

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

Richard Feringer: (Ladies and gentlemen, I'm delighted to see you all here at the first meeting...)

[tape interruption]

(...some of you may not believe me. We have a number of these brochures posted around the campus, and you can read a little bit about the many, many accomplishments of our speaker, the books he has written, some of the other things that he has done.

(I thought as an alternative, that I might just give a short, personal reference to Professor Huessy, dating back to the time when I met him in 1959, on the University of California campus. I had become acquainted with his writing several years before that time, and was delighted to have met him in 1959. But it's been especially interesting to me to meet other persons who have known Professor Rosenstock-Huessy, become acquainted with his works, because I have found without exception that these persons have been interesting, and extremely stimulating people themselves. I think this reflects my own view of tonight's speaker.

(One person, whom you may have heard, who's included -- included in this circle is Professor Page Smith, who was on our campus last summer, who was quite well received. And Page is one of Professor Rosenstock-Huessy's students from Dartmouth. And with this, it gives me great pleasure to present our speaker tonight, Professor Rosenstock-Huessy.)

Ladies and gentlemen, I am in a position today like the Mad Hatter in Alice in Wonderland. I have no hat of my own for the two lectures announced, because the title of these two lectures, the -- the unifying title has been stolen. It has not been printed. So here I am having -- without a hat for my two lectures. The Hatter in Alice in Wonderland simply said he had borrowed his own hat from the hats he had to sell. He had no hat of his own. Now my problem is to make you see at the end of our -- time -- day -- two days better that there is a unifying title. But at this moment, there is not. I have to try to leave you a path without previous general introduction.

And let me take then the narrow path next to my own house, and -- this moment in Santa Cruz, in California. I lived there on one side of a big freeway.

And on the other side is the Mission Santa Cruz, which was the first house built in this place by the Franciscans, in 1784. And across this big freeway, there leads for the children who go to the mission school, a winding staircase and an arch crossing the freeway so that without danger, they can pass over it. And on the map--and now comes my hope that this will serve as an introduction--on the map that describes the freeway, and my house, and this mission, and the school, it reads: "Pedestrian separation" for this {bridge}.

Now I have never heard a less-fitting term for something very useful and very important. "Pedestrian separation." Obviously it's a convention. And it is not a pedestrian separation at all. But according to the Lingo of Linguistics, we have the right to define our terms as we please, so let us be a pedestrian separation, you see? And this is the question of all questions, and that is the problem of our meeting here: is linguistics in a position to master language, and tell us how to speak, what to speak, and to whom to speak?

Let me throw out the suggestion that this illness of "pedestrian separation" separates today humanity. Not only that whole nations and whole continents decline to speak to each other--we have such a violent suppression of speech to the Chinese for the last 15 years in this country; it's now breaking up, fortunately--but all told, there are more and more societies which disclaim any desire to speak to other societies. And for the first time in the history of human speech, people claim the right not to owe the truth to anybody outside their own realm of living.

I had just a letter from a Dutch { } missionary in Russia and Poland. He said, "The terrible thing is that the alleged Christians there are only half of them honest; and the others lie and are on the side of the Communists, and report only, and spy on us. And it's quite intolerable. And I have left my work there, I'm back in Holland now, because they don't know what truth is. They don't know the obligation put on us to be true. They make no distinction from one day -- they will be -- tell the truth; it's purely accidental."

Well, I think there are some groups in this country who think exactly the same about truth. And you don't have to be in advertising to be -- fear -- be fearful about the ways the human mind can persuade itself, that it doesn't owe all the truth to everybody.

Each then is today I think in a greater danger than it ever has been. And believe it or not, but my conviction is that the next hundreds of years will be a desperate fight for the survival of speech. Two and-a-half hours by the ordinary

teenager are spent in front of television. That's enough to kill anybody's power to speak.

In 1890, so quite a while ago, there was a scholar; Abel was his name. He wrote a strange book on the contrary sense -- contrary meaning of words. And he drew our attention to the fact that "high" and "deep"--"altus" in Latin--is an ambiguous word. It can mean one thing, you see, to be deep, or it can mean high. He thought the same of the colors, that "blue" and "black" could be the same word, sometimes used in one sense, and sometimes the other. And he had many other examples. And so he said that the first man only pointed to things perhaps--I don't believe this myself, at all--but he thought that -- language was ambiguous. It could mean two things; you had to be there to understand what your colleagues mean.

If you go to Japan, I am told--I haven't been there--one Japanese politely will say, "The weather is," and the other will say, "The weather is." And how it is, we will not say. Today, of course, it's a -- the { } is very beautiful, but tomorrow it won't. And therefore it was better not to pronounce a dangerous judgment on the character of the day, but invite both parts to form their own judgments together with the other. Quite an interesting idea of {protecting} the evidence.

The Lingo of Linguistics. Now {don't} -- start from this premise, that you can speak as we please, if we only define our terms. To define the term means to invent a new word, because it is rootless. It is completely independent of what the term could mean, just as "pedestrian separation." It should mean that people cannot get together and it does mean that they get together.

Now my problem today is to prove to you that this is not true, that language is not at all arbitrary, and that it is not in the ken of specialists, of professionals to determine -- define their terms. We have so many specialities today, and so -- as we -- so we have so many languages. And I -- they're only lingos, they are dialects. But what is a dialect? What is a lingo? What is an artificial language?

It's a language that can only be spoken to by people who have the same intention, who are -- who -- like any specialist--be it a repair work- -- worker, people who have to -- mend the car--they all have to agree what pliers are, if the word -- if the word "plier" was not understood by them. But the thing becomes very difficult if a poet goes by and applies himself to pliers, he will not think of pliers in any sense of the word. But he has a different specialty of a different

profession. And language, in -- in contrast to lingo, only begins when people of different background, different history, different age, different time, speak the same language. Then it becomes language.

The language that a woman and a man speak to each other is the true fountainhead of all language, because -- since we have incest rules, and since the day--and that was the first day in -- in paradise, that man was not allowed to marry his mother or his sister--he had to learn the language of his wife, and she had to learn his language --. And all real language has nothing to do with the themes of the linguistic schools of today, be it Russian, or be it American; because they ignore completely the fact that we all, in the middle of life--whether we become monks and take a vow to the Virgin Mary, or whether we marry a -- earthly per- -- person--we have to make two languages into one, two lingos, two dialects into one. Only where there is courtship is true language. And people who have never made love to a person don't know what language is. And they may be the learned dictionary-markers in the world, including Mr. Noah Webster.

Language is not a nomistic theme, listing words. But language is the power to be -- make yourself understood by a person who did not understand you the day before. And if you don't invent for your declaration of love to your sweetheart something highly original, you cannot make love and you cannot get married well. You will get divorced.

Yes, most people who are divorced never spoke the same language as their wife, and that's why they have to get a divorce. To -- to get married is a very slow process. And you don't know this, you see. I advise you not to wonder that people are divorced all the time. You can only wonder that not many more people are divorced all the time. Because they do not take the trouble, besides going to bed together, to learn to speak to each other. And that is marriage, a true marriage of two minds. And Shakespeare knew it, but we have -- seem to have forgotten it.

I never hear in the roles for marriage, laid down by all these wise counselors, ladies and men, that the people have to learn to speak to each other. They take the measurements, whether the breast is wide enough, and the -- the {statue} is right, and the color of the eyes, {fits} the other partner. This is certainly indifferent. Can they speak to each other a new language that has never been spoken before? Every couple speaks a new language. And linguistics have absolutely nothing to do with this, as they are handled today, because they only speak of people defining their terms, which is perfectly uninteresting. Of course,

apes can define their terms. Humanity, however, has to renew the eternal language of mankind, in a special case of falling in love with the partner of the other -- another home. And that's why incest and language have very much to do with each other. Where you have incest, you have no language. And that's the reason why it is -- as a degeneration forbidden by -- in the oldest tribes. In no tribe do you find the right to marry the mother, or the daughter, or the sister, because they would have perished, that the -- the race, our race dies immediately from degeneracy if this is allowed.

It is an American, who in 1872, in the Journal of Anthropology, published at that time in Washington by the government, laid down this very important and very simple rule, that incest was not an arbitrary command -- I mean, the forbid- -- the -- the taboo of incest. But it was the only way in which human beings could survive, that they would have succumbed to enemies in their weakness, because the race goes down immediately. One of my horses was not changed in time, and so he married his mother, and the -- the horse from this alliance, which nobody had wanted, was two hands smaller than in an ordinary mating process would have happened.

So language has very much to do with the fundamental situation of mankind, that he must know to whom he may make love, and to whom he shall not. Now that's very serious. And I wanted to bring out today at least this one thing, before going onto the linguistics -- problem of the ling- -- so-called linguistic schools today, that our own existence is dependent on our speaking to the person he loves in a n- -- a renewal of language. Nobody ever asks how language is rejuvenated. Well, where there is life, there is death. We are only alive because life begets corpses, and then -- one day you all will be dead, and will be a corpse. And the coward doesn't face this. He subscribes to the -- cemetery of The Beloved and is im- -- declared immortal there. As I heard, myself, saying in Califor- -- Los Angeles, in this fantastic city, you see: "By the virtue of the -- by virtue of the powers vested in me," said the man with the Zylinder, "I hereby declare you to be immortal." The corpse doesn't answer, of course. And -- . And there you have the modern situation of linguistics. Words have lost their meaning, words have lost their power, if such a criminal fool can stand up and say, "By virtue" -- "By virtue"--ach, this word--"By virtue of the powers vested in me by the trustees of this cemetery, I herewith declare you to be immortal." Then an all-time low of human infamy has been reached. And that happens in the beautiful state of California.

Gentlemen, there is no time in the world that is as profound as this time.

It's an end to all speech, to all honesty, to all { } of speech. It's really { }.

Lingo takes the liberty of saying, "I define my terms." He is -- such -- this man defines his terms in terms of his { }. He'll pay for it; why shouldn't he say it? There is no re- -- other relation to his sentence and the man himself except his money belt. It's utter nonsense. And yet this goes on. Day after day. We have all the pieces of art, you know, Raphael imitated, Michelangelo imitated, { } imitated. Everything is imitated. Resurrection imitated.

This is very serious. Because that goes on under your noses. I have not seen any student demonstrations against this.

But we are -- the race is dishonored by these { }. We are. Whether it's by advertising, or whether this -- it's -- this -- this kills language. And I assure you--I'm quite serious--the greatest danger that is in the -- ahead of us, in the times to come, is the dying out of faithful, sincere language which has the power to penetrate, to make alliances, so that people are married for good. { } for a hundred years, this country has not made peace between North and South. This country has not made peace, after 1914 to '18, in World War I, with the enemy. It has not made peace in 1945. It cannot make peace. Peacemaking is just not in the power of the United States, because they think peace is an act of the will. I assure you, gentlemen, the language is much more profound and ladies -- know it anyway. Peace is not an act of the will, but is finally, to get inspired and give up her will, then there can be peace in the house.

That is, peace cannot be willed. But the common language of mankind; the peaceful, loving language; the affectionate language overcomes us as a surprise. We didn't know the moment before that we would be able to unite with the other person. We were quarreling -- we were at all -- we were not in accord. But then it happened. And the final word, the redeeming phrase is found under which people can rest in peace.

Our political scientists--I hope there is nobody here who can { } me--our political scientists never mention this fact that peacemaking is not an act of human will. It's an admission that is too difficult to be made. It has to be found. Just as any common language between a -- the Taming of the Shrew is a very true story. The shrew has to be tamed. And { } until finally she doesn't protest when he says that he loves her. Before, she spits and -- and -- and was very angry with him.

This is so simple that nobody ever mentions these great facts of language, that in every generation, every couple renews the human language by its power

to appropriate the language as it is spoken. There is never any problem in these linguistic books how it comes, that in every generation, there is again speech. They say it's just inherited. It is not inherited. That's absolutely untrue. It has to be learned. and you have to shake off the empty phrases which your parents have dinned into you, but you didn't understand. And you have to find at least one expression. Perhaps { } endearing name for your sweetheart, which nobody else understands. And as soon as you have made this progress, taken this one step into reality, that you name your girl with a name nobody ever uses for her, then you can say that you begin to speak. Before, it's just babble, all. Now the tragedy of course of linguistics is in this, today. If you open any book -- here I brought any number of them. One is Russian, and one is American--always the same. There is no difference. You see, they -- we are the socialist country; they are a capitalistic country. No difference. Names have lost their meaning. This is certainly true about all economics. I mean -- the Russians, they are very envious of our spoken {medicine}. Well, here are great lists in both books, the Russian and the American. Functional View of Language, is one called, and the other is called, Exact Methods in Linguistic Research. I've never read more {nonsense}, because they cannot distinguish serious language and talk. Now out of the loquaciousness of a child, and a teacher, and -- a student, you just babble and talk, and entertain each other, and converse. And in the language of the law, we have once for all, murder is penalized by the death -- capital punishment. There is a tremendous gap. The linguistics lump this together, and say, "That's all { }"

Anything that is said once forever is in a -- quite a different category from these babbling noises which we make and call speech. Talk is not speech. Anything you can handle and retract, and say, "Oh, I didn't mean it," and it -- say it differently, you see, and so { } better understand, all these detours and byways of speech are not speech in the full sense of the word.

To list at least two dif- -- two frequency { } for language is to miss the whole point that as in nature, there is a tremendous waste, a thousand flowers blossom, and one bears fruit, so it is with sentences. You say something, and you say something else. But when this one sentence is allowed to stand out for the ages, that's usually connected with some martyrdom, as in Lincoln's case. He belonged to the ages when he was mar- -- a martyr for the cause. Before, many

people were -- were doing something for the liberation of the slaves. And that's not too much, you know. Not against real estate.

And therefore, { }. And half of the people emancipa- -- -pating the blacks in the South didn't mean -- emancipating them- -- themselves. Just read the news from Philadelphia the other day, about this -- Negro electrician he was; gave up his living in the white neighborhood. In Philadelphia, town of Benjamin Franklin.

So they didn't me- -- don't mean what they say. They say they are for equality; they are of course for civil rights; they of course were white -- equality of whites and blacks. All the people in Phil- -- Pen- -- Pennsylvania, you can't find anyone who sides with Governor Wallace. Only in their acts they do. In their acts they side with the -- Governor Wallace. All their words therefore are blown-up water { }. They are worth nothing. They are not words spoken, but they are words talked. And as long as you do not learn this distinction between talking and speaking, the danger remains that we un-learn to speak.

This is very, very {parsimonious}, very {rare}. If I look back in my -- in my life, I would only count those moments of -- as speech where I was in danger of life, where I said something which was true and important, although it could have cost me my existence. These are the things you do not forget. And you have to say them.

That -- there it begins to dawn on you that any frequen- -- list of frequency of how often "and" is used, and when you are pardoned, are utterly unimportant as long as you do not know when they are seriously spoken, and when they are just said as a filler. For filling in, of course, we talk innumerable sentences. And we would be very surprised if we would be taken up on them.

I once had a very sad occur- -- experience. I gave two talks about the Civilian Conservation Corps, { } the Peace Corps. That's 25 years ago -- 26 years ago. And I invited -- since I encharged- by the president of the United States, of the training of the people in the Civilian Conservation Corps, I invited the commissioner of education in Washington. Now not in the state of Washington but in the real Washington, you know. And he came. I { }. I'm very astounded by it. I don't know why he came, but obviously he was -- thinking that there was a plot on foot to -- to criticize him. It was not a plot, but we did criticize him.

And I was asked to say what we could make them do, what they could

make us think. { } there were two topics. And I -- insisted that as -- now, with the anti-poverty program, it was important that these down-and-out people, { } poor, and the unemployed, {youngsters}, that they had opportunity to speak to somebody who was not down-and-out, and that you could not amass camps of 200 unemployed, or 50 poor. And hope for any result, but that the relation had to be one to one; one successful, one arriving; and the other, down and out. That may work; that may encourage both -- the -- the successful one to know that it's purely accidental that he was successful, and the poor and out, that there was hope for him, because somebody else loves him who is on the other side of the fence.

And as long as we -- our economic opportunity program does not {lead in} this way, there will be no lasting success. And they don't know it. Our social workers have all read -- read the wrong linguistics. They think if you treat the 50 down-and-out people anything can be {achieved}. Language is, however, always { }. But it means always that two people in different positions agree on something.

And as long as this fight against poverty is put on the level of social workers, and {the sociology} department, then nothing will happen. { } quite the contrary. { } will { } and throw it out again. And that's probably going to happen. Because the people just have neither the will, nor the imagination, nor the patience to demand that the work they do and the risk every one of us takes upon himself, be it -- be a godfather -- being -- becoming the godfather of the down-and-out. As long as you amass the poor, they remain -- the poor, they become even poorer. Fifty poor are much less able to be helped than one. Obvious.

{ }, you see that we live however in a day of statistics. And if you prove that there are 2,000 poor in this town, then the first idea is: help the 2,000. Aren't they? You cannot, as long as you label them statistically, economically, sociologically as the 2,000 poor. Only if they can consider themselves, every one of them, as a friend of a friend of a friend, or -- in three different classes of the community will he begin to -- not himself to be thought of, and to consider himself as a poor. And then he will have received a new name in his own Fan- -- imagination, and in the imagination of his neighbors.

And here comes now the barrier to linguistics: as long as a poor doesn't receive a new name in which "poverty" is not mentioned, the whole program is utter nonsense. As long as he is helped as a poor, he cannot be helped. Because language is categorical and dogmatic. Because I dare this man, myself, and

people call me by my name and I know that I'm called by my name, and { }. A poor man is so called behind his back, and that's most degrading. They don't tell him to -- in -- to his face, that he belongs to the poor. Well, -- just as little as they don't say to the black man, if he's black. Oh, they don't say this; isn't polite, you see. Now anybody who is polite, lies.

Politeness is not a condition of speech. That's only true for the { }.

Politeness is { }, because we don't know how much this man is wedded to his truth. He has not banked his life on this polite { }. He only wants to evade the issue. He's polite.

This is -- { }. Any peacetime society in this affluence as we are in, in this deep, alleged peace, is of course full of politenesses, you see. But this is just the danger point. That's no speech anymore. That's talk.

The essence of speech is that the name which I carry in my own consciousness, the son of my father and the son of my mother, a citizen of the United States as I am now, and before I was a citizen of Germany --. But I am a professor perhaps--I learned to be quite negligent on this {line} -- {I've had}. I've had so many professorships I don't care anymore, because under the name of "professor" there -- a multitude of sins is hidden today. Yes, it is. I was very proud { } as a young man, { }, I was the youngest professor in Germany. But that doesn't help. Doesn't help at all. Titles are very {negligent}.

But you have to learn that the people behind your back have one way of speaking of you. The people to your face have another way of talking to you. And you have an opinion of yourself and you hope one day there will be agreement between these three attitudes of people. That's your biography. Some people die in such a way that you learn that what the community thinks of them is the ultimate truth. And what they have thought of themselves is untrue, that they are no good. That happens. But the other way is better. If you can convince the community that not only what they say to your face--that you are a -- a great, grand character--but what they say behind you behind your back is identical with what in your own humility you feel is right about yourself. That hasn't to be any megalomania; that hasn't to be any pride. You can think very simply of yourself --. The harmony between these three circles of speech in your inner mind with the people you meet and who talk to you, and the people as they meet in your absence: these three circles are the problem of human speech. { } they harmonize, then there is peace. If they disintegrate, { } grow farther and farther away from each other, more contradictory all the time, you see, there is war. And when you see that in Saigon, the people demonstrate against the United

States, you may well tremble. They are { }. That's terrible. It has tremendous consequences.

This is the ruin of language. There is no more language between even us and the South Vietnamese. I don't know what to say about it. I only can tell you that this is enough to make you weep.

Because language has nothing to do with the frequency of the use -- end of the word "better," or the word "{gun}," or the word "black," or the word "white." But it has to do with the relationship between the word and the man who utters it. Is he willing to be killed for this word, or is he not? That's what the decision the people in Germany had to make under Hitler. And tens of thousands were slain.

And when I said, in 1933 at Harvard University, when I was asked, "Who would resist to Hitler?" and I said, "There may all told a hundred thousand souls who will stand upright and prepare to die instead of following this creature from the abyss."

You know what happened, in this sophisticated place of Harvard which at that time counted the years by 19- -- 1910 instead of 1933? They just had not lived through the First World War, as little as you have. And so they were very desperate indeed. And they are today.

For this reason. They have not suffered. And so they said to me with a laugh, "Is that all? A hundred thousand people? That's not very much."

Now you know, a hundred thousand martyrs are more than the Christian Church in all our history has ever seen. It's immense. And the 7,000, which I mentioned before, were all killed in the one -- six months from August to February 194- -- '44-45. And therefore the character of Germany was changed, because there were martyrs. And you now don't have to remember Germany as under Hitler, as deprived of noble souls. They represent the -- the -- the prime of Germany and the { } much more than the { }. But you still admire Hitler. I know many Americans who still swear by Hitler. Good Americans. You wouldn't believe it.

What is the reason? Because they have un-learned the distinction between true words, words spoken with their whole existence, and their whole character at the risk of life, and the other.

And I began to tell you the story of my commissioner of education in Washington, D.C. And {we learned} that he's not of {Washington, Washington}. But what did happen? The man listened to my wonderful speech, and I took him to my home, and gave him something to drink. I'm still quite angry that I did. {It makes me nervous}. Because what did he say? He said, "You are absolutely right." I made this point, not one soul, you see, not 50 together or a hundred down-and-out people, but { } students, and { } other people { }.

And he said, "You are absolutely right. But if you quote me on this, I shall deny it."

Now for a commissioner of education, that's quite a big order, don't you think? But you -- he said in my own house to me, "If you quote me on this, I shall deny it." I mean, quote him on my -- dissatisfaction with my speech, and where I was absolutely right.

That's a wonderful example of what is called "{good} politics." You can also call it "lying." And you can also tell it -- call it the "poisoning of the well." And we are in the midst of the poisoning of the well, that you know from nobody: does he mean it, or does he not mean it? Can he be quoted? { } -- as a com- -- as a commissioner of education that he -- I was right, but that if I quoted him on this, I -- he would deny it, this -- are such an unscrupulous -- I can't tell you. { }.

He didn't -- hadn't to say anything. But if you said anything about the righteousness or -- falsehood of my statement, he could not add that he would deny this -- his own truth. -- For a commissioner of education, well, that's the education of commissioning.

But we live in this world, in which nine-tenths of the people think that a -- a good lie is { }. And for this reason, you must understand, that frequency tells us nothing about speech. How often some lie is used, but that doesn't improve the lie. Whether a word is true comes only, you see, out of his -- the relation of -- to the speaker to what he says. If we cannot make a dent in the -- in the identity of a man's word, and a man's life, then that's speech. And wherever you can find an opening, a gap, and drive a wedge between what he says, and what he does, and what he is, and what he thinks, that's babble. And that is not speech. And you cannot learn of -- about the character of speaking anything from

those examples, like statistics, because these scoundrels all imitates the one true, and only honest speech. They are very anxious that you are -- they are not trapped. They all -- want to make you believe that they tell the truth. And this is why you can't use the example. Imitation of -- of a diamond, you see, you cannot use to explain a diamond.

And since nine-tenths of the public utterances of mankind--in our newspapers, in our books, in our novels--are written for sale, for acclamation, for electoral votes, they imitate true speech. And because they imitate it, they are not fit to be used in our analysis of human speech. And once you see this, then whole armies of dictionary speech fall down as a perfectly useless for explaining the mystery of our speech. The mystery of our speech can only be learned from these very true and rare cases, where a man has no other way of surviving than this one word. If you want to know how this happened, just read the first -- the speech of the first martyr of the Christian Church, the speech of Stephen.

I always wonder how little -- how little our theologians--who are expected, of course, to write books and to teach--know of the danger of life the first Christians were in when they said anything. There was always stoning ahead of them, or the gallows, or the Crucifixion. And therefore, every word in the Gospel is so interesting, because it was cut out of them in -- in the wildest necessity. They had -- would have preferred to say nothing, because they knew that the gallows were right there.

And so any such utterance had a terrific consequence. When Stephen was stoned, the first martyr of the Christian Church, immediately Matthew stepped down and began to write his Gospel, because from the first time that it dawned on these good people that they might all be stoned. They might all be done away with -- so you had to write. The writing of the Gospel is one -- a very miraculous story. And of course no theologian has ever thought of it, that it was so interesting, because it was so dangerous. And they only -- wrote finally in danger of life, because it would have -- been worse if, without their written testimony, they all would have been wiped out. In order to -- there was a -- two evils, you see. And that's why we re- -- still to this day read the Gospel because there you can study words that have consequences, and words that were not -- spoken by a commissioner of education, "If you quote me on this, I shall deny it." Peter wanted to deny his -- the Lord, didn't he? He did it twice. But then he saw it couldn't be done. So he was, as you know, crucified head down.

Now I mean this. You see, the word in the Gospel of St. John is written against the linguistics of the modern world as much as of their day. There were

plenty of linguistics. There was a great debate on foot in the days of Jesus between Philo, the Jew, and the school of Alexandria where Philo lived. The -- here are the seven liberal arts. Are they the right background for the human soul, for the Enlightenment, and for the -- the bliss of man? Or do you have -- to go to philosophy { } Philo? Philo was { } to go to the {Bible}. The debate was very large, and today it is the same.

We also have, {as} you don't know it, an institution, so-called, the liberal arts college. I understand that you even find yourself in one of them. If this is so, I would wonder if you know what the liberal arts college stands for? The liberal arts college stands for the seven arts of antiquity, which are this side of religion, and this side of revelation, and this side of speaking with conviction. And that's why they are so dangerous; and that's why so many people {love them}. The -- there is -- this is a case in which nobody is taken up for his convictions, in which you can learn of everybody else's convictions, because then you can read the most wonderful books, from Homer to Shakespeare, to Camus, and you haven't to say anything about it. You just enjoy it, as we call it, that you have an intellectual curiosity. It's the most vicious word ever invented by human speech. I have no intellectual curiosity, I hope, because I would be ashamed if I had it.

So it's like a -- { } of a woman. Life is full of teachers. But every teacher that comes today, they aren't allowed to know it. But to act from curiosity, gentlemen, that doesn't give you an education. That's a wrong application of words, and of sentences, and of reading. Curiosity is too cheap. That's good for 4-year-old children, but not for people who already have re- -- every reason { } to be ashamed of themselves, and to respect other people's {secrets}. But the curious man, you see, denies that secrets are sacred. Otherwise he would distinguish between the things he is already allowed to know, as they grow upon him, as he does something for them, as he serves his { }--his girl--and he {presents} her with his own affection, then she will speak. Then she will open up. But curiosity? { } -- when you read in the papers always these criminals who say they just for curiosity, they tried to -- to find out about the reaction of the woman or somebody else, whom they frighten, or whom they -- whom they rob, or whom they tie, or whatever they do --. This country is quite { } by assuming that curiosity has any decency. It is not. If it is applied to ants, and cells, it does no harm. It can lead to a -- to a scientific study. But if you apply it to human beings, beware of the man who says he's curious to know you. Just tell him that you are not interested.

This is one of the great diseases of our time, that in the { } schools and educational processes, the -- mere curiosity is rated as the same thing as an

education, which is done in the degree of maturing, of ripeness. It's all -- as it says in Hamlet, one thing at a time. You cannot know from your { } but we may know when the time has come in -- at which we shall know and must know. Knowledge is a necessity if it comes in its proper day. And it is horrid if it comes because a boy has an IQ of 150, and like the Loeb brothers in Chicago, then kills their best friend, because it's so interesting. They are so curious to know how such a murdered child reacts. Don't think that this is such a long time ago. It's only 40 years ago.

The -- one of them, as you know, was only freed two years ago. The great case of Doc- -- Mr. {Darrow}, as you may know. He got them from the gallows. This is curiosity, and it's one of the devils of today.

The seven liberal arts are quite innocent if they are not { } curiosity.

And let me tell you who they are. One art was astronomy, one was music, one was geometry, one was arithmetic. And they are the quadrivium, the first four liberal arts. And they had all been baptized and christened by the -- modern sciences. Arithmetic and geometry, since the days of Descartes and Copernicus, have reached { } freed them completely from the purely practical and egocentric sciences of antiquity. And if you look at physics today and music, and you think of Einstein and Beethoven, you know that they are worthy partners of the Christian era. They are inside Christianity. This is not true of grammar. You teach grammar in the same manner as it has been taught in Alexandria 200 years before Christ. And that is an abomination. And that has to come to an end. This is a pre-Christian science, to this date.

And in order to prove it to you, I'd like to spend -- can you give me more -- some more time? { }. I'm curious.

The modern grammarian has not been able to free himself from the implications of grammar in the pre-Christian period. And I'm very much concerned to prove to you tomorrow that grammar too has to enter the last 2,000 years of Christian -- the Christian era, and is, so to speak, waiting at the gates at this moment, and hasn't made its surrender to the spirit of Christianity. It is not so difficult to -- to prove this. It has always been felt by pious people in the last thousand years that grammar was a pagan science. There's an example which -- on which I may hang up my thesis. Back in 1179--that's in the days of the third Crusade, when the world was hungry already for unity as much as it is now, and the people went to Constantinople, and to Jerusalem to unite all Christendom and even the whole world--there was a monk in Paris -- on the Left Bank, where the University of Paris was, just sprawling and beginning to grow. And I myself

have {scented} the oldest commencement address ever given in the West, in that year, 1179 or 1180. I found this manuscript, so it's very dear to my heart, this period, in which all the rules of the game of a liberal arts college were invented. And where suddenly enabled the youth of Europe to study without becoming a monks. You could go to university after that, you see, and study the liberal arts. And then become a lawyer, or a physician, or whatever you wanted to become. And before, practically for several hundred years, all the learned studies there limited to monastic orders. And there were no { } and no knights who could do this.

Well, in 1179, this began, 1180, on the Left -- Bank on the River Seine in Paris, where to this day Le Quartier Latin dominates the imagination. The Latin -- Quarter that is the quarter of the students. And there lies on the Left Bank of the Seine River has made epoch, and you still nourish yourself with the same principles of a liberal arts education.

But what about grammar? Oh, they were very interested in logic, and they were very interested in arithmetic, and all the other arts. And -- of grammar, however, the leading spirit of the time had made so much use that the monks -- { } one of the {sacred} monasteries in the Quartier Latin of Paris, explained, "Grammar has given this man over to the devil."

Now I would say of the communistic, and enlightened literature on linguistics today. Their blind trust in the pre-Christian grammar has led them astray and made out of grammar something statistical, something in the dictionary, something of -- the defining of their own terms, something arbitrary. And the worst in the life of the Holy Spirit is arbitrariness. I can tell you one thing: if there is a Holy Spirit, He doesn't know one thing: to be arbitrary. He { } the necessary. And if He doesn't this, He wouldn't be the Holy Spirit. To be holy means to be unable to spend and to waste his God-given life on prattle, on -- on statistics or what have you. And that { } language not to confuse--this is the important thing--the important and the unimportant.

I -- say this. I was in love with linguistics all my life. I studied them since I was 12 years old. I composed a dictionary when I was 14. I composed all kind of biographies of linguists. I only say this in self-defense so that you must not know that I speak of this as though I was not a converted sinner. Language has been the -- the nourishment of my whole life. And so I really think that I should warn you; I know what I'm talking about. As the state of affairs is now, out of the beautiful term "philology," which at least implies a love of speech, "philo" means to love something; and "logy" is the logos, speech. We have now made "linguis-

tics," which shows that they are totally indifferent to what they say. It is something you can handle as { }. And it's so terrifying. You cannot speak of language without awe. Because any moment you can lie, any moment you can { }, any moment you can {betray} somebody. To speak is a very dangerous performance. It's like dealing with high electrical {sparks}. And I see how these linguistics -- linguists dabble with speech, as though it was just something like plumbing. Now even plumbing, I mean, { } out of the cold water comes the hot water is not very { }. And so plumbing is a serious business. But { } is much more serious. In one sentence, you can insult one-half of mankind.

And {we do}. All these linguists think that the listener is less important than the speaker. And -- I shall end on this note, in order to prepare my way for tomorrow with one now already famous example of the arrogance of the linguist to exclude all the people who do not define their terms, all the people who simply listen and obey. Obedience is something unknown in Am- -- in linguistics in American education. And it is the beginning of wisdom. But a man who -- or a woman who has not obeyed, are {naked}. They don't know what truth is. The first way in which we learn the truth is obedience. There is no other way. And if you don't teach the children to obey, they don't know what truth is. Because they must learn the magic of all speech by being forced, compelled to obey. And they'll never forget this, and they'll apply it to their children. And woe to these children if they don't {obey}. Then they'll say, "Yes, I didn't obey, but you should."

{ }. Obedience is the first form in which you come to know language...

[tape interruption]

...for that's very unfashionable in this country, I know, where the people talk so much that they think talking is speaking. I assure you, talking is not speaking. And all the demonstrators in Berkeley will not convince me, that they speak. They talk. That's not the same.

Now 20 years ago -- 30 years ago, there was a conference of the most learned linguists of France and the -- { } the {romance} languages. But it would -- could have happened to Slawistik { } the Germanic languages, just the same. And they tried to define an imperative. And what is an imperative? Well, that's -- as you know, something that has to obeyed. We only say, "Come," because we think the person should come. And if the person comes, then he says, "Here I am," the sentence is completed. So any important command

is only ended when the -- a recipient says, "Here I am." It was a great example of {Indian} grammarians, who were better than the Greeks, who say, "When is a sentence is complete? When the father has said, 'Children, go into the woods, break the twig.' Then { } something {more completed}, which the father has said." You know? { }.

When the children come back and stand before their father and say, "This twig is broken." That -- that completes the sentence. And thereby you see the electric current, you see, that circles between these people. He says, "Go into the woods and break the twig." Two hours later, they come back; the twig is broken; the sentence can go to Heaven. It's now, you see, ready to be {felt}. Before, it was hanging in the air, suspended. { }.

Now this venerable linguist probably had a white beard, said, "The first -- let me use a first example { }. First person, { }, or "May I die." The second: "Die." The third, "Let him die." The other -- the fourth: "Let he -- let us die." The second -- the fifth, "You die." And the last, "Let them die."

Have you ever heard such nonsense? He called these -- all these five sentences -- all imperative. {One is the root}; the other is a possibility. There is only one real imperative, and it's "Die," you see. And then comes the act; probably by which either a man commits suicide, takes his dagger and kills himself, or is killed by somebody else. Now this seems to me quite serious. I have nothing to teach this man. or these gentlemen. They are the leading -- the leading masters of philology, {Bruno, Galli}--some of you may have seen their work and know their books. They are very learned people, but they are { }.

Well, most scholars -- scholars are constantly in great danger, you see. An electrician is in danger of { }. And a scientist is in danger of -- losing his mind. I'm quite serious. This is always overlooked and { }. Most of my friends { }.

Well, { }?

A Dutchman got up at this -- meeting in 1948. And a { }, and said, "I don't know. An imperative is a sentence that waits for its -- its hearer, its obedient hearer. If I say, 'Come,' and there is nobody who hears me say this and responds, my {imperative} is not completed." The imperative waits for the man who accepts this command as directed towards me -- towards him. And only the man who responds completes the subject of the imperative sentence.

Now many of you who have studied languages will very well know that in all languages the imperative is a { } form, a form which does not express the present -- the present. "Ama" in Latin is just the root of the word "amare." The same, of course, in English, and in German, and in French, and in Italian. It is the shortest form of the verb, and it waits to be filled with the response of the listener, "I did it." whatever that is. And in this moment, where it -- comes a decent person allows the speaker to feel that he's recognized with his command, as legitimate, the sentence is finished. Just as in the sentence, "Break the twig," the sentence is finished when this -- the children come back and say, "The twig has been broken." In the same manner, we all -- when you give an order to your child, the order is only perfect, perfected, complete, perfected if the child comes and says, "Yes, Mama, what can I do?" That's the minimum. { } done exactly what the command implies.

Now this is unknown. It has not penetrated { } of the wisdom of the { } of the seven liberal arts, gentlemen. And I had to wonder, when I read this report of the getting together in the -- in the scientific -- at the Academy of Science in Amsterdam, at the Dutch { } -- that it took a Dutchman in his dry -- dry -- such a dry manner to discover that the six imperatives, allegedly, "May I die," "Die," "Let him die," that they are mixing all the metaphors. The imperative is only when I say something and hope for somebody to do it. That's an imperative. You see, I am {waiting} for the person who will undergo my treatment and will accept it {if, as directed towards me}.

Now the Lingo of Linguistics consists in just that: { } they have never been able to free the single sentence out of its alleged isolation. But they analyze sentences, paragraphs, you see, as though they stood by themselves. But they allow the second person, be it the wife to whom you declare your love and affection, be it the friend with whom you lined up { }, be it a -- a -- executioner or judge { }, you see, in judgment over the criminal. They should have never allowed the { }. Grammar to this day is a purely pagan activity. Paganism means that man is alone. If you isolate a speaker, so that he -- his sentences too are analyzed as though he was alone, {grammar} goes mad, people go mad, and this I think is the direct outcome of the {style} of the linguistic science.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

If there any questions which you would like to ask at the end of the lecture, I would prefer that you ask them right now.

Nobody says anything? Well, there must be something to be asked. -- At the end of the last lecture, I thought -- I understand there was some disgust because I had spoken of such an obsolete virtue as obedience. And I had also mentioned the fact that mere curiosity is not -- an excuse for many activities, whether it's Esquire or the -- or The New Yorker. You know, there's a great dispute now be- -- in -- in the making between the English and the Americans about Truman Capote and his investigation, his inquisitiveness, or his curiosity in the case of the murder. So I would -- would want -- only want to -- to tell you that I've chosen my terms with some care. I've only spoken of curiosity, yesterday. I have nothing to say against scientific inquisi- -- inquisitiveness, which is something very different from curiosity.

In -- if we are inquisitive, there are obstacles that stand in our way of dealing with things, especially in nature. And we have to enquire what irks us, what is -- stands in the way of developing greater speed, or whatever the question is. But that has nothing to do with curiosity. Most questions of children and fools should not answered. One fool can ask more questions than hundred wise men can ever answer. That's simply true, and you ought to know it. Mere curiosity has no justification -- yes, you may be curious. But there's no reason why you should -- that should be satisfied, your curiosity. If you go to great pains then, and take a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, or -- or do something, save money up to learn, then it is more than curiosity. As soon as you are willing to sacrifice something, then this ceases to be curiosity. But curiosity leads only to crime. And there are many crimes that are not in the penal code, and are just as criminal as those things in the -- criminal code.

Well, but let's have a friendlier look on life. Neither curious nor inquisitive. We don't have to look at life. Life looks at us. That is, we are called into life -- I called this -- this evening today. The word "call" is a very curious one. It has been also -- you can degrade everything, but it still has reserved this funny quality of transforming man into the person treated, the person transformed, the person touched, the person moved.

What I had to say against linguistics yesterday was founded on the fact that the philologist, the inquisitor in philology, seems not to know that to speak

means to be changed. Any human being, however, whether he likes it or not, knows that by speech and by listening, we become different people. And this -- since this has been omitted by the whole linguistic staff of experts, we -- our books on language look so very funny. They always assume that they are dealing with things when they -- talk of words and languages. And they always forget that they are called by the honorable, venerable, important name of "scientist," and "scholar," that they expect everybody to treat them as scholar. I once talked to such a skeptic philosopher, at some length, and he defended his position that nothing for sure could be known.

"Oh," I said, "Oh, Sir. That is not true. I have watched you carefully, and I have found that you are terribly insulted as long as -- if one of your students doesn't call you 'Herr Professor'. So there is one certainty in life, obviously, that you are a professor, and have to be called this way."

And most people who are skeptics insist that they of course, themselves, have to receive all the dignity, and all the honor from their rank and profile in society. Very strange people they are.

You can answer any skeptic with this simple fact, that he insists on his place in society, because he is called by this name, and that's a passive attitude which bestows a quality on him, and he insists that he is created in- -- into this feature, into this quality. He is a member of the club. He is a -- he is an honorable citizen of this town. And he wants everybody to know this. Knowledge of the others and being called in human society hang together. Knowledge may be about things of a -- or nature. But how you call me, on that -- on this, my bliss, my -- life eternal depends. If people deny me the right of a man, of a free man, of a citizen of the United States, that has terrible consequences.

But it's never mentioned in philology. All these philologists think that they should be asked to act as authorities, as experts, as professionals. Now, all these are names.

To -- to put together the whole secret in one sentence, gentlemen, perhaps you take this down, because it is -- seems to be unknown in our professional society today, is: that there are not just words in language; and there are not just concepts in thinking; and there are not just verbs, and adjectives, and nouns. There is one thing that is never mentioned in all these linguistic investigations, and never by the philosophers: that there are names by which we are called; and thanks to which we can breathe, as free men, because it's recognized that we are

-- man has a right to be called by the honorable nym- -- name of, for example, as a citizen, of a free man, of a person. And most people act on this assumption quite peacefully. But it -- when it comes to a professional -- knowledge of language, it's omitted. You find no grammar book --. I have this newest book on -- on the philosophy of language, here, and I assure you the simple fact that I call you by my name, and I call you by your name is not mentioned. And yet it is the most important quality of speech, that if you call my name, I respond. And if I call you by your name, you respond. This relation of immediacy doesn't exist with the grammarians, and the literary critics, and all the experts on the arts. They have forgotten this.

Now there is an excuse for this, which you may be interested to hear. The word "grammar," which I attacked last time as obsolete, and pagan, and pre-Christian, meant in -- in Alexandria li- -- really only literature. "Grammar" meant what is written. And it was the treatment of the grammar of a play of Aristophanes, or a -- the book by Plato which was analyzed by the grammarians. Now in a book, names are not called. The relation of the reader of the book and the author of the book doesn't come into play. Here is just this paper, this book. And if you analyze a literary product, as this one here, then it is -- doesn't matter how the author of this book and the reader correspond, how they treat each other, you see. That's omitted.

So there is a deep secret in our present-day treatment of speech, of language, of writing. The grammar is taken for grant- -- as limited to an objective statement of fact in the text of a book. The author stays outside; the reader stays outside. And their puzzling behavior--whether they love or hate each other, whether they scourge each oth- -- excoriate each other, that is not discussed. And so it is possible to buy a hundred volumes on language at this moment in America, and not to find any discussion of names. They only know of words. But words are spoken of things and people. But names are said to people. That's a very great difference. That's 180 degrees different. If I call you "Lady," you see, I hope you will -- flattered, you see. But if I only spo- -- speak of you tomorrow to somebody third, and say, "There was a lady in a red dress," you see, then you don't -- are not supposed to listen in. Otherwise, if you were present, I could not say, "There was a lady in a red dress." But I could say, "There is -- is this -- was this very pretty lady in a red dress."

All this is unknown. We have a philology now for 500 years, 600 years, seven years -- a grammar, in which the distinctive character of names is omitted. A name is something between you and me, from face to face. A word is someth-

ing which -- which I can signify you, whether you are present or absent, dead or alive. That is, 180 degrees in an opposite direction--mathematically, geometrically speaking. Why is this unknown?

Well, it comes from this literary tradition of the old Greeks, that grammar was limited to "graphein" -- "graphein" means writing--the grammarian interpreted literature. So what we today call "English literature"--and I suppose 50 percent of you are all dabbling in English literature--was then called "grammar." And therefore it is quite understandable, if you have texts, that the question of names doesn't come up, because here I sit and read what somebody else has written about other people, and it is always the relation of words to things. And you can really open any book on linguistics today, and the -- they say that words are symbols under which things are named or explained. But the simple fact, that if I don't use the right name towards you, that you can slap me, that you can sue me, that you can persecute me, that you can kill me because I am insulting you, is never mentioned. In other words, that part of speech which is dangerous, which is electric, which is dynamic is not mentioned.

And therefore language appeals to these people as something they can handle, they can manipulate, they can get away with. Whatever they say, paper is patient, and teach- -- students are patient, too, and they write the examination for whatever they are taught. And they'll never find out that's all nonsense. Or they do, later, but they don't meet the -- the teacher who put this examination paper before them, and they forget it. And the best thing, of course, of any life is, as Goethe has said, that we have special organs for forgetting disagreeable things.

And this power of forgetfulness should also be mentioned in speech. We could not live if every stupid sentence we have to learn or to read would stick with us.

Now -- if man is called by his parents first, in his proper manner, in -- by his name, and if then the outer world comes and says, "But you are just a Negro," "You are just a Jew," "You are just a Washingtonian," what's that? And if they suddenly feel that this is hurtful, this is very dangerous--to be called names--then I must try to show you that speech is a process that rolls off under firm, ineluctable, irresistible laws; that he who says, "A," he who calls somebody his father, is thereby already led into a long life. And this name, that he has a father--Mr. Smith--stays with him, and determines his life. And he better learns by obedience to this name how he can emancipate himself. We are not always the sons of Mr.

Smith. One day we are our -- fathers in our own right. But this has to happen. That is, the name of being the son of a certain person, of a certain mother and a certain father is upon us. We may like it or not.

I have a story to tell about a Peace Corps friend, who went to Peru. And he was an excellent man, and he told me a story. He went to a province of Peru, in the bush really, beyond the -- the -- Cordilleras, really on the Brazilian side. So the only way of getting there was by plane. There weren't roads; there aren't -- certainly no railroads. And he was well received at first. But then -- they were four Americans. And Mr. Castro, of course, from -- Cuba had his agents there. And they were attacked as Yankees, and Yankee imperialists. And they had to leave. That's -- never gets into the papers.

I met this young man. And he told me that it was a very wonderful place, because there had a great reformer 50 years or 30 years ago--I don't know the -- the number of years; I won't say anything, because I'm not sure how long ago it was--and he had unified this whole educational province of Peru in a single effort, from kindergarten to university. It was all one, big family. And it was a very wonderful man, and he was, so to speak, the saint, the Pestalozzi, of this province in Peru, far away from politics, far away from the mainstream of American life. Always try to keep out of the mainstream. And -- that's an insult to be in the mainstream of American thought, because that would only lead to Sears, Roebuck.

Now what happened to my friend? I wrote a whole chapter in my last book on the Peace Corps, called -- in his name. It is called "Palmer" -- "David Palmer Scott." That's his name. And he failed completely. He was thrown out. He had to leave. And I said, "But why are you so surprised? You brought it on yourself."

"Why? How? I did my job. I was so popular that the Communists, after they had squeezed us out, came to me and said, 'We will hire you again, but privately. You are a very good boy. But we can't have Yankee imperialism.'"

"Well," I said. "Did -- don't you see that you brought it on yourself?"

"No," I -- he said. "We did right."

"No," I said, "You didn't bring right -- do right."

"Why not?"

"Well," I said, "to this day you have not mentioned the name of this great reformer under whose halo you came there. And your -- the -- the people in -- in -- in the Cordilleras had no other way but calling you a Yankee, because they didn't know your name. They didn't know your antecedents. You hadn't made friends with anyone to call him 'John' and 'Bob'. And how do -- can you expect that people have another name for you but the most general, 'Yankee'? You were a Yankee in their eyes, because you hadn't made sure that somebody called you 'David'. And as long as you haven't broken through into your own name, you cannot be surprised that these cheap categories of -- classifications of 'Peruvian' and 'Yankee' prevail. And as long as they prevail, you will be in trouble."

And the whole Peace Corps of course stands here, you see, under judgment. If these pe- -- people do not become people called in their own name, they cannot break the stink of nationalism and antagonism. And nobody seems to know such a simple story, because in our textbooks on education, the word "Call," "I'm called," is not mentioned.

You know the story of the governor of Texas, who -- his wonderful name was Hogg. And so he took his revenge against society by calling his first daughter Ima Hogg, and the second daughter Ura Hogg. And so he got the name, "He's a Hogg." This is serious. But when Texas is serious -- is a real danger for the United States.

So there is a full quadrant missing on your wheel of language, on your map of the linguistic world, because you omit the most explosive, the most serious, and the starting chapter of speech: where we are called, to our face or behind our back. This is language at the highest degree. And what you call "language" is drivel. Because it omits names. And nothing where the name doesn't come into play is serious language.

Let me give you two examples. Today there is a great problem in our culture -- society about: shall there be capital punishment? And you will say, "What has this to do with speech?" It has much more to do than you fathom. All questions usually are insoluble in the way in which they are presented in our papers. You will never solve the Vietnamese question as long as you do not call Ho Chi Minh by his name in every article, every day. He is the man we have to talk to, and all the other people are quite indifferent. He is a national hero.

Now America knows very well how to treat national heroes. The whole 19th century, every national hero in any small country in -- in the world has been treated royally by the Americans. I don't see why he hasn't been treated royally.

Yes, I mean, we have to talk to him. He is not a Peruvian, as my friend thought; and he is not a Yankee; and we are not Yankees; but he's Ho Chi Minh. That's very serious. That's politics. And politics is dangerous. And you avoid it. You want to have an objective approach. There is no objective approach between real people. That doesn't exist. You are not an object of my love. If I love you, the objectivity goes out of the window. Objects are good for -- for plumbers. And we try to be objective in politics. That is, we don't use the right name by which these people would listen. It's incredible. The physicist has won the day. The -- all these people I know personally who deal with these political problems are decent chaps. They know very well how to treat human beings. But it -- when it comes to article writing, in world affairs or foreign policy, they just lose their mind. And then become secretary of state.

Well, have you ever heard Mr. Rusk use any human expression for anything he has dealt with? Never. It's all objective. And they ad- -- are -- he is admired for that.

Gentlemen, peace and war are declared from passions, and made by -- and not by objectivity.

Now my -- I -- next example is even more explosive. It is the question of capital punishment. If you say -- many of you will say, "That's -- can -- can't be done." And the executioner also thinks it can't be done. So in San Quentin, as you know, there are three people pushing a button, and nobody knows whose button kills the -- the culprit, so that the poor man -- or his wife, can sleep. And -- obviously there is a crisis. Capital punishment is today under judgment. But why is this so?

Do you know how the executioner had to act 100 years ago, still -- 150 years ago? -- There was a public scaffold, a public execution. And the executioner had to kneel down and ask the forgiveness of the culprit for the act he now had to commit under the law. And -- and when the culprit had said that he forgave him, he proceeded to break the staff over him and to take him out of the legal community of common speech. Because anybody who is still spoken to is a human being, and cannot be executed. There has to be a ceremony in which he is dismissed from this {rim} of human speech and intercourse.

Today the capital punishment is impossible, because the executioner does not ask the forgiveness of the culprit. What would happen if he did? He would change from a pe- -- person called, addressed, spoken to--as a "you," or as a

"thee," as a "thou"--into somebody who has now to take the other member outside the community where he becomes a "he," and an "it," a corpse.

That is the living process which I promised you -- to introduce to your thinking today. We are called into life, and I cannot point out to you more strongly that the case in which we are called out of life explains all the others. Birth and death are of course intimately connected. If you can -- can condemn a man to die in a solemn ceremony, and take him out of this circle of human speech, then you begin to understand under which conditions we are human beings. We are not human beings because the state of Arkansas prints on our behind the number "74." Which they do in Arkansas. It's not the behind, but somewhere else.

We are not numbers. We are only human beings as soon as somebody has given us our patronom- -- -nymicon, and our own proper name. That's very serious. And I -- please, when you discuss capital punishment, do not discuss it in these moralizing terms whether you can or cannot do it. There are members of the community for whom you cannot ask a jailer to spend his life. And lifelong prison is much more cruel than capital punishment. It's intolerable. Because you have jailers who do nothing but do this. And that's undignified. You dishonor the jailers. But of course, if you want to execute a person, then you must be a human being who knows what speech is. You must have this religious reverence for calling -- speaking to this man a last time, and telling him, "I'm terribly sorry, but you have forfeited"--and that's a very strange word--"your membership, and will you forgive me? And don't you share with me the understanding that this verdict is true. That we together have come to the conclusion that you dishonor the community, that you are a blemish on our ex- -- that we are sick." It's the body politic that needs capital punishment as its way of purge, of -- of eliminating eczema.

This is not even mentioned in our discussions. And yet you read in every history of England how the executioner, when one of these noble lords was execut- -- Essex, or somebody like that, you see, how this happened on the scaffold. You think that's just old fairy tales. No. These people were real people who spoke. And you are people who only read the newspaper. And that is not people. As little as it is people to -- to listen to television. Because what is lacking is your own contribution. All these things happen, and you say nothing. These just are engraved on -- on our minds. That is not an attitude which is fruitful, and an attitude which allows you to say that you are participating in the life of the community. You can know all the scandals of this town from the newspaper; I suppose the newspaper is quite honest. But you do not participate by reading on

it. You would only participate by calling these -- the people names. If you begin to call them names, you know how difficult it will be for you to survive in this town. You will be chased out, because life is very dangerous.

The opposite thing I would like to bring to your attention, the opposite side of this question, is the fact that we create by names the times and spaces which our historians, our politicians, our scientists take for granted. There is no Christian era, there is no 1966 except by our believing word. They are not objective facts. Nonsense. Absolute, not. They -- we, every one of us, determines in which time he lives. And we only speak so that you and I can say of one and the same thing at one time that it is in the future; and at another time that it is yesterday. You and I, we all, because we are allowed to speak, to participate in this one language of mankind all over the globe--what is to be, and what has been--these are the declarations by which the power of speech is most clearly developed and revealed. And again, our philologists know nothing of -- of this. They do not know that to say "tomorrow" and "yesterday" is to be a human being.

On a little island of the Windward Island group in the Caribbean, the most southeastern -- no, southwestern island, Carriacou, there live a few hundred Negroes. And it's a British dominion still, a British colony. And the officer of the British crown who administers this little island, has this to say, and you find it in the Geographical magazine, on page 767 of the December issue of last year. And I recommend it to you. It's perhaps the most important insight into language I've seen in print during the whole last year.

This officer of the British crown said, "Every one of these Negroes knows the tribe from which he came in Africa, by name, and is proud of it. After 200 years, everyone still wants to be called by the -- honorable name of Ibo, or {Kaminda}," or whatever the -- the tribe is.

Such is the promise of a name. Such is the beginning of a long future, by bestowing a name on a person, and calling him by this name, that we cut avenues of time, through centuries. And if you are called an American, if you are called a Christian, or you are called a Jew, that means that you create and are created into a time.

Time and space are human actions. And time is this action of society upon -- a butterfly of one-day duration called a "human being." Nobody seems to find it necessary to observe the fact that every one of you has realized, experienced innumerable times, every morning in ma- -- as a matter of fact. A child knows

nothing of time. It's a being of the moment. It is here. It is happy. You change its position, you bring it into another room. It has no connection with what has gone on before. It -- it is here. The child has this complete presence of mind. Every notion of time--the birthday, winter and -- or summer, the seasons--everything is put into the child by the community. Be it the family, be it the school, be it the book. It doesn't matter what medium it is. Time is only to be had by people who share life with others, and thereby are introduced into the same time. All times are social creations. The scientists of course are guilty of betraying you, of seducing you, of saying to you that they have a -- a time in which the past and the present produce the future. That's the great heresy of a gentleman called Immanuel Kant, and another man called LaPlace, the great naturalist, at the beginning of the 18- -- of the 19th century. And both are wrong. It's an idiotic heresy. Comes all from this Kantian idealism that time and space are forms of our intuition of the individual. Time is nothing but a social creation. In the year 534, the Christian era was introduced. In the year 580, the Jewish era from the creation of the world was introduced. And in 632 the Moslem era, of Mohammed's flight from Mecca to Medina was introduced. All our three eras have -- been appropriated and created in the midst of history. But by consent. And it is absolute nonsense to say that the future is created from the past and the present. The present is created by the conflict between the future and the past. Here I am, trying to finish my lecture as fast as I can, because the future is impinging on me. I shall be free. I shall not have to give a lecture for a whole -- next year. And this keeps me upright, keeps me going, you see. The future and the past, and that's the greatest heresy of our time today, and this is a great -- a great calamity for the statesman, for the thinker, for the poet; the future is something that is not made, but something that is believed in. Every child that goes to a college, as you shall -- seem to do--I don't know if you are here regularly--but as far as you are students in this college, you are preparing yourself for a glorious future. Now what does the word "prepare" mean? The anticipation of future. It means that you know that four years from now, you'd better have a degree, you see, so that you enter life prepared, so that any educational process is only possible because the future impinges on your acts today. The future is there; it's believed in by you. And therefore you now act as though the future was real, you anticipate. Now to say that this future, which impinges on you, which pleases you, which threatens you, which urges you on, that this is the product of this present

moment in which you are bored stiff and -- try to pass an examination, this is utterly ridiculous. The examination is the product of your fear, or your hope for the future, and not the other way around. There is no future because you take an exam.

But much more so. The names of the great groups, like these Ibo, on the Li- -- Windward Islands, you see, accompanies people through centuries, gives them stiff-necked resistance against slavery, against degradation. There they are. Only basing their -- their faith in the future on this blessing that they have received a name that has singled them out and has given them an avenue through time.

Well, these two contrasts--the executioner who kneels down and asks forgiveness from the murderer, and the sens- -- 10-year length of names cutting avenues from time immemorial into the life of people--may show you that to be called and to bear a name is a very, very real thing, is a power that cannot be omitted from your linguistic thinking without the most tremendous catastrophes. To make war--Number 3 of my evidence, so to speak--means to be not on speaking terms. And therefore, if we speak again to each other, There is hope that peace is developing. For three par- --I think I mentioned this yesterday already--the United States have given up speaking to the enemy. We don't speak to the whole eastern half of Europe, although the Russians always have been the allies of the United States--never the enemy, very strange; and we are much more socialized than Russia. And -- Heaven knows why that is. It must be the income tax or something like that. The length of time which it takes to come to peace may be set in relationship to the sacredness of names, that they accompany us through centuries. When you deny a man the name under which he wants to be called, then a great calamity arises. There can be no peace. As long as every man in the South calls a nigger a "nigger," there's war. Because he is not called by his righteous name.

Mr. -- we have a -- a constitution, you see, with wonderful privileges for the individual, and especially in the Congress. The chairman of a committee can never be deposed. And so we have a chairman of a committee on justice who calls the black men in this country "niggers." That's "justice," that's carried on by the United States Senate. This is much more important than all the injustices in hiring and firing. This is the seat of the evil. And since he has the insolence of doing this, and that you tolerate this, and that I tolerate this, this is incredible. Because this man calls these people bad names. And he's the chairman of the committee on justice. And he is never attacked, because they are sacrosanct, you

see. Very strange. Princes were sacrosanct. Popes were sacrosanct. But now Congress is sacrosanct. And there's the seat of the evil.

All I have -- I'm trying to do today is that -- to tell you that to call people is life or death, that this is a -- a real power in a man's life. If you -- only call all the Jews "dirty Jews," and all the niggers "cheap niggers," you are belligerent. You are in war -- at war. And how many -- ten thousands of people in this country are at war? Think of the man in Philadelphia, the electrician, who had to give up his -- his home in a white neighborhood a fortnight ago. He stand -- stood it for one year, and then he had to leave. This is a more important event than all the occupation in Vietnam.

The process of speech, if you begin with the appeal to the man's name, is a definite person, predictable and vital process. And because the philologists deny this, they have this funny idea that an imperative exists for six different forms of personality: "Let me die," "Let them die," "Die." That's not true.

The imperative--we said yesterday, you remember my example--the imperative waits until a man has responded to it with his own name, till he has obeyed. If I say, "Come," the sentence only complete when Smith says, "Smith is here." Then I have found a person to carry out my command. This imperative consists always of two sentences. One, "Come, love me"; and the other, "Indeed, I can't help it. I love you."

This is what I have called the process of speech. And all grammar ignores this, is pagan, because it wants to analyze this sentence, "Come," by itself. It will not admit that this is an incomplete sentence before somebody ans- -- asks -- answers and says, "Here I am." This is speech. Speech provokes people into different roles. It changes me and you in such a manner that in any generation, every one of us can partake in the new offices of society. Whereas all other beings remain lions, bears, wolves as they are, you and I can depose one rank, one office, one function and adopt another, and we are the rejuvenators of creation. Speech rejuvenates us because after I have listened so often to the fact that I'm my father's son, suddenly somebody says, "Now you are a doctor. Now we listen to you as an authority. Now you are a father. Now you have grandchildren." And as this goes on, we re-create the universe. Don't you see that speech does all this, and nothing else? Speech takes you from a hoped-for future into an accomplished past. Every one of you has made this experience that at one time things were in the future, and you expected them with -- with part of your breath--I mean, excited--and then it happened, and then you can put it to

the sig- -- past, and you can remember them.

Now all language is built around this necessity to make things future into things past. And that's why it begins with an imperative. And any great reformer will speak of the future.

Georges Clemenceau, the great politician in France, said of Jean Jaurès, the great Socialist who was murdered in 1914 by the Royalists in -- in Paris--it's probably forgotten now--who has -- has not heard of Jean Jaurès? Well, he was the leader of the Socialists in -- France, a very popular man, and a great speaker. And Georges Clemenceau, this "Tiger" of France, said of him, "Jaurès? That's very simple. You always know that he has written something. All his sentences are in the future tense."

All his sentences are in the future tense. Because he was the great reformer, the great believer in the future. Take this seriously. Only man has this power to make any sentence in the future tense. No animal can do this. That's man. He creates the future by his sentences in the future tense. And then there comes the historians, and transform these sentences in the -- to tense past. And we read the history of the past. But we must never forget that at -- we only read that history which out of the future became past. All the rest is bunk, or technique, or indifferent. It's ashes. You read now too many history books that have nothing to do with the future, because they do not tell you the achievement that something that was lying in the future was brought home, and carried in, and built up, and became an institution.

Is -- the imperative then begins in the future. There is no imperative which, because it is waiting for fulfillment, doesn't create in a child the power to understand what future is: that which has to be done but hasn't yet been done. The only safe thing for a real human being is the future. But it has also this tremendous pressure on us, that we know it can be missed. You can miss your future. Most -- 80 percent of the people have missed their future, because they didn't believe in this. They are scientists, you see, and scientists have no future. They don't believe in it. I can't help them, I mean. Of course, they have, but against their -- their own predicament. That's their predicament. They live by their friendship and their love to each other. It's a very human association, these so- -- scientists among themselves. It's a very great family all over the world. And in devotion and in sacrificial attitude, the scientists are today perhaps the finest race we have. But not -- just the same, what they have in their head is all wrong. Their relation to time is really that they think that the past begets the future. But

gentlemen, that's such a heresy. Christ came into the world to teach us that the past does not beget the future. That's the whole Christian doctrine. There's nothing more in the Christian doctrine but this simple fact that Jesus said, "I haven't lived, yet; and you have -- know nothing of me." And it's all the beginning, We begin again. That's -- ended Judaism. The Revelation in Judaism is of the past, and the Revelation in Christianity is of tomorrow.

This is all very serious, gentlemen. We have today such a lag of our culture. We are de-Christianized totally and we have instead physics, and techno- -- technocracy, and statistics. This is quite serious. We -- how can you educate your children without great hopes into the -- in the future? And the -- hopes for the future cannot be one more satellite. That's not a hope for their future. That's quite uninteresting for any human being.

The second sentence, which you learned--grammar, language, linguistics--had to form: when you put a man under the pressure of a command in which he believes, "Love your neighbor," now here is this child of God equipped with this one, great law: love your Lord with all your might and main, and your -- neighbor as yourself. And armed with this -- word, he leaves the confirmation table, and begins to live. And for another 70 to 90 years--we don't die anymore--the -- the man has -- is accompanied by this one future sentence, "Love your neighbor."

So a second form of language is necessary in which he expresses his doubt, his despair, his desire. That is the subjunctive, the optative, the desiderative -- all the present tense expresses feelings. That's what poetry does. The indicative -- the conjunctive of the present is the second great form of language in all languages, because while you are under the pressure of an order given, of a command to be introduced, of a religion to confess, you are swayed by emotions. Up and down, pessimistic, optimistic, you see, tranquil, excited, des- -- desperate, hopeful. And therefore the poets and -- now I'm sure your speaker will -- will show you how wonderful poetry is. After the imperative of commands, without which we would have no direction, the poetry in- -- filters into us the strength of sustaining on the road the doubts, the pains, the growing pains, all this interim of our existence, when the fulfillment is far away, but the beginning already has been made, and nobody knows how we make out. I mean, between the freshman's entrance in college and his last day, there are many such moments where he is very doubtful if he shouldn't have better become a barber, because they're upping their price all the time.

The third form is when you look back on an event and can tell people a

tale. All tales are in this passé défini, and they have given rise to the form which the grammarians call the indicative, and spread thinly over all tenses: future, present, and past. But believe me, the only tense in which the indicative is the fundamental form is the past.

When Mr. Charles Lindbergh did his masterful flight, he published the experience under the title, *We*. That's a very wonderful book for the Spirit of St. Louis. And why did he use the term "We"? He was alone. It was a single man's -- and a single engine's flight, even. And he said, "We," because he said, "My machine and myself"--and there's a deeper secret involved--when we look back, we invite all mankind to participate in our joy. We invite you to -- to celebrate our 25th anniversary. We have made -- may have been quarreling all the time. But when we invite them, it's all "we."

The origin of the past tense of the -- indicative in speech is the past. The origin of the subjunctive, or optative, or however you call it, is the present. And the origin of the -- of the future--now we can say, "I shall do this," "I will do this" -- these are auxiliary constructions. And they may take the place of the command, "I have to do this," and this -- what I really say to me, "Do it"--these are processes that follow inevitably once you are immersed into living. To live means to cope with the future in the form of commands, to cope with the present in the form of poetic feelings, and to cope with the past in the form of indicative statements.

And of course, then there comes Number 4, the professor of linguistics, and the analyst, and the anatomist, and the statistician; and this is Number 4, that he is with things and people as "its," and "hes," and "shes." And the -- what you call the normal language of conceptualism, of philosophy, of sociology, of psychology, of -- I don't know how many -logies there are, is the sentence from outside, the looking-on. You are not in the process, but you can see another man's achievement and say, "That is it." And as far as you say this, you are -- create a fourth tense in speech which is the neuter. "This is it." A conceptual -- any concept is eliminated from the stream of time.

Now we leave behind us today a century in which this conceptual state, the scientific state, the neutral state of "hes" and "its" is declared the normal state, the beginning. It's the end. It's the ashcan. It's the burial place. It's a dump -- city dump. All experiences can one day be lumped together and say, "That's it. Dismiss it. It -- it's gone." Any real life begins with orders. Physics didn't begin with the atom, but it be- -- began with the great command to Descartes, "Cogitate." And he did. And he neglected his wife and his child, and he cheated everybody,

the whole Jesuit order, and the Cardinal { }, but he did it. And he founded a new science of analytic geometry. And this was his command.

Any scientist, if he's any good, does act under the command, "I want to be a scholar, I must be a scholar. It's right that I should be a scholar." If he doesn't feel like this, and he doesn't feel his command, he's no good. We are under orders, gentlemen. As long as we have any future, we are in commotion, we are poetical, we are inspired. We are, so to speak, rhyming, singing, and full of song as long as we know why we are going, where we are going under the pressure of having a task to fulfill. Soldiers march when they go to battle. That's the simplest expression of this present, you see. The present is a suspended situation between a future that has to be fulfilled because it is ordered--by providence, or by the general, or by the United States government--and by the monumental past in which you then are erected into a -- into a statue, and stand on the -- Capitol Hill in Washington.

That's what life -- the life of language is: the transformation of commands into poems; and of poems into chronicles; and of commands, poems, and chronicles into analyzed anatomy, which they now call "philosophy."

If all these four idioms are fully spoken, the community is healthy. If one of these four great chapters is suppressed, the community withers. We have today a too-big head for the scientists. And the poets are foreshortened, the historians are foreshortened, and especially the imperatives, the Jean Juarès tenses in the future are very much foreshortened.

They tell you we must build a -- a satellite to the moon. And immediately the president feels, and rightly so, that he had to develop an ec- -- economic opportunity program in order to satisfy the soul of man. If there was no future on earth in this -- in this community, we could not afford to build satellites to the moon. It would be a scandal. That's -- in this way, this program is very intimately connected. Because the poverty program recognizes a command. The other is -- is nothing but competition, as you know, and vanity. But I have nothing against it, as long as it keeps the bomb from falling upon us.

But this is how life is, gentlemen. You cannot neutralize, abstract life and say, "We must now construe -- construct"--the very word is very eloquent and very terrible--construe -- wagons that can go to the moon," without at the same moment feeling, "Well, but the common man may not follow us. We must do something for him. There is a higher command for a society than building -- building vehicles for -- to the moon. Can we have this riches, this abundance

without including people --?

And to -- as you know, we live in a very lucky moment in which the great industries understand that they need buyers. And so they are quite willing to subscribe to this poverty program. But what I am interested in it -- that at the very moment our luxurious growth and our abundance, something of the future has to be formulated. And this anti-poverty program--you may like the term or not--and the Peace Corps are attempts to show us that there is something that has to be done, and hasn't yet been done. And nobody quite knows how to do it, by the way. The Peace Corps is not in his last chapter, but its first. We don't know how this will come -- out -- will work out. Because I think it is not -- the Peace Corps has interested me since the year 1912, and I have my own ideas about its future. It certainly is not an invention of America. And it's certainly must never be the invention of any one country. And as long as you make it a vehicle of nationalism, it will of course be degenerate. That's not the -- the question.

And so it is all very serious. But it's so wonderful, because it is a command. And people who have no command to fulfill, they go to lunatic asylums. All the intellectuals go there, you see, because they have no orders. They think they are free.

Yesterday I was attacked by some of you, because you said it was so terrible to be obedient. Gentlemen, you obey in order to be allowed to give orders. And -- since nothing in this world can be done without cooperation, and without a collective understanding --. You must understand that the whole process of politics, of creation, of begetting children depends on this very simple fact that we have first to fulfill our parents' desires, and then become the parents of our own children. In any human being, in other words, these four forms: imperative, optative, indicative, and neuter--infinitive, conceptual knowledge--are contained. You go into a house. there is a father; he gives orders. There is a mother, he -- she celebrates the holidays; she keeps the mores. That the whole past is in any woman present, as the whole future should be present in any man. Then you have the daughter, who is there for the beauty of the things, for the emotions, for the poetic aspect. She has her picture painted by the most famous painter of the day--don't have it -- painted in abstract. And -- and there is the boy, full of inventions, and full of conceptual criticisms, and says, "That's not -- not right." And he's critical. And that's his privilege.

A man comes of age--and now I'm very serious, and again, the linguists desert me there--a man comes of age under the law when they say -- when he is

21. But what does it mean to come of age? To speak these four dialects: of his father, of his mother, of his sister, and of his own. These are the four languages into which all human language is divided and organized. The language of command, the language of retrospect, of mores, of habits--you celebrate Christmas in a certain way. You celebrate Easter in a certain way. Your mother knows how to do it, and how much of the old mores have to be carried on. And in her -- wrestling with her children, she finds out what of it is still pertinent, you see, and which under the circumstances has to be omitted now.

The four people--father, mother, daughter, and son--or brother and sister as I have -- may perhaps preferably call them--are the four carriers of the complete language of mankind. No individual can speak it. No -- no whole nation can speak it. But every family group can -- must speak it. And unless in a family, the son, and the daughter, and the mother, and the father do not play these different roles, the family disintegrates; the family is degenerate. And of course, we have all these schools. We have here this beautiful hall--which I really like to speak in, I must say--because the families don't function. Otherwise the liberal arts could have their home in every family. But we can't do this, so we build this place. But I can only tell you exactly what all mankind has known since the days of Adam, Eve, Abel, and Cain. The unfortunate story about -- of Abel and Cain is that there was no sister.

Yes. You see, great poets have centered around this problem of the sister.

Iphigenia, in -- in Goeth- -- Iphigenia in -- in the Greek tragedy, you see, is the sister who brings the peace and ren- -- reconciliation. That's very serious.

And why do we speak? Because we do not allow the father, and the mother, and the daughter and the son to degenerate into incestuous groups. Because they are sacred to each other, they develop this spirit of the power of naming things to each other. If -- if the family group would just be like the animals, there could be no speech. It would be too close. There would be no front- -- border lines between them.

But I had six sisters. I know very well the whole realm of a sister's language, and a daughter's language. It was not mine. I played with soldiers, and built, and so on. And the -- the greatest secret of mankind is the fact that from the very beginning, incest was taboo. What I told you about the knowledge of your own name, in a Negro tribe on the Windward Island, 300 years back as slaves imported, is of course more true about you and me. You know very well whom you can make love to, and whom you cannot. And it's this clarification which makes every family the cradle of the new beginning of the human race. Every

reserve, every power is in the -- is present there to go out into the world and to convert the heathen. That is, to convert people to the fact that we march from being a "thee" commanded, into a "me" suffering, praying, doubting, waiting--impatiently or patiently--into a "we," looking back on a common enterprise; and finally being dismissed into a "they" and an "it," and "That's it, put it away."

Man is transformed by speech, or he doesn't speak. And all the linguists are quite sure that they are not changed, but language is changed by their research. Accordingly, their research doesn't bear any fruit. But your and my listening and speaking will bear fruit if you allow yourself to become a different person by this impact, which people make on each other. Everybody knows it; everybody accepts it; that's why we teach; that's why we learn. The teacher-student relationship is after all only a little, little image of the father, son or the parents-children relationship. A teacher is a half-baked father, and a half-baked mother. And -- in all humility, still teaching seems to be necessary, because so many parents don't know what great dignitaries they are. So I -- we have to do it. When St. Augustine was between his worldly lawyer existence and his bishopric, and was -- drifting--he didn't know what was coming to him--he had this one great problem. He had an illegitimate son, Adeodatus, "God-given." He had begotten this from his sweetheart, and the boy was an illegitimate son. And St. Augustine suffered from this. And he began to write a library for the son, of which only the first chapter is -- is available. He never finished it, because then he was called to Hippo, into this provincial town--which was much smaller than Bellingham--and -- and spent the rest of his life in this corner. You must always understand that St. Augustine became such a great writer because there was nothing else he could do in Hippo.

However, Adeodatus, who died when he was 16, and solved his problem in his own -- in this manner very simply, received one dedication. I've written on this at great length, and given talks in -- to the Augustinian Society at Harvard on this matter. It's a very touching document, because there you see the trembling of a father who says, "How can I teach my son, who knows that I did not -- right by him? I did not make him my legal son. So how can he forgive me? Will he -- listen to me?"

You know how many parents today are in despair, because they think sons are not there to listen to them. And -- they are their legitimate sons, but must -- in many situations, I have the feeling that the parents consider themselves illegitimate parents, because they do not claim the right to educate their

children. It's very strange. It's a very com- -- much more common today than -- than should be, that parents abdicate. I've seen incredible scenes of devotion of parents to their children, allowing all the insolences to these children.

And one of these men in New York, a very rich man, said to me when he was called by his boy to the telephone, "Oh Father. But Daddy, ta- -- you take my call, will you?"

And obediently the old man got up and went to the telephone. And when he came back, he said to me, haltingly, "You know, I -- of course, that was very insolent. But I think when I am old, he will take good care of me."

Now the one thing I can assure you, this boy will never take good care of his father, because he will despise his father, because the -- father hasn't spanked him. That's -- unforgivable in later days for a -- to a boy. He has not been corrected when he should have been corrected, the boy. And how can he forgive this? The father has just failed him, because the father must know more, and act wiser than the son.

Now this -- to let you -- us end on this tone of St. Augustine--it is quite hopeful. Here, he had developed a program of education and speech, which has something to do with the rejuvenation of the human race by speech. And he said to his son, "My dear son, when we speak to each other, the whole future is present in you, and the whole past is present on -- in me. We do not meet just one generation and the other. Because I can speak, must speak, may speak, are allowed to speak, every wisdom, every song, every truth of the whole past is alive in my language. And I have the great hope that if I do right by you, these songs, these truths, these proverbs, these knowledges, this language, this harmony of the spheres will reach down to the end of the world through you." And that is the teacher-and-student relationship in the power of human speech. Let me -- stop here. He has said it better than I.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

Richard Feringer: (...that you would have a similar experience that I had had in the past, and still do, when I hear him speak: of not quite -- understanding some points, needing some other points filled out a bit. And I had hoped that this kind of a discussion might aid your understanding of some of his ideas a little bit more.

(And with this, Sir, I'd like to turn the discussion over to you, and have any of you who wish to speak up and ask questions, start off the discussion and we can kind of see where we go from there.)

Well, if I may open the discussion: close the door.

Is -- does this prevent people from coming in?

(I don't think so.)

(Professor {Miletich}?)

(Ah, would you give us your definition of language, then also a linguistic one? And try -- also linguistic definition of language, try to compare them to the merits of your definition and shortcomings of the linguistic one.)

Yes. The shortcoming of the linguistic is perhaps -- if I may begin this way--because that is known to you, what they are doing--is that they take the single sentence and analyze it, and tell us what the subject or the verb means in this. My contention is that all language is one great ocean in which we swim, and that you cannot at -- in any way, understand language if you take the single sentence. That does -- is -- absolutely meaningless for -- to me.

I mean, old Wundt, the famous Max Wundt, that was the great psychologist of the end of the 18th -- 19th century, reformed linguistic in a way because he made this progress that we shouldn't -- at least not analyze a single word, but the sentence. I still remember my surprise when I was a boy of perhaps 16 or 17, when I heard this miraculous story, that you had to have a whole sentence before you could understand what language was.

I am not satisfied with this. And I say that man is made a member of the human race by speech, that this is an ocean in which we swim. And as soon as

we give up the feeling that this is an ocean, and one element, we leave the human race. You see that Mr. Hitler -- or the Chinese at this moment, or many other groups at this moment, have given up all hope ever to be able to speak to others. If you go to Berlin, in eastern Germany, you will find that these people claim the right to lie to every western German, because they are not Communist. That all the ethics of speech are today in jeopardy, in all these class struggles. It's a very -- terrifying situation. For the first time in 900 years--that's about the time of the Crusades--man has in wide parts of the world declared openly that he's not going ever to be on speaking terms with the -- wickedness of bourgeoisie, or the wickedness of such-and-such a religious group. And for the first time, this ocean of speech in which every innocent man, except philologists, have always believed, that -- is now -- given up.

And in this sense, the wrong theory of language is victorious, as all these materialistic gods of the 19th century. They all dominate now the laity. First, only the scholars didn't believe in God. Now -- even the dic- -- the general dictionary doesn't believe in God. Yesterday I looked up in Collier's a definition of -- of "language." Sir, I don't know if you were present when we spoke of this, this morning. Wie?

(No. I was not present here today { }.)

Well, it may help us to advance--I do not wish to -- to dwell on this too long. But it helps. You must first know that we are in a very sticky moment of the human spirit. It just has left us. And it's very dif- -- difficult to recover. On a much more calamitous and serious situation, because talk, newspapers, and television--which to me all are not speech, but imitative speech, irresponsible speech, valueless speech, worthless speech--taking from great, great truths and great speech the veneer, being totally irresponsible. Because, as I gave you examples, even the commissioner of education in Washington can say to me, "This -- you are right, but if you quote me on this, I shall deny it."

Now nine-tenths of the American people consist of people who make sure that they will never be quoted on anything. And that's a very strange situation. It's of course a complete devaluation of language. If you can dabble -- babble politely in society, and say things and you don't mean them, where are we? And the more people get into this state, the more devaluated the whole me- -- the whole element in which we have to bask, after all, and on which we rely for our very existence --. I mean, any declaration of love of a boy, is it always a lie? Does he never mean business? Or the girl, when she says, "Yes"? Does she always have another -- thought in mind than what she says? This is all taken for grant-

ed. We have analysis which proves that when a man says, "I love my mother," he only wants to kill her, and vice versa. I mean, we are surrounded today by the pretense that nobody wants to speak the truth. That everybody has the power to lie. If successful, he gets rich; if not successful, he goes to jail.

Now -- but the two -- the two alternatives are not very interesting to me. I want to know how it is possible to speak the truth. This is very strange, because the truth is denied. Everything is pragmatic. You speak for your self-in- -- self-interest. And therefore, as you know, a lie is forbidden, but it's a great help in the trouble of life.

This -- these all -- witty -- witticisms, which weren't very important as long as very few people read books, and wro- -- read newspapers and wrote newspapers, is now a tremendous calamity, because every one member of the 195 million Americans looks -- listens to television, and reads newspapers, and is exposed to these constant lies and constant pretenses.

So to give you my example, which frightened me. There is an encyclopedia by Collier's. It's one of the many -- encyclopedias -- is not worse than any other. I don't mean to slander it -- especially. It's any encyclopedia, defining speech.

And it says, under the heading "grammar," I found the sentence that speech is given us to speak to other people our feelings, our intentions, explanations. Now we live in such an atheistic era that it is taken for granted that prayer doesn't exist. Because obviously the most important use of speech is prayer -- the holiest, or the most central. Because -- to me prayer is the way in which I discover who I am. While I -- talking to you, I try to pose as a scholar, or as a speaker, or as a witty man, or as a learned man. So I'm always wrong -- or I'm not -- I'm posing. Because you came here under false pretenses. And I'm here under false pretenses. We all are, in this earthly world, in a way bewitched. We have only the hope that despite our masquerade here--we're all masked here--that the truth will come out, that through the medium of speech, we may break the barriers of our not understanding each other, our not knowing each other.

But the condition is that when I speak, I have not only you in mind, ladies and gentlemen, but that I know that I'm -- speak in the presence of Heaven. The -- the -- the encyclopedia laughs at this and says, "We speak to others." Well, then you cannot speak the truth, because others have always different interests from yourself. And only if there is some almighty ruler in the universe who watches you and me will we limit our lying, and our egotism, and our vanities, and our

ridiculous way of thinking about the world at large from our own little viewpoint. We will not sit there in judgment over Herr -- Mr. Mao or Ho Chi Minh in Vietnam and say we know it all.

This is only if -- if speech puts man under the life of our creator. And without this participation, I do not see why we should talk about language at all. It's an instrument like a pliers. And that's what the linguists say. The linguists say that "language is under our rule, that I can say what I please. I can make languages." They invent artificial languages. And I say, "No. This is impossible." You can, of course, invent an artificial language for what it is worth. I have nothing against Volapük, or Esperanto. But the -- inventor of Esperanto and Volapük knew very well that they are far from creating a living language. That is an instrument, a language for special purposes, for ordering in Hong Kong cheap suits. As you know, the Chinese produce there very s- -- cheap dresses. And I recommend them to you. And order them in Esperanto.

Now I'm -- pardon me. I cannot speak on language without injecting this -- in the note forbidden in the Constitution of the United States, that we speak in the presence of God. And that's very serious. Any linguist denies the existence of God, in the -- in the way in which he talks now about --. We have no other access to our religion than through speech, Sir. This idea that you can have in your head some belief in God, and then speak as though He didn't infiltrate, didn't inspire you, or -- expire you, is to me absolutely -- ridiculous, silly. But this silliness governs our campuses. Forgive me. It is the proposition that you can talk about the human history, about the Constitution of the United States, about good and evil without ever knowing that you speak because you have--vis ... vis of you--a -- a -- ma- -- a divin- -- -inity, a majesty which looks at you, and which controls you, and which directs you, and which tells you when you are lying. And here, the theory is: the bigger the lie, the leas- -- less you will be discovered. This is quite serious, Sir. And for a man, you see, who has left his own country, because the big lie there dominated, and had come to this country, it is rather exasperating to find that the country which was built, and based, and founded by the belief in a just creator, is now out to create all kind of departments in which this is openly denied. It's very strange.

When I came to my college, the -- Dartmouth College in New England, I found that several -- colleagues in the English department said, "It's our task in the liberal arts college to wean all these poor boys from their benighted religion." I looked at them in -- in dismay and said, "Well, then we are at odds, at

loggerheads." And I have been at loggerheads at various universities in my life, and the situation is quite serious.

The linguist -- linguists today are the starting point of all denial of any meaning of life. And -- the simple quest, Sir -- it -- it's very simple. If you take this single sentence, then you do not understand this -- this ocean. One wave begets the other. If I say, "There is no God," then somebody else goes out and proves it by action. That is, we are infectious. The sentences which we speak are not repeated by somebody else. But if I say something, anything of the character of a command, or a summons, an exhortation, a recommendation, then somebody goes--and that was my demonstration yesterday--to do it. He say -- you say -- I hate to give -- examples, because then I might then be arrested for summoning, you see, sedition. But anybody who says, "Let's -- keep America white," of course leads to the -- another man who says, "Well, we must do this now," and proposes how it is done. And then there will be surveys soon in the newspaper, a chronicle reporting that last night something happened by some rowdies, because they believed your sentence.

That -- it -- that is, what we say in the form of a summons enters another man in the form of a wish. What this other man wishes then enters fact in the order -- in the form of a report in the newspapers of a fact. And finally then comes a sociologist who says, "In America, race riots are quite ordinary and regular." And then the man who reports this -- the character of the Americans as loving race riots in Mississippi omits this -- the man who first wished this on the others, omits the seducer. And that's what we have today, these poor people in the street who do all the things. They are carrying out what our theories have insinuated.

And so I see a constant movement from wishful thinking in one man to -- to desire in the next, to action in the third, and to theory in the fourth. And everyone says, "I haven't said -- I have only said this little thing. And that -- am I not free to say what I think?"

The strange situation today that the most dangerous people rank as the most innocent people. The linguists have -- have told us that one can speak without regard to the divinity of man. If this is possible, Sir, if because there are -- there are 9,878 dialects and languages in Africa alone. There probably have been 100,000 languages in the world. The Bible has been translated into 1,028 languages as -- so far. And it's still proceeding.

(Let me ask you a question. Is Esperanto included among those { }?)

Pardon me?

(Is Esperanto included among those languages you mentioned? Is the Esperanto language included among those languages you mentioned?)

I hope not. I hope not. You see, no. Because this language is a means to an end, and language is not a means, Sir. We -- you know why it is not a means? Bec- -- I -- you -- didn't come to the lectures. My -- the discovery on which this whole hat is hung up is very simple. Because you are your mother's son, you know from the very first day and for the rest of your life--and you cannot change it by learning another language--that you cannot marry her. You know that you cannot marry your daughter. You know that you cannot marry your sister. These so-called taboos, for which we don't even have a decent name, depend on the divinity of your names. You are a human being, Sir. And you have the great privilege as a man to know who you are. And you know therefore that the great qualities of the human soul, by which we become human, means that you must develop the qualities of the daughters of Zion, and the mother of God, and the son of man, and the father of mankind--all these great religious terms--they live in every human being's chest. Every one man, by learning to speak, is immediately endowed with -- exciting avenues of being.

You think that language are words. As long as you think this, I cannot convert you, Sir.

(I do not.)

I cannot, no.

(I do not.)

What?

(I do not think that language is a word. I can give my definition of language, but I'm interested in your definition of language. So what I'm { }.)

I don't under- -- quite understand.

(I would like to hear your definition of "language.")

It's the way by which man, in -- in difference to other -- all the rest of nature, is able to officiate in the changing offices of creation. We are the only

people who, as we go on, and as people are born and die, you see, differ in our tasks. In every generation, something has to be buried, and something new has to be taken up. It's language which enables you to say, "I am my parents' son; but now I take a vow of chastity," or "I -- I become a professor, a scholar to scientific truth, and there has -- never anybody in my family done this before, but I begin it."

So man is this strange person who--for this reason, by the way--in -- in difference to the animals, buries his dead. There is no tribe who doesn't bury. You remember, we talked on this, this morning with Mr. {Butler}, the man from Australia. Burial is the greatest basis, so to speak, of the divinity of language. Because in -- in burying our dead, in becoming aware that death is real, we make room for future -- the future. It's a tremendous challenge. The most primitive man buries his ancestors. And so he does two things at once. He keeps alive the memory of these people. And he admits that he now is in their place, because he must take care of them. That's what ancestor-worship means. This is a tremendous thing. No animal does anything but run away when it has to die. When my horses die, I have -- I raise horses, then they run away into the lates- -- last corner of the field and wish to hide. When a human being dies, it is buried.

This acknowledges two things, Sir, of great importance, which are beyond words, so to speak, you see. The name of a dead man formerly was broken over his head, so to speak, over his -- to make sure. And then the -- at the same time, he received a religious homage. I mean, every -- annual- -- annually, his memory would be repeated and celebrated.

So we have this strange power, as human beings, to overcome death, to en- -- enclose it; that is, to acknowledge it, and yet to say, to survive it. Man cannot be understood as a living animal. He can only understa- -- understood as a man who knows that he must die, and who triumphs over it. Without this triumph over death, no human civilization, no human history, and no language. And that's why the Greek Homer called us the "articulate mortals." We are the only being who on the one side die, like the animals, and on the other, like the gods, last. And we do it with the help of language. Your name lasts -- outlasts you.

This is then why I say words are not language. Your name is the most vital part, because I use it to call on you, and you use it, probably, my name, when you speak -- to me. And as long as we enhance our mutual names as titles--what they really are--. When I call somebody "Mr." or somebody called "my son," or somebody called "my sister," I bestow a title on them. I create a constitu-

tion. And we belittle this, now. We are all so slangy and all so shirt-sleeved, people are so informal that Mr. -- the president is "Teddy," or he is -- I don't know. And Mrs. Johnson is--how do you call her?--Lady Bird. And an American will not give in before he has not abolished all -- titles, and is -- he's happy if he can say he is informal. Now -- but don't be betrayed. The form of the American Constitution is the informality. So it is a form.

Without the -- knowing that the president really is Mr. President, it doesn't give you any satisfaction to call him "Teddy" -- Theodore Roosevelt, you see. The funny thing is that in America, the understanding of language is made a little difficult because we live on this witticism that nothing is quite serious, and that the man in shirt-sleeves, so to speak, pleases us better than in full costume. But we know that the full costume is needed. Woe to the judge who doesn't appear in his gown on his bench. We wouldn't like to be condemned to death by a judge who came there in his bathing suit.

Well, doesn't you think that's true? I mean, at least if I'm condemned to die, I want to be judged by a man in full dress. That dress is language. That a judge should wear a dress is the consequence of the fact that you call him "Judge."

You read Carlisle, Sartor Resartus, who -- has anybody read the book? Thomas Carlisle, as you know, was an English writer. And he's the only English writer I know, except Shakespeare, who knew what language was for. And in this book Sartor Resartus, the resown tailor--that's what it means, the s- -- tailor sewed up again--he -- he knew this secret of names. And I recommend it to you. It's the only book written on the topic which is still valid in all these last hundred years.

Language consists of naming each other, and therefore it is a process between you and me, Sir. And it is not something about things. The greatest -- great heresy of linguistics at this moment is that here you sit, and here you sit, and you say, "Oh, this is a glass; this is a cup; this is a bottle; this is a loudspeaker"; and then you say, "We know all about language." It's a way of -- of labeling things. The poor things don't know what we're doing to them. They don't listen in, you see. And so we can invent Esperanto. And as far as things are considered, Esperanto is a language. But as far as the inventor of Esperanto is considered, and his mother and his wife, if he -- you would call him by his Esperanto name, he wouldn't come. But he wants to come by the -- name given him in all seriousness by his parents when they loved him, and when they begot him, and when they recognized him as a -- as a citizen, and as a -- their son. And this is a -- a

totally different world, the world of names, which Carlisle had in mind with his resown tailor.

And people whom I meet only talk about this perfectly indifferent thing, whether this should be called a bottle, or this should be called a bathtub. Or -- I prefer to call it a bottle. It's clearer. But it has something of a bathtub, too. If you get an -- a small animal, you can ask him -- to take a bath in it.

That's by and large how people consider language nowadays, as an instrument, you see, to express that there are certain things to be had in the next store. That's not language. For this, I would use sign language -- signs, tokens. I go there, and point it out -- him; and the man says, "Suh, suh, suh," and there we go, and that's -- doesn't --. Sign language is not language. The animals have excellent sign language.

Everything between present company is not language, or wouldn't make necessary language, Sir. I must use language to you, because what I say must be true for my grandfather and for my grandchildren. And for this reason, because what we try to say here has to be settled for the future, when we are all dead --. There is such a thing as truth, which for the animal kingdom doesn't exist. And there is such a thing as revelation. There is such a thing as prayer. There is such a thing -- all the utterances that are meant to outlast you and my physical existence, that is the criterion: what's -- language is. The rest is -- I mean, I'm -- I'm perfectly willing to invent a token language here for our immediate use. And another group will invent another token language. That doesn't deserve any great consideration. Language begins where the name of a man who has died is still valid, because it -- you still say, "I have to admit, I am this dead man's son." Then it comes to be very powerful, because you don't get rid of this forever, ever, ever. He -- you remain his son.

I gave this example in the lecture that the slaves -- the former slaves from Africa, who were imported into the Windward Islands in 1680, and 1690, and 1700 -- to this day, every one of them on the little island of Carriacou know from which tribe they came in Africa. That's their nobility. That's their {pride}. Slaves, serfs. And they will never give it up, because that's the only endowment in this cruel world which these poor people have still as their orientation in life.

Names give orientation to me. Speech, words, dictionaries give or -- not orientation, they confuse me. Pardon me. I have gone -- spoken too long. (I think you inferred last night that you -- you might have perhaps gotten

a little trouble because you said something that a person shouldn't be curious. So the scientists among us, they took -- took stock of this, and they disagreed with you. Now, what is your definition between being curious, and having an analytical mind? Actually I think we -- figure scientists should have an analytical mind; but still you say that a person shouldn't be curious.)

Well, we -- quibble over words. As I have heard it used, "curiosity" after all is treated as though anything I would like to know must be -- come within my reach. Now you know very well that isn't so. If you read the Bible, when -- when Noah was drunk, his daughter said to behave -- or is it Noah? Who is it? I don't know. Lot.

(Lot.)

The -- curiosity is a -- gives you a -- a privilege of piercing, and peeping, peering into other people's secrets. Sir, what has this to do with science, with scholarship, you see? It's -- the dif- -- when I say "curious," I mean living people, and also living animals, and living birds must be protected against the cruelty of the curious who can disturb the peace of the land, disturb the nest of a bird just because he's curious how he will behave when I kill him.

You know the {Loeb} case where they -- the two brothers in Chicago 30 years ago, or 40 years ago, killed their own friend, you see, because they would like to -- would -- wanted to see how he would behave in being choked. Well, am I not right that this is no criterion, Sir? We are in -- I mean -- and many sins in this country are committed, because people have said, "That's a virtue," curiosity. Intellectual curiosity, they call it, you see. It's neither intelligent, nor is it -- is it permissible. It's just dirt, infamy, impertinence.

I mean, it's like -- boring a hole in my neighbor's door and piercing without his knowing -- what's going on -- to see what he -- is going on there. It's -- that's curiosity to me. It's wanton. -- Why should I respect -- I have -- I know in this country, I don't know why, curiosity is consecrated as though it was -- would lead to the greatest heights of human intelligence.

Thomas Alva Edison is a great inventor, but he didn't act on this -- on -- on the basis of curiosity, Sir. This investigation is something much more serious, isn't it?

(You might say an analatical -- an analytical mind then was an investigating mind, rather than a curious mind. Is that -- would that be your

definition?)

Well, our mind of course is a -- can be talked into anything, I mean. If you offer a man a million dollars, he will commit every crime under the sun. It is to be feared. We're all corruptible. And my -- my protest against curiosity is, you see -- comes from the fact that it is described as a quali- -- a virtue in itself. Curiosity does no harm when it is under the control of decency and reverence, I mean. And I would say the first condition between two human people is -- two human persons, that one has the other at much at heart as his own existence. And that's the frontier for curiosity, you see. You do not want to be known in every minute of your life by -- foreigners who have no regards for your weaknesses. And the same is true of others. Curiosity in itself sets no limitations to your greed, to your eagerness to -- to learn something. Question is, has the person, or the thing, or the situation, or the institution, which you are curious about -- has he agreed? And the agreement is more important to me, you see, than this -- this intrusion. But -- it is a whole question, you see. The difference between anatomy and physiology in medicine, you see. The -- the anatomy presupposes that you have a right to produce a corpse. The physiology says that you try to keep the man going. I mean, you -- you want to study living processes, which means that he must not die while you are looking at him. But the curious says, "It doesn't matter if he dies. Even more interesting. I would like to see how he behaves in dying."

It's this -- you know how any child, how cruel they can be. They don't mind if they see a bird wince in pain. They just observe it. Well, spank him. The child, I mean.

(I wanted to ask you: what then do you think of behavioral science and the study of man? What did you think of behavioral science in the study of man, as a science?)

What? I have not understood it. -- Just hearing.

(Okay. What then do you think of behavioral science or the study of man as a science?)

Well, I pity them. I mean, if this is their relation to their fellow man, I'm very sorry for them. I mean, we -- we can only study man from affection and fear. You fear that if you don't study them, we will all run into trouble, you see, together. So it is always the same thing with -- as with Benjamin Franklin: we

better hang together, or we'll hang singly. I mean, this is the only excuse for all interest in humanity, you see: the -- our identity, and our solidarity. And as soon as you break away from this and observe -- you are in great danger of treating the other part of -- which you observe as an anatomist treats a corpse. And this is forbidden.

I have a -- know a psychiatrist who -- says we are in such danger now of this anatomical approach that I must be very careful when I diagnose a case. He is a psychiatrist, so he has to do with the people off-balance. And they may be -- very diseased, indeed. But he has made it a rule that he turns to a reservoir of ordinary, regular people--laity--who will help him to see this person not on the ground of medicine -- medical encounters, but of human encounters. Because he says, "How can I know when I see this one person whether it is his mother-in-law who has made him sick, or whether he is sick and has made -- endangers his mother-in-law?" Probably it's always both.

But -- "So," he says, "I postpone my diagnosis of the case." Here is the case, I have some symptoms. I'm -- the person obviously is in -- in dire straits. But I will not say what the diagnosis is, before I have not seen him cope with an ordinary encounter of a healthy person of the -- from the community. If I do not add this to my information, you see, my information is scanty."

Now that's by and large the opposite from your behaviorists' observations, you see. The behaviorist thinks he can observe --. My friend says "I must first allow myself this man to show love, affection, antagonism," what have you, you see, "in a new situation. Before, I do not even know that I can observe his behavior, and interpret it rightly, because it's too limited. I must add to what I can observe, you see, in his behavior, new elements." And so he is surrounded by a stack of such high school girls, and trade union men, and ministers, and teachers, and all kind of people he has befriended who allow him to go to the telephone and say, "Wouldn't you come over -- and take a walk with this gentleman," or whoever that is, you see, with his patient. And then he can -- inquire how this -- how this worked.

This -- only one means to show you the reverence in which we must hold people. We must not even, as a doctor, pass judgment on them, before we have given them an opportunity to -- to show different features. Because man is free. And man in every minute can be -- show that he has been slandered. That he -- we are blind to his real problem, you see.

I have a student of 25 years back--pardon me, won't you take a seat?

Please come around here. He'll find a chair.

So again, for those who were not at -- present in -- in -- in my -- in my -- listened to my speeches --. You see, this -- what this doctor, the psychiatrist, does is: he tries to open a way into the future, because speech is given us for creating the future. This is completely forgotten, because when you deal with -- with definitions and say, "This is a cup," there is no tense in this. This is abstract. Any time this will be a cup. But you do not speak to me when you say, "What a nice day!" except to create a situation in which we both feel at home, which hasn't existed before. We're all creative when we really speak to people, because we make people either feel bad, or feel ill, or feel -- feel good, sit down. We compliment them, and we agree on something--that the weather is very nice. And disagreements create a certain tie between us. You must think all the formulas which we use--"How do you do?" and "This is a fine day"--are great means of opening up avenues of common action, of common conviction, of common sentiment. Where we do not do this, you see, we are in great danger of treating the man as an object, as a thing, as an obstacle in our way, as somebody who has to be bribed, or has to be -- put out of the way.

Speech is always an invitation to the future, to the accomplishment which is our task, to lead things to their destination. That's what man's, obviously, destiny on this earth is. God needed an -- an -- an hench- -- a hand- --how would you call Him?--a servant who would lead the creatures to their destination. That's not my definition, but of Mr. {Scheeler}, a German philosopher. You know his man -- name. He said, "Man is on this earth to lead things to their destination." That's a very good definition. If you apply it, it means that the future is the master of the past, that you must never justify any action by precedent. That's no excuse for you.

Unfortunately, the -- parts of -- humanity live in the past, the criminals. They are just by precedent, because they are acts which we have eliminated from the future. We say, "Murder must not happen," "Theft must not happen," "Burglary must not happen," you see. And therefore, once you commit a crime, you are a throwback. You are -- suddenly belong to antiquity. You belong to an -- an order which we have superseded, of which we have decreed: it must not recur. So the criminal is judged by a judge indeed on the basis of precedent, in a negative way. The precedent means that this has already been judged as not admissible in the future, which we try to create for our children and our grandchildren. And that is the essence of the law, that the law is -- draws the line between the things that may enter the future, and the things that must never

enter the future. And that's why the expiation of the crime means that the culprit is thrown back into the past history, and must not appear as defiling our future steps. If we wouldn't punish the criminal--as these imbeciles, these pacifists, and so weit, always recommend, and treat them as sick--we would not clear -- clear the deck of our ship into the future.

This has to be eliminated as being superseded, as being -- belonging to a cursed past. And the blessing is only on a group of people who will severely keep the purity of the home, the purity of the government, the purity of the state--whatever it is--the purity of the school, in force. A scientist who lies, a -- a family who doesn't keep chastity -- chastity in its wards, has ceased to be a family, has ceased to be a scientist. So they have to stop calling themselves member of a scientific group, or of a -- they are eliminated. They are judged.

And this is very strange that people do not see that -- that mildness against crime leads to ruin. The society has to be severe, because it is -- because you and I, we are just as weak as the criminal. And if we do not strengthen our aversion against it, we will be tempted to do the same. The criminal law today is treated as a luxury. And why -- aren't you mild and re-educate this man? You know why I can't -- approve of this. Because we are so very weak ourselves. There is no -- no crime that is not also living in my chest, in my possibility. How can I say that I am not tempted one day? So I am -- build up walls myself against crime.

The -- the -- the -- the charity with the criminal always strikes me as coming from very haughty people--Quakers, probably--who say they can never be tempted themselves, so we can be mild against the criminal if somebody -- who is so unhappy that he is tempted, since we are never tempted, we can treat him just like a violet and -- and say, "Oh, dear murderer. Don't do it again. No -- won't you, yes?"

And the murderer will say, "No, I won't." And then we let him get scot -- go scot-free. I can't afford this, Sir. There is not a crime in my -- that I couldn't commit. I'm too weak for this. I have to show my aversion, my hatred of the crime, in order to strengthen my own {scent} against it, I do not understand the arrogance of all these mild-men, of all these -- these clubs for the abolition of capital punishment, and how they all say. They're all very proud people. They seem to be -- never to be tempted themselves. But I am. There is not an act, after all, in human history which you and I could not commit -- have committed. We are so divine that we are capable of anything, of the greatest san- -- sanctity, and the greatest criminality. And as long as we hoe this line, we will know what we

have to do, and what we have to say to each other. As soon as you say you are special case, and you cannot be tempted, you cease to be a human being. You see, the presupposition of speech is that all people are capable of everything. Everybody is a genius, and nobody is a genius. Everybody is a soldier, and nobody is a soldier. Everybody is a policeman, and nobody is a policeman. And the criminals know it. They all try to become prosecuting attorneys or policemen. That's very true, you see, it's -- it's -- because they know the changeability of man. And speech has something to do with this. In speech, we recognize our identity. When a man says to a woman, "I love you," he not only says that he loves her, but he also gives to understand that she loves him, that she's capable of responding, of reciprocating. And -- so, people by speaking develop in each other unknown qualities. Speech -- {love} makes rich, love creates an abundance of life. Without a family, where would the gifts of a child be? It -- a child becomes all the cleverer because there are five children in the family, and one elicits from the other all kind of talents. Retarded children are children who are deprived of this interplay of talents.

And we encourage each other and we discourage each other by just being together. I'm afraid you encourage me at this moment to speak too much.

(Jim, did you have--?)

(I -- I heard somebody say this, in a fair trial/free press conflict. He said that due process of law conserves an island of language in a sea of talk.)

And island of language in a --?

(In a sea of talk. His argument was that in the court, we swear "to tell the whole truth, so help me God," we preserve language, speech in the court in pursuit of truth and justice. Freedom of press is not bound by those rules may, by contrast, may be talk, may be rumor, may be allegation. But would you care to speak to that point, or --?)

Well, you are absolutely right. That's the most -- perhaps the beginning.

but I made the beginning in my lecture. And I must repeat -- I'm very glad to repeat this. It's very important. Nine-tenths of modern -- what modern people take as matter for interpreting speech and language, is not speech in my eyes, but babble, it's garrulity, it's -- it's gossip, it's talk. Now talk and speech are very different. Speech is that what you can quote against me, and for which I will account. If I say, "This is my wife," I must be willing to be killed if somebody

wants to -- to murder or rape her, or I'm not her husband. This is a condition of my saying that I'm her husband. She must be absolutely able to rely on my defense of her interest, at the danger of my life. If I run -- go -- am to run away from this, I have ceased to -- have a -- the -- the title of her husband. People don't care. They -- run away, and their forfeit this title, and they go to Las Vegas. And that's very serious.

Today, in Calif- -- when you live in California, as I did during the last half year, you have the impression that the people are there so -- well off that they can no longer distinguish between the day and a lifetime. It's a dream. They live from day to day -- they live very nicely. They are good people. But my problem in the -- in a less favorite zone--I live in New England--we know very well that the things which we me- -- where we mean business are quite different from the niceties of a summer day which is pleasant, and we play around, and we go swimming. And whether you have a bikini or not, it doesn't make any difference. It's not real, this one summer day. But marriage is real, vows are real, science is real, vocations are real, war is very real, you know, service in the army. If you come to California, there seems to be no difference between the things you do for 24 hours, and you do for a lifetime or for -- eternity.

And -- I don't take this too seriously, I mean. You know that there are very good people in California, too. But the whole country has this aspect of -- of the -- no distinction between the -- things of the moment and things of permanency. And now all our speech, Sir, is this one worry: how do we distinguish seriousness and joke, and play? The -- nine-tenths of the -- today is playfulness, and people are delighted when people speak playfully, and you never know whether they are serious or not. Obviously that's not speech. Speech is given us to say something that is permanently effective and true. And talk is something of which you can say the next minute, "Oh, I didn't mean it. I of course meant something quite different. You mustn't misunderstand me." In -- other words, talk can be taken back. Speech cannot be taken back. Or, if taken back, it costs a tremendous price. You can get a divorce, but at what price? At what cost, I mean? Not in money only, but of your own soul.

So speech is this by which we hew avenues into the future, as the -- roads into a -- in a big wood -- in a redwood park. It's as difficult to hew avenues into time. But man can do this. That's his divinity. And talk is -- nine-tenths of our -- of our words are used in vain. Fooling around, playing around, you talk. And it doesn't matter what you have said, and nobody will hold it against you, and you say, "Well, that was just talk." Does this satisfy you, Sir?

(Yes.)

And see -- my opposition against linguistics, Sir, comes from the very fact. It is not the question of -- of Esperanto. I think on this we could find an agreement with everybody. But the linguist will not make a distinction between the sentence, "La rose est une fleur," which I had to learn as my first sentence in French grammar, you see--the rose is a flower--and the sentence, "This is my father." Now if this sentence, "This is my father," is wrong, then I am a big liar, and a very dangerous person. I'd better be watched. But if I say, "This flower is a rose," you see, and it isn't a rose, I've just made a mistake. That is, that's -- quite a very different category. You understand.

If you mix these two sentences in your analysis of linguistics, you will never get any important results. Because the unimportant sentence then is clumped together, lumped together with the important sentence. The important sentence has consequences for my -- the father and for you. The error -- your error in judgment that this flower is not a rose, you see, but another flower, you see, has no consequences. The flower laughs it off, you see; the florist laughs it off; and your sweetheart may just -- be impressed by the rose, you see, under which name ever you -- you give it to her.

So there are always, in any language, in any speech, the serious application and the playful. The gardener, the botanist must not make this mistake. If he goes wrong, he is a useless person, because we -- we think that he should be serious about roses. He should not say, "This flower is a rose." We trust him that he will be serious. But for a man who goes into the store, just because he wants to bring a flower to his girl, much is forgiven. Whether he knows how the flower is called is a very secondary proposition.

And so in every moment in these waves of speech which flood -- I mean, mankind after all is zimming, zimming, zimming, zipping all the time with speech; millions of words are used, you see--we will only understand speech if we are ready at every one moment to ask: is the man serious? Analyze language only in the mouth of such whose future depends on the reality of their sentence. The botanist does. He cannot become a professor if he makes such mistakes, you see. And that's very disturbing. Then he can't marry, because he has no income. Yes -- any untruthful sentence, where you are entitled to expect the truth, has terrific political -- consequences, you see. But every sentence which has no consequences is talk. And you must not use it for analysis -- analysis of the meaning of language. And this is done here constantly. The linguist simply takes any

sentence, regardless of its political or -- existential meaning. And that's why existentialism today is a great philosophy. Even philosophers have discovered the meaning between playful talk and real talk. And they say, "The truth is only important if it is existential." I subscribe to this. They are approaching my own doctrine of -- of language on -- in this manner, because they say, "Existential thinking knows when people are serious or when they are just talking."

(I think that there exists a basic misunderstanding between {perhaps your relation} to our linguistics, because --)

Between --?

(I think --)

Between whom? Please, I -- I didn't --.

(You and your relation toward linguistics in general, because you're implying something to linguistics for -- what linguistics never try to do.)

Yes, they try nothing important to do. That's very true.

({ } area, { } object matter. And linguistics is interested in something what is not primarily meaning, and you are concerned with meaning. In this sense, simply, are you {speaking the} language --?)

But Sir, but Sir. Pardon me. Yes. I am a linguist by prefer- -- I mean, by origin, so to speak. Since my 12th year. I know that they deal with nothing important, but they don't know it. They think they know all about language. But they don't.

(No, they do not think that.)

No, Sir. You -- you -- I'm sorry.

({ } idea that they know all about language. What they doing, they're trying to analyze language. And different levels of language { } to -- to tell eventually how language works. Not as you stated in your opening statement two days ago, that a linguist tries to tell us how to talk, and to whom to talk. Not at all. We are not interested to tell you how to talk, and to whom to talk. Simply to describe mechanisms, systems of different languages. Nothing else.)

Oh, Sir. I'm -- we are in total agreement. But they are so -- very obnoxious for this very reason, that they -- that they pull down--how shall I say?--discredit language. They have separated religion and language. That's impossible, Sir. ({ } quite a different problem. They are not concerned with your problem.)

Exactly. Well, atheism always says it can deal with the world without God. And I think they can't. This is exactly that. An athe- -- atheistic science of language is a contradiction in terms.

(Not at all.)

Well, you say. So I say anything that these linguistics have found out, I know all their -- about -- I own their works. I've been in correspondence with these people. I've been their disciple. I've been their -- their student. My dear man, don't think I'm talking as a blind of the color. But they have omitted--since my 12th year, I have felt this--they have -- I have dedicated my first books to the leading linguists of the ages, Sir. So don't think that I'm not acquainted with these people. More than acquainted. I have done all these sins -- committed these sins myself.

(Yes, but I understand you, that you are here implying something -- asking them to do what are they -- they are not doing. This is what matters. For instance, you could say, "I dislike { } semantics, because it doesn't tell anything about my love for flowers. You know, this is the same principle involved. You cannot ask a linguist something what a linguistic is not trying to do. This is what matters.)

Sir -- I just had -- forgive me, but I think I have made this very clear. I have called one-half of my -- of my poor enterprise, "The Lingo of Linguistics," and I have called the second, "We are Called into Life." So I said, the second half is not covered by the linguists. And I think that's simply--according to yourself, simply true. I have not accused them of anything, but I have narrowed the scope of what they're doing. I've said they describe things, and they cannot distinguish important and unimportant, which is always -- always -- exactly. And that is their haughtiness and their arrogance. And that's why they are -- do so much harm. Because people who do not -- do decline to -- discriminate between the important and the unimportant are exactly like the scholastics who discuss how many angels were dancing on the toe of God Almighty. That was sterile, and it had to be dismissed. And that's why we are no longer following the Scholastic philoso-

phy, because they got lost in their inability, their ineptitude to distinguish between the important and the unimportant. A science that cannot distinguish between important and unimportant is judged, it's fruitless.

And you -- in denying this, you give me absolutely your proof of me. You say yourself that they do not want to distinguish important and unimportant.

That's what I say.

(Pardon me, but --.)

That's an accusation. The worst accusation you can have against a people. I mean, you can classify the history of art by the distinction: whether the -- things are painted on canvas, or on chalk. But do you think that this very important for a history of art? And if you limit your distinction in the history -- of the history of art to these two poor -- criteria, I would say this is not worth the candle. Abolish this field of teaching, you see. The same is with these linguists. You can do it. I have no objection. They count languages, and so on. Very useful. But in their very limited range. If I however have to educate a child in reverence to language, I must never give him a book of these people to read. I must -- yes, I must avoid in this deracination, in this -- showing these children that it is just -- just a game.

(You will be disappointed.)

Wie?

(They are not going to agree with you. They will not agree with you at all.)

No. But I have escaped their inferno. And I'm very proud of this.

(Professor { }.)

{ }. And you -- I think you mentioned Ernst Cassirer -- Ernst Cassirer?)

No, I never mentioned him.

(Oh, excuse me. { } I'm sorry. But you mentioned the -- this common -- the common sources of religion and language. And he does, also mention { }. { }.)

I'm hard -- could you speak a little louder? I have difficulty just in hearing.

(He proved it, his theory, with the help of the -- linguists, and the -- { },

and quite a few other scientists, which you seem to despise.)

Not "despise." That's the wrong term. Sir, if I -- if you are at war, you

always love your enemy. I mean, if you take an American general, the highest

praise he has for anybody is: they -- he does as well as the Germans. You see, so

we always take our cue from our enemy. This is very strange, but it's true. So I

don't despise these people. I'm despondent that they should dominate the globe.

I want to conquer -- take the globe from them. I think their government is very --

very -- little beneficial. Because what we must learn to distinguish: between

seriousness and play. And they decline to tell us this. This is the most serious

thing today, in a world in which nine-tenths of -- life is -- the advertiser tried to

con- -- to make into play. Life is too serious to be left to the bikinis, the surfers,

and the skiers. And it's all very nice that life seems to be a play. But if this young

lady believes -- this, she will not be able to live well. We have to tell her what --

when something is serious and when something is play.

Play is that which is without consequences and without fruitfulness.

When you play in love, you have no children. If you are serious in love, there are

grandchildren. And that's quite a story.

(I said that play --)

Before there can be grandchildren, imagine what man has to go through!

Children, that's nothing. That's easy. But grandchildren. Your own grandchil-

dren. My dear man, first your child must remain undivorced, and the children

must marry again. It is a terrible story. That's very serious.

(But play is a very important thing in art. In fact, the most important thing

--

)

What do I care for art? What do I care for art? This is Mr. Cassirer, my dear

lady. I have nothing to do with the intellectuals who worship art, and { }.

(But you speak so much about love, and love is an art in this { }.)

Yes, but play is governed by decisive actions, vows, oaths, promises,

whom you can trust. I feel very glad if a man is a man of honor, and he has

promised me to furnish me with a horse. I will very well allow him to play with this horse to the last minute before he delivers it to me. But I expect him to deliver the goods. And his playfulness is an element of his -- civilized state. Of course, we can joke to -- with each other. That's all very nice, but it's subordinate to the great acts of life. But they are very few. There are engagements, there are marriages, there are contracts, there are wars, there are peace -- treaties. Very few acts are decisive for men. And they are terribly serious. And you must know what you are doing. When you play, you don't have to know what you are doing. you are on safe ground, nothing can happen. Around every playground -- look at a golf clu- -- course, look at a tennis court, look at a baseball court. They are all cut out of reality. The playground is a thing by itself, and so it's perfectly safe. Nothing really -- real can penetrate. And the -- we men can produce by our reflection, by our thought, by our meditation a second world of what we call the world of reflection, in which Mr. Cassirer was at home. I knew him.

The reflective mind creates a second world inside the real world. And any playground gives testimony to this. If you play croquet, or if you play baseball or football, you see, you are very severe in following the rules. Nobody must cheat. But what does it matter? It's still a play. You can abolish football. You can invent a new game. That's all second-rate. In this country, however, playing of course--and Mr. Cl- -- Cassius Clay is more important than Mr. Rusk. This is very terrifying to me. But it is so, that our play champions play a greater role--Mr. Ar- -- Arnold Palmer or whatever -- whoever it is--than the serious people. Well, I try to avoid this. Playing is very nice in its place, but the nation must remain on its guard that the player -- a playing person is not to be taken too seriously. It's just a -- he plays.

The whole age, however, of our modern factory masses, is so hungry for real life, that these substitutes for life, like a baseball, or a golf player, gets all the honors and all the attention. People have lost the power to distinguish between serious living and jokes, and play. A sportsman is still -- only a sportsman. I'm also -- I have my sports, too. I am a horseman, I am -- have raised horses, I am a mountaineer, I have made first ascents. I have skied. All these things are wonderful, but they are not serious.

And if language loses the power to distinguish between these two things, that is real atheism. And we are in this stage in this country. I -- can't help feeling, all I have to do with my many grandchildren is to try to avoid their deception by the advertising of -- by the sportsman, or by the players that this is real life. This isn't real life. It's play. But you have to -- the same problem in this college, obviously, isn't that -- wouldn't you say? It's very important to -- to tell the

students that art, too, is an accom- -- companion to life, you see. Goethe, the great poet, warned his own son in a famous poem, you see, "Please my dear son, never forget that the Muse can accompany life, but never may guide it." That's the first thing about art; it's a companion to life; it's an embellishment to life. But it's not the leader of life.

The prophet may be really, but not the artist. But we have come from a century in which the drunkard -- if he was a drug addict--like van Gogh, or so--that he is made the leader of a nation, the -- the herald of the future. Well. Two world wars were the consequence. The divinity of art has led Europe astray. It has succumbed to this. Because the artists were the only gods believed in, in the 19th century. The -- the -- Europe lost its -- its smell for the future. You cannot follow artists into the future of mankind. They are -- out on a -- on a wing. They are extremists. The taste of an artist is too sensitive for normal human beings. But you are now -- I mean, I have -- I have young friends, innocents themselves, and the only thing they read is Proust. Why American pe- -- boys in their innocence have to be fed with the -- with the feces of Europe, I do not know. And that's what education is in this country. If it is -- if it is the most putrid thing of Europe, it is devoured here.

Wie? Well, I --.

(You don't convince me.)

You don't think so? Well, I'm sorry. Somebody has to be on his guard.

And so -- since I am the lonely crier in the wilderness, I will.

(Well, I don't agree with that. Don't you think there's people here that have a -- little individuality themselves without looking to the past, and Europe to --?)

Well, I wish they had. Sure.

(Well, there is some individuality here. I don't think everybody looks to Europe to figure out what they're going to do in the future.)

But Sir, I taught at a -- on a campus of freshman this year. It's a new branch of the University of California. And I really went there without any prejudice. I didn't know what I would find. I had -- no intention there. I was invited. And -- very good people. And I -- we have become really good friends. But the first thing -- on the first day that happened was that they quoted Camus.

And then they quoted Sartre. That was the second day. And I tell you, neither Mr. Sartre nor Mr. Camus have anything to offer to a healthy American in California. But that's their business. But then I was startled, because then they said, "Oh, yes, even Camus has mentioned an American writer, called Emerson." So I was a little overcome, you see, by pity, that an American should come to know Ralph Waldo Emerson by the detour of Paris, Quartier Latin, { }. Is that necessary? You -- I mean, it's not me that wishes this on them, you see. It's my experience with Americans, that -- .

I had another friend, a young man, very gifted, who -- who said to me, "I have to -- to -- to look up the avant gardists in Paris."

I said, "Paris is a dead city. There are no avant-gardists in -- in Paris. The avant-garde is just somewhere else. And it isn't advertisable where the avant-garde is. You have to smell this out. But if you naively believe that because Paris once had them, a hundred years ago, that there is anything avant-gardist about Mrs. DeGaulle, you are quite mistaken."

But there are these superstitions. I mean, people -- you -- he -- he was despondent. He said, "But there has to be one place where I'm sure to find the avant-garde." Of course, there is no such place.

I mean -- so you see, we are -- I'm not in disagreement with you.

{ }.)

(We'll still have individuality here then, too.)

Of course you have.

So any more questions, please?

May I say one thing and apologize? The -- the topic is so gigantic. Speech is so hard to touch upon in -- with any sense of reality, that I must apologize. It's an endless task to make people aware of the closest before their eyes. You see, there is an old verse in German, which I allow you to -- please allow me to translate.

"Was ist das Schwerste von allem? was Dir das Leicht ist so scheinest, mit den Augen zu sehen was vor den Augen Dir liegt?"

What is the most difficult thing of all? To see with your eyes what is closest to your eyes? So speech coming out of our mouth is very hard to grasp. Most people never reach the point where they can see what they do when they speak. I assure you. And once you wake up to this fact, you will have -- every one of us is very wise about speech. But he must understand that it is so near to him, that he usually has quite wrong ideas about speech. He doesn't observe what he does when he speaks. So my task here was to make you aware of the real dangers of serious speech, and the valueless of babble.

Thank you very much.