

Incomplete

400

## The Woover's Fate

Le Mangage de l' amour.

The words we speak form us . On the wings of our own words we travel to new shores. And a new type of man has arisen always when man began to ~~any~~ speak differently. Speech is not information of the listener in the first instance. Speech in the first instance is formative of the speaker.

So far linguistics have not taken this into account. The speaker's contribution is dealt with in phonetics as though his larynx, tongue, throat, jaw, lips gum, were his stake in speaking. Logic deals with the objective meaning of his sentences; that is, logic analyzes the sentence regardless of who said so. The Phaidon of Plato, for instance, has been analyzed through the ages, for its logical argument on immortality. One day, however, Woodsbridge was tired of this logical analysis of the meaning of Socrates' words. He reread the Phaidon as a book dramatizing the death of Socrates. He said: there is no objective meaning to this dialogue. We are shown how Socrates died in the presence of his friends. Part of his dying was that he spoke to his friends. But the Phaidon is not memorable for logical argument but for showing what the words Socrates spoke in this ultimate situation did to Socrates and our picture of Socrates. The Socrates who spoke and behaved as in Plato's Phaidon, now lives in our hearts as a man very different from a Socrates as we might have known him through Aristophanes. And for this reason, The words of Socrates create Socrates. This was Woodsbridge's discovery in his The Son of Apollon. (1929)

This means that logic and phonetics do not even face the question what speech does to the speaker. Neither does grammar or dictionary tackle this problem. They, to the contrary, ask for the relation in which this sentence finds itself to words formerly spoken or written. Modern editors blame an author if he says something in a manner hitherto not common. Their idea of speech is formed by the King's English, Roget's Thesaurus and Noe Webster. They think that in speaking we chew old bread. Speech and language appear to the grammarian as things of the past which we today use again, as tools and instruments of communication and how these various ways are called by which language is treated not as an event in the speaker's life but as ~~xxxxxxx~~ a means to some external end, external to the speaker.





and his energies with a mate of the other sex.

This is extraordinary. In the ordinary way of life, the individual hides the sperm of life behind a solid wall of armor and protection. Ever since the life split into female and virile elements, high and higher barriers were erected between the basins in which the male and the female elements of reproduction were lying in wait for their ultimate re-union. Most of the time the most eternal life, the sperm, is precluded from any exit. As in physics, resistance is required to heighten efficiency. The higher the life, the higher the walls which must be transgressed before the two poles of male and female can unload and equalize their electricity. As it noted in passing that monogamy logically is the highest barrier for the life force and would have to be deduced from a mere observation of the laws of physics, resistance and impedance. Monogamy is the limiting concept of the rarest and highest degree of walling off the divided and separate sexes from fusion.

The individual organism is like a coil of electric wire which increases resistance. From the point of view of the race, this coil, these protective organs of our bones and skin, around the vital substance which survives them, are arsenals and trenches of the kind. The ordinary view that the individual is the "ordinary" purpose of creation, and the act of mating one extraordinary incident in its existence, is an arbitrary judgment. In electrophysics, the coil around a resistor would never be considered the ordinary end or aim or purpose, but merely an end means to ~~enlarge~~ enlarge the current. The extraordinary in biology, the act of mating, in electricity, is considered the normal and ordinary meaning of the process. Here, we insist that the positive and the negative electricity are aiming to be re-united and that any resistance which is inserted, is explicable in the light of the final flow of the current.

This may show how careful we should be in the use of the terms "regular", "ordinary", as well as extraordinary. The relation of the individual to the species defies any such simple distinctions. We ourselves shall not simply reverse the common usage. This, too, would be arbitrary. However, we shall not be cowed by the vulgar usage of taking the sexless, indifferent individual, the bachelor state as the normal one. As soon as drop this superstition that our faculties were given us as individuals, and only in the one case of mating, our genitals served the species, a Copernican revolution can take place. We all of a sudden are free to recognize that speech, animal speech, was not given us in the ordinary course of events, for our individual existence at all. The allocation of the faculty to speak goes now to another fund. Not the fund of individuality contained the power to speak. The species claims the potency to speak as a part of the potency to mate and to recreate the kind notwithstanding

our individual organisation. Speech is a catalyst. In speech, the individual organisation is broken down, in favor of the species.

Speech, in the animal kingdom, became necessary because a process was needed for melting the barriers, for tilting over the arsenal and walls of resistance which we call "the individual", and which rarely the opportunities during which life can meet life.

Now sounds, music, animal speech, have the definite function of tilting over the individual crust and to draw out the life process from under its individual shell. In the act of mating, in orgasm, the animal forgets its "own" organisation. And the minutes or hours during which the animals coo and play and strut and sing and woo, are necessary as the preparatory steps during which the individuals may come to shed their self, their fears, their abhorrence and reluctance to forego the hard shell of individuality and to burn up for the sake of the kind. The longer the resistance, the higher the life. The higher the life, therefore, the more eloquent the language, and the courtship.

Animal speech is not communication, or information or conveying of facts or thoughts. Animal speech is not "statement" but the fight against the individual state. It is enchantment for the purpose of breaking up the animal's state. By enchantment, the roving carnivore, the robber and consumer of food, is attracted to another form of existence. Animal speech is the means to prepare orgasm. In this function, animal speech contradicts the animal's organisation as orgasm cannot be called a normal function of this organisation. Mating as we have seen, similarly to the spark which leaps across the distance between two electric poles, is a victory over this individual organisation.

Enchantment is necessary to melt the harness and armor which we call the individual in a specimen of the animal kingdom. A specimen combines the species and the individual in one frame. The term "specimen", is helpful in that it reminds us of the double aspect of any living being: it is species and individual in one. Any complete living being contains individual organisation and "orgastic", reproductive, cells. We said already before that we would not counter the idolatry of the "individual" by a similar idolatry of the species. We are satisfied to perceive their united existence in any specimen without calling one the ordinary and the other the abnormal. The specimen is built towards both fronts, the front towards the species and the front towards individuality. The specimen can shift from one "front" to the other. And sounds play a vital part in this transformation. They act as transformers. By sounds, the bulwark of the individual is broken down and the reproductive cells are emancipated.

And the sounds do this to the very individual which utters these sounds, and even more so perhaps than to the listener. The singing bird leads on in holy frenzy, not "what" he tells his presumptive mate, attracts her; that he is singing out his soul, attracts her by its infectious example. The animal does not speak or sing because it has "something" to say. There is nothing to the content of its speech. The speech is the process by which he

0

a French novel by Ketty Kephren, in Les Livres Libres 117, 1931 Paris, p. 239.

10  
gets beside himself, and thereby invites his mate to accompany him on this ecstatic journey outside the safe contour lines of its individual organisation.

Our tomcat had proposed to a mate for many hours of the night and morning. Shortly before noon, he gave up. We still do not know what frustrated him as the she-cat was near by all the time. Nevertheless, it is a fact that he was reeling sick on the ground for the whole next day. His own organisation had been tilted over and processed by his own tones. It is therefore important to understand that the tones which he produced ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ ~~XXXX~~ can in no way be interpreted as mere signs made to his mate. In signs of communication, the expense at which we make them, can be overlooked as negligibly small. In the case of our tomcat, they did cost him a lot. In fact, he shook the foundations of his being were jeopardized. He was beside himself and in danger.

\*) A literary piece on this theme is to be found in "Evocation" / When the capercaillie, the cock of the woods, plays, you can hunt him. This moment is the only moment in which the experienced huntsman will take aim at him at all. For during this moment, the capercaillie is beside himself. His eyes are closed. His audition is blurred. His defenses are down.

### 2. The wooer.

No be  
The love song of animals is the process of bringing down their defenses. The love song of animals is not "mental", it is a process in the life of the species. It is part of the process by which the individual, in a specimen, is forced to give way to the species. It is directing force in which all the energies of the specimen are turned towards the selection of a mate, and this process contradicts the survival of the fittest individual. For, the meaning of the process is that the existing individual itself is survived. The love song condemns the individual so that the species may survive in a new and less "death-near", less doomed, future specimen.

The eloquence of the specimen reaches its highest pitch when the waves of sounds are set in motion against the individual and towards the species.

This orgasmic eloquence as we shall see is the primary case of animal speech. Or the secondary cases of speech in which the eloquence thus created is used for secondary or individual purposes, we shall speak further on. At this point, it behooves to compare the eloquence of the human wooer. Although human ~~XXXX~~ speech as we are anxious to re-assure the reader, certainly sublimates, the hermit thrush's song to the wailer's lullaby, the priest's holy writ, the poet's frenzy, and the prophet's psalms; yet is the cooing and wooing, courting and playing of the male not without continuation in the species of homo sapiens. ~~XX~~ the reader will kindly keep in mind that the courser's snip or one male for one female, for a time at least, was repressed in our species in favor of higher political discourses, and that the love making of the individual human being lived on in the shadow of these higher types of articulate speech,

But though repressed it could not be extinguished.  
It remained at the base of the edifice of ecstasies.

7  
from public expression.

as

"surrender"

The old tribes went so far to excise all individual "inflammatory speech" from male to female. The marriage rules and "moieties" of the tribe intervened. They stressed the sacred character of the selective process as an act of peace within a larger society. Greek womanhood was married ceremoniously but without the individual eloquence of the son-in-law. The often disparaged rituals of the wedding as "sale", or "elopement" or traditional by the father or the bride, all were instituted to counteract the animal elements in the act of selection. This lack of sentiment in the official proceedings of matrimony has often been mentioned and criticized. We now are in position to understand it. The whole task of ancient mankind was concentrated on developing articulate speech beyond the grave, beyond space and time of one individual couple. From the animal kingdom, speech hailed. However, here it was absorbed in the process of mating, and it was inarticulate. It served the moment.

The new human worlds of tribe, temple, poetry, prophecy, were held together by articulate speech which inspired permanently and by name a ~~PERMANENT~~ group, a land, a universe, a people. Hence, articulated speech first of all, in its ritual, names, prayers, incantations, titles, formulas, was put at the disposal of the larger worlds emerging beyond the animal world of ~~nameless~~ nameless life. It was withheld from the fleeting moment. High language aimed at eternities.

With this march of speech through the ages firmly in mind, the reader will not misinterpret the fact that at all times, the individual lover has directed the energies of articulate speech to his mill most eagerly. The love to a friend, to a male friend, gave birth to the old epics of Gilgamesh in Babylon. The love of the young men, made Socrates and Plato eloquent. Sappho is a similar case, on the part of the woman. And gradually, the love of man and woman regained the eloquence of the nightingale and the hermit thrush. Not, however, between bridegroom and bride, at first. Dante did not sing his poem for his legitimate spouse but for the vanishing Beatrice. In our own days, however, we have a remarkable report on one of the most famous stallions of the human race. It is a singular document, probably unique in our traditions, which we are going to quote now. It may re-establish in the reader, in an era of artificial semination, castration and eugenics, a whole some respect for the real secrets of our divine and animal creature. Of Gabriele d'Annunzio, the Italian a courageous woman has given this report to his biographer. This lady went to see him. She was a poetess in her own right, independent, and when she entered the poet's house at the appointed hour,....but here is her story: " ... Allow me a necessary remark. Otherwise you may not understand this confession. I rarely shall quote words of d'Annunzio verbatim. The reason is simple: When he speaks he cannot help expressing himself a little bit like everybody else, especially when the conversation turns on facts or objects of every day life. His genius and his incredible wealth of words of which his memory is capable, cannot alter this. To be sure, his sentences are more elegant, are better styled than is common with men; his terms are better selected. However, it is not at this point that he differs totally from the others.

Article 1

And here allow me to insert a necessary remark. ~~xxxxxx~~ other wise you may not understand this confession. I rarely shall quote words of Annunzio verbatim. The reason is simple: When he speaks he cannot help expressing himself ~~xxxxxx~~ ~~xxxxxx~~ a little bit like everybody else especially whenever the conversation turns on facts or objects of every day life. His genius and his incredible wealth of words of which his memory is capable, cannot alter this.

To be sure, his sentences are more elegant, are better styled than is common with men; His terms are better selected. However, it is not at this point that he differs totally from the others.

It is his musical way of pronouncing the words, the rhythm of his expressions, the sound of his voice which give to his language a special attraction, a suggestive power.

These qualities are undoubtedly rare; they are rather difficult to analyze and to describe. I assure you that it is infinitely more easy to realize them.

..... He took my hands and slowly, ~~xx~~ caressing them, he began to speak to me...

More than ten years have passed since this far distant day. Many accidents of life have modified my being and my thinking. A real tempest of scepticism has broken upon me, has destroyed and eradicated in my brain and heart all sentiment, poetry, youth. Therefore it is not under the spell of a recent seduction that I am writing these confessions which with some precision may be called from beyond the grave. Nevertheless, I feel entitled to repeat the declaration which I could have given to myself the day after my visit if I had had the energy and clarity then. And that is that after the poet had spoken, a few moments I understood that my will literally no longer existed; I ~~xx~~ was ready to do and to suffer anything ~~xx~~ which it would be his pleasure to ask from me.

To repeat that which he told me on this day would be a technical impossibility. The things which he says in such moments - for I am not so silly to think that his behaviour was solely created for me - has an effect on the spirit and the will power of the feminine sex which ~~xxxxxx~~ should be compared much more to opium and cocaine than to the effect of the most persuasive human speech.

It would seem as though his voice dominated you and destroyed in you all will with the power of an unknown energy.

Words are in existence which burn more deeply than the most burning caresses. . . He ~~xxxxxx~~ knows them. Caresses exist which are yet more ~~xxxxxx~~ disembodied than the sweetest words. These too he knows.

..... ~~xxxxxx~~ Oh! the wings of his gestures of his voice, a wave of desire, endless, invincible, seems to assail you, to envelop your whole being with an invincible atmosphere of love, to break down even the

most remote ~~remnant~~ remnant of resistance within you. . . The woman to whom he speaks in this manner feels herself isolated from everything which represent her habits and normal life, , removed ~~into~~ despite herself in an unknown and mysterious country in which, alas, everthing is permissible.

There is something so profoundly human and sincere in the suplication and ardor of this man who knows how to pray for love with the same intensity with which a ~~living~~ man dying from thirst would pray in the desert for a drop of water that only a creature of marble perhaps could resist..

The woman who writes these lines , to this day was convinced that she was frigid. She was mistaken. At that moment , I learned to understand adame Stael's remark: There are no frigid women; but there "are clumsy men.

It remains to be shown that in a case like this, denial still is preferable to defeat. I for once, think that this is highly debatable....."\*)

\*) Tom Antongini, Vita Segreta etc. Milano 1938, p. 643 ff.

I am not discussing the amorality of Gabriele d'Annunzio but exclusively ~~with~~ the fact that ~~is~~ the individual scene ~~of~~ as described by L' Ignota, the woman without a name, he was ~~the~~ perfect ~~and~~ the innocent ~~lover~~.

What is meant by this statement, will become clear by contrast. A Puritan of my acquaintance, a married man, one day sighed and said to me: "How horrible sex is; it is imperdonable ~~to~~ the male. The female ~~is~~ ~~not~~ ~~attracted~~ by her travail for the lust; we never can be expiated. The poor devil was not innocent because he did not know how to acquire the innocence granted to us by the right courtship, the enchantment which affirms that the speech of love is not the speech of the individual in us, and therefore is not found on the ledger of ~~the~~ his individual thoughts or words. The Puritan in his diseased mentality divorced his mind and the words or thoughts of his mind from the experiences of his body in marriage. Now he must have tortured his wife. The way he felt, he raped his wife practically each time that he could not "conquer" his sex. This obsession has become vocal in Bernard Shaw. And if the reader now reads Mr. Shaw's account of the act of mating, he may understand why the roué d'Annunzio is a white clad angel, and Shaw an ugly evil doer in the matters of sex, although d'Annunzio ranks as the greatest immoralist and Shaw as exceedingly moral, in the annals of literature.

This is what Shaw has to say ~~on~~: When St. John Ervine, reading Shaw's "Back to Methuselah", objected to the wry face made by Eve, when the serpent whispers the secret of reproduction to her, Shaw said that what made the God of the garden of Eden incredible was his deliberate combination of the reproductive and the excretory organs and consequently with shame.

"Shaw doubted whether the children should know who were their parents or the parents to be able to identify one another. The most satisfactory method thought Shaw, would be for a crowd of healthy men and women to meet in the dark, to couple, and then to separate without having seen one another's faces." \*)

\*) Hesketh Pearson, G. B. S. (the English edition is called "Bernhard Shaw, his life and personality," New York 1943, 90f.

Shaw's style is indeed equally unpoetical as this shameful proposal. Here as in all modern socialist and mob occupation with sex, love is divorced from speech.

A strange situation: these allegedly biology-minded, people who rejoice in reducing man to the descendant of the ape, sever the real bonds which connect us with the nightingale and the stallion. It is the poem by which Rosalind is courted, in its lofty spirit, which is faithful to man's cosmic bondage with all other creatures. The rationalist who in theory is anxious to look at us with the eyes of zoology, destroys the potency of procreation. There will not be and there are already no children born in the lands of the rational approach to procreation.

2

Since my student days, I always felt pity for Shaw. He seemed

to be unable to live. Now, ~~after~~ his official biographer has spoken; - he ~~xxx~~ tells us that Shaw, at the end of his twenties was ~~practically~~ a virgin, and was practically raped then by a greedy lady. This, of course, is a wide spread perversion of our days where the female is the aggressive part. Shaw obviously has never recovered from the misunderstanding connected with this speechless ingress in the kingdom of Venus. Shaw mistakes the prostitution of our bodies ~~for~~ the love which overcomes the shyness of our bodies. As Shaw does not admit the existence of enchantment in the natural world, he has no way of understanding love. He shows this by disparaging our sexual organisation.

However, in it, the ABC of love is hidden. The ABC of love rests on the wonderful fact that the unenchanted is and must and shall remain horrified by the sexual organisation of our bodies. He is deliberately deterred by the sexual organs in the place in which they are found. Genitals and physiology are dissuading us from mating. But they have the same effect on the animal out of season. The obstacles are made abhorrent and forbidding lest the victory of the species over the individual come to easy! The ugliness of the physiology rarefies intercourse and secures the utmost selection. The whole sex process is not intended to work without or outside enchantment. Shaw's proposals prove that any divorce of word and sex must lead to the abolition of marriage. Promiscuity is the only solution then. We, however, ~~can~~ by observing the obvious facts of the animal kingdom, could see the degrees of resistance exalted more and more formidably until monogamy is reached with the human species as the simple crown. The overwhelming majority of all primitive tribes cultivates monogamy. In the order of nature, man is simply the most selective wooer.

That there is a proportion between the degree of every day ugliness and the necessary degree of enchantment to overcome ~~this~~ this ugliness, is suggested by the flora around us. While we and all the animals move through space and meet our mate on the road, flowers do not move. They are rooted to the soil. Their danger therefore is not promiscuity as with us revving animals. Their danger is to die solitarily. Hence, all the plants display their sexual organs vividly and perpetually. Flowers turn their inside out, so to speak. Animals are armored cars. Flowers are as vulnerable as our private parts because they are the plant's private parts!

The human beings who have few occasions on which they find a partner, behave like flowers at these occasions. A peasant girl in the Balkans going to Church or to a wedding, wears a ~~xxx~~ startling and clerful costume; for during the week she sees nobody outside her own family, in other words, she ~~xxxxx~~ finds herself most of the time in a sexless situation.

Like a flower, such a girl is in danger of never being met by her beau. Hence, nobody begrudges her rich adornment on the rare days of opportunity. Vice versa, a secretary in New York City must be nearly immune to enchantment if she is to survive.

All this is the law of all animated beings who are bisected. Sex means bisection. Their perpetuation rests not on sex but on a victory over sex, that is a victory over dividedness in specimens.

And this makes it easy to comprehend the relation of ~~xxxx~~ breathing and inspiring, as two degrees of vitality in all of us. The animation works by inhaling and exhaling in the individual, we call respiration. But this respiratory process is not given to the individual; it belongs with the whole specimen. The specimen is the unit which can turn from individual to species and vice versa, alternately. Just as government is the power to change from war to peace and from peace to war, so, the specimen can change from the state of mere individuality to the state of mating and back again.

Now the breath of life which passes the lungs, is not the monopoly of the individual in us. The individual in us can get along with a kind of suspended animation, millions suffer today from this state in which the oxygen of the air is good for nothing but breathing.

When this respiration is fanned to the higher voltage of its highest pitch, it serves the species by enchanting the specimen so that it forgets the individual. The air or oxygen which the panting animal uses up in mating, burns it up on the altar of the kind.

In humans, we call the ordinary process of inhaling respiration and the extraordinary we call inspiration. Now our idealists and materialists club each other down with these terms trying to reduce the whole of life to one of the two states only. Science observation proves that both parties have something in their favor. It is not a mere mind who thinks, we are animals who breathe and have a real body. And we have lofty ideals and enchanting voices carry us into new countries never seen by our individual eyes. Inspiration is heavy and intensified breathing. To think makes hungry, as any artist or scholar knows. Inspiration has ten or a hundred times the voltage of respiration. At this height, the process of burning up is embodied in sounds. In rhythm and melody. Song, plainchant, is the natural and original fruit of enchantment and its high pressure. As inspiration is realized in sounds, the individual's defenses are dissolved or burned up. Enchantment by sounds is the physical phenomenon through which inspiration proceeds. In every specimen, enchantment must take place whenever the species is to triumph over the individual.

Sounds represent ~~xxxx~~ enhanced animation. They come to pass when mere breathing is intensified to a degree by which the individual armor is liquified. Animal speech, then, will not

ol

... to be classified as part of the individual's armature; it is given the animal to get beside itself, and to get together. Animal speech belongs to a different state of the animal, the state of enhanced animation. That it is important to distinguish states of life, and that it is compelling, may be seen from the fact of sleep. That which inspiration represents beyond mere respiration of the individual, sleep might be said to represent in the opposite direction. The hibernation of animals reduces the liveliness to an anabiotic degree of sloth.

In distinguishing three degrees of vitality, we may find it easier to understand that speech originates in ~~the~~ one of the three and that this state is the state of ecstasy. In this state, the specimen steps outside the individual. In the state of awakening, the animal is left to itself, or more correctly, to its self. For self is the simplest term for (individual ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~) without regard to species.

Now, these considerations of the animal's various states are notanton because of our present social situation. Millions of people, in our society, live in a state of suspended animation, during working hours. The factory system is based on the assumption that a man will accept a state of suspended animation if only he is paid a living wage.

Can we therefore expect that something is done to speech as soon as great numbers of people become mass, that is people who have no opportunity to get beside themselves. For, is not speech at the opposite pole from suspended animation? Indeed, it is incensed animation. Hence, speech is in crisis today. And when speech is in crisis, love is in crisis, one being the wings of the other.

When homescoming soldiers are told that jobs are all they can hope for, for the rest of their lives, speech becomes inextinguishable. People who know of no other life really than one of suspended animation, will be satisfied to treat speech as mere signals. The words which they may have to use still, can be reduced to green and red lights, a mechanical drawing, figures on the commodities to be bought, arrows and circles for directing them hither and thither. Their relations to the other sex become sexual intercourse. And behold, "fraternization" in Germany literally was understood to mean just this.

Enchantment is not only not practised but it is officially declared as non-existent, by the leaders of these disinherited masses, the so-called intellectuals. Needless to say that innumerable quacks practise the arts of black enchantment, black magic, with the masses because white magic is denied and negated and abolished ~~as~~ by the decrees of modern science. But we shall not enter upon the sideline of black enchantment, of the tenacious lingering on of eternal forces in a depraved state when their legitimate forms are frustrated. The main point at issue is that with the modern city dwellers, something terrible has happened: Their individual defenses never disappear. They cannot be broken down anymore by the one power which could do it: enchanting speech. They cannot

speaking themselves outside their selves. Therefore, single marriage becomes untenable. If marriage is a contract between two individuals who wish to have a good time together, or "fun", it is a contract as a contract of sales. It is ridiculous to treat a contract as a vow. Nothing is eternal which we contract as self, as individual, reasonable people. When reason learns, will changes. And as reason learns constantly, the "will" of the contracting parties must change. A married couple, and two contracting parties, ~~are~~ differ very simply: In a married couple, the husband is in charge of the wife's best interests, and the wife is in charge of her husband's best interests. If ~~that~~ this is not the case, if they insist on the question: what do I get out of this marriage, they are not married but have contracted a legal contract for mutual prostitution. Legalized prostitution many marriages may be. But marriage is not refuted by the fact that it becomes rarer and rarer every day. This simply means that less and less individuals behave as sovereign specimens who are free to alternate between species and individual. Just as there are fewer sovereign states with us which can alternate between war and peace, so a vast number of individuals is full of fear and never has its defenses down. They no longer enact the full interplay of species and individual. And with the lack of experience, they cannot help considering speech as statement of fact instead of a means for getting one's self into another state.

Our whole civilisation is based on the belief that speaking is formative and that by throwing ourselves behind our words verily and truly, we become that which we have said we wanted to become. If this, as we have shown, is rooted deeply in our animal endowment in which this power of speaking oneself into a new state, is not only latent but patent, too. The gap between animal speech and human articulated speech, is not ecstasy. Both speeches are ecstatic. The gap is between moment and eternity. Animal speech is unable to go beyond the moment in which the self is sacrificed to the species. Our speech goes beyond the moment. It creates longer bodies of times and in Christianity, it finally establishes one infinite body of time from the first to the last man who can be spoken to at all.

However, even this body of time ~~which~~ of which the Fruit of all the Lips of Antiquity became the seed, can include only those who have ears to hear, who are plastic, who are not deaf to the meaning of speech as enchantment. What happens to people who no longer know of speech in any other way but as statement of fact?

With our defenses as an individual up, with our five senses, our fists, our muscles, our nails and claws, our pro-

Why is artificial semination the real disgrace, the ultimate degradation of man? Why are our eugenisists so silly in studying hormones instead of enhancing the degree of enchantment?

The right love is the perfect love . The perfect love is that which "infringes", as the Italian text, of d' Annunzio says, even the most remote and ultimate bulwarks of self defense, which takes the souls of the lovers to a mysterious country, which isolates them from their every day life, and which makes them realize that in every day life , they have been unaware of the existence of this other , defenseless and united way of life. The perfect love makes the words more power ful than the senses, and the hints behind the words more powerful than the words. In other words, the naive order of things by which the grossly material seems to have more pull, weight, gravity, is reversed. Meaning, in the realm of love, is more powerful than words, "words are more powerful than hands. The laws of Newton are defied and abolished in the union of two souls . ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~  
All love moves upstream"