

I AM AN IMPURE THINKER

Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy



INTRODUCTION BY

W. H. AUDEN



ARGO BOOKS, INC.

NORWICH, VERMONT

CHAPTER 3

MODERN MAN'S DISINTEGRATION AND THE EGYPTIAN KA



Disintegration of the Ego

MODERN MAN'S PERSONALITY IS weakened. Modern man is no longer certain of the sources of personal integrity. We see the adults take flight into their expert knowledge, into their "fields" to find certainty and character and distinction. The modern adult does not like politics or any general confession of faith or the emotional vagueness of a "movement." He concentrates on his profession and he is as good a specialist as he can be. But simply by watching how the word "adult" has spread, we may gain an inkling that the modern "adult" is not too strong as a personality. He is called an "adult" from the evidence of statistics about his biological age. When persons are called "adults," there is a divarication of biological and social maturity. We see the boy and adolescent stay young, brutish, shapeless long beyond the years in which his grandfather took shape as a personality and took his place in society as a citizen, in the congregation as a member.

Shapeless youth and specialized or unemployed adults are losing the path towards "personality." This is coupled with a good deal of confusion about "personality." Many a leading scientist, for example, honestly thinks that he owes his personality to his science. Many white collar men and employees honestly think that only scholars or artists can be personalities. Again and again, I hear the college students protest against

the idea that they could aspire to personality. "I am just a human being," they stammer. The moderns prefer to be reduced to Egos, to the I, and that is as far as they will go in their self-identification. The recent trends in psychology have elaborated this desolate state of the Ego. It has been said that the Ego seeks the love of a "thou," and that the Ego is often overruled by the subconscious "it." But though propagated by special schools, like psychoanalysis, the public discussion has not seen fit to face squarely the *question of Ego and person*. There is no general understanding what an individual (an Ego) and a personality are, how they are related to each other, whether they form a necessary sequence, or whether they are mere words.

The Ego is one special aspect of the person, developed since 1600, since Descartes' identification of the mind with the soul. Personalities break down today because of the unbalanced victory of the Cartesian doctrine of man as being the Ego, the mind written with the capital "M" of modern idealism, realism, and pragmatism. It is the thesis of this paper that these three schools of thought and in fact all post-Cartesian philosophy entertain a lopsided view of man, and that the simple fact that you, my dear reader, are good enough to read these lines proves that there is in you another force which is not the Ego, but the "thou." Only because you are a listening "thou," listening as to a command, as much as you are a thinking Ego, can you be a person. He who has not listened cannot think.

All modern thinking about man is based on too narrow a concept of his nature. This can be proven with certainty. The fact that you chose to read this essay must have reasons that transcend your and my Egos. As long as you read this essay you act as a listening "thou," not as if you were an Ego. And as little as you are an Ego when you read this, so little is the author whom you read the Ego to whom you consent to listen. But this question is related to the central one at hand: Can man be a person when he starts with the assumption of his being an Ego? Is it an essential a priori of a person to listen, to read, to respond? Is responsiveness an a priori of person-

ality? As a requisite for personality, it officially does not exist among the moderns. Descartes saw our most personal quality in our power to check, to control, to observe and to doubt responses. These constitute the powers of the mind, in the eyes of the moderns. Is this definition wrong? We say that it is. We say that its propagation desiccates all sources of personality today, that modern man's flight into his special field as an expert observer, etc. is the catastrophe of the machine age by which the only source for personal life is buried.

In order to prove this point we shall use Egyptian source material. It is of help to travel to foreign countries and periods for disentangling ourselves from the accidents of birth and environment. We shall find a world in which Descartes' "mind" did not exist, and in which personalities did live. We shall understand finally why neither ancient Egypt nor modern France covered the whole ground in which the sources of personal life rise. This will caution us against narrowing our concept of a person either in the Cartesian or the primitive direction. Making it more comprehensive than it has been during the last three centuries, we shall be able to tap the sap of life at the very core of the tree again. For modern man is just one branch on the tree of life of humanity, and we must reclaim our connection with the whole.

I

The Ka in Egypt is a sign that is represented by two up-lifted hands.¹ It bestows life on the king or individual. One's Ka is the "power behind the throne," the life giving genius. The Ka is mentioned in every inscription. It is the essence that has to be listed as present if the individual is to fulfill his function in this world or in the next.

The interpretation of the exact meaning of Ka, then, is of great importance. There have been two schools of thought. And in examining them we shall see that the differentiation between the "thou" and "I" state of mind offers the key to our understanding.

¹ See our picture No. 1, page 192.

Maspero held that the Ka was the alter ego, a duplication of the individual, himself once more. Erman, the greatest authority, saw in Ka the embodiment of the general supply of living energy; Steindorff saw man's genius.

Now it is a fact that the king's Ka alone is represented in pictures. "The king being a God on earth, has, ever since he is born, the privilege of being united to his Ka. This is not the share of ordinary people; the latter reach union with their Ka after death only." (A. Moret, *Le Nil*. etc., 1926 p. 361 n.l.) The representation of the royal Ka shows a bearded man who carries the shield with the name of king.² Ka is intimately connected with the name of the king. The Ka is called in Memphis the product of the "Tongue." The Tongue-God made all the Ka-s. (Erman, *Berliner Sitzungsberichte*, 1911, p. 940). The one Ka unfolds into many Ka-s, representing special qualities of the royal power: his hearing, seeing, perceiving, splendor, glory, spellbinding, longevity, his being Reverend, thriving, may all be listed as individual Ka-s. The list sometimes comprises seven, sometimes twice seven, fourteen, but without any persistency in it. The power of the Ka includes everything that characterizes the influence of the king on earth; all special qualities emanate from the central majesty embodied in the Ka.

In Pyramid text 1653, Atum, the god, creates the first two gods in the following manner: "After having made them, he put his arms around them and these arms contained the Ka, and by doing so he gave them divine existence and permanence." And Atum, in this same text is implored to bestow the Ka on the dead king in the same manner.

So far so good. But modern man could not resist the temptation to modernize this strange concept. Von Bissing (Münchener Akademie 1911, *Versuch einer neuen Erklärung des kai*, p. 5) by his argumentation does us a real service. Taking modern man's psychology for granted in the old times, his logic comes as a real eye-opener. Von Bissing finds that the plural Ka-s (Kau) may represent the power which comes to the dead from the sacrifices. From our general conception of

² Our picture No. 2.

the Ka, this is but one more emanation of the Ka. Just as much as old names of persons run: "Re is my Ka," "Ptah is my Ka," so the offerings are the dead man's Ka-s and the effect of the offerings on the person for whom they are given is to restore his original power or life energy. Hence the offerings for the dead enter the field of force called Ka, and may finally be called Kau themselves. But Von Bissing, instead of starting with the royal Ka, starts from these Ka-giving offerings for the dead and sentimentalizes on this. He sees the hieroglyph of the two extended arms, and he concludes that the Ka- hieroglyph signifies the arms of the longing soul that extend themselves towards the offerings. He has been refuted by Kees (Hermann Kees, *Die Jenseitsvorstellungen* etc., Leipzig, 1926, p. 75). But for our purposes his slip is valuable.

His interpretation is perfectly reasonable on the basis of our current subjective psychology which teaches every individual to look into the world from his own self as the center of reasoning, as a mind. To identify the Ka with the arms that man stretches out imploringly, lowers the Ka to the level of human weakness and subjectivity. It would be the very opposite of strength or of the process by which man is given a name for himself by the world. We would then have in early Egypt the idea of the "self-made man" indeed. The Ka would be man pulling himself up by his own boot straps.

Von Bissing is so sure of the universality of his own era's logic that he does not know that this one interpretation is excluded under all circumstances by the Egyptian tradition. The name is always "given" to a person, and for instance the vulture-goddess of upper Egypt carries the Ka protectingly over the king's head. Before the Cartesian mentality conquered, man never thought that the mental processes originated in himself. The Ka always is a power that is given to man, not made by him. Shakespeare in *Romeo and Juliet* has a verse that shows the root of the Ka in the human soul. When Juliet has called Romeo, Shakespeare makes Romeo exclaim: "It is my soul that calls upon my name." To the vulgar psychology this is sheer nonsense. Is the soul then outside of Romeo since he is called from the outside by the name? Vul-

gar psychology holds that the body of Romeo is here and now first, and that the word Romeo is just a label, a word, by which he may register in documents or statistics.

Modern psychology and logic starts thinking at the aspect of speech as hanging words upon things. Modern logic puts the objective fact of "somebody," first, the social fact of his being labelled Romeo, second, and the fact that other people may define this Romeo comes third. Thus their a priori is the body, and their aposteriori is the label. 1. self, objective Ego. 2. label, concept, classification. 3. use of this classification or label by others. The Egyptian logic and, I suppose, all non-Cartesian logic does just the opposite. It does not even know that man may use the term "The Ego." This term does not occur before 1780. This coupling of the demonstrative article, which points outside into the external world, with the word "I," which always points inside to the living power, the "sacred vigour" of the Homeric kings and the majesty of all those in authority who may speak in their own name, is not even two hundred years old. It is a hybrid formation. The deadlock of modern logic results from the fact that it is not understood as a hybrid and irrational form. "The Ego" is a contradiction in terms.

II. Powerless and Powerful Language

In order to learn from Von Bissing's wrong interpretation of the Ka in Egyptian religion all that modern thinking may learn from it for the evaluation of the Ego concept, we must now ask the reader to enlarge on his assumption that language consists of words. This assumption is too narrow. To say that language is contained in the dictionary is a half truth. The state of language in the dictionary is a special state of affairs. A dictionary is the "reduction" of language to the aggregate state of mere words. "Words" are language which is powerless, which is dismissed or spent. "Words" are spent language waiting for resurrection. As mere words language finds itself between two other phases of its circulatory process, between

the use of language for conceptual purposes, for thought, and its use for the other purpose, nearly overlooked, ridiculed as arbitrary: for naming things. This nearly lost distinction between concept or word and name is parallel to the paradox of Ka and Ego. What is the distinction between a word and a name?

The name is the state of speech in which we do not speak of people or things or values, but in which we speak to people, things, and values. The words "forget," "me," "not" are three words of the English grammar. However, "Forget-me-Not" is the name with which man addressed this plant. They are the right words for the plant. The right word is that word under which the thing so named will move and obey and come forth and be a part of the realm created by my linguistic influence. When Orpheus invoked the walls of Thebai to go up under the tones of his music, he moved people or stones to do that which he wanted them to do. All perusal of language in the form of names has exactly this intention. To speak of the Congress of Industrial Organizations is to use words. To speak of the CIO, is to speak of it politically, making use of all its associations with feelings of antipathy and sympathy, with emotions and motions. Names today are hidden in letters like AAA, CCC, NYA. I deem this significant for the philosophy of our era.

For centuries our philosophy has been exclusively concerned with words on one hand, and concepts on the other. The social life of language, however, is that of names which have power to move people and things. And since words were denied this quality in our era of reason, the power of names crept back into our lives through the back door of letters which read so similarly to the formulas of chemistry. In chemistry, at least, we all admitted the step from analysis to synthesis, and in chemistry, the analytical formula served the technician to produce, to resuscitate, to commandeer the substance thus labelled. Now, in a carry-over of this scientific process from word ("Oxygen"), to "O" = 16, to recipe ("take two units of O and mix them in such and such a way") we today are recognizing the power of the CIO over millions of

people. The CIO is, so to speak, the Ka that gives life, glory, dignity, to unskilled workers all over this country. It is quite obvious that CIO is not a word which they use but a name under which they are addressed and which they recognize as being their address. And "CIO" is the right way of addressing them as far as the CIO is successful.

The name is the right address of a person under which he or she will respond. The original meaning of language was this very fact that it could be used to make people respond. The very word "responsiveness" today is less popular than its often invoked variation—"responsibility." I am responsible for something objective. The complaint is heard often that people are not responsible enough. However, may it not be true that we cannot be responsible when we are not allowed to be responsive first? If no soul calls upon our name, we perhaps are too weak to shoulder responsibilities. As long as we are only taught and addressed in the mass, our name never falls upon us as the power that dresses our wounds, lifts our hearts, and makes us rise and walk.

The right words, i.e. "names," guarantees responsiveness. Responsiveness is the lying open for being empowered. We have long spoken of an open mind. But the mind is open for conceptual understanding of the things outside. The other openness of any human being is to an appeal made to him in the power of his name. "As an American, as a human being, as a Christian, as a believer, as a child of God, you must listen," this appeal might say. "All members of the CIO do so and so," is another form which this appeal may take. We, too, have not just one Ka under which we are moved. The first name, the family name, our professional title as a doctor, or scholar, or a farmer, as a native of this state, a resident of another, may be listed as so many kas which bestow on us responsiveness.

Now, the power of a name lies in the fact that it eases our conscience. The simple fact, that the mother calls the child by the right name, makes the child smile. The cry, which is the first utterance of the child when it enters the world, is transformed into the smile of response through the intermedi-

ary of the name. The name pacifies the child and gives it ease in this new and cold world which it did not enjoy before. *Names give orientation.* As long as we are addressed with a name that has power we feel that we are led. We may smile, because, even when an enemy calls our name, we still are not confused. We know where we are. In as far as our society is imperilled today it is because people are not addressed in the powerful manner which might give them orientation.

All religion tried to give orientation. All religion is out for the right word in the right place and time. All superstitions arose because religions wanted eternal recipes for giving names. The true life of human speech defies all recipes. The names under which the parts of the world must be made to move change with the times. But that does not mean that the appeal must not be made. The fact that no one name lasts forever in its power over an open heart only means that our minds do transform constantly powerful names into mere words and concepts. And once a word is definitely analyzed and conceptualised, it has lost its quality of name. Any definition cuts the umbilical cord between the use of an element of speech as a name and the use of the same element as a mere word.

Because we need orientation, we wait for our soul to call upon our name. This fact leads to one other difference between words and name. All words can be used by everybody and can be carried over to any number of things and objects either by definition or metaphorically. But the same element of speech when used as a name is neither a metaphor nor a classification. It is exclusively used between you and me. If the child was not sure that the mother meant him, Johnny, only, and nobody else, the child would not smile. The name is personal, or it is no name. Personifications are possible only as long as language is name-giving. Because name is personification. The word is generic, the name is specific.³ Names are exclusive speech between a person and somebody whom he tries to make into a person by calling him with the right

³ This is essential for the solution of the dispute over the "universalia." It cannot be understood without dealing with the "names" of God.

name. Whereas a description of the outer world may be given in words, the orientation of you or me in the world can only be given us by a specific name-giving process to which we then respond. Orientation and response are two aspects of one and the same process. The child which hears itself called by the same name again and again, responds and thereby gains orientation.

"Orientation" is the objective aspect and "response" is the subjective aspect of one and the same social process of giving or using the right name.

Words classify, but names orient. Words generalize, but names personify. Words dismiss living subjects into the realm of objectivity. Names pick up the little baby or the flower or the sun, and incorporate them into one society of communication. Without names, communication would be impossible. For before two individuals may talk to each other in words about things, they must be mutually responsive, they must recognize each other as persons. Each must make more and more of a person out of his interlocutor by giving each other names. Even abusive name-calling is better than nothing. Because, although negative reaction, it is a condition for the person in the individual who is "called names."

Our present-day discussions about communication usually stress the Babylonian confusion in terminology. As many people, as many definitions of democracy. But communication will not improve on the objective front of definitions as long as we do not make sure in whose name we speak to each other. Whose name do we carry when we speak to each other about the weather, or about the true, the beautiful and the good? The great problem of our days is whether man speaks to man anonymously or only as an incognito slowly to become known as a person. Communication can take place between people who are eager to personify their interlocutor more and more. Communication dies down between people who wish to remain anonymous to each other forever.

The linguistic elements in their name-giving phase are the "word" with a capital W; as words they are mere words, and used in vain. As concepts, they are purified and wait for their

resurrection. And this constant process from name to word to concept to name again, is the life of the Word. Whenever any one phase is omitted, society disintegrates because its members lose orientation.

III. Orientation in Egypt

The Egyptian Ka oriented the King. It authorized him to govern in wisdom, knowledge, in right perception and insight, glory permanence, as Horus, the reborn son of the ever dying, ever resurrecting Osiris. It is not difficult to trace the development of the Ka from the gods to the king and only much later to the individual Egyptian for his life after death. Without pretending to say the final word here, we may however mention some indisputable facts.

Before the Nile and its inundations created the unity of work and law in Egypt, the life in Egypt did not differ from that in the Libyan oasis and other parts of Africa.⁴ The chieftain of any tribe, in this hot climate, was responsible for the rainfall. And he gave way to a successor every seventh or ninth year because the magical power of rain-making had to be regenerated regularly.

When Osiris discovered the possibilities of the Nile valley, and the regular flow of the fertile mud between July and October, the Egyptians gave up the universal fear of primitive men against the low land of the valleys, and closed the new "city" ("nwt") of Egypt against Northerners, Westerners, Easterners and Southerners,⁵ rejected the God of Libya, Seth, and turned their new temples to the service of the two gods that did not simply represent the unruly wind, rain, and clouds of the sky—as Seth—but who did represent the unbroken order of this sky as horizon and sun, Horus and Ra.

The sun, a curse in this hot climate so far, now became a blessing because "he" could set a unified law and order for

⁴ Wainwright, G. A., *The Sky-Religion in Egypt*, p. 8 ff., 1938, Cambridge.

⁵ James H. Breasted, *Development of Religion and Thought in Egypt*, New York, 1912, pp. 13 and 14.

the thousands of miles of Egypt's length. The pyramid stone on the obelisk in Heliopolis became "the great occasion for chaining a cosmic power to a definite and specific place of worship."⁶ Here, the sun cut out a definite place, a temple on earth that reflected the recurrent order of the sky. A temple is the mirror of heaven. As long as the sky god Seth governed, no "temple," but altars only, had been possible. The Egyptian temple reflects eternity.⁷ The chieftain of old, the rain sorcerer, now became the owner of the magical mirror of heaven on earth. The Pharaoh was not a king in our modern sense of the word. He was the owner of the first revealing and sacred house of man on earth, of the "city of Egypt" given by the gods to man in the sacred order of the year that from eternity to eternity guaranteed the fertility of the land through the inundation of the Nile. The word Nile now became the word for rain, too. And instead of seven or nine years of government, Pharaoh shared the eternity of the celestial orders. When he built his pyramid in imitation of the benben stone in On (Heliopolis), he thereby became the undying Sun-god himself, Ra.

So Pharaoh was lifted up from a rain sorcerer of Libyan days, to the steward of God's house on earth, the Sun God. The sun was lifted every morning by the god Nun up to heaven with two outstretched arms.⁸ We find pictures showing the God lifting the fiery ball over his head.⁹ Then we find two outstretched arms based on the two signs for eternity ("ded"), and life, and again these arms throw up the ball of the sun.¹⁰ In other pictures the celestial god reaches out with his two arms for the sun, when the night gives way to the morning.¹¹ The gesture of the two arms that lift up the sun every morning signalizes the central problem of the new faith that was the "Constitution" of Egypt. Now, if the sun, Ra,

⁶ Herman Kees, *Totenglauben und Jenseitsvorstellungen der alten Ägypter* Leipzig. 1926, p. 35.

⁷ Kees, p. 7.

⁸ Kurt Sethe, *Altägyptische Vorstellungen vom Lauf der Sonne*, Preussische Akademie der Wiss., phil.-hist. Klasse, SB, 1928, 259 ff.

⁹ Sethe, p. 262, our picture no. 3.

¹⁰ Sethe, 271 f, our picture no. 4.

¹¹ Sethe, 268 and 276.

the model of every Pharaoh, had to be lifted by the god of the source waters up to the horizon every morning, Pharaoh too had to be lifted up to his throne by the Ka.

On the other hand, the individual Egyptian had nothing to do with the sun in the beginning except to worship "him"—certainly he could not think of identifying his own life on earth with that of Ra. It took fifteen hundred years before every Egyptian saw his own life finally end in an atonement with the course and orbit of the Sun in after life. His first great model of the eternal, undying, recurrent life, with "*ded*," permanency, in the houses of "millions of years," as the temples were called,¹² was not Horus, the god of the celestial horizon, or Ra, the sun, directly; his model was his king who, by entering the City of Egypt, the "settlements made in the name of Horus,"¹³ had been lifted from a mere chieftain and medicine man into the Pharaoh, the surveyor^{13a} of the divine house that reflected heaven on earth and forced heaven down to earth. The King's Ka or majesty consisted in the fact that his raiment no longer was a barbaric tattoo or mask, but the cosmic house and temple itself. The King of Egypt was the first human being who dropped all tribal masquerading and went clean shaven, unmasked and untattooed. For this king had donned the garment of celestial order. It is too weak a word to say that Pharaoh "inhabited" the cosmic gates. His whole life was transplanted upon the celestial wheels, and followed the cosmic calendar hourly and daily and annually in the house.

The Egyptian king was the link between heaven and earth, and in the king's "*name*" the forces of the cosmos and the recognition by society coincided. The radiations of the Ka range from alimentation to glory. But this, though it has puzzled many an Egyptologist,¹⁴ will always result from a happy intersection of the cosmic and the social. We all crave for a necessary role in nature to be recognized by society. We

¹² A. Moret, *Le Nil et La Civilisation Egyptienne*, 1926, p. 148.

¹³ Breasted, p. 14.

^{13a} Pharaoh surveyed the orientation of every temple.

¹⁴ See especially von Bissing, p. 1 ff. and Moret's famous book of 1902.

all wish to yield a reasonable, necessary and, that is, natural function under the official sanction of society. The doctor can function as a force in nature only through the power which he wields over real processes of life and death: he operates, feeds, and treats and these are real interventions with the cosmos. On the other hand, he is called a doctor, hands out prescriptions which go to the pharmacist, and talks to the patient's family and nurse, and all these are social processes of being named and recognized by organized society. In the same manner, the Pharaoh who reconciles Egypt with the life of heaven, who is lifted up by eternal alimentation to the millions of years of the stature of the Sun, is lifted up before his people by his name and authority and glory. Both cosmic reality and social recognition are two aspects of one and the same thing. We all crave for this unity between our cosmic and our social role. No wonder, then, that both are covered by the gesture, the process, the divine event which is called "ka."

In Abydos, Pharaoh Seti the First sits before his table of offerings; behind him, his "ka" walks as a bearded man, carrying on his head the Ka-sign, the two uplifted arms with the name of the God-King "Horus Ra." That is, the name by which he is lifted up to the millions of years of the run of the celestial orb. Besides, the Ka-carrier has in his right hand the sign of eternal life, and in the left arm he lifts a pole like the one on which the Romans carried their eagles. But, instead of the eagle, the ka sign is on this pole. Above the hieroglyph for the god-king and inside the two outstretched arms of the ka sign balances the sign "sa," protection. To be lifted up as the sun rises every morning, means to be protected, to have both a necessary role in the cosmos and an established name in society. To have one's ka—who would not wish that his nature and his society could agree in so perfect harmony as the Ka of Pharaoh?

The Ka was held up above the king so that he might feel that he only had to respond. Names unburden our soul immeasurably from our own choices. They tell us what our destiny is. The Egyptian ka is an eternal category because it

unifies the meaning of the name and of the orientation of a person. Persons are oriented individuals.

IV. Disintegration and Orientation

A person is not an individual that can think. But a person is an individual whose soul has called upon his name and thereby determined the direction of his life. A person is a man who has been given direction. When a scientist follows his logical analysis, his laboratory experiments, his die is cast. He has responded to the direction of his life; he has acknowledged the imperative written over his own life: there shall be science and you shall be the servant of science. Nothing that this scientist thinks or writes or publishes within his scientific field makes sense outside this decision that he had made long before. He responded to the call of science long before he knew what he would do during his life as a scientist. He got his orientation by moving along on the wavelength that had appealed to him when he dialed his reception apparatus. Descartes is the founder of modern science because he made a decision in 1620 that his life would be oriented solely by the idea of a progressive scientific research program. You do not share the answer given by Descartes, the scientist, but you share the response given by Descartes, the man.

The response to science precedes any scientific statement in particular. Man is called upon by other vocations of a non-scientific character just as well. And any science of society must penetrate behind the decision made by the scientist, must see that the scientist is not the normal type of human being but just one among others, in order to discover the essential composition of the good society. The notion of persons in a society and the notion of scientists must never be allowed to coincide. The orientation of an individual that makes him become President or scientist or baker is a decision that makes president and scientist and baker equals as responsive and oriented persons long before their various ideals of presidency, scholarship, and bakership begin to operate upon them. The

democracy of a scientific age can only be retained and saved when the scientist willingly remains a part of the people in this democracy. How can this be done? The scientist must hold to the faith that every person that decides to become a scientist does so not as a scientist but as a human being who harkens to his deepest calling. Then he will realize that his own decision unites him with all people who grow into responsive, named, oriented persons. The scientist is a personality as a member of humanity, not as a member of the academic class.

The Egyptian world, literally in the childhood of humanity, explored the one and uppermost experience of the child's mind: that of being addressed, of having been loved and called upon and directed by elders who did not run away as animals do when they have fed their fledglings, but who stood by the young, the children, the grandchildren, the great and great-great grandchildren forever. The Ka, the name-giving character of speech became the aspect of all logical processes that was realized and revered and fructified to the extreme.

Our era has suppressed the very notion of this mental situation. Descartes complained that for twenty years his brain had been corrupted by confused and wrong notions. He complained that Descartes the man had been anteceded by Descartes the child. The confidence between his father's religion and his own science was destroyed. He thought that the name-giving relations in society were sheer waste. He and his followers have destroyed the cement that connects the living bricks of our social temple, called persons. This cement is the right name. Neither Descartes nor Egypt are wholly right. The name which a man is given binds him to two achievements equally difficult: to go forward as a specialist and to remain a human being as the perfect men before him. The essence of the era in which we live is that man as a specialist shall progress and have an open mind. But this era will end in catastrophe if it forgets that, as a human being, man must have the same open heart that made the first fully human being the heart of the world. The mind listens to words for objects; the heart listens for its clue for personal orientation, its proper name on

the stage of history. The open mind that understands words and the responsive heart that is called by its name represent the polarity of human mentality which we must uphold.

The Ego and the Ka are both real sources of our personal life. We now can form certain conclusions from the fact that the Ego who uses words to manipulate things and the Ka that calls me by my name to move me, have opposite principles of political economy. When I use words, I always try to get a maximum result with a minimum effort. If I can say something in three lines, I shall not waste four paragraphs. He would be a fool who would waste his energy on a task for which he need not spend more than five minutes with the right tools.

Do as much as you can with as little effort as possible, is the motto of the anonymous, impersonal, objective, scientific mind. This Cartesian mind has successfully discovered how to use fewer and fewer means for bigger and bigger results. A modern factory is the ideal display of this economizing in words, in organization. This economy, however, cannot apply to man himself. He must still find some incentive for an "all-out" attitude. Man must still feel called forth as being good for something. He would be a rascal who, out of sheer indolence, would not use his full energy. Cartesian logic reduces man's responses to minimum responses. For every individual or particular task this reductionism is valuable. But when it means that these savings in time or effort reduce man's stature, when it means that because I only have to work three hours for my daily bread in the future, I also will only be fully alive three hours of my day, then the person is thwarted. For a person is a man who responds with his whole heart to his calling. And any element of the universe that whispers to a human being, "respond lest I die," calls forth this man personally to his human destiny. "All out" is the attitude of the man who has heard his calling and who knows that he can only become a person in the process of responding to his calling. Man must be both indolent and all out. When his mind can find a shorter way, a better tool, he may save energy. The mind is our saver of energy; this is what we call the Ego.

But the soul is our investor, our spendthrift, our saviour when life seems to die from inertia and indifference and lack of orientation.

The "thou" is not a figure of speech, but a corollary to the "Ego." When the concept of the Ka in Egypt hardened and when the concept of the Ego as conceived by Descartes became the only motor in the life of the mind, then both obstruct the mental process. Egypt went fossil because Ka, name, was every word. No name could die. Our society disintegrates because no name is allowed to authorize and to call forth persons. The Ka of Egypt and the mind of Descartes each alone obstruct the constant flow of creative speech through individuals that must guarantee the orientation of society.