Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy rejected Cartesian philosophy thus providing a new starting point for the study of communication. The communication theorist must, like the pirate, be free of entangling commitments to paradigms which are based on Cartesian principles. Rosenstock-Huessy believed that scholarship must serve the development of world peace and the restructuring of society.

Two years ago I presented a paper at the International Conference on the Life and Work of Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy. The conference was held at the University of Waterloo and was an attempt by persons affected by the seminal work of Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy to call the attention of the academic community to his seminal insights into life. My paper at that conference was entitled, Contributions of Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy to the Development of Communication Theory: Some Preliminary Suggestions (Tate, 1986a). I told the members of the conference that after writing the paper and discussing it with a friend I was convinced the title of my next paper would be, "On the Impossibility of Doing Communication Theory!"

In a sense that is the subtitle of this article. Central to the thought of Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy is the acknowledgement of gratitude for work done in the past but a swift passing to exploration in the new world of the Third Millennium. In this sense it has become impossible to do Communication Theory in the same manner as it has been done in the past whether from a Rhetorical, Empirical, Phenomenological, Semantic, Linguistic, Semiological or Critical perspective. Let those persons who insist on living in the past fail to recognize the new world and continue in their deadend pursuits. The Communication
Theorist must now recognize the reality of past revolutions and sail into the Third Millennium casting free from the anchoring points of past communication theory. An introduction to the work of Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy, a man who W. H. Auden called, "One of the truly seminal thinkers of the Twentieth Century," will help to explain these concerns.

AN INTRODUCTION TO EUGEN ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY

If this article were written for an European audience there would be little need for an introduction to Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy. His work is well known on that continent and there are several centres focusing on his life and thought in Germany and Holland. The German Sociologist Dietmar Kamper, whose paper on the Scholar as Argonaut for the Waterloo Conference has influenced a portion of this paper, is only one of many European scholars and persons influenced by Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy's life and thought. On this continent his students from Harvard and Dartmouth have carried on his work including Jack Preiss, Page Smith, Clinton Gardner (1981) and Harold Stahmer (1968). Rosenstock-Huessy's influence is understood by other major scholars of our day including W. H. Auden, Harvey Cox, Martin E. Marty, among others. Generally, however, Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy is not known by scholars living and working on this continent even though he taught and lectured here from 1933 to his death in 1973. For those who have not come across his work here is a short biography which will help one understand his importance.

Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy was born in 1888 in Berlin. He received his Doctorate in Law from Heidelberg University at the age of 20. He taught constitutional law at Leipzig University from 1912 to 1914. In 1914 he married Margrit Huessy and added her surname to his own in the European custom. During the First World War he served as an officer in the German Army on the French front. His involvement in the Battle of Verdun was a turning point in his life.

In 1912, Rosenstock-Huessy met Franz Rosenzweig, a young Hegelian scholar. The friendship between these two scholars was unique as they came to understand each other as alter-egos. Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy had converted to Christianity and during their conversations a few years later convinced Franz Rosenzweig to do the same. Rosenzweig went home to tell his parents of his decision and decided to attend the Yom Kippur services at the synagogue for one last time. It was there that he "converted" to judaism. During the war Franz Rosenzweig served as a German soldier on the Macedonian Front. The correspondence between Franz Rosenzweig and Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy as soldiers during 1914 - 1918 was formative for both men (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1969b). While writing these letters to his friend, Rosenzweig developed the book which became his seminal work, The Star of Redemption. Similarly Rosenstock-Huessy sent Franz Rosenzweig an early prepublication copy of his book Angewandte Seelenkunde (An Applied Science of the Soul) which

288
was published in Germany in 1924.

After the war Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy had several job choices. He could have returned to his university teaching in Law as he was recognized as an outstanding jurist. He was invited to become undersecretary of the Ministry of the Interior to work out the new constitution for the Weimar Republic by a radical socialist member of the German Reichstag. He was also invited by the editor of a Roman Catholic magazine to join it in Munich and to help revitalize it.

Writing about these choices Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy said:

Then it came clear to me that by accepting any one of these offers I would become a parasite of German defeat. The country was heading towards disrepute, defeat, poverty, and I would get on top of this corpse. I would shine either as an undersecretary or a religious editor or as a university teacher. And I would have to wave a flag which had proved to be uninspired, unprophetic, and would make other people believe that I believed in its message when I did not. (1970b, 187)

As he described his experience after the war in determining a suitable profession he wrote about his law career: "I then went back to my faculty and read an address before the dean and faculty taking by and large Justice Robert Jackson's point that a world community could only be constituted by the world's nations taking action against Germany as a state. The paper which was printed then, and today reads as though written for the Nuremberg trials, finished my career in that faculty" (1970b, 187). A presentation before the Roman Catholic bishop of Wuerzburg and Catholic students of that city ended any possibility of his religious career.

Instead Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy took a position at the Daimler-Benz automobile factory in Stuttgart. There he developed an adult education program for the workers. He founded the first factory magazine in Germany. In 1921-1922 he pioneered again by founding The Academy of Labour in Frankfurt, which developed Adult education for all persons. In 1929 he was elected chairperson of the World Association of Adult Education. He returned to university life in 1923 as professor of Law at the University of Breslau.

While he was at the University of Breslau he became concerned about the state of unemployment among the young people of Germany. In 1928-1930 he organized voluntary work service camps bringing together workers, farmers, and students who worked together on the land. It was in this project that he met Count Helmut von Moltke and his wife Freya. Helmut von Moltke became a leader of the Kreisau Circle, a group of people opposed to Hitler who met together to plan the future of a post-Hitler Germany. He was arrested after the unsuccessful attempt on Hitler's life on 20 July 1944 although he was not involved in the plot.
and did not support violent opposition to Hitler. He died in a Nazi prison in January 1945. Freya von Moltke became housekeeper for Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy after the death of his wife, Margrit in 1959, worked with him on his two volume Sociology and translated several of his books into English.

When Hitler came to power in 1933 Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy left Germany with his family and went to Harvard University where he taught for two years. In 1935 he joined the faculty of Dartmouth University where he taught social philosophy until his retirement in 1957. While at Dartmouth in 1939 he helped to organize Camp William James as a leadership training camp for the Civilian Conservation Corps. During the 1950's he lectured at the German universities of Gottingen, Berlin and Munster. During the 1960's he lectured at Columbia University and the University of California. He continued to live and write at Norwich, Vermont, until his death in 1973.


In his introduction to The Origin of Speech Harold Stahmer credits Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy with 150 books and articles published in Europe beginning in 1910 in the fields of law, history, political science, psychology and sociology. Most of his major books are still available only in German.

THE THOUGHT OF EUGEN ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY

The thought of Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy points the way to a new understanding of communication and experience. He has not provided a new paradigm for social scientific research on communication. He has not even provided a new paradigm for the philosophical analysis of communication. His work is non-paradigmatic.

The thought of Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy is best described as an intellectual breakthrough. Kuhn's (1962) understanding of the paradigmatic development of social sciences requires that a new paradigm replace the old one. Axelrod (1979) has pointed out that true revolutions in the social sciences take place as intellectual breakthroughs. Axelrod has shown that an intellectual breakthrough occurs with estrangement between the individual and the group. This is very different from Kuhn's understanding of continued communication between the group and individual so that the group eventually accepts the new scientific paradigm. As Axelrod states:
For Freud, Simmel and Buber breakthrough begins with this estrangement—this relatedness to the tension between the individual and group. But they express this estrangement in a certain way; not by escaping or declaring indifference, but by attempting to generate more relevant and crucial possibilities for inquiry. They choose to struggle with the restrictive conditions suitable to their own experiences of theorizing. And in order to amend or dissolve the accepted paradigm, they articulate their critiques and provide a higher rationality --- one that allows their work to reach an audience and to re-enter the community of discourse (1979, 69).

Martin Buber admitted he had no teaching and the intellectual community could find no new paradigm in his work (Axelrod, 1979, 69). Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy wrote, "I do not enlarge on the academic premises; I contradict them" (Rome and Rome, 1964, 32).

The work of Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy does not present a new paradigm for the social sciences. It represents the destruction of paradigmatic social science. It is not confined to one academic discipline but ranges over all disciplines from Communication to Theology, Philosophy, History, Psychology, Sociology and Anthropology. In this respect it is threatening to the intellectual establishment with their organized areas of specialization.

In the final pages of Out of Revolution, Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy expressed his estrangement from the intellectual community in the following passage.

My generation has survived social death in all its variations, and I have survived decades of study and teaching in scholastic and academic sciences. Every one of their venerable scholars mistook me for the intellectual type which he most despised. The atheist wanted me to disappear into Divinity, the theologian into sociology, the sociologists into history, the historians into journalism, the journalists into metaphysics, the philosophers into law, and—need I say it?—the lawyers into hell, which as a member of our present world, I never left. For nobody leaves hell all by himself without going mad. Society is a hell as long as man or woman is alone. And the human soul dies from consumption in the hell of social catastrophe, unless it makes common cause with others (1969a, 758).

Rosenstock-Huessy understood that a generation which had been through the experience of two world wars could not accept the old paradigms of social science. He came to this realization in the trenches of Verdun. A student of his, Clinton Gardner, came to this realization as he took over command of the just liberated concentration camp.
at Buchenwald towards the end of the Second World War (Gardner, 1981, 64 - 65). A generation which has experienced the meaningless slaughter of Viet Nam, Lebanon, and El Salvador should also understand that the old paradigms of social science are useless. A new starting point must be found for a meaningful understanding of communication and behavior. This new starting point must take seriously the Planetary Revolution which has occurred during the past century.

The two world wars were the form of world revolution in which this new future reached into everybody's life; the nationalist and communist ideologies with their dreams of revolution were checkmated and are mere foam around the real transformation. The real transformation was made by the wars and it made the Great Society final. She is the heiress of State and Church (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1966, 5).

Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy began his reformulation of the social sciences by rejecting the Cartesian principle that thought is the basic reality of life. The second to last chapter of Beyond Revolution is entitled, "Farewell to Descartes." The last chapter also focuses on Descartes and comments on his lack of humor. This chapter is entitled, "The Survival Value of Humor" -- a topic Norman Cousins (1979, 1981, 1983) understands well in our modern day.

In Out of Revolution Rosenstock-Huessy traced the major revolutions which have formed the life of persons on this planet. In his historical works, Rosenstock-Huessy showed that Western society was formed by four kinds of speech. Tribal speech oriented people to their ancestors, the past. Templar speech, such as arose in the Egyptian empire, oriented people to the stars, the world outside. Greek speech oriented people to the inner self through poetry and philosophy. Finally, the speech of Israel oriented to the future by way of prophecy.

With the coming of the Christian era, these four ancient modes of speech were fused. After Christ, men no longer felt bound by a single orientation. They felt free to participate in all four forms of speech. They discovered the rhythm which moves a man from listening to the imperative of prophecy; to the subjective questioning of his response; to the narrative listening to how others, in the past, have responded; finally to the objective or outward speaking which is his particular response to the reality which he had first heard in the imperative form (Gardner, 1970).

These four forms of speech have made the four revolutions experienced in Western society necessary. We are heirs of each of these great revolutions. The French Revolution freed the people from the monarchy as did the United States Revolution on this side of the Atlantic. The British Parliamentary Revolution gave the people the right to rule
along with the Aristocracy. The Reformation freed people from the
Church and turned their attention inward on their calling in life. It
replaced sacred and Canon law with Civil Law (Tate, 1985b). The Rus-

sian Revolution is to be seen as the natural successor of the other
three freeing the worker from the power gained by bourgeoisie in the
French Revolution. Each revolution does not rise from the others but
builds on the success of the others.

During the Battle of Verdun it became clear to Eugen Rosenstock-
Huessy that another revolution had come about freeing us from the
rigorous scientific method brought about by Cartesian thought. He then
understood that Descartes was wrong when he said, Cogito ergo sum (I
think therefore I am.) Modern science has been built on the Cartesian
principle that thought is the basic reality of life. Cartesian philo-
sophy has given us five hundred years of advances in Chemistry, Phy-
sics, Biology and Botany.

Rosenstock-Huessy's breakthrough was that he understood that one
cannot build a social science on Cartesian principles. It is necessary
to break with Descartes. The corollary to 'Cogito ergo sum' -- I think
therefore I Am -- is, I will be measured because I exist. Since
thought is real it can be measured empirically. Overagainst these
Rosenstock-Huessy placed his new grammar: mensuror, quia existo; re-
spondeo, etsi mutabor. [I hear so that I may come to exist; I respond
although I will be changed] (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1970b, 65 - 67).

Each of the four major schools of Communication Theory today begin
with the Cartesian assumption that thought is the basis of reality.
The Rhetorical perspective of communication has emphasized the analysis
of arguments and their influence on the audience. Arising in Fifth
Century B. C. Greece, flowering in the work of Aristotle and the Clas-
sic Roman scholars, and continuing in our day in the work of Kenneth
Burke, Chaim Perelman, Richard Weaver, Ernest Bornmann, Marshall Mc-
Luhan and others, this "most humanistic of all the Humanities," to
quote Richard Weaver, focuses on the thoughts of the persuader (Adver-
tiser/ Media professional) as they influence the thoughts of receivers
(readers/ viewers). The effects tradition of North American Mass
Communication Theory is directly rooted in the Aristotelean - Cartesian
understanding of people.

The Empirical perspective of David Berlo, Gerald R. Miller, James
McCroskey, George Gerbner, Joe Woefel, Michael Burgoon, Charles Berger
and many others arises from the perceived need of the social scientist
to be as rigorous in his or her study of communication as the physicist
or chemist is in the Natural Sciences. David Berlo began The Process
of Communication with the assertion that the only reason to communicate
is to persuade the other person of the correctness of one's perspec-
tive. While he and Gerald R. Miller have moved away from this narrow
understanding of communication (see especially Berlo's article in
Communication Yearbook 1 and Miller in Book, 1980) to a transactional
understanding of communication, the central reality of empirical re-
search is still thought expressed by one person to another. Since thought is real it can be measured and quantified statistically and empirically.

The Phenomenological perspective, of which John Stewart and Michael Hyde are the primary leaders, along with David Crowley in Canada, also begins with the Cartesian principle of thought as the first reality — as Stewart plainly says in his 1978 Quarterly Journal of Speech exposition of a phenomenological perspective: "Motivated by the same desire that Descartes had to locate an apodictic foundation or absolute starting point for all thought, the phenomenologist begins with the indubitability of the cogitatio." At the same time Communication scholars who take the phenomenological perspective reject the Psychologism of the Empirical perspective. Basing his theory on the work of Martin Buber, Ronald C. Arnett (1981), has clarified the distinction between a psychological understanding of meaning as existing within the individual and the phenomenological understanding that meaning exists only between people engaged in dialogue. For the phenomenologist meaning is interpersonal, not intrapersonal. Thus the phenomenological perspective is to be understood as a third alternative to the subjectivism of the psychological/empirical perspective and the objectivism of the Behavioristic/Critical perspective.

The Critical Theory of Communication also begins with thought as the basic reality. For many Critical scholars communication is a new discipline dating from the 1940's (Melody and Mansell, 1983; Mansell, 1982; Smythe, 1981; Smythe and Van Dinh, 1983). This lack of a complete understanding of the long history of Communication Theory is unfortunate for it allows these scholars to attack a strawperson empirical communication theory which has probably never existed (Mansell, 1982). However, the basic emphasis in Critical Theory to "free people for self-determination" (Haight, 1983) rests on the assumption that ideas, thoughts, and the inner reality are controlled by the economic and political structures of society.

Audi, ne moriamur. Listen, lest we die; or: listen and we shall survive is an a priori that presupposes a power in man to establish relations with his neighbor that transcend their private interests. The formula, by its own supposition, denies the Marxian idea of thinking as pure self-interest; it also precludes the idealistic idea of thinking for the sake of thinking... By introducing the listener, the "you" that is, expected to listen, something is achieved that science fails to do; the dualistic concept of a world of subjects and objects is abandoned. Grammar does not know of two but three persons, I, you, it... Human survival and revival depend upon speech (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1970a, 24–25).

With these words from Speech and Reality Rosenstock-Huessy breaks with all current approaches to the study of communication. Modern
communication theory, of whatever variety, caricatures people because of the Cartesian and Aristotelian presuppositions which underlie it. For Rosenstock-Huessy, Franz Rosenzweig, and Martin Buber one can develop a social science only on the analysis of interaction —"Respondo etsi mutabor (I respond although I will be changed). This formula which we propose as the basic principle of the social sciences, for the understanding of man's group life is as short as Descartes' Cogito ergo sum" (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1970b, 10).

The abstractions and generalities that prevailed in philosophy from Descartes to Spencer, and in politics from Machiavelli to Lenin, made caricatures of living men. The notions of object and subject, ideas and matter, do not aim at the heart of our human existence. They describe the tragic possibilities of human arrogance and pettiness. They miss the target at which they pretend to shoot: human nature (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1970b, 8).

A Communication Theory based on this radically new understanding of life will begin with the reality of response — speech — communication, instead of thought. It will need to use the analytic method which he developed for this analysis — metanomics or grammar. It will have to begin with the new grammar which Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy gave to replace the Alexandrian grammar on which Western culture has been based. It will have to begin with Speech Thought and an understanding of the "speaking thinker", a term introduced by Franz Rosenzweig. A lengthy passage from Rosenzweig will help to make this starting point clear.

In the new thinking, the method of speech replaces the method of thinking maintained in all earlier philosophies. Thinking is timeless and wants to be timeless. With one stroke it would establish thousands of connections. It regards the last, the goal, as the first. Speech is bound to time and nourished by time, and it neither can nor wants to abandon this element. It does not know in advance just where it will end. It takes its clues from others. In fact, it lives by virtue of another's life, whether that other is the one who listens to a story, answers in the course of a dialogue, or joins in a chorus; while thinking is always a solitary business, even when it is done in common by several who philosophize together. For even then, the other is only raising the objections I should raise myself, and this is the reason why the great majority of philosophic dialogues are so tedious. In actual conversation something happens. I do not know in advance what the other person will say to me, because I do not even know what I myself am going to say. I do not even know whether I am going to say anything at all. Perhaps the other person will say the first word, for in a true conversation this is usually the case. For the thinker knows his thoughts in advance and his expounding them is
merely a concession to what he regards as the defectiveness of our means of communication. This defectiveness is not due to our need of speech but to our need of time. To require time means that we cannot anticipate, but we must wait for everything, that what is ours depends on what is another's. All this is quite beyond the comprehension of the thinking thinker, while it is valid for the "speaking thinker."

I use the term "speaking thinker" for the new thinking. Speaking thought is, of course, still a form of thinking, just as the old thinking that depended solely on thinking could not go on without inner speech. The difference between the old and the new, the "logical" and the "grammatical" thinking, does not lie in the fact that one is silent while the other is audible, but in the fact that the other needs another person and takes time seriously...In the old philosophy, "thinking" means thinking for no one else and speaking to no one else (and here, if you prefer, you may substitute "everyone" or the well-known "all the world" for "no one"). But "speaking" means speaking to some one and thinking for some one. And this some one is always a quite definite some one, and he has not merely ears, like "all the world", but also a mouth. (Rosenzweig, 1961, 198-199).

Franz Rosenzweig made it quite clear in the paragraphs following the passage quoted above that he learned this distinction from Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy. He also used the analogy of comparing the Socratic dialogues with the teachings in the Gospels. Socrates is the classic figure of the old philosophy. In the dialogues Socrates carries on a conversation with another person. The other person is allowed to talk but only as Socrates leads him. Socrates has thought out the topic in advance, initiates the conversation, and leads the discussant to the discovery of truth.

In the Gospels, on the other hand, Jesus called for a response from the other person, did not frame the response for the other. Instead of prepared truths he left the disciples with things which they did not understand until they lived into the new experience. The Gospels are full of indications that the disciples did not understand the words or actions of Jesus until after his death, resurrection, and ascension. Jesus called for a response from real people in real circumstances which reflection would later clarify.

It is impossible, then, to do communication theory without the other person who stands over against us and responds. Perhaps the best example is the current debate between the Empirical Theorists in Communication (the so called Administrative Researchers) and the Critical Theorists. Neither school could carry on their work or perspective without the other as they need the other to clarify, through their
response, the perspective which they seek to propound and use to gain power over the other group.

In Anselm's [Credo ut intelligam -- I have faith in order that I may come to understand] statement the emphasis is on the hearing, as the organ for inspiration by truth. In Cartesius', it is on the doubting as the organ for transformation of this divine truth into human knowledge. In our phrasing, the emphasis shifts once more, and now to the process of making known, of speaking out at the right time, in the right place, as the proper social representation. We no longer believe in the timeless innocence of philosophers, theologians, scientists; we see them write books and try to gain power. And this whole process of teaching again needs the same century-long self-criticism applied by Anselmists and Cartesians to the process of detaching us from God and from nature. In society, we must detach ourselves from our listeners before we can teach them.

Both the Credo ut intelligam and the Cogito ergo sum worked very well for a time. However, finally the Credo ut intelligam led to the Inquisition and the Cogito ergo sum into an ammunition factory...When Joan of Arc was questioned under torture, her theological judges had ceased to believe. When Nobel Prize winners produced poison-gas, their thinking was no longer identified with existence.

Our formula Respondeo etsi mutabor reminds us that human society has outgrown the stage of mere existence which prevails in nature. In Society we must respond, and by our response we bear witness that we know what no other creature knows: the secret of death and life. We feel ourselves answerable for life's "Renaissance." (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1969a, 14 - 15)

In Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy: Revolutionizing Communication Theory (Tate, 1985a) I explored some of the many insights which Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy gives to a revamped Communication Theory. In this article I want to draw out two insights which I believe are extremely important. First, the depth which Rosenstock-Huessy's Cross of Reality brings to our understanding of communication. Second, an emphasis which I overlooked in my previous paper, which Rosenstock-Huessy shared with the Critical Theorists of our day -- the necessity of response to the problems within the Society in which one lives as they affect persons with whom one is communicating.
Reality itself—not the abstract reality of physics, but the full-bodies reality of human life—is cruciform. Our existence is a perpetual suffering and wrestling with conflicting forces, paradoxes, contradictions within and without. By them we are stretched and torn in opposite directions, but through them comes renewal. And these opposing directions are summed up by four which define the great space and time axes of all men's life on earth, forming a Cross of Reality (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1966, 166).

Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy utilized the Cross of Reality to remind people of the multiformity of life. His understanding of the cross arose out of Christian symbolism, although this is a debated point in modern Rosenstock-Huessy scholarship (Bryant 1981, Gardner 1980, Stahmer, 1968), and took form as a result of his metanomic analysis of communication.

Whenever we speak, we assert our being alive because we occupy a center from which the eye looks backward, forward, inward and outward. To speak, means to be placed in the center of the cross of reality. Four arrows point in the four directions in which any living being is enmeshed. A human being, when speaking, takes his stand in time and space. "Here" he speaks from an inner space to an outer world, and from an outward world into his own consciousness. And "now" he speaks between the beginning and the end of times.

That time and space are the pattern of our existence is a commonplace....The trouble is not that people have overlooked the fact about our moving in time and space. The trouble is in that they did not analyze the time and space in which we move. The time and space of living organisms differs widely from the time or space used in mechanics for dead matter.

In mechanics it is assumed that a body at present is only influenced by causes working on it from the past. As Laplace has said, "The present is caused by the past; and the future is the result of the past and present." Now this is simply nonsense for our lives. In nature no present whatsoever exists. A razor-blade moment separates the past and the future. The present is man's creation; any present is created under the pressure from the future and past. You and I are suspended between the past and the future; and we know it, and must make the most of it. What we say, we do say under pressure from both times (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1970a, 52 - 53.)
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The Cross of Reality Applied to Communication Theory
The Cross of Reality, as developed by Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy should be important to the doing of communication theory. The Cross of Reality reminds the communication theorist that as one is addressed as Thou (1), one is able to become an I (2). As one responds one begins to develop a self-concept. As we return the gift of having been addressed we form a duality, a We (3), as in marriage or in a friendship with another person. Finally, as one participates in the outside work world, one becomes known in the third person as a She or He. The Cross of Reality teaches that life is lived within these four dimensions.

The application of the Cross of Reality to Psychoanalysis by Hans Huessy (1965) defining emotional disturbance as getting stuck in one phase or dimension of life also seems applicable to applied Interpersonal Communication theory. Communication disturbance or failure may result from ignoring one of the dimensions or getting stuck in one of them thus being unable to communicate freely from all perspectives.

The Cross of Reality is also an useful tool for analysis and helps the scholar to understand that the study of communication can take many forms. None of the various perspectives on communication theory developed to date is sufficient for a complete understanding of communication. We must be eclectic, moving from one perspective to another remembering that it is only in the centre that communication is understood. It is this understanding of the unity of the various schools of Communication Theory which is missing from Littlejohn (1983), Bormann (1980) and especially, Sless (1983), Irwin (1983) and Mayer (1983). While many scholars would attack an eclectic approach (See Sless, 1983), it is my belief based on an understanding of the Cross of Reality that the communication scholar must be eclectic (see Allport, 1967 for a discussion of the necessity of eclecticism in the Social Sciences). Being eclectic allows the communication scholar to present a more complete understanding of how people communicate and the role of the media in society.

THE COMMUNICATION SCHOLAR AS PIRATE AND ARGONAUT

In Planetary Service: A Way Into the Third Millennium, Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy introduced the concept of the citizen and scholar as Pirate. The pirate holds allegiance to no nation or King. He or she is free from all regulation to do deeds of good or bad.

I cannot help placing the future planetary service under the pirate's flag. How else could you understand me? Piracy is after all the last bit of freedom from regulation, whose purpose our fellow men understand, and which we are still considered capable of committing. That is indeed indispensable, for we need a sphere for our planetary service which no government or governing body takes care of or has to be responsible for. The accepted textbook on international law
says as eloquently as soberly, "All pirates have this in common, they make it impossible to hold any state or church responsible for their actions." What great people they are! It is said of them, that they understand the knack of making it perfectly clear that no one need feel responsible for them. That requires great skill.

In the age of statistics, this skill is more important than any other. For anything that doesn't occur in statistics is considered either non-existent or at least ineffective. One of my best friends assured me at my own table: "You are statistically unimportant." I couldn't care less. (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1978, 77.)

The pirate is one who is willing to live without social recognition. The pirate works without a pension plan. The pirate does not expect to be understood by everyone. He or she is "not a member of a visibly-organized system of law or of a diplomatically-recognized power. [Their] actions are unique enough to prove that [they have] the intention and the mandate to shake off or even explicitly repudiate any authority or any power which at the first glance seemed to rule...or to which we might have to ascribe...actions" (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1978, 78).

Why bring the concept of pirate into the discussion of communication theory? Because it is my contention that if we reject, with Rosenstock-Huessy, the Cartesian premise that thought is the basis of all reality then we cannot give allegiance to any particular perspective of Communication Theory. The communication scholar, like the pirate, cannot hitch his or her star to any existing school of theoretical thought in the discipline of Communication. The theorist must break away from the existing comforting and friendly groupings of scholars who support one another with approval, reinforcement, and reward. Given this understanding of the nature of personal existence a communication theory will come only from response to other persons seeking to understand communication but to tie oneself into an existing group for promotion, recognition, or reward is not feasible for the pirate-theorist. One may expect to be misunderstood, reviled and ignored in this piratical stance although this does not call for a martyr syndrome in which one seeks persecution as a form of validation.

The other analogy which Rosenstock-Huessy introduced was that of the argonauts (not a Canadian football team). The argonauts who sailed with Jason were persons who sailed through uncharted seas. They were drawn from all walks of life to sail into the unknown.

Scholars who remain rooted in traditional paradigms for Communication Theory sail only through charted and explored seas. Their voyage is guided and instructed by the Cartesian principles which underlie the paradigm they have chosen. The findings are predictable given the ideological commitment which has been made by their acceptance of
Empirical, Phenomenological, Critical or Rhetorical theoretical perspectives. Since they are committed personally, and often with great ego involvement, to these paradigms other perspectives and paradigms are nonsensical to them. There can be no dialogue between scholars because of the personal commitment made to a known perspective. Thus academic debates involve people talking past one another in order to gain power within the discipline and the organizations which seek to serve the discipline.

The Communication Theorist must be like an argonaut. Rosenstock-Huessy has left us on the shore of an uncharted ocean to explore a theory which is non-Aristotelean and non-Cartesian. It begins with the a priori of relationship and response. All reality is drawn from our response to other people -- to those, who as Martin Buber says, stand over against us.

In his attack on the Alexandrian grammar, which we all learned as children, i.e., I love, You love, He, she or it loves, They love, We love, etc. Rosenstock-Huessy began to chart the course of this new understanding of interpersonal communication. His grammar goes like this:

```
Love!
That I may love! (That we may love!)
Loved! (They love)
We have loved.
```

The old Alexandrian grammar treated all cases as equal and of equal importance. The statements of this new grammar are not equal. "To have spoken to each other is the indispensible base for our right or capacity to say 'We!'" (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1970a, p. 110). Thus this new communication theory must reinstate the reality of speaking and listening "in place of the nightmare of a speechless thinker who computes a speechless universe" (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1970a, p. 112).

This new understanding of communication must also include the reality of language. To learn a language is to become a member of a group. To have a name is to have a history, a past, and to be a part of a family with a future. This communication theory must take seriously the power of speech and names. As Rosenstock-Huessy pointed out in order to destroy a society you must first destroy the speech of that society, an insight which Albrecht Goes shares in his novel, The Unquiet Night. The use of initials in place of names in our society may well be seen as an attempt to destroy the speech of our society and thus our society.
CONCLUSION

There are many areas in which the teachings of Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy impinge on modern Communication Theory. The first is his attack on the basic Cartesian premise which grounds all present communication theories. Rosenstock-Huessy began with the reality of communication/response. He understood, as few communication scholars do, the reality of process and charge. "I respond although I will be changed!" He rejected the empirical perspective but this should give no comfort to the Critical Theorist because he rejected this perspective also, based as it is on Marx's misinterpretation and misunderstanding of Feuerbach. He analyzed the origin of speech, the role speech plays in society and life, the diseases of speech which affect the lives of people, and the causes of silence or Communication Apprehension. His emphasis on the centrality of communication and response as the basic reality of personhood serves as a corrective to the Western understanding of people as solitary individuals. This corrective is needed for modern psychology and sociology which have confused personhood with a sanitized, economic individualism (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1969b, 178 - 194).

Finally his emphasis on service for peace calls the communication scholar away from a noncommittal objectivity to reaffirm an applied communication theory which can be used in the cause of world peace. This service is based on the understanding of the uniqueness of each person and the reality of speech thought. Reality comes, for Rosenstock-Huessy, from the transactional response with the other person and not from mediated messages through technology. At the same time Rosenstock-Huessy understood the impact of modern technology and called for the effort of freeing people from the impersonalness and increased rapidity and rigidity of time in the modern technological world (Tate, 1985c). Scholars who can teach one to live in a world of two different times -- fruitful time and technological time. The work of Rosenstock-Huessy restores to the social sciences a true concept of time and space. This can only be done by people who know how to live without commitments to modern technology and "technological time." This calls for communication theorists who are free from traditional thought paradigms and traditional disciplinary allegiances. It also calls for scholars who are free from regional loyalties and perspectives bound to centralist power.

Only non-professors are thinking and teaching in professional Germany today. Only non-gentlemen can start something which will catch on in England. In France, the provinces...suddenly begin to be worth something, as opposed to Paris, the queen so far. Only a pirate, an unpredictable person, can save us from time-foreshortening, space-expanding, group-destroying technology. The former leading groups no longer contain the avant garde. The outsiders are the avant garde (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1978, 110).
(Need we add that only the prairie and Maritime provinces can lead in Canada today and not the center as in the past.)

This brings us back to the subtitle of my article -- On the Impossibility of Doing Communication Theory. The Communication Theorist of the third millenium is the person who does not do communication theory as we understand it today (Littlejohn, 1983; Bormann, 1980). Like the pirate and argonaut we sail into uncharted seas to develop a new perspective on communication.
FOOTNOTES

1An earlier version of this paper was presented to the Annual meeting of the Canadian Communication Association, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario, June 1984. I wish to thank Rick Houghton-Larsen and Kathleen McConnell for their helpful comments on the manuscript as it was being prepared and revised. I wish also to thank Gerald R. Miller for his advice and counsel.

It is not the practice of this editor to publish his own articles in this journal. This is the first to appear in this journal since I took over as editor three years ago. Two other articles were promised for this issue to accompany the McLuhan article. One has yet to be written and the other awaits revisions by the author who is currently lecturing in Europe. This article has been refereed in the usual manner and was published only after several persons indicated that they believed it would be a good article for this issue.
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