gospel of St John where John the Baptist speaks to his disciples about his relationship with Jesus and says about himself that he is a messenger who preceded Him. John answered, ‘No one can receive anything except what is given him from heaven. You yourselves bear me witness, that I said, I am not the Christ, but I have been sent before him. He who has the bride is the bridegroom; the friend of the bridegroom, who stands and hears him, rejoices greatly at the bridegroom’s voice; therefore this joy of mine is now full. He must increase, but I must decrease. He who comes from above is above all; he who is of the earth belongs to the earth, and of the earth he speaks; he who comes from heaven is above all. He bears witness to what he has been and heard, yet no one receives his testimony; he who receives his testimony sets his seal to this, that God is true. For he whom God has sent utters the words of God, for it is not by measure that he gives the Spirit; the Father loves the Son and has given all things into his hand. He who believes in the Son has eternal life; he who does not obey the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God rests upon him.’

The two voices in this inner dialogue are a voice on earth and one that comes from above. He who is to become greater is he who is represented by the voice of God. In this Jesus Christ has gone before him. On this Christmas night which celebrates Jesus’ incarnation, Hammarskjöld thinks about his own evolution as a human being and is aware of his freedom to choose who he may become. Within the field of force in which he finds himself, he is not clear what his free choices will be. For this he has to measure himself against his opponents. In the trial of strength - the encounter - his freedom will take shape. In a contest without tension between the right opponents, letting go of what is to become ‘smaller’ in him and letting emerge what is to become ‘bigger’ in him, will result. In his inner struggle Hammarskjöld wants to be alert to the powers which are working in him and what their meaning is for him. He wants to go to meet them with an open mind. The inner dialogue is for him the battlefield for this self-examination. Hammarskjöld spurs himself on to help the real opponents and also himself.

We see in the series of texts which follow, how Hammarskjöld helps himself by naming the opponents. He works out the rivalry as a dialogue. By writing he achieves clarity and truth. He has the feeling that the implications of his dream pose a risk for him, because by remaining receptive he will become vulnerable. It is a conscious choice to remain receptive under risky circumstances. The tendency to withdraw is inspired by the need for security. Out of pride, he feels that he is sufficient unto himself. His self-satisfied worldly-wise prudence is an attitude in which he is not open to the voice of God and he realises how important it is for him to remain receptive and he admonishes himself to act out of humility. He knows himself and he knows that being open to God opens reality to him. It is in living contact that he experiences warmth and softness. Moreover, without being receptive, it is not possible to listen, see and understand. The capacity to listen, see and understand is a gift in itself. It is clear to him that he will come to grief if he follows his ambition and as he has very high ambitions his fall will be deeper. Whichever direction his personality leads him, whether or not his ambition follows it, will be a matter of personal ethics.

Hammarskjöld then broadens the perspective of his argument. The connection with his deepest causality shows him that his efforts are being guided. He realises that he has been called and he is prepared to honour it - to act on it, if that is what is been asked of him. He accepts the loneliness which the choice of this inner identity brings with it, being aware that his commitment will be decisive for his mental and physical well-being. From this perspective we can see Hammarskjöld’s Markings as texts in which he again and again looks for clarity as to what his calling is, receives it, loses sight of it and finds it again. In July 1961, when the Congo crisis was about to flare up again, Hammarskjöld – going against the flow – kept to the course which he had set out with the United Nations. Under extremely tough circumstances for him, he writes: ‘Weep / but do not complain. / The way chose you - / And you must be thankful.’

9 Gospel of St John, 3. 17-36, the Revised Standard Version of the Holy Bible.
10 Markings, p. 213.
Here, on Christmas Day 1955, he reflects on the meaning which his loneliness can have for him. The loneliness gives him a sense of inner freedom, because there is nothing which he is afraid to lose and therefore he has nothing to protect. This frees him to look for the truth with great openness and to become involved in a deeply human way. At the same time, this freedom makes him look death in the face - which has meaning and is meaningless at the same time. When he writes about death, the aura around him becomes filled with sunlight and stillness, contrasting with the image of death inside himself. He realises that just as he the monsters of the deep which he sees playing in the clear green water of the reef are capable of great destruction, he is aware of the destructive powers in the world and this causes him to recoil. He asks himself the question if there is a reason to be afraid. The sense of security which not-seeing gives, is false. He examines his own fear and determines to remain receptive in spite of his fear.

'Looking down through the jade-green water, you see the monsters of the deep playing on the reef...'

Hammarskjöld writes then in 1955. What monsters of the deep were innocently playing while waiting to attack?

The increasing tensions in the Middle East were a great source of concern to him at that time. Because of the regular violations of the Armistice Agreements by Israel and Egypt at El-Auja in the Negev/Sinai desert, the situation was becoming very worrying. The relations between Israel and the Arab States had been tense since the recognition of the State of Israel in 1948/49 by the United Nations. As a settlement had not yet been reached, the United Nations was sitting on the sideline. It follows that if the United Nations does not take any initiative, the cease-fire will be in danger. After the death of Stalin the Soviet Union began to meddle more and more in the affairs of the Middle East. The West reacted by signing the Baghdad Pact, a mutual security agreement between Great Britain, Iran, Iraq, Pakistan and Turkey, and this in turn, increased the tension among the Arab States themselves. Added to this, the USA, Great Britain and France wanted to make a pact to interfere if things threatened to boil over in the Middle East, which was, of course, a very sensible move for them in the light of the Cold War. America's financial support for the Aswan Project in Egypt was a further cause of irritation for the USSR. As you can imagine, this caused polarisation of the situation on all sides, raising the spectacle of the Cold War spreading to the Middle East with far-reaching consequences. The United Nations had a responsibility to do something but under the circumstances, Hammarskjöld wondered what action he should take as Secretary-General. He did not know enough about the situation and did not know how the leaders of Israel and Egypt would be disposed to react in this field of tension. It would be wise to check it out for himself as he had done a year earlier when he undertook his mission to Peking. He could interrupt his journey to South-East Asia the following January (1946) and visit the Middle East. In that case he would have to request meetings with both President Ben Gourion of Israel and President Nassar of Egypt. What would be waiting for him there and what could he and the United Nations do to offset the war which was threatening?

'Do you feel safer when scudding waves hide what lies beneath the surface?' Hammarskjöld is amazed at the words which he has written. It is as if he has seen right into the very depths of his being. Who is writing this? In the clear insight of who he is himself, what will remain of him in the contest with God. God must be writing with him because he sees deeper into himself than he alone is actually capable of.

While writing, Hammarskjöld notices that the mystical experience enters into him in his susceptibility as 'the reality which grows peaceful and mature'. He had begun writing on this Christmas Day because the dream of that night had tilted him up way beyond himself in an extraordinary way. Now he notices that he is free to be himself in the surrender and the opposition which he offers to God: the mystery is continuous reality. These days are very real for him, how he is himself in freedom and in surrender, as well as in the way in which he is focused on God, in his freedom as a human being. Stillness and distance form the basis for his inner freedom and the stillness of the mystery. The reality of the mystery is the reality of love and he experiences this reality as a gift and as a calling. He can only receive the gift if he can give himself fully and can only answer the call if he does so without holding back. 'One has to give everything to get everything' (Il faut donner tout pour tout) is the final chord of the thirteen marking stones written on
Christmas Day 1955. With this quote from ‘An imitation of Christ’ by Thomas à Kempis, which was one of his favourite books, he concludes a year that had been very strenuous for him and in which he had given all his energy to get the results he desired. He now has to prepare himself for an even more turbulent time – resolving the Middle East crisis.

The ‘mystical experience.’ Always here and now – in that freedom which is one with distance, in that stillness which is born of silence. But – this is a freedom in the midst of action, a stillness in the midst of other human beings. The mystery is a constant reality to him who, in this world, is free from self-concern, a reality that grows peaceful and mature before the receptive attention of assent.

In our era, the road to holiness necessarily passes through the world of action.

‘Il faut donner tout pour tout’.11

---

11 Markings, p. 122
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