

Between the "Queen Mary" and a collapsible boat, a "Faltboot", the difference seems overwhelming. And most of the time, the size of the difference prevents us from putting them in the same class. Yet, in both is demonstrated man's insatiable lust for overpowering the watery element. And in this spirit, the captain of the "Queen Mary" may salute before the intrepidity of the faltboot-oarsman.

Stirred by his intrepidity, the whole British navy may restore her own resolution to master the seven seas.

In a similar way, the superb rigging of modern civilization needs its counterpart, the Fältboot of civilization in which we cogs of an overcomplex machinery may recognize our common inspiration. We are crews on so complicated boats that education and literature and, in its modest way, this autobiography of our race, cannot help simplifying.

It may be that the complicated riggings of science, economy, politics, alone give two thousand million people the power to survive. Yet the joy of living must spring from the simple creative acts that renew those superhuman and impersonal powers, daily. And without this joy of living, war and peace are too heavy burdens for mortal men.

In the Mass of the Church, in the world's great Literature, in the ideas of our political parties, in the factual discoveries of science, we have rediscovered, on a gigantic and truly universal scale, the same quadri lateral that inheres in any sentence spoken in our mother tongue. In the light of the most consummate achievements of the four aspects of our conscious life (law, art, science, politics) we rediscover the structure of any conscious life:

For, when we now turn back to our starting point, and analyze

any speaker's utterance, on the basis of our final clarification, we shall be able to trace the same elements in every sentence that we speak.

Any vocal expression contains (1) rhythm, (2) time-span, (3) accent, (4) emphasis.¹ We will take up these four elements one after another. The sentence: He is a jolly good fellow, may be analyzed as follows: (1) it is rhythmical, as anyone knows who has sung it. (2) It is contained in a peculiar time measure. This element becomes clearer perhaps when we compare the following sentences:

He is a jolly good fellow.

Once, two hundred years ago, there was a jolly good fellow in Baltimore, Maryland.

He is a jolly though no a good fellow.

Be a good fellow.

Comparing rhythm with time-span, we may say that when we sing: 'He is a jolly good fellow,' : the rhythmical element is preponderant. We are, therefore, inclined to reiterate it. Rhythm is an invitation for a refrain, a repetition. However, when we turn historical, toward a narrative, we instinctively set out to lengthen the sentence by adding some temporal and spatial determinants. By this shift to greater lengthiness we become aware of the 'time' element peculiar to any sentence. Any sentence has an appropriate length. This element may be called 'the style' of the sentence. The fact that history is more apt to speak in long-winded sentences than poetry or song, is a symptom which should make us aware of the appropriateness of the time-span of any sentence. For instance, when we turn to the last form listed above: Be a [jolly]good fellow, it seems significant that the adjective 'jolly' is omitted. When we command, we shorten the sentence. It would sound incompatible with the pur-

pose of the order given to say: Be a jolly good fellow. In good style, we either may exclaim: Be jolly or be good. The future is always aiming at the "unum necessarium" for which Mary in the New Testament cared more than for the many things; hence, we cannot aim at two qualities, 'jolly' as well as 'good' in a phrase that is imperative without running into trouble. The best 'style' for the order is: 'Be good.'

3. Emphasis

This sentence 'Be good' reveals the third element of speech. It is much more emphatic than any one of the three other phases. More of the whole person of the speaker must go into this sentence than in the other styles. Although it may be said in a loud or a low voice, always must it be underwritten by the full authority of 'the whole man who gives this order or wills this behavior. To see the meaning of emphasis, we may grade the degree of emphasis in modifying the utterance:

- a. Perhaps you will be good enough
- b. Would you not be good enough?
- c. I wished you were good enough
- d. Be good.

I think that the greatest purity of style and the greatest power is inherent in "d". But to be effective, "d" must be spoken by a person who is very sure of his authority. Forms "a", "b", "c" are more current in our democratic society because the speaker does not dare to use emphasis. ~~The master~~^{He} is bold enough to insist on his right to order the listeners' mind. Only a speaker whose authority the listeners recognize and by whose name he is loved or impressed. ~~Id~~^{pre} A competent army officer, on the other hand, will not shout, but may give his orders in a short and quiet way because he is sure of the emphasis that accompanies his order in the souls of his soldiers.

1. (pg.2) Compare Emil Sutro, Duality of Voice
(G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1899: pp.161 ff.)

Henry Beyle ~~in his life of Vendémia~~ quotes from Mazzoni's Ode 71
Cinque Maggio: "The line," ~~of~~ celebre obedir" (the quick obedience),
and adds himself this interpretation of emphasis: "An absolute
monarch is the one person in the world who makes the fewest ges-
tures. They are useless to him. For a long time he is accust-
omed to see his slightest sighs followed up with lightning speed,
by the execution of his will."*)

Emphasis, it will be obvious from this illustration, means
the degree of relation between the will and the spoken word. When
we speak more emphatically, more of our will is in the sentence; we
mean business. When we speak without emphasis, we, in our quality
as 'willers' are divorced from our quality as 'speakers'.

4. Accent: This becomes evident when we turn to the statement in
the form "c": He is a jolly though not a good fellow. This sent-
ence speaks the objective language of the indicative because it is
built around the accent on jolly as against good. All logical langu-
age distinguishes analytically; and all criticism uses accentuation
to carry its point. The one sentence: He is a jolly good fellow,
may be analyzed in many ways, with the accent shifting each time to
another of the component words: He is a jolly good fellow (but his
brother is not). He is^s (but perhaps will not remain) a jolly good
fellow (very often used in a warning or cautioning statement). He
is a jolly good fellow^x (but a poor householder), and so on and so

forth. *Accent came late in antiquity. It changed the whole structure of Indo-European speech. Of the four elements of the sentence, accent has the character of second thought!* Any narrative, as we said before, is stressing the lapse of much
time; it takes time. Orders require emphasis. Emotions crave
rhythical expression.

*) Stendhal, Vie de Rossica, Paris 1922-1923, p. 215.

To sum up:

"A", "b", "c", "d" are variations of the one sentence; He is a jolly good fellow, in the direction of rhythm, time length, accent, and emphasis; however, they only drive home to us more easily the truth that all the four elements subsist in any sentence. We cannot speak without some rhythm, some accent, some emphasis, and some style. All fundamentals must combine, although they may combine in varying admixtures. It is true to say that not one of the four elements may reach zero without corrupting speech. Whenever one or more of the elements approaches zero, we have a social crisis or language catastrophe. Modern scientific jargon is invading the districts of the narrative, of the imperative and of poetry. The modern child is taught to detest emphasis, to see merit in short stories, to abhor sentimentality. In consequence of the preponderance of accentuation, of logical antithesis, our society is sick in will, in its emotional life and in its attitude toward the past. It has tried to live on scientific logic and analytical distinctions. It has lost its freedom to shift between rhythm, emphasis, style, and accent. The moment we understand that accent is just one form of varying our sentence, we would recover our full plenitude of speech. And only when we shall wield speech in its plenitude, again, shall we master the time and space axes of our existence by consciously insisting on the important aspect at the right moment, with freedom regained. Man is the physician of his own diseases, and the creature of his own creation. *as long as he uses his freedom of changing his style and switching from rhythmical to emphatic to lexically accentuated to leisurely style.* The era of science has taught man to shift the accent ~~and~~ ^{his} ~~logical~~ ^{and} antitheses ad libitum, to analyze, debunk, criticize all traditions and superstitions skeptically. By developing the accents of scientific logic, man has become free from the shackles of his emotional and ^{his} conventional

tional existence. However, today, a new and even greater freedom is required. ~~for,~~ We look through the shackles of scientific skepticism itself. We conceive of man as being the lord of science as well as of convention. Science, too, is a human creation, and its creator, man, may shift the emphasis, at any moment, to forms of speech that are more apt to serve his life in this planet, at this moment. We insist that man must transcend his sciences today, because he ~~cannot~~ has more urgent needs than the one of being scientific. He cannot help emphasizing peace between the scientist and the layman, between the growing young classes and the adult groups in society, between the intelligentsia and the masses, between the teacher and his students, and he ~~falls~~ is a desperate crisis of the sexes as soon as he forgets the arts of courtship and she forgets the arts of listening. The language of politics and education transcends the logical languages of science because it is emphatic. An education that would remain in the grips of the scientific attitude of logical distinctions and alternatives, would ~~pollute~~ ^{pollute} the whole realm of action to ^{The} political ~~mob~~ as the most scientific nation, ^{the} Germany, did in 1933. In other words, a society in which education photographs science, divorces its educated classes from politics. They become speechless in politics. Then, ~~education~~ ^{is facts} will be destroyed by politics; it will become an appendix of politics. The only other way is to make education representative of emphatic speech again. When education ceases to copy science but becomes representative of creation by insisting, it may leaven politics. A race is on, today, between politics and education. And it depends on the educators if politics shall leave the educated man speechless (fascism, communism), or whether society may remain shot through with the living and enlightened, ^{here, the idolatry of scientific logic must cease. It is only} word. In every sentence which we speak we affirm four things:

I. For the man in politics, It is important to know when to speak. II. Science affirms that it is important to know what we speak. III. Poetry affirms that it is important to speak. IV. And tradition affirms that it is important to speak with

propriety it is important how we speak.

ad I. In our race with brutal force and with gigantic cultural determinants (war, dictatorship, technique, monopoly), we must assign, with double vigor, the proper moment to speech. And education will save the freedom of our children and grandchildren when we minimize logical subtleties and emphasize again that the word must be spoken at the right moment, when it answers a deep social need. In emphatic language, we mean business; our will underwrites our insight. The emerging of the word out of the very depth of our common sufferings is the process that must be stressed in order to heal the grammar of mankind.

ad II. We articulate because we cannot forbear to be inarticulate. We speak because we prefer the light of a speaking community to the darkness of a speechless beehive. We have lived in poetic, conventional, and scientific periods. We cannot survive without freeing our abstract speech from its detachment and uprootedness, without guiding it home to the matrix of a common soil for will and speech. The criterion of emphatic speech is its lack of arbitrariness.

ad III. Science deals with anything under the sun, just shifting the accentuation one shade of meaning to another shade of meaning. Education and politics deal with the unum necessarium, with the indispensable. When we shall articulate the unum necessarium, of every moment, our speech shall have recovered from the pest of our times, the decay of the will, in the educated class. The educated class will cease to be the educating class as long as it insists on teaching logical analysis only. The pseudoscientific educator stigmatizes emphatic commands as visceral, rhythmical animation as sentimental, and historic forms of thinking as ritualistic. And his little victims, the students, under his influence, suspect every spiritual creativity

or historical creation or emotional recreation as irrational and therefore unscientific and beneath their dignity as enlightened thinkers.

But visceral, sentimental and ritualistic are no terms that should frighten a healthy human being. Only a prudish spinster will deny that man has intestines, sex and legs and arms. The whole man turns about, under the impact of a command, and as he is frightened or encouraged, his kidneys, stomach, liver and gland, all participate in the mental act.

Sentiment, lyrics, song are based on our sex life. Here the source of all our emotions is found. And only a coward declines to thank the angles and demons of love who keep his heart alive, for better for worse.

Ad N

Ritual, obviously, has to do with the frailty and wax-quality of our physical organization. We run, march, kneel, swing, work, fold our arms, don our dresses in formal ways because we must inherit the acquired qualities of our race in the way of rites and customs, habits and forms that receive and introduce the child of nature into the history of its kind. Pseudo-scientists, then, when they ask us to accentuate logically, without giving up a place to style, rhythm, or emphasis, isolate the accentuating power of the brain from the rest of our organization. They use up rapidly the cultural heritage of religion, art, and ethics. Because their analysis can do nothing else but to hover over statements and products that have been created by the other mental attitudes.

The era of scientific analysis exploits the world of linguistic creation, and just as the exploitation of the soil, the forests, the river has created soil erosion, dust bowls, and pollution, so we need today linguistic soil conservation, linguistic rehabilitation, linguistic fallowness. We have to restore the power of the word to

move the whole man, mind, body, and soul. We must remove the misunderstanding of the word, in a pseudo-scientific education. In it, the seasonal character of science in the metabolism of human consciousness was misunderstood. Science was made absolute. However, the seasons follow each other ineluctably. And with the disintegration caused by the scientific exploitation of values before our eyes, we only have to choose between capitulating before a speechless dictatorship of the shouting and inarticulate masses or a restoration of the complete cross of reality.

Appendix I
(The list is incomplete)

WORLD WAR
1914 - 1918

A. Compared by the belligerent nations

- 1912 1. Bulgaria to the War of 1912
- 1870 2. France to the War of 1870
- 1800-1815 3. England to the Napoleonic Wars 1800-1815
- 1776-1783 4. America (first period) to the Collaboration with France 1776-83
- 1756-1763 5. Prussia to Frederick the Great and the War of Seven Years 1756-63
- 1742-1748 6. Austria to the War of Succession in the beginning of Maria Theresia 1742-48
- 1560-1579 7. Belgium to the Struggles of the Dutch Against Spain - - - - - 1568-1579
- 1453 8. Russia to the Loss of the Cross on the Hagia Sophia in Byzantium - - - - - 1453
- 1415-1434 9. Bohemia to the Martyrdom of John Huss and the War of the Hussites - - - - - 1415
- 1099-1274 10. America (second period) to the Crusades (first 1099, seventh and last - - - - - 1274)
- 951-1268 11. Italy to the invasions and the rule of the Nordic emperors between - - - - - 951 and 1268

B. Compared by scholars

- 1. in France
 - 410 A.C.
 - 452 A.C.
 - 202 B.C.
 - 168 B.C.
- while losing to Alaric and the Goths
in Rome 410 A.C.
- while winning to Attila and St.
Genevieve 452 A.C.
- 2. in Germany
 - 1914-1918
- while winning to the war against Carthage 202 B.C.
- while losing to the war against Macedonia 168 B.C.
- 3. in Russia: Last Capitalistic Catastrophe without parallel