

Human Being as Noun? Or *Being Human* as Praxis? Towards the Autopoietic Turn/Overturn: A Manifesto

The Greek roots and related roots of *cosmogony* are *genos/genea* (race, family, genealogy, genesis), *gonos* (offspring), *kosmos* (cosmos, universe). Thus, *cosmo-logia*, or *cosmology*, the study of the cosmos, and *kosmos* and *gonos* or *cosmogony*. In our creation myths we tell the world, or at least ourselves, who we are. [David Leeming, *Myth: A Biography of Belief*, 2002].

A U.N. climate panel is set to release a smoking-gun report soon that confirms *human activities are to blame for global warming* and that predicts catastrophic global disruptions by 2100. [*Time*, “A Warming Report: Scientists to show new evidence”, January, 2007 Emphasis added].

But who, we? [Jacques Derrida. “The Ends of Man” in *Margins of Philosophy*, 1982]¹

My life had its significance and its only deep significance because it was part of a Problem; but that problem was, as I continue to think, the central problem of the greatest of the world’s democracies and so the Problem of the future of the world. [W.E.B. DuBois, “Dusk of Dawn”, cited by Denise Ferreira da Silva in *Toward a Global Idea of Race*, 2007; Emphasis added].

What if we did not know where we are and who we are? What if all previous answers to the question of who we are were merely based upon the application of an answer given long ago, an answer that does not correspond to what is perhaps asked in the question *now touched upon of who we are?* For we do not now ask about ourselves ‘as human,’ assuming we understand this name in its traditional meaning. According to this meaning, man is a kind of ‘organism’ (animal), that exists among others on the inhabited earth and in the universe. We know this organism, *especially since we ourselves are of this type*. There is a whole contingent of ‘sciences’ that give information about this organism—named man—and we collect them together under the name ‘anthropology.’ [Martin Heidegger, *Basic Concepts*, 1981/1998; Emphasis added].

What is by common consent called the human sciences have their own drama...[A]ll these discoveries, all these inquiries lead only in one direction: to make man admit that he is nothing, absolutely nothing—and that he must put an end to the narcissism on which he relies in order to imagine that he is different from the other “animals.”...This amounts to nothing more nor less than man’s surrender....Having reflected on that, I grasp my narcissism with both hands and I turn my back on the degradation of those who would make man a mere [biological] mechanism....And truly what is to be done is to set man free. [Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks*. 1952/1967].

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

Almost a quarter of a century ago, twenty-three years ago to be exact, I wrote an essay for a special issue of *boundary 2*, edited and introduced by William Spanos—“On Humanism and the University, 1: The Discourse on Humanism”². Both Spanos’ far-reaching introduction, as well as the essays of individual contributors, can be seen from hindsight, to have been written in

¹ This quote was not included in the draft sent on 6/7/07.

² [Vol. XII, no. 3/Vol XIII no. 1. Spring/Fall 1984]

the lingering afterglow of what had been the dazzling, if brief, cognitively emancipatory hiatus, made possible by the synergy of the multiple forms of spontaneously erupting uprisings of “Otherness”, that had emerged in the wake of the social uprisings during the 1950’s and 60’s in the US.

However, these movements internal both to the United States and to its fellow Western-European, and Euro-American nation-states, were themselves only a part of the more comprehensive planetarily extended series of anti-colonial struggles, which, initiated before the Second World War, were to gather momentum only in the wake of the ending of that war. These as struggles directed against the then still imperial nation-states of Great Britain, France, the Netherlands and Portugal, all of whom had between them, ensured that by “1900 more than half of Asia, 98% of Africa” (as well as most of the ex-slave plantation archipelago islands of the Caribbean), were “under direct colonial rule”. Consequently if from the mid-nineteenth century until 1920, “more than 450 million people in Africa and Asia” had been reduced to being “native” subjects of the West, their reduction to secondary inferiorized Human Other status, had been effected at the same time as “some 8.6 million square miles in Africa and Asia had been acquired by Europeans” (as well as by a post-1898 U.S.) “in the name of progress”;³ of Manifest Destiny, its biocosmogonic/bioevolutionary and therefore now purely secular behavior-necessitating “opium of the people” belief system.⁴

It was in the dynamic context of the vast self-mobilizing processes of the Anti-Colonial Revolution⁵ as directed against the empirical effects of “this gigantic thing called colonial”⁶, that not only had the emergence of a multiplicity of “forms of otherness in a continuum of being”

³ (Westad, 2005)

⁴ J.F. Danielli, citing Marx in his seminal 1980 paper, “Altruism and the Internal Reward System, or ‘The Opium of the People’” in *Journal of Social and Biological Sciences*, vol. 3 no. 2 (April 1980).

⁵ (Westad, 2005)

⁶ (Lamming, 1953)

extended across the globe, but that the specific local form of this which had erupted in my own island of Jamaica beginning in the late Thirties, had cut across my childhood and early adolescence; determining what was to be the trajectory of my life, and work.

However, it was only to be in the wake of the Black American students' Fifties/Sixties struggle, in the U.S., for the establishment of Black Studies in the U.S. University system, that I had been provided with a Black perspective of Otherness from which to explore the issue of *race*; and with it the *why* of the West's institutionalization, since the nineteenth century of the bio-climatically⁷ phenotypically differentiated Color Line, one drawn between in W.E.B. DuBois' terms "*the lighter and the darker races*" of humankind,⁸ and at its most extreme between White and Black. That is, as a line made both conceptually and institutionally unbreachable, with this thereby giving rise to an issue, which as Aimé Césaire of the Francophone Caribbean island of Martinique pointed out in his letter of resignation from the French Communist Party, in 1956, was one whose historically instituted singularity, that to which we gave the name of *race*, could not be made into a subset of *any other issue*, but had instead to be theoretically identified and fought in its own terms (Césaire, 1956).

It was the institutionalized perspective of Black Studies in the terms of its original Fifties/Sixties intentionality, which by making the exploration of this issue in its own specific Otherness terms possible, had led to my own contribution to the still memorable "Discourse on Humanism" volume. The very topic of the volume, as conceptualized by its editor, William Spanos, provided a collective conceptual framework, that of the critique of mainstream academia's legitimating discourse of humanism; yet as a discourse whose, role from its then emancipatory, secularizing Renaissance Origins had paradoxically, also given rise to the issue of

⁷ Arsuaga, 2002

⁸ DuBois, 1903/2003

“race” when seen its own terms. That is, to its discursive negation of co-humaness, on the basis of its projection of the Aristotelian concept of *by-nature* difference⁹ between its own “Western humanity” as the ostensible embodiment of the normalcy of being secularly human,¹⁰ and all other groups, who were now to be, therefore, logically classified and institutionalized as that “humanity’s” Others, i.e., as *homunculi* (or *little men*). The then title of my essay, as a projected negation of that “by-nature difference” form of negation, was to also provide, its Sartrean “fundamental project”. The title was therefore taken from the very fine poem, “Speaking of Poetry”, by John Peale Bishop, a poem in which he makes use of the tragically foiled outcome of the love relation and brief marriage between Shakespeare’s Desdemona and Othello, to get at the heart of the historically chartered and institutionalized, U.S. and overall Western dilemma, its both discursively and empirically institutionalized *Color* and correlated *Rich/Poor* (now also *developed/under-developed*, North/South) Lines/Divides, and the hitherto non-findability of a ceremony to breach them.

In his editorial introduction to the 1984 volume, William Spanos, after placing my essay in the section entitled *The Question of Origins*, summarized what the essay attempted to do. He noted that it provided “a revisionary interpretation that traces the historical itinerary of the *Studia Humanitatis* from its profoundly disturbing origins in the Renaissance to its reconstitution as a

⁹ The Spanish monarchy was to legitimate its claim to the ownership of the vast expropriated territories of the Americas and the Caribbean on the basis of this Aristotelian derived concept of a “*by-nature difference*” between Spaniards/Europeans as Aristotle’s *natural masters* on the one hand, and the indigenous peoples on the Americas (classified generically as *Indians*), as *natural slaves*. This politico-juridical claim to legitimacy was intended by the monarchy to displace and replace the 1493 Papal Bull which had legitimated its claim in religious-Christian terms as that of the right of all Christian kings to expropriate the lands of non-Christian kings, since these lands were *terra nullius* (the lands of no-one). In parallel humanist terms, transported *Black African slaves*, whose *slave* and *trade goods* status had been initially religiously legitimated in terms of the Biblical Origin-Story of the curse laid by Noah upon his son Ham’s descendants, to be the slaves of his brother’s descendants, were also classified as “civil slaves,” whose “just” slave status, was also due to their *by-nature* difference—i.e., they were “*disobedient by-nature*”. See for this Anthony Pagden, *The Fall of Natural Man*, and Jacob Pandian’s “*Anthropology*” and *The Western Tradition: Towards an Authentic Anthropology* (Prospect Heights, IL, Waveland Press, 1985).

¹⁰

disabling orthodoxy in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.” And that it also proposed “the need to retrieve its heretical essence as rhetoric for the post-modern historical conjuncture.”

If we add to the word *postmodern*, which is itself still an *intra-Western* conception, the word *post-colonial*, which is now necessarily an *intra-human* one, the essay—i.e., “The Ceremony Must be Found: After Humanism”—looked at from hindsight, can indeed be seen to have put forward some major insights with respect to both aspects of the above project. In my attempt, however, to in effect, reenact Renaissance humanism’s original heresy—as it had been effected in a situation *specific* to the ethno-phenotypic peoples of the late medieval Latin-Christian (and thereby Western) Europe, and so enacted by their then lay or secular intelligentsia’s “back to the pagan Greco-Roman classics,” invention of revalorized *Man*, as a now entirely separate concept/self-conception from that of the post-Adamic “fallen natural man” instituting of the medieval Christian subject, my own heresy had remained incomplete. In that, what revalorized *Man*’s (in its first form as *homo politicus* or political ruler/subject of the state) new *Studia Humanitatis* had then been enacting/elaborating, was an epochally new, because secularizing¹¹ (i.e., degodded, desupernaturalized) answer to the question of who we are.¹² Doing so, over against what had now come to be, by then, the ossified *Scholastic* orthodoxy of medieval Latin-Christian Europe’s order-instituting/order legitimating theologically absolute answer to the same question. For me to reenact this heresy completely, therefore, and no longer in *intra-Western* terms, but, instead, in the terms of our now contemporary planetarily extended, and thereby *intra-human* situation, one brought into existence over the past 500 years precisely

¹¹ The term *secular* is one specific to Christian theology, as a term of Otherness, referring to the post-Adamic fallen world of Time. *Degodding/desupernaturalizing* are therefore analogical terms that are non-Christian-centric and thereby universally applicable.

¹² Epigraph 5

on the basis of Renaissance humanism's initially enacted heresy, my essay can be seen in this respect to have, in the end, failed. Failed in the terms of its title, to "find the ceremony."

This following Intervention sets out to retrieve that failure by means of the elaboration of the proposal that the 1984 essay's Ceremony-not-quite-found-then, is now the dialectically reenacted heresy of the Ceremony's Found's now narcissistically revalorizing¹³—this therefore outside the limits of Renaissance humanism's *Man*, in its now second reinvented, and transumptively inverted, *biologically absolute*,¹⁴ *homo oeconomicus* form, this form itself in its now post-Sixties, post-1989, planetarily institutionalized, neo-Liberal fundamentalist expression. In effect, therefore, its (i.e., the Ceremony Found's) ecumenically human, because Fanonianly hybrid, and as such, epochally new and emancipatory answer to the question of who we are.¹⁵ As an answer, therefore, able to *separate* the being of being human (in its hitherto innumerable local particularities) *from* our present globally hegemonic, and homogenized conception of being human in the now purely secular, because biocentric¹⁶ terms, of *Man*, in its now second reinvented, since the nineteenth century, concept/self-conception as Liberal/Neo-Liberal humanism's *homo oeconomicus*, in the reoccupied place of the Renaissance "lay intelligentsia's" original invention of *Man* in civic humanist terms as *homo politicus*). Yet like the latter, also now rhetorically discursively, and institutionally over-represented and enacted as if its

¹³ See Epigraph 6

¹⁴ Harold Bloom points out that the rhetorical figure of "transumption or metalepsis is the legitimate and traditional name in rhetoric for what John Hollander calls the "figure of interpretive allusion." Transumptive chains point toward the "diachronic concept of rhetoric, in which the irony of one age can become the ennobled synecdoche of another. "Whilst transumptive chains abound, certain *central linkages...vital to tradition, and the crossings over in and between traditions, keep to the continuity going by means of its retroping of earlier tropes.*" (H. Bloom, *The Breaking of the Vessels*, Chicago, 1982; emphasis added).

¹⁵ Epigraph 5 and 6

¹⁶ *Biocentric* terms in the transumptively inverted reoccupied place of medieval Latin-Christian Europe's theocentric ones that had been the a priori ground of its pre-Renaissance, theo-Scholastic order of knowledge.

prototype's *member class* of being human were isomorphic with the *class of classes*¹⁷ of our species being; its referent "we" thereby also isomorphic with the referent "we...of the horizon of humanity."¹⁸ It is against this background, that I write this manifesto of the Ceremony Found.

The Intervention as The Manifesto of the Ceremony Found

A PREAMBLE

The first part of the title—Human as noun? Or *being human* as praxis? takes its point of departure from Judith Butler's seminal insight put forward from two of the perspectives of Otherness which emerged out of the Fifties/Sixties uprisings. Her insight that once we dispense with the priority of *man* and *woman* as *abiding substances*, it is no longer possible to subordinate dissonant gendered features—(such as a man with feminine features who nevertheless retains "the integrity of his gender"—as "so many accidental characteristics of a *gender* ontology that is fundamentally intact." This therefore means that "if the notion of an abiding substance is a fictive construction," one that is therefore "*produced* through the compulsory ordering of attributes into coherent gender sequences, then it seems that gender as substance, *the viability* of

¹⁷See for this, the formulation made by Whitehead and Bertrand Russell with respect to the difference that exists between a class of classes (i.e., "machinery") and a mere member of the class (i.e., tractors, cranes, etc.). In this context, the rhetorical strategy, that cited earlier, and as defined by Paolo Valesio as that of the *topos* of iconicity, by means of which the West's humanist invention of the concept of *Man*, at the same time over-represented that concept as if its *member class* were a universally applicable one. It is this over-representation that has enabled the West to institute its world-systemic domination on the basis of its conceptual and empirical globally institutionalized *absolutization* of its own genre-specific *member class* as if it were isomorphic with the *class of classes* definition(s) of our species being. Nevertheless, the West itself was to be no less entrapped by the Janus-faces consequences of this *topos of iconicity* over-representation, than the rest of us, whom it was to make into Human Other status-functions enacting (if post-colonially, and post-Sixties, with our own mimetic intellectual complicity) of this over-representation; one as indispensable to *Man* in its specifically *bourgeois ruling-class* (or ethno-class) reinvented form, as it had been to that, (in its then eighteenth century civic humanist, and *landed gentry* ruling group form) of *homo politicus*, which its new prototype and correlated New Studia's bio-episteme was to displace/replace.

¹⁸ See for this, as well as for Epigraph 3, Jacques Derrida's, brilliant calling in question of this over-representation of the West's invented concept of *Man*, in his "The Ends of Man," a 1968 Conference talk published in *The Margins of Philosophy* 1982.

man and *woman* as noun, is called into question, seeing that such dissonant features resist assimilation into *the* ready: made framework of *primary nouns and subordinate adjectives*.” Furthermore, if “these substances are nothing other than the coherences *contingently created* through the regulation of attributes, “it would therefore suggest that “the ontology of substances itself is...an artificial effect.” Nevertheless, given the imperative nature of the production of the ontology of substance as an “artificial effect” this would ensure that while “[i]n this sense *gender is not a noun*, neither can it be “a set of free-floating attributes.” This, given that the “*substantive effect of gender is performatively produced and compelled by the regulatory practices of gender coherence*.” As a result, while gender roles (of men as well as of women) prove to be performatively enacted, that is, constituting the identity it is purported to be”—and, one can add here also *subjectively experienced* to be—“this is only made possible by the “regulatory practices of gender coercion” as effected within the terms of the “inherited [Western] discourse of the metaphysics of substance”. With the result that while “gender is always a doing” it is “not a doing *by a subject who might be said to pre-exist the deed*” (Butler 1990, 24-25).

My own leap-frogging hypothesis here, put forward within the terms of the Ceremony Found’s new answer, is that Butler’s illuminating insight with respect to gender roles is true in other ways. First, it is true with respect to a range of other, also performatively enacted roles, and therefore of their respective ontologies of *class substance, sexual orientation substance, and of course and centrally so, of the closely correlated ontologies of “race substance,” and as well, of the also projected to be genetic non-homogeneity of “Rich (eugenic)/Poor (dysgenic) substance”*¹⁹—with Darwin advising in this respect, the non-procreation of the Poor, who because, by implication, *naturally dysselected* are not able to “avoid abject poverty for their children.” While at a world systemic level, the also ostensible ontology of

¹⁹ (Darwin 1871, 1981, p.

developed/underdeveloped substance,” correlated with that of the also projected *eugenic/dysgenic* non-homogeneity of substance between we who inhabit the planet of the suburbs/exurbs on the one hand, and those who inhabit the planet of the slums²⁰ on the other. Finally, however, it is true, only because of the larger truth of which all such performatively enacted roles are mutually reinforcing functions. The truth, that is, of our *being human as praxis*. This seeing firstly, and in general, that if as David Leeming points out, it is by means of our cosmogonies, or origin-stories that we tell the world, or ourselves who we are,²¹ we are able to do so only because it is also by means of them, that we are enabled to behaviorally auto-institute and thereby performatively enact ourselves as the *who* of the *we* (or fictive mode of kind) that we are. Specifically, therefore the truth of our being human in the now planetary homogenized terms of the West’s *Man*, in its second, biohumanist *homo oeconomicus* reinvented concept/self-conception, thereby within the terms of its now purely secular if no less also fictively constructed, (by means of the socio-technology of our humanly invented, then retroactively projected origin-stories or cosmogonies²² and thereby autopoetically instituted, subjectively experienced and performatively enacted genres²³ of being *hybridly*, human. This in the terms of

²⁰ Davis

²¹

²² In our case, the “part-science, part-myth” cosmogony of Evolution as elaborated in Darwin’s 1871 *The Descent of Man*.

²³ The term *genre* which derives from the same root etymology, as *gender*, meaning *kind*, is here being used to denote, different, always auto-poetically instituted and fictively constructed *kinds of being*, and thereby of performatively enacting oneself as optimally a “good man or woman of one’s *kind*,” in *genre-coherent* terms; of which *gender coherence* is itself always and everywhere a function. Specifically, therefore, the genre of being human, in the terms of *Man*’s second reinvention, as *biohumanist homo oeconomicus* (as a reinvention initiated in the later eighteenth century by Adam Smith and the other members of the Scottish Enlightenment, even if one not fully actualized until the nineteenth), as a genre whose new ruling class status’ code of symbolic life or “economy of greatness” [Adam Smith,] was now the ownership and market accumulation of the mobile property of *capital*, projected as the then “metaphysical source of life” (Godelier, 1999) in the reoccupied place of the earlier pre-bourgeois ruling group, the landed gentry, together with its slave-owning plantocracy in the Caribbean; for whom the *oeconomy of Greatness* (as the incarnation of *Man* in its still first phase as *homo politicus* of the State), had been the ownership of immobile freehold landed property, *pari passu*, in the Caribbean, with the ownership of an also fixed labor stock, that of “Negro” slaves. See for this, J.A.G. Pocock, “Civic Humanism and its Role in Anglo-American Thought,” in *Politics, Language and Time: Essays on Political Thought and History*. (Chicago and London, The University of Chicago Press, 1989). See also, Maurice Godelier, *The Enigma of the Gift*. 1999.

Frantz Fanon's 1952 epochal redefinition of the human from the only perspective from which such redefinition was to be generable; that of the perspective of Ultimate Otherness (to being human in the terms both of the West's first invented and second re-invented concepts of *Man*), this Ultimate Otherness as one existentially lived by all descendants of the ex-slave archipelago of the post-1492 Western New World. This "ultimate otherness" as constructed from the early sixteenth century onwards as the founding underside of what was to become our now planetarily extended, and purely secular Western and westernized world system. One that would give rise to the existential experience of a WEB DuBois, a half a century earlier, when he had recognized that, in order to realize himself as fully American, and therefore ostensibly as fully human, he had—although being in *class* terms, a normative highly educated professional, and as such, a proper Western bourgeois self—to, at the same time, also subjectively experience himself as a *Negro*; and therefore to experience this latter, as a dissonant anomaly to being human in the terms of his normative self, to experience himself, thereby as a Problem²⁴. In other words, to normally be reflexly aversive not only to his own phenotypic/physiognomy, but also to the alternative autopoetic field (or "culture" in Western terminology) of his own people, as well as to its quite other "sorrow songs," its lumpen poetics of the blues, of jazz. A world therefore as proscribed then, as was to be, "the rotting whitewashed house" described by David Bradley, several decades after, that was the Black Culture Center placed on the nether edge of the campus²⁵). As an "underside" reality, therefore, that would *have to be* subjectively experienced by him, as, the *chose maudite*, central to the "order of sacrifice and/or of language"²⁶ instituting of the *normalcy* of his proper self on the genre-specific model of that of the Western bourgeoisie.

²⁴ Epigraph 4

²⁵ Bradley, 1982, as cited in the original 1984 *Ceremony* essay

²⁶ Julia Kristeva, in "Women's Time" in *Signs*, 7. no1.

Parallely, for Fanon as both a French imperial “native” subject, growing up in the island of Martinique, and thereby existentially, like all his peers, experiencing it as “normal to be *anti-Negro*—Don’t behave like a nigger!”, his mother would admonish him when growing up—but also as a “specific intellectual” in Foucault’s sense of the term, who was also a psychiatrist at the beginning of his vocation, and thereby having to prepare himself to deal with the profound self alienation both of his black patients as well as of other to be colonized *native* patients, as he would later have to do with those of a then still settler-colonial French Algeria. At the same time however, his own experience of the anomaly of being human, in White and Western bourgeois terms, while also a “Negro” was reinforced on the basis of his reading of a religious/cum ethnographic study of a group of Black Africans²⁷, who had still managed to remain *auto-centered*, (that is, with their society still then closed off from the homogenizing “flood of [Western] civilization,” thereby with their still being able to experience themselves as being *human*, within the terms of their own autopoiesis, that is their own still genre-specific mode of mythically or cosmogonically chartered auto-institution). As Fanon had noted, because the latter, growing up, exactly like a French bourgeois child, as a *normal* child at the center of his own family, of his own world, although of the same biogenetic phenotype, which would have led to his being classified by the West, as a “Negro” or as Negroid,²⁸ could *never* subjectively experience himself as a “*negro*”; thereby, as an *anomaly* to being human, as he and his peers, and his patients because all now incorporated into Western civilization, and therefore into its chartering cosmogonic complex, *had had* to continue to so experience themselves. This comparison had then helped Fanon to make an epistemological break, one analogous to

²⁷ Father Trilles, L’ame de Pygmée d’ Afrique as cited by Fanon, in the chapter 6, entitled “The Negro and Psychopathology” in *Black Skin, With Masks* Trans. C.L. Markham (New York: Grove Press, 1962)

²⁸ See for this Luca Cavallo-Sforza, et al. *The History and Geography of the Human Genome*. (Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1994).

Copernicus' earlier and also profoundly counter-intuitive statement that "although it may seem absurd, the earth also moves"(that is, that it was *not*, as in the Christian Creation story, divinely condemned to be *fixed and motionless* at the center of the universe, as its dregs, as the abode of the post-Adamic Fallen natural man, being thereby having to be of a corruptible physical substance, non-homogenous with the incorruptible physical substances of the always harmoniously moving bodies of the celestial realm)—and to propose the following in his book *Black Skin/White Masks*.

Firstly that the self-alienation experienced by himself and his Black and other "colored" patients (i.e., those on the negative side of the *Color Line*), could in no way be "an individual problem." Rather it was clear, that over against Freud's and indeed the human sciences', as a whole, purely ontogenetic perspective, that is their purely biological conception of the human, that instead being human, empirically entailed that besides *phylogeny* and *ontogeny*, "there stands *sociogeny*." It therefore followed that if himself and his Black peers and/or patients had been instituted as subjects, *not* in their own cosmogonically chartered auto-centered terms, but in those of the contemporary West's genre-specific mode of *sociogeny* (in the terms therefore, of what I shall further define here as that of the latter's governing, replicator sociogenic code of symbolic *life/death*, or in Lévi-Straussian terms, of the "cooked and the raw"²⁹) and had thereby come to *be*, and, therefore, to preconceptually experience ourselves in terms of the *White masks*, that were phenotypically normal *only* for the specific subset hereditary variation of the human species that are Europeans (if at the same time, normal in *class* terms for both the European and westernized non-European bourgeoisie), this is only so because of a larger and universally applicable phenomenon. Which is that, all human *skins* can only *be human*, by performatively enacting themselves/ourselves *as human*, in the always already cosmogonically chartered terms

²⁹ Claude Levi-Strauss

of their/our sociogenic, and therefore symbolically encoded, and fictively constituted/genre-specific *Masks*, or replicator codes of symbolic *life/death*. This given that if, unlike the Primates, human groups are alone able to transcend the narrow *genetically determined* preset limits of eusocial kin-recognizing inter-altruistic behaviors, and to attain instead to far higher levels of cooperation and organization,³⁰ they/we are able to do so only by means of our ability—through the earlier co-evolution with the brain of the emergent properties of language and narrative, to autopoetically institute ourselves, through the medium of our retroactively projected origin stories or cosmogonies, as symbolically *made similar*; that is by being “re-born” that is, *initiated*, in the terms of each such Origin-Story’s mandated/inscribed, sociogenic code of symbolic *life/death*, as now, behaviorally, kin-recognizing, inter-altruistic, and thereby cooperating members of the same fictive kind, that is of the same artificially (i.e., non-genetically) *speciated* genre or Mask of being human.

In this context, therefore, the imperatively overall “regulatory practices” which call, for the sub-set “regulatory practices” instituting of all the roles, including gender, which *together* constitute the overall mode of auto-institution enacting of such a genre of being human, here specifically in the terms of the second reinvention of *Man* in its now biohumanist *homo oeconomicus* concept/self-conception, are practices that at the same time function to enact the latter's sociogenic code of *naturally selected/naturally dysselected* and/or eugenict dysgenic *symbolic life/death*. With this, therefore, making it clear that, while being human is *not* a noun,

³⁰ See with respect to cooperation, the rebuttal by Martin Novak, the Director of the Program for Evolutionary Dynamics at Harvard, that the processes of Evolution can be restricted only to processes of Selection, as maintained by Darwin who, defined the latter as the *only* directive agency of change. Novak adds to *selection*, the additional processes of *mutation* and *cooperation*, arguing further that “cooperation is essential for life to evolve to a new level of organization.” In the same way, therefore, as “[s]ingle celled protozoa *had to cooperate* to give rise to multicellular animals, so “[h]umans had to cooperate for complex societies to arise” [If in my own terms for *all* human societies beginning in Africa with the *nomadic* form of small-scale societies were to be invented and institutionalized]. See for Novak, Carl Zimmer, “Scientist at Work,” in *Science Times*, New York Times, July 31, 2007.

neither can it be, to paraphrase Butler, “a set of free-floating attributes,” if the individual subject is to be made to experience her/himself in the genre-specific terms of each society's mode of auto-institution as such a subject; thereby to reflexly desire to realize her/himself in the terms of its discursively, *positively marked* (and therefore, opiate reward activating) code of symbolic *life*, and at the same time to be aversive to, and thereby, detach her/himself from all that is the negation of that sociogenic self—that is, from the negatively marked liminally deviant or as (in our case, *nigger/ now ghetto nigger*)³¹ *embodiment* of the normal self's Lacanian Lack-of-being, its symbolic *death*.³² That is, the “raw” to the former's “cooked” (in Lévi- Straussian terms) or in Aristotelian terms, the *zoe* or “bare life” to the *bios* as the “good life” for the living of which the *polis exists*.³³

It was in this context, therefore that Fanon, like DuBois before him, and Eldridge Cleaver after him,³⁴ had come to recognize, that it was precisely by their reflexly desiring—as the “regulatory practices of genre coherence” induces them/us to do—to be optimally human in the terms of the West's *Man* (in its second invented, now bio-humanist phase, also over-represented

³¹ In the wake of the post-Sixties' incorporation of the Black middle class, including academics as “honorary” members of the normative White middle class, and with their former liminally deviant pathological Other place as a *segregated population* coming to be reoccupied, by the inner-city urban ghettos and their State/Private Industrial complex extension, new definitions have come to express the separation of the middle class population, including the now status quo interests of the academics and intellectuals—*however radical their/our* discourse—from the now totally *damnés de la terre* populations—those stranded on a rooftops of Katrina's New Orleans. Thus while the middle-classes self-ascribed themselves in *ethnic terms*—i.e. *African-American*—those in the inner cities, and its “planet of the slums” prison extension, continue to define themselves as *Black*. Recently however even *Black* has become divided, between the Poor, but “respectable,” and the *ghetto nigger* as the ultimate deviant category, the systemic *production* of the *chaos* of whose jobless/poverty, drug-ridden, criminalized, violent inter-gang warfare lives, is lawlikely indispensable to the production of the normative White and middle class order. With this *Order/Chaos* dynamic being, as Uspenski et al (cited in the original essay) point out, lawlikely indispensable to the institution of *all* human societies, as Maturana and Varelas autopoietic languaging living systems.

³² While it is J.F. Danielli, who first identified the role of discursive practices, whether religious or secular, whose semantic activation of the opiate reward/punishment system of the brain function to induce and motivate all our non-genetically based inter-altruistic, kin-recognizing and therefore order-integrating behaviors—in his earlier cited essay, “The Internal Reward System or the ‘Opium of the People’” 1980, the functioning of this system with regard to the motivation and demotivation of all species in species-specific behavioral terms, has been clearly laid out by Avram Goldstein, in his book, *Addiction: From Biology to Public Policy* (New York: W.W. Freeman, 1994).

³³ See for this, Malcolm Bull, “Vectors of the Bio-politicals” in *New Left Review* no. 45, May June 2007, pp. 7-27

³⁴ In his *Soul on Ice*

as the first had been, if it were as isomorphic with the being of being human, this by means of the same *topos of iconicity*³⁵), as if, therefore its ethno-class mode of being human (given the *similarity of sound* between the word *man* and *human*) were isomorphic with the being of being human in the terms of the “we men”/ [we women] of Derrida’s “horizon of humanity”³⁶—that had led to their being induced to be reflexly aversive to their own, and their population’s skin color and Bantu phenotypic physiognomy, itself now always already instituted—together with their population’s origin continent of Black Africa—as the discursively/semantically negatively marked (and therefore opiate-punishment activating)³⁷ embodiment, of symbolic *death*, within the terms of the sociogenic code of symbolic *life/death* that our cosmogonically chartered and biologically absolute answer to the question of who we are, dynamically enacts. (This as lawlikely as the category of the non-celibate Laity had been made to embody, before the revolution of Renaissance humanism, the symbolic *death* of the *Fallen Flesh*, as the Other to the symbolic *life* of the Redeemed Spirit incarnated in the category of the *Celibate* Clergy, within the then terms of that order’s answer to the question of who we are, and as then theo-cosmogonically chartered by the Christian version of the Biblical Creation story.³⁸

Thus Fanon, like DuBois before him, and Eldridge Cleaver after him, were to initiate a new heuristics—that of the systemic mistrust of their self-evident, subjectively experienced, ostensibly *instinctive* and *natural* order consciousness, as one in whose terms they had not only found themselves desiring against and being aversive to their Negro selves, and that, in Cleaver’s case, to of their population of origin, but had found themselves doing so against their

³⁵ (Valesio 1980)

³⁶ (Derrida 1968, 1982)

³⁷ (Danielli 1980)

³⁸ See for this, Jacques Le Goff, *The Medieval Imagination*

own deliberately willed intentionally.³⁹ It is in this context that Fanon, by identifying the causal principle of this *subjectively* experienced *existential contradiction*, as that of the *objective* functioning of the hitherto non-recognized phenomenon of *artificially* instituted sociogenic Masks that are defining of us as being hybridly human (in our specific case that of the *White* or Western-bourgeois Mask of his book's title); and, thereby, with the systemic *intentionality* of its replicator code of symbolic *life/death*, serving to structure our subjectively experienced orders of consciousness, doing so hitherto, normally, outside our conscious awareness, can be recognized to have been thereby *overturning* one of the fundamentals of the West's inherited philosophical tradition—that of the ostensibly *indubitability* and *self-determined* nature of consciousness as experienced by the Cartesian *ego cogito*.

Given, however, that all such sociogenic codes or Masks are always already inscribed in the terms of our chartering cosmogonies or origin narratives as the indispensable condition of our being able to autopoetically institute ourselves as genre-specific fictive modes of eusocial inter-altruistic kin-recognizing kind, (as for example, those of our present bourgeois modalities such as that of the “White Race” on the one hand, with all other “races” being its Lack, and on the other, and post-colonially, our present plurality of nation-state fictive modes of kind, all of whose members are thereby *origin-narratively* co-identified, this co-identification can never pre-exist such each society's specific mode of auto-institution and its complex of socio-technologies, by means of which alone, the I of each individual self, is symbolically coded to preconceptually experience, and thereby performatively enact itself in the same cloned *kin recognizing* terms as the I of all other members of its referent “we.” Thereby with each such

³⁹ See for this also Tim Wise, *White Like Me: Reflections on Race from a Privileged Son*. (New York, Soft Skull Press, 2005), in which a radical political activist, who experienced himself at moments, reflexly responding in the same, so to speak, anti-Black way, this against his, own politically willed intentionality.

group sharing in, over against all other groups, the same mode of “collective intentionality,”⁴⁰ that of a specific “fictive mode of kind,” in pursuit or in defence of whose actualization, they/we are prepared, where necessary, to sacrifice their/our *biological* lives.⁴¹

It is in the context of the above therefore, that as Western and westernized academics/intellectuals, working in the disciplinary fields of the “human sciences” (or Humanities and Social Sciences), that we find ourselves in the predicament identified by Hans Weber’s concept of the “webs of significance” that as humans, “we spin for ourselves,” and in which we remain (and must so remain) suspended. The predicament is this : *Seeing that such cosmogonic “webs of significance” that we spin for ourselves, are at the same time the indispensable condition of our being able to performatively enact ourselves as being, and thereby to be, human in the genre specific terms of an I and its referent we—how can we come to know the social reality, of which we are a part and which itself functions as the socializing mode of auto-institution, in whose field alone we are, recursively enabled to performatively enact ourselves in the genre-specific terms of our fictive modes of kind? How can we come to know that social reality outside the terms also, of its sociogenic code of symbolic life/death, as the It⁴² about which that social reality orders its hierarchies and role allocations, thereby self-organizing itself as an autopoietic languaging living system?*⁴³ Outside, that is, the necessarily

⁴⁰ See for this, John R. Searle, *Freedom and Neurobiology: Reflections on Free Will, Language and Political Power* (New York, Columbia University Press, 2004).

⁴¹ Thus, the logic by which if today, in Iraq, Sunni, Shia, and Al Qaeda suicide bombers sacrifice their biological lives to actualize themselves in term of their origin-narratively chartered symbolic *life* as Sunni, Shia, or in the case of Al Qaeda, as Radical Islamists, this is no less the case of the, for the main part, young U.S. males, sent to invade Iraq, and who every day also sacrifice their biological lives in order to actualize, by dying for the flag, the “collective intentionality” which gives expression to their shared historico-cosmogonically chartered sociogenic code of symbolic *life* as “Americans”; and thereby as belonging to the U.S.’ post-Civil War, fictive mode of nation-state kind, to its “imagined community” Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, (New York: Verso, 1983).

⁴² Beer, 1980.

⁴³ (Beer 1980)

circular and thereby cognitively closed terms that are (if only in the last instance) lawfully indispensable to its existential enactment and stable replication as such as a living system?

It is in this context, therefore, that the “human sciences” of our present order of knowledge, whose domain of inquiry is precisely that of the social reality of our present nation-state world system, as well as of that of its local nation-state units, have to be rigorously elaborated, and lawfully so, in terms governed by the imperative of the enabling of its stable replication as such an autopoietic and sociogenically encoded living system, and as such, the first planetarily extended such system in human history. With this problematic having led to Louis Althusser’s recognition, that as academics/intellectuals (i.e., the grammarians⁴⁴) of our order, who are also its normative middle-class subjects, we must necessarily function to elaborate the mode of knowledge production, that is indispensable to its replication as such a system.⁴⁵ For, although Althusser continues to identify the overall system, and its mode of autopoietic institution in the terms of *one* of the indispensable, but only proximate conditions of its functioning, as such living system—that is one defined in Adam Smith/Marx’s terms, as its “mode of economic production,” (rather than, from the Ceremony Found’s ecumenically human perspective, as that of each such societal system’s *genre-specific mode of material provisioning*, this does not contradict his core thesis.

With as a result, our bio-humanist “human sciences” necessarily calling for our social reality and its third and hybrid level of existence, to continue to be known in the same rigorously abductive,⁴⁶ “world in little”⁴⁷ or “knowledge or categories” terms⁴⁸ in which both of the other levels of reality, the physical and the purely biological, had been millennially and lawfully

⁴⁴ Legesse

⁴⁵ As cited by William Spanos in his *The Ends of Education*.

⁴⁶ Gregory Bateson, *Mind and Nature: A Necessary Unity* (New York: E.P. Dutton) 1979.

⁴⁷ (Hocart 1934)

⁴⁸ (Moraes-Farias 1980)

known, before, that is, the “breaching” of their respective projected *divides* or *Lines*⁴⁹ onto which the sociogenic codes of symbolic *life/death*, firstly that of the medieval order of Latin Christian Europe, its code of *Redeemed Spirit/Fallen Flesh*, had been projected, (this seeing that as “the foundational principle of their orders, such codes cannot be located in the society at large but must be projected onto a “space of otherness beyond the reach of human desire and temptation”⁵⁰), upon the ostensible *incorruptible* Celestial/*corruptible* Terrestrial, Heaven/Earth divide; secondly that of the pre-bourgeois landed gentry order of Great Britain (its civic humanist code of symbolic *life/death* as that of *autonomous Rational human nature/subjected irrational sensory brute nature*) as projected upon the, then believed to be, *divinely* determined, but *naturally implemented* Chain of Being Divide between Humans/Animals, and correlatedly the ostensibly *perfectibility/degeneracy divide* as elaborated by Enlightenment scholars like Buffon, and projected between Europeans as phenotypically *normal* humans and non-European phenotypically different populations as their *abnormal* Human Others.⁵¹ Consequently, with both the physical level of reality, in the case of the first and biological level of reality in the case of the second, because then having to be put under the same rules of symbolically encoded description, as were also those of their respective social socio-hierarchical realities, having to be known abductively in the modality of a “mutually reinforcing system of presuppositions,”⁵² with this then serving to legitimate their structures of domination and subordination. Consequently, in whose terms, as the indispensable condition of their respective orders, together with the answers which their respective sociogenic codes of symbolic life/death enacted to the question of who we

⁴⁹ Wlad Godzich. Forward to *Heterologies: Discourse on the Other* by M. de Certeau (Minnesota, University of Minnesota Press), 1980.

⁵⁰

⁵¹ Sala-Molins, Luis, *The Dark Side of Light: Slavery and the French Enlightenment*. Trans. With Introduction by John Conteh-Morgan (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press) 2006.

⁵² See for this, Gregory Bateson, *Mind and Nature: A Necessary Unity* (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1979).

are, no ceremony could have been found by means of which to breach, firstly the *Celestial/Terrestrial* or *Heaven/Earth Divide* in the case of the first, and in that of the second, the Divide between the projected to be divinely created *Rational humans/human nature* on the one hand, and the *irrational animals/brute nature* on the other; this as reinforced by Enlightenment scholars' System-of-Nature-Divide between the *normal* and thereby perfectible Europeans on the one hand, and their Human Others who had allegedly degenerated from the natural norm, which had continued to be embodied in the former.

In each case, therefore, with their respective ceremonies only having eventually been made findable, firstly by the new civic humanist answer that the Renaissance lay intelligentsia, gave to the question of who we are, with their invention of [the concept of] *Man*, and with this then providing the new perspective from which, in the wake of Copernicus' initial challenge to the *Celestial/Terrestrial Divide*⁵³/the ceremony would eventually be found by means of Newton's law of gravitation as a law applicable to the Earth as to the Heavens, since all made of the same homogenous substance, of the same matter; with this enabling one, as Newton exulted, to extrapolate from that which is near to us, to *what* that which is far from us, *must be*.⁵⁴ Secondly, by the new answer that Liberal (or bio-humanist) humanism beginning with Adam Smith and other members of the Scottish School of the Enlightenment followed by Thomas Malthus' demographic cosmogony gave to the question of who we are.⁵⁵ With, thereby, the Ceremony able to breach the hitherto projected "space of Otherness" Human/Animal *Divide* coming to be definitively effected by Darwin's law of Evolution as put forward in his 1859 *The Origin of the Species*, etc. a law as applicable to humans (if only with respect to the

⁵³ See for this, Fernand Halryn, *The Poetic Structure of the World: Copernicus and Kepler* (New York: Zone Books, 1990).

⁵⁴ Amos Finkelstein, *Theology and Scientific Imagination from the Middle Ages to the Seventeenth Century* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986).

⁵⁵ See for this Thomas Malthus' 1789 *Essay on Population* (Check Date)

biological/neurophysiological implementing *conditions* of being human) as to animals. (If in his “part-science, part-myth” case,⁵⁶ also, however, with the Enlightenment’s correlated projected *perfectibility/degeneracy* Divide between Europeans as Nature’s perfectible norm of being human, and its non-European others,⁵⁷ now coming to be transumed, beginning with his 1871 *The Descent of Man* etc. into the *eugenic/dysgenic* divide that would come to be projected onto the “space of Otherness” of the Color Line (or “higher races”/“lower races”) Line; and, concomitantly, onto the Rich/Poor Line or Divide, correlated with the *Intellectual/Corporeal* class Divide, itself in turn as correlated with the *intellectually superior/intellectually inferior* Gender line or Divide—all as Lines or Divides whose mutually reinforcing system of presuppositions would now come to function as the “space of Otherness” complex onto which the code of symbolic *life/death*, enacting of the then new Western-bourgeois prototype of being human, in its second reinvented biohumanist form of *Man*, as *homo oeconomicus*.

If, however, both of these levels were from now on gradually to be freed from having to be known in abductive order-stabilizing terms, this was not to be so in our own hybridly human case. Since given the *existential* imperative of our having to continue to know our social reality in the terms that we at present do—that is, in the terms of the answer that we now give to the question of who we are, as an *allegedly* purely biological being in whose, nevertheless, genre-specific *naturally selected/dysselected* code of symbolic *life/death* terms, we now performatively enact ourselves, as *secular*, and thereby necessarily Western and westernized bourgeois academics, and as such, therefore having to know ourselves, in the prescriptive, sociogenically encoded structures, of our present order of consciousness, one which pre-defines us as being “of

⁵⁶ Glyn Isaacs, *Aspects of Evolution*

⁵⁷ Louis Sala-Molins, *op. cit.*

this type,”⁵⁸ the question with which we find ourselves confronted is the following: how can we come to know our social reality, no longer in the terms of the abductive order-legitimizing “knowledge of categories” system of thought (Althusser’s Ideology) to which the code law likely gives rise, but, heretically, in the terms of “knowledge of the world as it is”?⁵⁹ That is, in the same way as Western intellectuals from the autopoietic/cum intellectual revolution of Renaissance humanism and its new *Studia* onwards, have come to know, and brilliantly so, the physical and biological levels of reality, in terms of the imperatively open-ended because self-correcting (however, eventually), order of cognition that—as distinct from the new instrumentalist, market-oriented techno-sciences, including that of contemporary biotechnology—is that of the physical and biological sciences? To answer this question as to how we can come to know the level of our social reality in the terms of “knowledge of the world as it is,” and to thereby realize what had been the originally emancipatory openings of the Anti-colonial Revolution together with the correlated Otherness continuum of the social and intellectual movements of the Sixties, before they were aborted, we now turn to the core of the manifesto of the Ceremony Found.

The Concept of the Autopoietic Turn/Overturn:

Thinking Towards Autonomy and the Non-Opacity of Agency

⁵⁸ See for the elaboration of both of these divides, class, gender, as well as the divide between “higher races/lower races,” Darwin’s *The Descent of Man, etc.* With this being so even though he was also very much *for* the abolition of Negro slavery.

⁵⁹ See for this, Moraes-Farias, “Models of the World and Categorical Models: the Enslavable Barbarian, as a Mobile Classificatory Label,” in *Slavery and Abolition* 1 (2): 115-31.

The proposal of the Autopoietic Turn/Overturn is intended to resolve the predicament I have outlined. I have adapted the concept of *Turn* from, and as a further progression on, the earlier paradigm of the Linguistic Turn as put forward in the mid-twentieth century by Western academics, and that of *Overturn*, from the lexicon creatively generated by the “redemptive-prophetic intellectuals”⁶⁰ of the Rastafari originally Jamaican millenarian politico-religious—now widely extended transnational popular “planet of the slums”—movement. Specifically from the *counter-cosmogony* that underlies the movement in whose logic, words are turned upside down—their use, for example, of the inverted term *downpression* to define the existential perspective of their *systemic oppression*, this given their largely jobless existence. The French theorist, Granel, makes the parallel point with respect to those categories of the modern techno-industrial nation-state, as well as of the West’s overall secular nation-state world system, who are logically excluded, “from all modern politico-philosophical discourse,” because, as such, “the waste-products of all modern political practice, whether capitalist or Marxist.”⁶¹

In addition, however, I use the term *counter-cosmogony* in a specific sense adapted from Conrad Hyers’ brilliant re-reading of the Priestly version of the Genesis narrative of the Hebrew Bible, as elaborated by the exiled Jewish priests who had been captive in Babylon at the heart of the then Babylonian empire, this in the wake of the conquest of the kingdom of Judah and the destruction of Jerusalem in 587 B.C. by the Babylonians. In his study,⁶² and by means of a point by point reading of the Priests’ (or Priestly) version, Hyers reveals how the then entirely new *monotheistic* cosmogony, or Origin Creation-story that it elaborated, functioned as a *counter-cosmogony* whose narrative structures served to utterly delegitimize the then *polytheistic*

⁶⁰ See for this, Anthony Bogues, *Black Heretics Black Prophets : Radical Political Intellectuals* (NY: Routledge , 2003)

⁶¹ (Granel, as cited by JF Lyotard, “Heidegger and the Jews.” Trans., Michel and Roberts Intro. By D. Carroll, Minneapolis, Minnesota Press, 1990, p. 93).

⁶² Conrad Hyers, *The Meaning of Creation: Genesis and Modern Science*. (Atlanta, GA U.P. 1984).

politico-religious cosmogonic complex, (together with its pantheon of gods and goddesses, and central hero-figure the god Marduk), which had functioned to charter the Babylonian empire, and to thereby legitimate its predatory imperial conquests of weaker peoples. Not only is this reading an example of the kind proposed by the Autopoietic Turn/Overtturn, that is, the approach which takes cosmogonies and their Weber-type “webs of significance” which charter us as the “who” that we are, as the object of our inquiry, but also its identification as a specific genre—i.e., that of a *counter-cosmogony* projected from, as Maurice Gauchet⁶³ also points out, the exiled captive priests’ then uncompromising “gaze from below” perspective. This as the perspective that led them to project the Invisible existence of a now all-powerful sole Creator God, one for the first time in human history, now placed entirely *outside the cosmos*, and as such, the Creator not only of the stars and planets, (which rather than they had been millennially held to be, i.e., the religio-polytheistic gods and goddesses chartering of, *inter alia*, all the then empires, including Babylon’s), were instead merely *created objects*, but the Creator also of all humankind, including the rulers of the mightiest empires, thereby reducing them to being *merely created beings*. As such, therefore, the source of an entirely new “paradigm of justice” able to transcend all imperial paradigms, those then existent, as well as those that were to come.

With both Hyers and Gauchet’s readings of the Priestly version of Genesis, at the same time revealing the parallels with the also desperate “gaze from below” nature of the Rastafari’s own projected counter-cosmogony. Thereby, the logic also of the regularity with which the Rastafari’s “redemptive-prophetic intellectuals” have taken over and adapted the Biblical terminology of the exiled Jewish priests in Babylon—as for example the Reggae singer-prophet Bob Marley, in his song “By the rivers of Babylon/ where we sat down and where we wept

⁶³ See Epigraph 1, Maurice Gauchet, *The Disenchantment of the World: A Political History of Religion* (1997).

when we remember Zion” as well as in other songs such as his Exodus—enabling an analogical reading of their counter-cosmogony, so as to also identify *what* the *major elements* of our present world system’s chartering cosmogonic complex, must necessarily *be*, given that these would also be the elements to which the new “gaze from below,” of those exiled in a new Babylon—that is, as a liminally deviant *category* which, *cannot* be included within the paradigm of justice instituting of our present Liberal-democratic nation-state Western world system and its now purely secular order of things, any more than the exiled captive priests could have been included in that instituting of the Babylonian imperial order; indeed any more than Barbarian slaves of ancient Greek democracy could have been included “in the paradigm of justice” instituting of that order,⁶⁴ —would have necessarily had to counterpose itself. That is, in *its* now dynamic contemporary quest for a quite other and superior order of justice, to the now purely secular one which mandates/legitimizes, their exclusion.

Nevertheless, the Autopoietic Turn/Overturn is also put forward in its own terms as the praxis of two proposals. Firstly, that of Aimé Césaire’s proposed new (1946) Science of the Word—when at a Conference in Haiti, in a surrealist-cum-Négritude talk entitled “Poetry and Knowledge,” Césaire, had begun by pointing out that the natural sciences, for all their achievements in knowing how “to utilize the world,” remain “poor and half-starved”; fundamentally therefore an “*impoverished knowledge*” since from its inception onwards, he noted, “whatever its other wealth may have been, there stands an impoverished humanity.” Nevertheless, he continued, “it is out of this great silence of scientific knowledge” with respect

⁶⁴ Asmaron Legesse proposes that because of the “injustice inherent in human systems,” there is always a “liminally deviant” category whose inclusion/exclusion is made to function as the integrating mechanism of each order. Since it is through their systemic negation that the *normal* subjects of the order are able to experience their shared *normalcy*. The analogy with Greek democracy and its liminally deviant category the Barbarian slaves also excluded from the ordering “paradigms of justice” instituting of that first form of Western democracy is taken from the brilliant insight by the philosopher Bernard Williams. I shall have to track down the reference.

to our human predicament, that a new form of knowledge, “poetic knowledge” one that returns to and begins with *the Word*, as our “first and last chance” is now possible; one in which the Word “promises to be an algebraic equation that makes the world intelligible.” In that, “[j]ust as the new Cartesian algebra permitted the construction of a theoretical physics, so too an original handling of the Word,” can give rise to “...a new theoretical and heedless science *that poetry could already give an approximate notion of.*” One in which “the study of the Word will condition the study of nature.”

That is, therefore, a new, because autopoetically *hybrid* form of science—with science itself therefore being redefined beyond the limits of the *Natural Sciences*’ restrictedness to their specific domains of inquiry, the physical and purely biological levels of reality (with the latter including, of course the physiologically and neurophysiological implementing *conditions* enacting of our always cosmogonically chartered genres of being human, of their respective sociogenic codes (Césaire’s Word) of symbolic *life/death*—as one (that is, a science) whose specific domain of inquiry is that of a third level of reality, meta-biological and biological, yet as one that has hitherto functioned, as such, outside our conscious awareness. Doing so, however, according to what can be now recognized—this within the emancipatory openings made possible by the new “class of classes” Origin Account enacting of the Ceremony Found’s profoundly revalorizing (because based on the negation of the negation of our co-humanness and, therefore, on the *a priori* of the “irreducible oneness of our species”⁶⁵), new answer to the question of who we are—as laws of auto-institution that are as specific to the functioning of this third level of reality as biological laws are specific to the functioning of the second. If, paradoxically, as laws

⁶⁵ Sala Molins, *The Dark Side of the Light: Slavery and the French Enlightenment*. Trans., Intro., by John Conteh-Morgan. (Minneapolis) Univ. of Minnesota Pres, 2006.

which as the very condition of their functioning as such laws, have themselves also done so outside our conscious awareness.

Consequently, because the telos or aim with respect to this third domain of inquiry is that also, as the indispensable condition of finding the Ceremony able to breach the Color Line (in effect the “race” or Negation of co-humanness Line) together with its correlated complex of projected “space of Otherness” Lines or Divides, is therefore the same in this respect as that of the Natural Sciences—that is to work towards a new order of imperatively self-correcting (however eventually) thereby open-ended mode of cognition—this will entail the following: that Césaire's proposed study of the Word, one based on the “study of nature” from *its* (the *Word's*) now determinant perspective, and therefore as one whose praxis is that of the Autopoietic Turn/Overturn, will begin by transgressing our present order of knowledge's normally conceptually unbreachable divide between, on the one hand, the physical and biological sciences (together with the range of techno-sciences to which they have given rise), and on the other, the disciplines of the Humanities and the Social Sciences (Fanon's “human sciences”). And will do so by noting that Césaire's study of the *Word/of Nature*, is one that is itself isomorphic with the study of his fellow colonial Martiniquean, Frantz Fanon's, new object of knowledge, as identified in 1952, in the context of his own then epochal parallel redefinition of being human in the terms also of our species-specific *hybridity*; the “study of the word/the study of nature,” thereby, as the study of, in Fanonian terms, *sociogeny*. Therefore as the study of what I have proposed is the always already cosmogonically chartered sociogenic replicator code of symbolic *life/death*, in whose terms, we can alone both preconceptually experience and performatively enact ourselves *as* humans; therefore, as the only auto-instituting species of hybrid living beings. This given that as Peter Winch also proposed, the only life that we humans live, is our

prescriptive *representations* of what constitutes symbolic *life*, and what constitutes its Lack or mode of symbolic *death*. Consequently, because each such regulatory code functions in Gregory Bateson's parallelly proposed terms, at the level of the individual subject's *psyche* or *soul*, whose "descriptive statement" (as enacted by the codes) must therefore be everywhere imperatively elaborated and conserved, (this as the lawlike complement of the genetically enacted and conserved *descriptive statement* of the individual subject's *body*), by each society's system of learning,⁶⁶ together with the apparatus of its "educational (in effect, *initiation*) institutions,"⁶⁷ then the "study of the Word" as that of the sociogenic code's *descriptive statement*, must necessarily, as Césaire proposed, not only correlate with, but even *determine* the [approach to] the "study of nature."

The study therefore, in the case of the latter, and within the term of the Autopoietic Turn/Overturn, as the proposed praxis of Césaire's new science, of the physiologically/neurophysiological *implementing conditions* (rather than the *basis*) of our being able to lawlikely performatively enact ourselves as being, *hybridly* human—that is as both a sociogenic and therefore, an already symbolically encoded *I*, one thereby cloned or made similar with, all other members (or *I*'s) of one's origin-narratively co-identified, and therefore inter-altruistic, kin-recognizing, eusocially bonded "we" or "fictive mode of kind." While central to the study of the physiologically/ neurophysiologically implementing *conditions* (not the *basis*) of our being hybridly human—will be that of the *co-functioning* of each sociogenic code's origin-narratively cosmogonically chartered system of *positive/negative, symbolic life/death meanings*, with the biochemical or *opiate reward* and *punishment* (behavior motivating/demotivating)

⁶⁶ Gregory Bateson, "Conscious Purpose vs. Nature," *The Dialectics of...* David Cooper, ed. (London, Penguin, 1969).

⁶⁷ Robert Young, *White Mythologies: Writing History and the West* (New York, Routledge 1990).

system of the brain⁶⁸ With the latter's systemic activation by the positively/negatively marked meanings thereby enacting of each such sociogenic code's, representation of symbolic *life (good)* and "*death*" (*evil*, the lack of being *in the terms* of that "life"), thereby directly leading to our performative enactment as subjects in the always already cosmogonically inscribed and chartered genre-specific terms of our "*fictive* modes of kind. This at the same time as these objectively instituted sociogenic codes of symbolic *life/death*, come to be, as the praxis of the Autopoietic Turn/Overturn will make clear, *experienced* by its subjects as extra-humanly ordained; whether, on the one hand, by *the Absolute Divine Will* (as in the case of the West's evangelical Christianity or of today's Radical Islam), or whether, in our secular, and therefore Western and westernized case, coming to be experienced as *natural, instinctive*, the expressions of [the trope of] "human nature." As such, thereby held to be no less *extra-humanly*, ordained, either, as earlier by the Enlightenment's "Nature's Will" or later by the Will of Darwin's Evolution, as expressed in his *The Descent of Man's*, as that of the "unerring powers of natural selection."⁶⁹ In effect, by on the one hand, the Argument from Divine Design, in religious terminology, and on the other, in secular but no less determined by a projected extra-human Agency, the Argument from the Design of Natural Selection and Dysselection, in ensuring the "survival of the fittest" and the extinction of the non-fit⁷⁰

Which therefore means that as the condition of the enacting of the code at both levels (that of the Word, the *ordo verborum* [order of Words] and that of "nature" the *ordo naturae*,

⁶⁸ See J.F. Danielli; ob. cit.; Avram Goldstein, *Addiction: From Biology to Public Policy* (New York: W.W. Freeman, 1994); Sylvia Wynter, "Towards the Sociogenic Principle: Fanon, Identity, the Puzzle of Conscious Experience, and What It Is Like to Be a Bat," in M.F. Durán Cogan and Antonio Gómez Moriana, *National Identities and Socio-political Change in Latin America* (New York, London: Routledge, 2001).

⁶⁹ Darwin, *The Descent of Man, or Selection in Relation to Sex*. 1871/1981.). Hans Blumenberg, *The Legitimacy of the Modern Age*. Trans. R. Wallace. 1983

⁷⁰ See in this respect, Darwin's speculation (in his *The Descent of Man*, etc.) with respect to the ostensible teleological inevitability of the extinction of the *lower races* such as (the original pre-settler, pre-immigrant) Australians, and "negroes" by the "higher races."

each level has to lawfully and intricately cohere; — as a form of finely calibrated non-linear coherence, in order to *activate* and together *implement* the genre-specific order of consciousness (or mode of *mind*), integrating of each human group’s specific *fictive* mode of kind, its *I* or its *We*. As in the case of our now secular, and therefore Western or westernized secular nation-state fictive mode of kind, on the one hand, or on the other, that instituting of the U.S. Evangelical Christian Right’s both religious and bourgeois-national mode of fictive kind on the other, and with the hybridly conflictual yet also reinforcing nature of their respective Origin-stories, that of Creation and that of Evolution⁷¹—a logical corollary follows; one that calls for the meta-systemic functioning of Césaire’s proposed hybrid science of the Word as that of the sociogenic Fanonian code, and/or the Autopoietic Turn/Overturn as its praxis.

This corollary is that in each human societal order, as based on its cosmogonically chartered and genre-specific *fictive* mode of *kind*, both what Althusser defines as each such order’s mode of knowledge production, and the archaeologist McNeill, as its (mode of) “representational arts” or aesthetic production, must necessarily be cognitively and aesthetically (i.e., psycho-affectively) closed. If that is, the *positive/negatively* marked *meanings* of the code are to be stably and systemically synchronized with the functioning of the biochemical or opiate reward and punishment system of the brain, as the condition of the subjects of the order, performatively enacting themselves/ourselves as *being human*, in the genre specific terms of each such codes’ positive/negative system of meanings. For “meaning,” as the physicist David Bohm insists, *is*—because of its ability to directly affect *matter*, positively or negatively, that is, by means of its, after Butler, “*genre ’d* practices of regulatory coercion”), *being*.⁷² Its ability therefore to motivate the always cosmogonically inscribed and chartered genre-specific

⁷¹ See for this, Michael Ruse, *The Evolution-Creation Struggle* (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 2005).

⁷² David Bohm, Interview in *Omni*, 1987.

positive/negative terms, of each sociogenic code's mode of symbolic *life/death*, as the code which structures our normative orders of consciousness, and thereby, each order's ensemble of individual and collective behaviors. In the case of our own *naturally selected/dysselected* code, with both Virginia Woolf in 1929 and Carter G. Woodson in 1935 coming to parallel conclusions—each from their specific perspectives of Otherness, *gender* anomaly in the case of the first, *race/phenotype* anomaly in the case of the second, together with the Black U.S. population to which he belongs—with respect to the systemic nature of the technologies of *positive/negative* representations of the specific order of knowledge,⁷³ which produces them as such *anomalies*, each in their respective relatively inferiorized and ostensibly *genetically*, therefore naturally dysselected, determined places. The one with respect to her British imperial ruling upper class male peers, all then discursively and empirically institutionalized as ostensibly the *generic sex*⁷⁴ and thereby the *normal gender*, the other, like the rest of his Black U.S., then collectively segregated, systemically subordinated and inferiorized population, with respect to the White Euroamerican (optimally WASP or Anglo-American) population, this latter discursively and empirically institutionalized, as ostensibly the *generic human phenotype*, and thereby as such, the incarnation, at one and the same time, of being both *normally American*, and by extrapolation, of being ostensibly, *normally human*.⁷⁵

⁷³ Virginia Woolf actually uses the word *cocaine* to describe the “rush” that angry male professors get when writing books whose purpose was to assure them of their own male intellectual superiority, with this further motivating them to write more books, as it motivated their non-academic peers to build empires and “civilize natives.” See her *A Room of One's Own* (Orlando, FL, Harcourt).

⁷⁴ See for the concept of *generic*, Jane Gallop, *Reading Lacan* (YEAR), where she points out that the use of the pronoun *he* to refer to both men and women scholars, constitutes the male sex as the *generic sex*, by veiling its male attributes. Equally the secular West by using *Man* as interchangeable with *human* constitutes its own population as the *generic human* and its own *bourgeois class* as the *generic class*, by veiling on the one hand its ethno-phenotypic attributes, and on the other the *class* attributes of in both cases its mode of knowledge production as well as of aesthetic production.

⁷⁵ In the above context, if Carter G. Woodson had pointed out (in his book, *The Mis-education of the Negro*) that in the curricula of American schools, the systemically negative representations of the Black population and their/our continent of origin, Africa, as contrasted with the systemically positive representations, of the White population and of their origin continent Europe, directly functioned to *motivate* the latter and to *demotivate* the

While if we see these systemic *positive/negative* representations as themselves a central part of the “mutually reinforcing system of presuppositions” enacting and lawlike so, of the West’s *Man* in its second, since the nineteenth century, Liberal/Bio-humanist conception/self-conception, both Woolf’s and Woodson’s insights with respect to the role of knowledge in the ordering and legitimating of their respective and correlated *subordinate* roles, as roles instituting of their/our societies, opens up onto a universally applicable hypothesis. In that if, as the archaeologist McNeill has proposed, in all human societies from the smallest, and thereby, most simple, to the most extended and thereby, more complex—the role normally played by the representational arts (the mode of their aesthetic production), has always been that of explaining the world, *not in the terms of factuality*, but instead, in “*the terms of religious schemas of some mythology*,” (that is, in the terms of their respective order-instituting cosmogonies or origin stories, whether religious, and as in our case, secular), and as schemas which then function to constitute the reality of each genre-specific autopoietic field or languaging living system as that of the “*independently real*,” this, is no less true of our Althusserian “modes of knowledge production.” Not, however, the latter’s role as ostensibly determined, by Althusser’s “mode of economic production” concept adapted from Marx who, in turn, adapted it from the quintessentially bourgeois intellectuals of the Scottish Enlightenment, including centrally Adam Smith⁷⁶—but rather its systemic, genre-specific, role in explaining/describing the world of its

former, Claude Steele, *together* with a fellow social psychologist, has carried out a series of tests, which proves the role that negative stereotypes play in demotivating Black and other students. Unlike Woodson, however, Steele does not recognize the fact that the negative stereotypes are not arbitrary, but are lawlike representations of our present order of knowledge. See Claude Steele and Joshua Aronson, “Stereotype Threat and Intellectual Test Performance of African Americans” in *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1995. Vol. 69, no. 5, pp. 797-811. See for Woodson, *The Miseducation of Negro*. (Chicago, 1933)

⁷⁶ J.G.A Pocock, “Anglo-American Civic Humanism” in *Politics, Language and Time: Essays on Political Thought and history*. Chicago and London, University of Chicago Press, 1989, pp 101-102. What he demonstrates here, is that because each *mode of production* was now supposed to teleologically displace the one that preceded it within the terms of the Scottish School invented *historical cosmogony*, it was no longer the *political state* that was the institution determinant of human history; that therefore the pre-bourgeois, ruling caste landed gentry’s code of

social reality, together with the latter's role allocations, structuring hierarchies, and correlated ratios of distribution of the collectively produced “goods” and the “bads” in the lawlikely relative quantitative degrees necessary to their stable reproduction, as such role allocations, and hierarchies, *not* in the terms of *factuality*, but instead in the terms of a religious, (and in the case of the West, a secular) schema, specific to the origin-story or cosmogony chartering of each society's fictive modes of kind, and correlated sociogenic genre of being human.

Overall, therefore, within the terms of the new answer that the Ceremony Found gives to the question of who we are—that is as a Fanonianly hybrid uniquely auto-instituting mode, of living being, *we cannot* as hitherto always *relative* genres of hybrid living being, *pre-exist* our cosmogonies, or origin myths/stories/narratives. Seeing that if, as Leeming seminally points out,⁷⁷ such cosmogonies function to enable us to “tell the world and ourselves who we are,” they also, function even more crucially, to enable us to autopoetically institute ourselves as the genre specific “We” or fictive mode of kind, that each of us (as a thereby always already sociogenically and therefore symbolically encoded and cloned “I”)⁷⁸ will from now on,

symbolic *life*, as that of *homo politicus*, and its Ideal identity, as *that* of the *virtuous citizen* able to make autonomous decisions for the “common good,” through its control of the state, now had to be replaced, *pari passu*, with the rise of the bourgeois enterprise of manufacturing (and of what was to be the Industrial Revolution), which in terms of the “mode of production” schema, has been represented as *inevitably fated* to displace the Agrarian or large-scale commercial agriculture, which was the enterprise of the ruling caste of the landed gentry. This schema was therefore intended to legitimate the new bourgeois self-conception invented as that of *homo oeconomicus*; thereby as one ostensibly, whose *economic* decision making and self-interested pursuit of the accumulation of capital as the means of production of manufacturing/the Industrial Revolution, was now institutionalized as being isomorphic with the “common good” redefined in the terms of Smith's title, as *The Wealth of Nations*; this represented mode of the imagined “common good” thereby coming to be indispensable to the Western bourgeoisie's securing and stable replication of its ruling class status, as well as of the hegemony of the Western world system in its now ethno-class configuration.

⁷⁷ See Epigraph 1

⁷⁸ Thus the paradox that it is only in the terms of the West's secularizing philosophical *cosmogonies* that an ostensibly pre-social “I” or individual subject in a “state of nature” can be enabled to autopoetically institute itself as such a subject; at the same time as, in the cases of Locke and Hobbes, for example, both as such subjects were *cosmogonically* chartered as, members of the “We” of a then post-medieval *politically absolute* monarchical England/Great Britain.

preconceptually experience and therefore performatively enact ourselves to be—and therefore are.

Consequently, if as Sylvia Yaganisako and Carol Delaney propose,⁷⁹ given the fact that such “[o]rigin stories” are, the world over, “the prime locus for *a society’s notion of itself*,” that is, for “its identity...world view and social organization,” then the wide range of all such origin stories, this including both the “now dominant [religion-Christian] origin story of Creation as narrated in Genesis,”⁸⁰ as well as, from the nineteenth century onwards, the secular Origin-story (and, therefore, the Darwinian “part-science, part myth” bio-cosmogony) of Evolution—should all be treated “neither as *false tales*, nor as possible windows into the *real true origins* but as *representations of origins*.” With the result that, given that each such “representation of origins” once enacted must lawfully function as *the* determinant of a non-recognized principle of cosmogonic/sociogenic causality, that is, as the second symbolically encoded “set of instructions,” of the genre-specific behavioral self-programming schema structuring of the normative order of consciousness of each such “fictive mode of kind,” whose “truth”⁸¹ is then circularly and empirically verified by the ensemble of individual behaviors, which that consciousness serves to induce/motivate, a corollary follows. This is that it is only by means of their genre-specific opiate activating behavior motivating/demotivating magma of positive/negative meanings, or Imaginary,⁸² as ones inducing of the individual and collective

⁷⁹ In the Introduction to their edited collection of essays, *Naturalizing Power: Essays in Feminist Cultural Analysis* (1995).

⁸⁰ One therefore, as they add, “common to both Jews and Christians, and in a slightly different way to Muslims.”

⁸¹ That is, W.E.B Dubois’/McWhorter’s “abstract general truth” (1944, 1968), Paul Veyne’s “program of truth,” Foucault’s “regime of truth” (insert reference, dates).

⁸² Cornelius Castoriadis, defines the Imaginary of each human society, as, that magma of images and encoded premises, which while providing, “*collective values of unitary* meanings are logically *unprovable*.” In his talk/essay, “Imaginary Creation in the Social-historical Domain” in *Disorder and Order: Proceedings of the Stanford International Symposium* (Sept. 14-16) Stanford, Anma Libri, pp. 140-61. An excellent example of the

behaviors of their subjects, that each such society, in turn, is enabled to performatively enact itself as an autopoietic (linguaging) living system, in Maturana and Varela's definition of all such systems;⁸³ this at the same time, as each living system self-organizes itself about the It or genre-specific sociogenic code of symbolic *life/death*, in whose terms its subjects preconceptually experience and performatively enact themselves as such genre-specific subjects. This analogically to the way in which, at the purely biological level of existence, the living system that is the beehive also self-organizes itself about the species-specific DNA code or genome of the bee.

Given, therefore, the lawlike nature of the existentially driven circularity or recursive self-referentiality of our chartering and order instituting cosmogonies, specifically with respect to the functioning of our cosmogonies' "representation of origins," this necessarily results, for the subjects of each such order in a normally unresolvable cognitive dilemma. One recently identified by Yaganisako and Delaney, as it has come to function in our contemporary case as now *purely secular*, and therefore as such, necessarily either Western or westernized academics and/or intellectuals; if doing so with specific reference to anthropologists. For while the latter, they write, "often include in their accounts, origin stories of the people they study," given that they had come to recognize "after Malinowski, that an intimate connection exists between *the word, mythos, the sacred tales of a tribe*," on the one hand, "and their behaviors" (i.e., "their ritual acts, their moral deeds, their social organization, and even their practical activities") on the other, nevertheless these same anthropologists "hesitate at the threshold of their own, reluctant to explore their own origin myths whether religious or secular." Here they then go on to make the

above, was the failure of all attempts by other scholars to *prove* the post-Sixties, order-restabilizing neo-Darwinian bio-cosmogony, of Herrnstein and Murray's *The Bell Curve etc.* to be *wrong*.

⁸³ Humberto Maturana and Francisco Varela, *Autopoiesis and Cognition: The Realization of the Living*. Foreword by Sr Stafford Beer (Boston: Reidel Publishing Co., 1980).

further point, that this reluctance on the part of anthropologists is a lawlike one, since one which they share with the peoples they study (and who are classified, generically as their “*native informants*”). This given that they too, (i.e., the anthropologists) “treat their own stories of origin” (i.e. that of Creation and Evolution) as “taboo—set apart and sacred,” as do all human groups. If doing so in the case of the former, in now non-religious terms, and, instead embedding this view in (the ostensible *objectivity* of) “an evolutionary paradigm.” Yet one which is itself generated from their own “part-science, part myth,”⁸⁴ Darwinian *biocosmogonic representation of origins* of Evolution—that is, as one whose “part science” aspect does indeed, not only correctly describe the origins of the physiological/neurophysiological implementing *conditions* of our being hybridly human, but the origins also of the co-evolution of the emergent properties of language and narrative with the brain, as the properties that were to be the indispensable conditions of our coming to be the uniquely auto-instituting mode of living being that we are—with this representation, however, taken as, and mistakenly so, to be, true also of the origins of our being [hybridly] human, with this now serving to charter and legitimate their projection of the notion that their own origin myths “are in some sense, real and true.” This given that in their Origin-story of a process to which they abductively,⁸⁵ give the name human evolution,⁸⁶ “first there were myths,” then there “were religions” (both now “relegated to a dim past”), as stages that we have now outgrown, in order to replace them both with “science.”

With this genre-specific bourgeois or ethno-class “representations of origins” thereby making anthropologist logically unable, normally, to see him or herself as in anyway *coeval*, as

⁸⁴ Glyn Isaccs, *Aspects of Evolution*, in D.S. Bendall. *Evolution from Molecules to Man* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

⁸⁵ See for the concept of abduction, as a form of totemic (or “knowledge of categories of thought”) Gregory Bateson, *Mind and Nature: A Necessary Unity*, 1970.

⁸⁶ The abductive transfer of the processes of Evolution from the second level of purely biological life to the historical processes of autopoietic transformations specific to the third level of our hybridly human reality, functions to teleologically legitimate our present Western-bourgeois world system as the ostensible climax/end of history

Johannes Fabian was to seminally observe,⁸⁷ with the other human groups who were/are the objects of study; and thereby to be seen as fully—if *differently, co-human*—with themselves. This seeing that to do so, would call for them/us to accept the *relativization* of their/our own “part science, part myth” origin-story together with its autopoetically instituted genre of being human, and nation-state cum Western civilizational “fictive mode of kind,” as that empirically of *mankind*, itself rhetorically overrepresented, in the biocosmogonic terms of our Darwinian “part science, part myth” Origin Story “representation of origins,” *as if it were that of humankind(s)*. Therefore, as if, to extrapolate from Jacques Derrida’s penetrating 1968 conference presentation, “The Ends of Man,” “there is an uninterrupted metaphysical familiarity with that which, so *naturally* links the ‘We’”—not only of his fellow philosophers, as well as of Yaganisako and Delaney’s fellow anthropologists, but also the *we* of all ourselves who as *secular*, and therefore necessarily, either Western or westernized middle-class academics and/or intellectuals, are all cosmogonically chartered by the same evolutionary paradigm—to the “we men,” in the horizon of humanity” (Derrida, p. 116).

Further, therefore, with this over-representation (i.e., of our ethno-class [i.e., Western-bourgeois] mode of referent “we” (and its world-systemic nation-state modes of Breadwinning/Investing/capital accumulating/consuming middle classes), as being isomorphic with that of the “we” of the ecumenically human, being made possible only by the fact that, as Derrida also point out, in our discourses “there is little practice of the history of concepts,” with this meaning that “the history of the concept of ‘man’” itself *is never examined*; and, with it, the history also, of the concept of secularizing *Man*’s discursively invented and objectively institutionalized series of Human Others, as identified by Jacob Pandian (1988). That is, firstly,

⁸⁷ Johannes Fabian, *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Objects* ()

the concept of the “*Negro*”/the “*Negress*” (*negros/negras* in Spanish, together with the concept of *Indians/Indian squaws* (*indios/indias* in Spanish), with this in turn followed from the late eighteenth century onwards, by a second series of Human Others, all classified generically as *natives* (men and women); with all being made to function as the embodiment of the (concept of) the *Native Other* to the *True Human Self* of the West’s second reinvented (concept of) *Man*.⁸⁸ While it is *this systemic* non-recognition of the *invented nature* of these concepts, which serves to ensure, as Derrida further notes, that everything continues to occur “as if the sign ‘man’ *had no origins, no historical, cultural, or linguistic limit*”.⁸⁹ As if therefore *Man’s* embodied signifiers of Otherness as the negation of its self-concept, whether in its original Renaissance civic humanist form, as *homo politicus*, or in its later bio-humanist form as *homo oeconomicus*— that is, as if the latter’s *Human Other* institutionalized signifiers of symbolic death, i.e., *Negro, Indian, Natives, niggers*, (indeed, “*White Trash*” or *Trailer park trash*), together with *Welfare mom, ghetto Black*, as the extreme expression of the global category of the *non-Breadwinning non-taxpaying “planet of the slums” Jobless Poor*, not to say at the world systemic level, the Otherness category of the “*underdeveloped*”⁹⁰ also all themselves had “no historical, cultural, or linguistic limit”; that is, no *cosmogonic*, and therefore no *autopoetically instituting limits*.

The proposal here, however, is that, in the above context, this oversight, in our own now Western and westernized case as secular middle class academics, is one which functions for us, according to the same laws of human auto-institution, to which, together with all other human groups, we have been (normally) subordinated from the Event of our Origin; this as a *form of* subordination that however needs to be recognized, within the terms of the Ceremony Found’s

⁸⁸ Jacob Pandian, *Anthropology and the Western Tradition: Towards an Authentic Anthropology* (1988)

⁸⁹ (Derrida, 1968, 1982, p. 116)

⁹⁰ See for this Sylvia Wynter, “Is Development a Purely Empirical Concept, or also Teleological? A Perspective from “We-the-Underdeveloped” in Aguibou Yansane, *Recovery and Sustainable development in Africa*. (Greenwood Press, 1996).

new post-Darwinian Origin Account, enacting of its new answer to the question of who we are, as having been precisely *the price paid* for that emancipatory First Emergence that was defining of the Event of our origin as a uniquely hybrid mode of living being on the savannas of today's Black Africa. So that, when, for example, the anthropologist Peter Wilson describes the event of “one primate genus” coming “to develop” (what he defines in Westerns ethno-taxonomic terms as “*culture*”), by means of which the human populations of the species were to, from now on “make themselves the object of their own thought, *and subject themselves to their own humanly devised procedures,*”⁹¹ this is the same process identified by Nietzsche as that of “man’s labor upon himself” by means of which, through the “morality of mores” he would make his behaviors calculable and to be depended upon,⁹² (his behaviors, in effect, *lawlike*), both refer to the same phenomenon. That is, to the fact that our own now continued subordination to our own now humanly invented rules, had had its origin in an Event that was both biological and meta-biological; and as such, in addition to the First Event of the origin of the physical universe, and the second of the origin of purely biological forms of life, one that was now the Third Event.

Consequently, given that this is also the Event that the paleontologist Juan Luis Arsuaga describes—in his book, *The Neanderthal’s Necklace: In Search of the First Thinkers* (2002)—as the one by which “[t]he first modern humans in Africa, although surrounded by other [hominid] populations as robust as the Neanderthals of Europe, took *a different evolutionary route, an alternative strategy to solve ecological problems*” by “developing a brain specialized in the manipulation of symbols” together with “...articulated language at the service of a unique capacity to...*tell stories and create fictitious worlds*”⁹³—these as were/are the *stories* in whose

⁹¹ Peter J. Wilson: *Man, The Promising Primate: The Conditions of Human Evolution* (1983).

⁹² Nietzsche, ref. Kaufman, ed.

⁹³ Juan Luis Arsuaga, *The Neanderthal’s Necklace: In Search of The First Thinkers* trans. A. Klatt (New York, Four Walls—Two Windows-, 2002) p. 307

chartering integrating schema and/or “fictitious worlds” they/we were to be enabled to autopoetically institute themselves/ourselves as now symbolically encoded, and thereby artificially made similar as inter-altruistic, eusocially kin-recognizing, and thereby cooperating *fictive* modes of kind; this beyond the narrow preset limits of all forms of purely genetically determined eusocial conspecificity. *Thereby with our “stories” being as much a part of our being, as the imperatively artificially co-identifying eusocial species that we are, as for example, are our bipedalism, and the use of our hands.* This, then as, the Event of the origin as specifically *human* modes of living being, as a now *hybrid* (i.e. biological *and* meta-biological) species, as one therefore, *no longer* behaving, *only according to the laws regulatory of [purely] biological life*, but also according to laws of human auto-institution specific to our also third and hybrid level of existence.

The caveat here, however, is the following: that with our First Emergence *from*— what would have been *otherwise*, our total Primate mode subordination, as far as the limits of our inter-altruistic kin-recognizing bonding, and cooperating eusocial behaviors, are concerned—to *the DNA code of our species genome*, had imperatively called for a two-pronged price to be paid. The first that of the fact that because our now cosmogonically chartering codes of symbolic *life/death*, as the newly hegemonic *determinant* of our eusocial behaviors, this in the overall context of each such story or cosmogony’s, (in their then first matrix form), *religiously* enacted behavior-necessitating (i.e. motivating/de-motivating) schemas or programs, *had to be able* to activate the opiate reward and punishment biochemical implementing mechanisms of the brain⁹⁴

⁹⁴ See Avram Goldstein, *Addiction: From Biology to Drug Policy*, [New York: W.H. Freeman, 994], where he writes,

In summary, a natural opioid system exists for signaling both reward (probably by beta-endorphin) and punishment (by dynorphins)...We can speculate that reward systems drive adaptive behavior in the following way. They signal “good” when food is found and eaten by a hungry animal, when water is found and drunk by a thirsty animal, when sexual activity is

(in the terms appropriate to each such code's genre-specific religious creeds' "what is to be said" as well as to its rituals prescriptions as to "what is to be done),"⁹⁵ this had therefore called for the subjects of each such creed's and its chartering origin story to normally remain *subjected* to its schema as the condition of being who they/we are. Concomitantly, with this also calling—as a function of inducting/motivating the requisite forms of inter-altruistic kin-recognizing behaviors, instituting of each such creed's *fictive* mode of kind—for the laws regulatory of such behaviors to be ones able to ensure that the structuring of our chartering cosmogonic narratives or origin stories, and thereby of the now genre-specific human sociogenic code of symbolic *life* and *death* which they inscribe/mandate, be ones rigorously analogous (with respect to each such origin narrative's behavior-motivating/de-motivating story-line) *to the purely biological laws regulatory* of what Goldstein defines as this "delicately regulated [natural opioid system] perfected by evolution over thousands of years to serve the survival of all species." Thereby, as schemas able to ensure the systemically activated *co-functioning* of the *good/reward, bad/punishment natural opioid* mechanism of the brain, with the *positive/negative* magma of meanings enacting of its genre-specific sociogenic code of symbolic *life/death*; in effect, the systemic co-functioning of the code's regulatory *second set of instructions*, with the *first set of*

promised and consummated, when a threatening situation is averted. They signal "bad" when harmful behavior is engaged in or when pain is experienced. These signals become associated with the situation in which they are generated, and they are remembered. Thus, the conditioning...seems to represent the necessary process by which an animal learns to seek what is beneficial and avoid what is harmful. This delicately regulated system was perfected by evolution over millions of years to serve the survival of all species (Goldstein, *ibis.*, p. 60, Emphasis added).

⁹⁵ See Ernesto Grassi, *Rhetoric as Philosophy: The Humanist Tradition* (University Park, Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1980). Here, however Grassi's thesis makes it clear—over against Goldstein's thesis that the biochemical behavior-regulatory system functions for humans in the same *species-specific* appropriate/non-appropriate terms as it does for purely biological species, by showing that the specifically *human code* would have functioned in *creed-specific* (therefore genre-specific) terms for humans; as it now does in the terms of our now purely secular Liberal humanist bio-cosmogonically chartered creed enacting of the West's second reinvented concept of *Man* in now bourgeois, *homo oeconomicus* Breadwinner/taxpayer, Liberal-democratic terms.

instructions of our species DNA code regulatory of the functioning of our brain's natural opioid system.

It is in this context that N.J. Girardot, by his identification of the [behavior-motivating/demotivating schema] defining of all religions—that is, as a schema based on the projection of a “general order of existence” together with, firstly a postulate “of a significant ill,” or “affliction” this followed, in turn, by the specific creed's prescribed behavioral pathways put forward as the “cure” of each such “ill,” then further giving as an example, Christianity's postulate of a significant “ill” as that of post-Adamic mankind's enslavement to “Original Sin,” therefore, with redemption or salvation from this “ill,” only being attainable by means of Christian baptism, followed by the Christian convert/subjects adhering to the prescriptive behavioral pathway laid down, by the Christian Church—can be seen to have, also identified the lawlike way in which each such cosmogony's, and its behavior-programming schema (whether, I shall add here, *religious*, or as in our case *secular* with the transumed postulate of Malthusian *Natural Scarcity* and Darwinian *Natural Selection* reoccupying the place of enslavement to *Original Sin*⁹⁶) *must* therefore, be *narratively* elaborated, according to specific rules. That is, according to the same “good/bad” (story-line) terms, by means of which “the natural opioid system,” as defined by Avram Goldstein, functions directly and unmediatedly, to motivate/demotivate, the *species-specific* behaviors of all forms of [purely] biological life. This therefore means that what Girardot has identified, if not in these terms,⁹⁷ is the reality of the empirical functioning of laws specific to our *third level* and hybrid level of reality, as the level

⁹⁶ See for this Max Stackhouse, in his Foreword to Robert H. Nelson, *Economics as Religion: From Samuelson to Chicago and Beyond*. (University Park: Pennsylvania University Press, 2001). See also H.G. Brennan and A.M.C. Waterman eds. *Economics and Religion: Are They Distinct?* (Klower Academic Publisher, 1994).

⁹⁷ Girardot puts forward his thesis, in terms adapted from the anthropologist, Clifford Geertz, in his religious studies approach to the study of Taoism, a Chinese religion. See for this, N.J. Girardot, *Myth and Meaning in Early Taoism*, (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1983). I have freely paraphrased his major thesis.

itself only brought into existence by means of our behavioral praxis of being hybridly human. These, therefore, as the laws of auto-institution, which have hitherto functioned to ensure, that as the first price paid for our rupture with purely organic life, in order to auto-institute ourselves as human, in behaviorally self-programming, and therefore Fanonianly hybrid *bios* and *mythos/logos* (*theologos*, now-*biologos*) terms, we continue, and imperatively so, *to remain*, normally, *as subordinated to* our humanly invented cosmogonically chartered, sociogenic codes of symbolic *life/death*, these as the new replicator codes enacting of our *genre-specific* fictive (or *artificially speciated*) modes of kind, as all forms of purely biological living beings must remain subordinated to the biological laws, and DNA replicator codes⁹⁸ governing of their species-specific behaviors—this including their *eusocial* cooperative kin-recognizing behaviors.

In consequence, the second price that had had to be paid for the rupture of our First Emergence, has been from then until today, the fact that the limits of each *genre-specific* origin-story, because the limits also of the limits of the degrees of subjectively experienced psycho-affective inclusiveness defining of each such inter-altruistic mode of fictive mode of *kind*, also functions at the same time, as the imperative boundary of *psycho-affective closure* defining of each such referent *we*, of its *us*, as over against the *they* and the *not-us*. Consequently with all the wars, whether small-scale or large-scale, being waged from then on until now, *not* in terms of purely *biological preservation*, but instead in those of, on the one hand, the imperative preservation, or on the other, the exalted magnification, (this latter as in the case of all *imperial* wars) of each genre-specific group's mode of symbolic *life/death*, instituting of *its* fictive mode of kind, over against that of other groups. At the same time, as lawlikely correlated with the genre-specific mode of psycho-affective closure, defining of the limits of the referent *We* of each

⁹⁸ See for the concept of *replicator codes*, Richard Dawkin's essay "Universal Darwinism," in D.S. Berdall ed. *Evolution from Molecules to Man*, (Cambridge) Cambridge University Press, 1983.

such group, and its fictive mode of kind, has been the no less imperative functioning also, of what can be defined as that of the law of *cognitive* closure. That is, as this law functions at both the level of purely biologically species-specific modes of living being, and as well as, analogically, at that of the hybrid level of the *genre-specific* modes of living being that are our own. This, therefore, as the also supplementary price paid for the rupture effected by means of our First Emergence, from the subordination of the limits of our eusocial cooperative inter-altruistic kin-recognizing behaviors to the genetically pre-set limits defining of the primate family to which we, partly, belong.⁹⁹

As a result, therefore, if, as the cognitive scientist, Gerald Edelman has pointed out with respect to the functioning of the purely biological laws which govern all species-specific behaviors, that because each organism must, *lawlikely* “know” its environment in terms which conserve its *genetically* determined, “*descriptive statement*” of *what it is to be* that organism, and, must therefore, selectively, both categorize and know its environment in the *species-specific* “good/bad” terms that are adaptively advantageous to its realization and survival as such an organism, this means that the way each such organism “knows” and experiences reality, through its *species-specific* “perceptual categorization system,” *can in no way be concordant with the way that reality is outside its species-specific viewpoint*,¹⁰⁰ this was also to be the case with respect to the laws of human auto-institution that govern our *genre-specific* behaviors. In that we too, from the Event of our origin, must, if now doing so, as a now hybrid mode of living being, also selectively know and categorize our environment in the “good/bad” terms which ensure the conservation of our cosmogonically chartered code of symbolic *life/death*, and its second set of

⁹⁹ See for an excellent description of the origin of this law, that of cognitive closure, even where he does not define it as such, Nicholas Humphrey, *A History of the Mind: Evolution and the Birth of Consciousness* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1992).

¹⁰⁰ Gerald Edelman, in *Neural Darwinism: The Theory of Neuronal Group Selection* (New York, Basic Books, 1987).

instructions' *descriptive statement of what it is like to be* that genre-specific mode of living being; in terms, therefore, that are adaptively advantageous to its realization and survival *as such* a being. Thus the fact that the way in which we humans “know” and experience our social environment through our cosmogonically chartered sociogenic code's genre-specific “perceptual categorization system” (Althusser's Ideology), can also be *in no way concordant with the way that reality is outside* our sociogenic code's genre-specific viewpoint. Which therefore meant that in response to an existentially imperative “reasons of being” we too have, hitherto—as far as our knowledge of the social reality of the autopoetic (linguaging) living system, which called for us to know that reality in the *good/bad* terms of our genre-specific code's correlated behavior-motivating/demotivating schema that is the condition of our behavioral performative enactment as each such cosmogonically chartered mode of being human and its “fictive mode of kind” or referent *we—had* to also to remain, *normally*, subordinated to the law of cognitive closure defining of all forms of living being.

This is therefore the fundamental cause of the “cognitive dilemma” identified both by Yaganisako and Delaney ,and Derrida, in the case of Western secular academics, like ourselves. In that, once according to the laws of human auto-institution the cosmogonically inscribed/chartered, sociogenic code of symbolic *life/death*, autopoetically instituting of our genre specific fictive mode of kind—has been institutionalized, thereby determining the mode of institution of the social reality of the specific autopoetic linguaging living system, which is reciprocally, that is circularly and recursively, that genre-specific code's condition of existence, as the former is of its, we must necessarily know that social reality *not* in the terms that are concordant with the way that reality is, *outside* our present genre-specific codes view point, but instead, as it must *rigorously* be known (from the *inside*) in the adaptively advantageous

“good/bad” “perceptual categorization system” (Althusser’s Ideology) terms indispensable to the dynamic enactment and stable replication, both of our contemporary local “nation-state” sub-unites, and their *fictive* modes of kind, and as well, of the macro world system of the West in its now bourgeois or ethno-class configuration—that is, in its planetarily extended, and no less “fictive mode” of Liberal/Neo-Liberal democratic, civilizational kind.

It is therefore in this context, that of the overall price paid for the Event of our First Emergence as an autopoetically instituting hybrid mode of living being, that the far-reaching hypothesis put forward in 1999 by the French anthropologist, Maurice Godelier—when linked on the one hand, to the “particular wrong” put forward by W.E.B. Dubois in Epigraph 4—that is, to the wrong of himself, like the rest of the Black U.S. population at that pre-Sixties time, having to *experience* themselves, as a then disenfranchised, and apartheid/segregated *anomalies* to being [White] American in the greatest [Liberal] democracy on earth (one defined in Western bourgeois [or ethno-class] terms, as a democracy of *equal Breadwinners cum job-holding taxpayers*) and thereby correlatedly, within those same terms, as also anomalies to being fully human, and on the other, to the “*general wrong*”,¹⁰¹ identified in Epigraph 3, that of the catastrophic threat now posed to our very survival as a species by the ongoing and accelerating processes of *non-naturally* driven processes of global warming and climate change—alerts us to the dimensions of the new mutation that is now urgently called for. **That is, that of our Second Emergence this time round, from our continued subordination, as the price paid for that of the Event of our First Emergence—to our own *humanly invented* autopoetically instituted Origin narratives, and thereby to the latter’s mandated/prescribed replicator sociogenic codes of symbolic *life/death*—itself as an Emergence whose mutation can only be effected, from within the terms of the Ceremony Found’s new post-humanist Origin account and answer (one beyond**

101

the limits therefore of, our present world system's now globally hegemonic and homogenized answer and therefore *inter alia*, its empirically enacted, order-instituting bio-cosmogonically chartered Liberal-democratic and ethno-class "paradigm of justice," against which the "redemptive-prophetic" Rastafarian intellectuals of Jamaica have also projected their "gaze from below" religio-political millenarian counter-cosmogony; as one in which, Jah, their black God, as a new fount of justice, assures them (in one of Marley's songs) that as sons and daughters of Jah, "no one will sit on the sidewalk and beg bread," no "they won't"!

In his book, *The Enigma of the Gift*, Godelier, on the basis of his in-depth study of the Baruya people of New Guinea,¹⁰² puts forward the hypothesis that although as humans we have, from our origins, had, above all else, to first *produce* our societies, outside of which we cannot live as (nor indeed *be*) humans¹⁰³ nevertheless, while we have always done so, we have at the same time, consistently projected our own collective agency—by means of (the socio-technologies) of our "foundational myths," i.e., our origin/story cosmologies, onto millennially varying forms of *supernatural* agents—whether as *nature* spirits, *deified* ancestors, gods, goddesses, or whether as the relatively late, historically speaking, respective Invisible Sole and Single God(s), of the three Abrahamic monotheisms. Yet in *all* cases, doing so for the same purpose; *that of making our own empirical human agency opaque to ourselves*.

Why this imperative? Here Godelier's excellent in-depth analysis both of the "foundational myth" or mythic complex of Origin-stories instituting of the Baruya people (and therefore of in my own terms, their *fictive mode* of Baruya *kind*), and as well, of the way in

¹⁰² Translated by Norah Scott, (Chicago, Chicago University Press, 1999).

¹⁰³ Thus as the historian Bill Christian points out, *the first form of* (nomadic) social organization have been found on the continent of Africa, where *almost half of human history was lived*, before the first small groups, (carrying with them already invented matrix forms of autopoietic technologies instituting of human forms of social organization left Africa some 65,000 years ago, going on to people the planet). See for Christian, his *The Maps of Time: An Introduction to Big History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004).

which what is narrated in their “mythology” lawlikely correlates with “what goes on [empirically] in [their] society” uncovers a major corollary of the cognitive price originally paid for the mutation effected by the Third Event of our Origin as defined by our First Emergence; a corollary that continues to function for us (if in the now new terms, of our present Western and westernized and thereby purely secular bio-cosmogonically chartered world system) in the same analogically lawlike terms, that it does, as he shows, for the Baruya people and what would have been, before their colonization by the West, their then totally auto-centered cosmogonically chartered society.

Thereby as his analysis of their society enables us to see, this corollary, is that of the *existential imperative* of the subjects’ of each human society, *having to make* the empirical reality of our own collective human agency (even more so, the reality of our empirically *being directly responsible* for the “good” and the “bad” of each such order, together with the distributed ratios of “reward” and “punishment,” and centrally, therefore, for *its* systemically functioning order-instituting *paradigms of justice*), opaque to themselves/ourselves. This as the non-negotiable condition of their continued existence *as such* genre specific [sociogenic] subjects and fictive modes of kind and correlatedly, that of the continued dynamic enactment and stable replication of their/our respective societal orders as *autopoietic living systems*. With this existential imperative, being able to be now recognized as the lawlikely causal principle of the specific cognitive dilemma observed in our contemporary case by Yaganisako and Delaney as well as by Derrida; at the same time, as that dilemma can now be recognized, in turn, as the expression of the unique form that this dilemma has taken in the case of the West. That is as a dilemma which in the wake both of Godelier’s hypothesis and of his analysis of the Baruya people and their society, can itself be now identified as that of the West’s hitherto theoretically

unresolvable *aporia of the secular*; this as the *aporia*, whose conceptual non-resolvability, is also itself directly causal, at the empirical level both of the non-resolvability of the “particular wrong” of Epigraph 4¹⁰⁴ as of the only relatively recently recognized “general wrong” of Epigraph 2. Therefore, all of whose hitherto proposed “what is to be done” solutions, must themselves continue to function within the logic of our present world systemic society’s variant of the “*existential imperative*” identified by Godelier, as illustrated by his analysis of the “foundational myth” instituting the Baruya society, as of the empirical society so instituted.

His analysis of the Baruya society and people therefore reveals, *inter alia*, the following with respect to the functioning of the universally applicable existential imperative:

(i) That the foundational myth that is the overall Baruya mythic complex of Origin-stories, functions, by the very plot-ling of their narration, to *validate* the projection by the Baruya, of their own collective agency onto the magma of supernatural agents (including centrally, the Sun) who people their Castoriadis-type Imaginary.

(ii) That it is the projection of their own agency onto these latter agents, and as carried out by their mythic Origin-stories complex, that then functions to mandate and legitimate, not only the respective role allocations structuring of the order, but also *as well the inequalities between them*; most of all, given the politically *stateless* or *a-statal* nature of Baruya society (and therefore, the relatively egalitarian [i.e., non-stratified] relationships between *male* members of the group), to therefore also legitimate, the *large scale inequalities* between the men and women;

¹⁰⁴ This seeing that, if in the wake of while post the Sixties anti-apartheid civil rights movement a contemporary middle class intellectuals like DuBois has been electorally enfranchised, thereby made into an equal Breadwinner taxpayer citizen of the Liberal democracy of the U.S., this political incorporation has been made possible, only on the basis of the continued electoral disenfranchisement of the Black, Jobless, unskilled, non-Breadwinning, non-taxpaying category of the Black Poor, whose large-scale incarceration, largely on drug-possession charges not only deprives them of the vote, but enables the Black ghetto cum Gulag archipelago prison system extension, to reoccupy the pre-Sixties role played by a segregated Black population of all classes. That in Legesse’s term of the liminally deviant category of instituting of the normative order of the U.S.

this together, with in Butler's terms, the regulatory coercive practices of *gender* coherence that empirically produces this always already mythically chartered *inequality*.

(iii) That given, however, that both the inequalities as well as the regulatory practices of *gender* coercion, to which the women are subjected, are themselves a function of the overall regulatory practices of *genre-coherence*¹⁰⁵ indispensable to the autopoietic institution of the Baruya's mode of *fictive* kind" (which is *the telos* of the everyday functioning of the empirical society; (as well as of its founding mythic complex, and their/its narrative structures), serves to enable the subjects of the order, to *experience* their respective role allocations as ones which because supernaturally, that is, extra-humanly, ordained cannot be questioned (this including the role of those who most lose out, the women), and to thereby collectively continue to work towards the dynamic enactment and stable replication of the Baruya societal order, one itself made to be phenomenologically experienced by them, through the mediation of the mythic complex, as the realization of the "true" because (until the coming of the Western colonizers) *only possible order*.

(iv) That because, as his analysis further reveals, neither the Baruya society as a warrior *a-statal* society (that is, *without* the state's agencies of enforcement), nor indeed, what I shall define in my own terms, as their Baruya *fictive mode of kind*, (as based on their genre-specific *gendered* sociogenic code of symbolic *life/death*, itself chartered by the mythic complex), *could therefore have pre-existed*, nor indeed can *exist outside* that mythic complex, the reason for the

¹⁰⁵ Although Godelier does not use these terms, he nevertheless documents the difference between the *gendered* form of the divide (that is, in my own terms, of the genre-specific sociogenic code of symbolic *life/death*) that tends to be central to relatively egalitarian or non-stratified societies such as that of the Baruya, as contrasted with, for example, that of the stratified society of East Timor, where the gendered form of the divide or code, is transcended by another form. One in which a specific *clan* becomes *the* governing clan (men and women) over all other clans; therefore, with the gendered enactment of this new code now playing, only a reinforcing role: as it also does for example in our contemporary Westernized secular societies, where it is transcended by the code of *class*, with both in term transcended by the sociogenic code of symbolic *life/death*, enacting of the West's *Man* in its second reinvented form, and to which we give the ethno-taxonomic term of *race*.

existential imperative of their projection of their own agency (that is the projection carried out by the Baruya religious practitioners who are all men) onto *supernatural* agencies in order to make their own agency opaque to themselves, becomes clear.

For although Godelier himself, as a top-flight anthropologist, but also as a Western bourgeois subject, instituted as such in the *genre-specific bio-cosmogonically chartered* terms of the now biologically absolute (i.e., on the *model* of a natural organism) answer that the West's second, reinvented concept of *Man*, gives to the question of who we are, and therefore, as one for which both the *reality* and *relativity* of our genre-specific modes of *fictive kind*, *can not* be recognized to exist, given that this would entail the recognition of the *also genre-specific relativity* of its own answer)—fails to see that what he so excellently describes in his book, was/is precisely the autopoietic procedures and socio-technologies instituting of the genre-specific Baruya mode of *fictive kind*, as such a mode of kind¹⁰⁶ nevertheless, his analysis transcends *this* form of non-recognition. Doing so, by the far-reaching dimension of his other recognition that the *existential imperative* central to the Baruya's ritual ceremonies, that of their systemic making of their own empirical agency opaque to themselves, and, even more so, by his realization of the universally applicability of this imperative to all human societies, hitherto. For, in effect, what he has come upon, although not specifically identifying it as such, is

¹⁰⁶ As, for example, his excellent description of the central male initiation ceremonies which, in an originally *warrior* society as that of the Baruya, functions to give a second birth/rebirth to the male age group initiates in the *gendered* form of symbolic *life* defining of them no longer as “raw” biological males, but as men-of-the Baruya *fictive* mode of kind, therefore for whose defence or exaltation, they will now be prepared to give up their biological life. This, at the same time, as Godelier's description also makes clear, the initiates are made to *experience* by means of the same ritual ceremonies (including their being “fed” with male semen), their biological life as an inferiorized *negatively* marked form of life, one given birth to, by the systemically inferiorized category of the women, together with its particularistic “we-of-the-same-womb” *genetic* kinship loyalty, as a *secondary* form of life, and therefore of kinship loyalty, as contrasted with the *political* form of kinship based on of symbolic *life*, into which they are being *re-engendered* by the men. The former life, therefore, as defined by the bio-instinctual tendency towards biological self preservation, the desire for which, had to be *overridden* by the men, by means of their ritual ceremonies' *artificial* activation of Goldstein's *natural* opioid system in terms of the sociogenic code of symbolic *life*, as itself *mandated by their* foundational mythic complex, and brought into existence by means of the *initiation* procedures, of their *praxis*.

precisely the functioning of the regulatory laws governing all processes of *human autopoiesis* or of *auto-institution*. These as laws, which have, from our origin, prescriptively called for the socio-technology of the projection onto extra-human agencies of our own empirically collective agency, with the making of the reality of that agency “opaque to ourselves,” *being the very condition* of our being able—as an imperatively *eusocial* species, depending for our survival, realization, on levels of inter-altruistic kin-recognizing *cooperation*,¹⁰⁷ that now had to be *artificially* induced—to effect the mutation, that was that of our rupture *with* and first Emergence *from*, the *total* subordination of our behaviors, to the narrow preset Primate limits of kin-recognition/cooperation, as *biologically* prescribed by the “first set of instructions” of the DNA code of our species genome. Of our being able instead, by means of our Nietzschean-type “*labor upon* ourselves,”¹⁰⁸ and its correlated “second set of instructions” to auto-institute ourselves as the uniquely hybrid mode of living being that we are. As a result, because it was specifically by means alone of our humanly invented¹⁰⁹ and retroactively projected cosmogonies or “foundational myths” in their first matrix religious forms—as the forms which, for millennia were to mandate/prescribe the “second set of instructions” of the genre-specific sociogenic codes of symbolic *life/death* instituting of our *fictive* modes of inter-altruistic kin-recognizing kind, with this, therefore, ensuring in the case of the Baruya population studied by Godelier, the motivation of their behaviors *not* as *biological males/females*, but as *symbolically encoded Baruya-men-and-women*, the *why* of the existential imperative was to be the following:

(v) That because our “**fictive modes of kind**”, together with the cosmogonically

¹⁰⁷ See earlier the Novak note re: Three aspects of Evolution, *mutation*, cooperation, and selection, with the latter being only *one* of its self-organizing processes.

¹⁰⁸ Nietzsche’s *Basic Writings*, Ed., by Kaufman.

¹⁰⁹ E.O. Wilson, the biologist/sociobiologist, while agreeing that as mytho-poetic creatures we live in stories, proposes instead, from his biologically absolute perspective, as that of ethno-class *Man*, that is the brain which *creates* our chartering stories, rather than merely setting constraints on the patterns our chartering Origin stories must follow according to the laws of human auto-institution. See for this his *Foreword* to Loyal Rue’s *Everybody’s Story: Wising Up to the Epic of Evolution* (New York, NY State University Press, 2000).

mandated codes of symbolic *life/death* which institute them/us as such *kinds*, and correlated genres of being human, are *entities*, such as that of the Baruya or, as it is also in the case of the “imagined communities” of our present Western and westernized, purely secular to *nation-states*’ local modes of *fictive* kind, together with that of the West’s macro-world-system of civilizational kind in its bourgeois configuration into which they/we are incorporated--which can in no way exist in Nature, nor be given origin to *by bioevolutionary processes* (as ones that would, for example, have enabled such modes of kind to be *genetically* determined, and thereby *stabilized*), this therefore meant/and means that each human society’s projection of their/our own collective agency, for immeasurably long millennia onto *supernatural* (and therefore, *extra-human*) Agents, had been, as in many cases, it continues to be a lawlike function of the following existential imperative. That is, the imperative to guard *against the entropic falling apart* of their artificially instituted, symbolically encoded *fictive* modes of kind; against, therefore, the entropic disintegration of their societies, each of which as autopoietic living systems, are self-organized about the It of their genre-of-being-human, therefore about their also, *fundamentally humanly invented* replicator sociogenic codes of symbolic *life/death*; this analogously to the way in which, at the level of purely biological life, the beehive of the bee self-organizes itself about the It that is the DNA replicator code of the bee. Therefore, in our case, with the projection of each code’s original source onto a supernatural Agencies (having thereby served as an indispensable function of the stabilization of the code, whose *positive/negative, symbolic life/death* system of meanings, once implemented by the biochemistry, of the “natural opioid system” which that system of meanings has activated in its genre-specific terms has been transformed into a *living entity*: into “words-made-flesh”.

It is in the context of both of Godelier's analysis of the Bauruya, as well of his general hypothesis that the far-reaching world implications of Renaissance humanism's original counter-cosmogonic “back-to-the-pagan-classics” invention of *Man* as a *separate* notion from *Christian*, and thereby its initiation of what was to *the relativization* of Christianity's *theologically absolute answer* as one which until then *there could have been no other possible answer*, can be understood.

In that, in the context of Godelier's hypothesis, what that first act of *separation/relativization* of Renaissance humanism's new answer—its *relativization*, that is, medieval Latin Christian Europe's theologically absolute, and Divinely guaranteed answer, together with its projected “space of Otherness” complex which had mapped the symbolic *life/death* Divides of its code upon the physical level of reality¹¹⁰—had set in motion, was nothing less than the initiation of the processes by means of which the West was to *desupernaturalize* of the extra-human agencies onto which human groups had millennially projected the reality of their/our own collective Agency, from the Event of our origin as hybridly human, and according to the laws of human auto-institution which had emerged concomitantly with that Event/Origin. Thereby with this initiated process, of *relativization/desupernaturalization*, one further enforced by the West's second reinvented Liberal humanist answer—in the empirical wake of the U.S. French (Rights of Man vs. nobleman) revolutions, together with the *slave* revolution of Haiti—and as an answer that would further lead to the *privatization* of Christianity's supernaturally guaranteed absolute answer—coming to effect a discontinuous rupturing intervention of discontinuity into the millennially

¹¹⁰ In addition to the Heaven/Earth Divide the "sacred geography" of the medieval order, had also projected its *Redeemed Spirit/Fallen Flesh* code, onto a Divide between the habitable regions of the Earth, centered on Jerusalem, represented as the realm within the Christian God's Providential Grace and the *uninhabitable* regions of the Torrid Zone, and the Western Hemisphere, both represented as having been condemned to be *outside* that Grace.

extended order of human history hitherto. That is, onto the continuous process of the projection of the reality of our human agency onto the magma of humanly invented *supernatural* Agencies, as projections—which from our Origin, had functioned to ensure the *opacity*, to our normative (always already symbolically encoded) orders of consciousness, (each specific to its genre of being human and to its respective fictive mode of kind), of the reality of our own empirical auto-instituting human agency.

To ensure therefore the continued non-autonomy of our cognition with respect to the empirical reality *of all three levels of existence*, with this thereby enabling them to be known (as medieval Latin Christian Europe had to “know” the earth to be non-moving because post-adamically-divinely condemned to be fixed at the center of the universe as its dregs, and as the Baruya had to know the reality of the Sun as that of the Great Donor/Ancessor of the men, who were/are the embodiment of the code of symbolic *life*, in the same lawlikely abductive terms of “a mutually reinforcing system of presuppositions,” that had been indispensable to the continued enactment of their genre-specific *fictive mode of kind*, to their stabilization, together with that of their respective social orders, as autopoietic living systems.

Uniquely in the case of the post-medieval West, therefore, the setting in motion, by means of its two new answers, of the desupernaturalization of our projected Agency, was to lead to the recognition of the hitherto non-recognized principle of *natural causality*, in the reoccupied place of Christianity's hitherto unchallengeable principle of *Divine Causality*, and, in its wake, with the gradual uncovering of the reality of autonomously functioning laws of nature, as all processes of nature came to be recognized as self-organizedly functioning “*cursus solitus naturae*,”¹¹¹ With this new principle of causality having made possible the development of, firstly, the physical sciences, secondly the biological sciences, whose respective new orders of

¹¹¹ “In the accustomed or customary course of nature”.

self-correcting, open-ended cognition, would gradually come to free their respective levels-of-existence's *appropriate* domains of inquiry, from having to continue to be known in the abductive terms hitherto called for in order to ensure the *existential imperative* of guarding against the *entropic* disintegration of our *artificially*, i.e., autopoetically instituted, sociogenically encoded genres of being human, and correlated *fictive* modes of kind; the against the entropic disintegration also therefore, of their respective societal orders as autopoetic living systems.

Nevertheless, because the West was to effect this epochal *desupernaturalization* only *on the basis of its reprojection of its own human agency*, onto two, now no longer supernatural, but no less *extra-human* agencies, both chartered as such Agencies by the terms of the *humanist* counter cosmogonies instituting of their respective inventions of *Man*—the first reprojected onto the extra-human Agency of [the tropes of] *Nature/Human Nature*, the second onto that, not merely of Evolution (but of Evolution, as defined in the terms of Darwin's biocosmogonic charter instituting, in his 1871 *The Descent of Man, etc.*, of the West's *Man* in its second reinvented and specifically bourgeois form, as a *process* ostensibly defined exclusively by the “unerring powers of Natural Selection”/Dysselection, held to function at the level of human reality in exactly the same way it is held as to do at the purely biological level of existence—both forms of this reprojection, were to have specific consequences. Not only, that is, were they to charter Western humanism's two secular sociogenic codes enacting of each form of *Man* (as the incarnation of symbolic *life*), and of its Human Others (as the embodiment of symbolic *death*), as codes, therefore, to which we give the ethno-taxonomic term of *race*, since they and which can be logically enacted only on the basis of the West's negation of equal co-humanness, with all other groups. But, in addition, the very dimensions of the contradiction enacted by the West's *humanly emancipatory* desupernaturalization of Agency, on the one hand, and on the other, with

its effecting of the former process only on the basis of what was to be the *humanly subjugating* reprojection of its own Agency, onto also extra-human ones, that was to initiate from then on until now, the hitherto theoretically unresolvable *aporia of the secular*, unique to the West. This as an aporia that was not only to lead to the Janus-faced consequences of the past five hundred years of its imperial (now neo-imperial neo-Liberal) expansions, but continues to be expressed by the still ongoing—indeed accelerating—no less Janus-faced consequences to which its theoretical *unresolvability*, continues to give rise. This including centrally the also hitherto unresolvable nature of the *particular wrong* put forward by DuBois in Epigraph 4, as well as, correlatedly the "*general wrong*" identified in Epigraph 2.¹¹² With both of their respective unresolvabilities themselves (together, correlatedly, with the non-findability of the ceremony to fulfillingly wed, in Bishop's poetic terms, the Venetian Desdemona to the "Huge Moor" Othello) being directly due to the cognitive impasse to which its *aporia of the secular* continues to give rise.

That is, as one by means of which, the West, while coming over the centuries to exercise to the fullest, all of its new power to harness the forces of nature, to the imperially expanding purposes of its respective ruling groups, as a harnessing that had been empirically made possible, by means of the new, self-correcting natural-scientific open-ended order of cognition based on the principle of *natural causality*—with this including the latter's Pandora' box feat of the splitting the atom, this leading to, *inter alia*, nuclear weaponry in the form of the atomic bomb, on the one hand, and to that of the cracking of the DNA code, this also leading *inter alia* to biological weaponry on the other—nevertheless with respect to its ongoing orthodox cognition of the empirical social reality of the planetarily extended world system that it has brought into

¹¹² The reference here is to the Marxian thesis that is only when the *particular wrong* experienced by specific groups, coincide with a "general wrong" experienced by all, that revolutionary *transformations* of the normative social order, becomes possible.

existence, it was to be the invertedly negative, and therefore, humanly subjugating aspect, that would come to the fore. In that, as a result of its reprojection of its own, and indeed of all humankind's collective empirical agency, onto two forms of non-supernatural but no less extra-human agencies, not only its own Western academics and intellectuals but also, all of us whom it has westernized the image of its own prototype of being human,¹¹³ would, with respect to the cognition of the social reality of the planetarily extended world system order that it has brought into existence, (and into which we are all Western and non-western, secular and non-secular now both *bio-cosmogonically* and *empirically* incorporated) continue to take part in and rigorously reenact, the millennially, supra-millennially conserved *existential imperative of the making opaque* to ourselves the reality of our collective human agency. Yet, this latter as the very existential imperative, that if the West was to, on the one hand, epochally challenge by means of the interventionist discontinuity of its *relativization* of medieval Christianity' theologically absolute answer, thereby initiating the desupernaturalization of the entities onto which the reality of our human agency had been millennially projected, because it was one that was to be, on the other hand, and in the reference frame of the *aporia of the secular*, effected only on the basis of its reprojection of that agency onto new [secular] extra-human ones, it (the West) would be compelled to continue to recycle and reconfigure, at the level of that same existential imperative

¹¹³ If the multiple challenges of the anti-colonial struggles, together with those of the Sixties movements in the imperial centers themselves, had originally, when functioning *together, called in question*, empirically and intellectually, the West's prototype of being human in its second reinvented and hegemonically bourgeois concept of *Man*, as, in bio-humanist terms, *homo oeconomicus*, Frantz Fanon was to precisely diagnose the reasons, especially in the case of the non-Western anti-colonial struggles, for our failure (as indeed for my own failure in the 1894 essay) to reenact the dimension of the autopoietic heresy, now called for. As he wrote in his 1963 *Les Damnés de la Terre*:

Western Bourgeois racial prejudice as regards the nigger and the Arab is a racism of contempt; it is a racism which minimizes what it hates. Bourgeois ideology, however, which is the proclamation of an essential equality between men, manages to appear logical in its own eyes *by inviting the sub-men to become human, and to take as their prototype Western humanity as incarnated in the Western bourgeoisie* (Emphasis added).

(that of making our own agency opaque to ourselves); if now doing so in now far more dangerous because (as in the new wave of neo-Liberal thought including economics and evolutionary psychology),¹¹⁴ ostensibly now doing so on *natural scientific* grounds.

It is in this overall context that our continued re-enactment of the same existential imperative, identified by Godelier, in the case of the Baruya, can now be seen to directly collide with another and unique form of that existential imperative, one hitherto unimaginable, yet one in direct response to a now "general wrong" one, as briefly indicated in Epigraph 2—which we are all now being called upon to confront and deal with, this for the first time in human history, *as a species*; and as such, as the referent "we...of the horizon of humanity." Our ultimate predicament that is, as that of the acceleratingly threatening loss of the climatic-ecological *habitat conditions*, indispensable to our species survival/realization and continued performative enactment as the uniquely auto-instituting, hybrid mode of living being, that we are, and therefore through whom alone, the self-organizing macro-system that is our planet, Earth, now has the paradoxical possibility of becoming at last, through us, fully conscious of itself. If, that is, we ourselves are to survive, in spite of the fact that we have so little time left to actualize the nature of the hitherto (millennially prohibited) heresy of securing the *non-opacity* of our own agency, and with it, the full autonomy of the new order of cognition that is now imperatively called for. This latter as one without whose realization—no effective "what is to be done" solution, can be found either to Dubois' "particular wrong" on the one hand, (Epigraph 4) nor to the "general wrong," as set out above, and both of which are reciprocally, as results of the enacting of the same sociogenic code, the causal condition of each other. As is, the non-

¹¹⁴ See for this Susan McKinnon, *Neo-Liberal Genetics: The Myths and Moral Tales of Evolutionary Psychology* (Chicago, Prickly Paradigm Press, 2005).

findability of Bishop's ceremony, to breach the Divides enacting of that very same sociogenic code of symbolic *life/death*, that of the West's *Man*, in its second reinvented form.

For if, as Time magazine reported in January 2007 (Epigraph 2), a U.N. Inter-governmental panel of Natural Scientists, were soon to release “a smoking-gun report which confirms that *human activities* are to blame for global warming” (and thereby for climate change), and had therefore predicted “catastrophic disruptions by 2100,” by April, the issued Report not only confirmed the above, but also repeated *the* major contradiction which the Time account had re-echoed.

This contradiction, however, has nothing to do in any way with the rigor, and precision of their *natural scientific findings*, but rather with the contradiction referred to by Derrida's question in Epigraph 3—i.e., But who, we? That is, their attribution of the non-natural factors driving global warming and climate change to, *generic human activities*, and/or to “*anthropocentric forcings*”; with what is, in effect, this *mis-attribution* then determining the nature of their policy recommendations to deal with the already ongoing reality of global warming and climate change, to be ones couched largely in *economic* terms. That is, in the terms of our present mode of knowledge production, and its “perceptual categorization system” as elaborated by the disciplines of the Humanities and Social Sciences (or “human sciences”) and which are **reciprocally enacting of our present sociogenic genre of being human, as that of the West's *Man* in its second Liberal or bio-humanist reinvented form, as *homo oeconomicus*; as optimally “virtuous *Breadwinner, taxpayer, consumer*, and as systemically over-represented as if it, and *its* behavioral *activities* were isomorphic with the being of being human, and thereby with *activities* that would be definable as the human-as-a-species ones.**

Consequently, the Report's authors because logically taking such an *over-representation* as an empirical fact, given that, as highly trained natural scientists whose domains of inquiry are the physical and (purely) biological levels of reality, although their own natural-scientific order of cognition with respect to their appropriate non-human domains of inquiry, is an imperatively self-correcting and therefore, necessarily, a *cognitively open/open-ended* one, nevertheless, because in order to *be* natural scientists, they are therefore necessarily, at the same time, *middle class* Western or westernized subjects, *initiated*¹¹⁵ as such, by means of our present overall education system and its mode of knowledge production to be the optimal symbolically encoded embodiment of the West's *Man*, its second reinvented bio-humanist *homo oeconomicus*, and therefore bourgeois self-conception, over-represented as if it were isomorphic with the being of being human, they also fall into the trap identified by Derrida in the case of his fellow French philosophers. The trap, that is, of conflating their own existentially experienced (Western-bourgeois or ethno-class) referent "we," with the "we" of "the horizon of humanity." This then leading them to attribute the reality of *behavioral activities* that are *genre-specific* to the West's *Man* in its second reinvented concept/self-conception as *homo oeconomicus*, ones that are therefore as such, as a *historically* originated *ensemble of behavioral activities*—as being ostensibly *human activities-in-general*. This, in spite of the fact that they do historicize the origin of the processes that were to lead to their recent natural scientific findings with respect to the reality of the *non-naturally caused* ongoing acceleration of global warming and climate change, identifying this process as having begun with the [West's] Industrial Revolution from about 1750

¹¹⁵ The institution of *initiation* as originally invented by the so-called "primitive" peoples of the first *nomadic* human societies of Black Africa, is *the* institution specific to all human societies, whether given the Greek name of *paideia* or of our *education systems*. See in this respect, Anne Solomon's description of the Rock Paintings of the ancient San of the Kalahari, some of whose groups have been proven to be genetically nearest to *our real life empirical* human ancestors—that is, not Adam and Eve. Central to these Rock Paintings, she found were *initiation* Ceremonies, many of which were specific to the women. In *Scientific American* Nov. 1990.

onwards. That is, therefore, as a process that can be seen to have been correlatedly concomitant in Great Britain, both with the growing expansion of the largely bourgeois enterprise of factory manufacturing, as well with the first stages of the *political* and *intellectual* struggles the British bourgeoisie who were to spearhead the Industrial Revolution, to displace the then ruling group hegemony of the *landed* aristocracy cum gentry, and to do so, by *inter alia*, the autopoietic reinvention of the earlier *homo politicus/virtuous citizen* civic humanist concept of *Man*, which had served to *legitimate* the latter's traditionally *landed*, political, social and economic dominance, in new terms. This beginning with Adam Smith and the Scottish School of the Enlightenment in the generation before the American, French, and Haitian (*slave*) revolutions, as a reinvention that was to be effected in now specifically *bourgeois* terms as *homo oeconomicus/and virtuous Breadwinner*.¹¹⁶ That is as the now purely secular genre of being human, which although not to be fully (i.e., politically, intellectually, and economically) institutionalized until the mid-nineteenth century, onwards, when its optimal incarnation came to be actualized in the British and Western bourgeoisie as the new ruling class, was, from then on, to generate its prototype specific ensemble of new *behavioral activities*, that were to impel both the Industrial Revolution, as well as the West's second wave of imperial expansion, this based on the colonized incorporation of a large majority of the world's peoples, all coercively *homogenized* to serve its own *redemptive material telos*, the telos initiating of global warming and climate change.

Consequently, if the Report's authors note that about 1950, a steady process of increasing acceleration of the processes of global warming and climate change, had begun to take place, this was not only to be due to the Soviet Revolution's (from 1917 onwards) forced march towards industrialization (if in its still *homo oeconomicus* conception, since a march spearheaded by the

¹¹⁶ See the already cited essay by J.G.A. Pocock

“symbolic capital,” education credentials owning and technically skilled Eastern European bourgeoisie)—as a state-directed form of capitalism, nor indeed by that of Mao’s then China, but was to be also due to the fact that in the wake of the range of successful anti-colonial struggles for political independence, which had accelerated in the wake of the Second World War, because the new entrepreneurial and academic elites had already been *initiated* by the Western educational system in Western terms as *homo oeconomicus*, they too would see political independence as calling for industrialized development on the “collective bovarysme”¹¹⁷ model of the Western bourgeoisie.

Therefore, with the acceleration of global warming and climate change gaining even more momentum as all began to industrialize on the model of *homo oeconomicus*, with the result that by the time of the Panel’s issued April 2007 Report the process was now being driven by a now planetarily homogenized/standardized transnational “system of material provisioning or mode of techno-industrial economic production based on the accumulation of capital; as the means of production of ever-increasing economic growth, defined as “development”; with this calling for a *single model of normative behavioral activities*, all driven by the now globally (post-colonially and post-the-1989-collapse-of-the-Soviet Union), *homogenized desire* of “all men (and women) to,” realize themselves/ourselves, in the terms of *homo oeconomicus*. In the terms, therefore, of “its single (Western-bourgeois or ethno-class) understanding” of “man’s humanity,” over-represented as that of the human; with the *well-being* and *common good* of its referent “we”—that, not only of the transnational middle classes but even more optimally, of the corporate multinational business industries and their financial networks, both indispensable to

¹¹⁷ See the quotation from Fanon on p .39 re the mimetic trap into which all of us, as the former colonized “natives” or *sub-men*, had fallen in the wake of political independence. The phrase *collective boarysme* was coined by the Haitian scholar Price-Mars for the Haitian elites to identify the nature of their failure in the wake of the Haitian Revolution, until today

the securing of the Western-bourgeois conception of the *common good*, within the overall terms of the behavior-regulatory *redemptive material telos* of ever-increasing economic growth, put forward as the Girardot-type “cure” for the projected Malthusian-Ricardo transmuted postulate of a “significant ill” as that, now, ostensibly, of mankind’s threatened subordination to [the trope] of *Natural Scarcity*, this in the reoccupied place of Christianity of its postulate of that “ill” as that of enslavement to Original Sin.¹¹⁸ With the result that the very ensemble of behavioral activities indispensable, on the one hand, to the continued hegemony of the bourgeoisie as a Western and westernized transnational ruling class, is the same ensemble of behaviors that is directly causal of global warming and climate change, as they are, on the other, to the continued dynamic enactment and stable replication of the West’s second reinvented concept of *Man*; this latter in response to the latter’s existential imperative of guarding against the entropic disintegration of its genre of being human and fictive nation-state mode of kind. Thereby against the possible bringing to an end, therefore, of the societal order, and autopoietic living Western and westernized macro world system in its bourgeois configuration, which is reciprocally the former’s (i.e., its genre of being human, and fictive modes of kind’s condition of realization, at a now global level.

This, therefore, is *the cognitive dilemma*, one arising directly from the West’s hitherto unresolvable *aporia of the secular*, that has been precisely captured by Sven Lutticken in a recent essay. Despite, he writes, “the consensus that global warming cannot be ascribed to normal

¹¹⁸ See for this the earlier cited reference to the Foreword by Max Stackhouse, as he writes, *inter alia*, [Robert H. Nelson’s] insightful historical analysis showed that:

many of the classic founders of the field of economics not only were guided by theological assumptions but also viewed the field in messianic terms. That is, they presumed that the primary reason for human pain, suffering, and death (what theologians identify as a consequence of sin in a fallen world) is that we are in a state of scarcity. Moreover, we can only be delivered from this perilous existence by the overcoming of material deprivation—a prospect that can only come from rightly formulated, rightly believed, and rightly lived principles and policies. Economics can deliver us, bring about a redeemed state of affairs on earth, and led us to abundant living—the *material incarnate form of salvation* (Emphasis added).

fluctuations in the earth's temperature...[the] *social and political components of this process have been minimized; man-made nature is re-naturalized, the new (un)natural history presented as fate.*" And with this continuing to be so because (within the terms, I shall add, of our present "single understanding of man's humanity" and the unresolvable aporia which it continues to enact), "[t]he truly terrifying notion is not that [global warming and climate change] is irreversible, but that it actually might be reversible—at the cost of radically changing the economic and social order..."¹¹⁹ The changing, thereby, of the now globally hegemonic biologically absolute answer that we at present give to the question to who we are, and of whose biohumanist *homo oeconomicus* symbolic *life/death* (i.e., *naturally selected/dysselected*) code's intentionality of dynamic enactment and stable replication, our present "economic and social order" is itself the empirical actualization.

In this context, and as Godelier's in-depth study of the Baruya (and therefore in my own terms, of the autopoietic instituting processes by means of which they collectively produce themselves as men and women of their *fictive* modes of kind), reveals their mode of material provisioning (mode of economic production, in the terms of our present bio-episteme, its Foucauldian "order of words and things") is, a genre-specific one, that is, one whose function is *not* to materially provision the Baruya, as *biological men and women*, but instead to materially provision them as (the always already *symbolically encoded*) men and women of their *fictive mode of kind*, that they are. Consequently because this itself is a function also, of the existential imperative of ensuring the dynamic enactment and stable reproduction of themselves and their society—this latter as an autopoietic living system, self-organized about the *bio-cosmogonically* chartered replicator sociogenic code of symbolic *life/death*, as the Baruya's *gendered* form of the It, which is also the condition of their performative enactment of themselves and their *mode*

¹¹⁹ Sven Lutticken, "Unnatural History" in *New Left Review*, 45, May/June 2007, pp. 115-132.

of kind as the (*non-natural entity*) *Baruya*, what becomes *overturningly* clear here, is the following: that what we define in our now ethno-class terminology *as modes of economic production*, rather, than being *the determinant* factor they are now to be held out to be, are instead an indispensable, but only *proximate* function, of the overriding telos of *Baruya* society, which is that of its mode of auto-institution; in effect, that of its mode of production and reproduction of the *Baruya*'s genre of being human, and, thereby, of its *fictive* mode of kind.

In consequence, because I propose, according to the laws of human auto-institution regulatory of our third and hybrid level of reality, this can be no different with respect to, in Lutticken terms, our present "economic and social order," this means that our present hegemonic mode of material provisioning, (in contemporary terms, our present mode of economic production), must, as lawlikely, function (like the *Baruya*'s) *not to provision the human species and their multiple class of classes modes of fictive kind*, but instead *only to materially provision the Western and westernized members of the bourgeoisie (i.e., the middle classes), and to so provision them/us, not merely as biological men and women, but rather as men and women of their/our fictive nation-state mode of Western (and westernized) bourgeois kind*. That is, as ethno-class *homo oeconomicus* men and women who are optimally Breadwinners and as such, *able-to-consume*-consumers (and who also, as Breadwinning *taxpayers* are the *normal*, citizens of, and therefore imperatively, the *normal* electoral majority subjects of, the bourgeois political order of Liberal democracy).¹²⁰ Nevertheless because our present mode of knowledge production, and centrally so, the discipline of economics over-represents our present genre-specific mode of material provisioning, that of the Free-market Liberal/neo-Liberal capitalism,

¹²⁰ The U.S. overthrow of Aristide's Haiti had to do with the fact that while an electoral majority of the Poor can exist (as in today's South Africa) the government of a *Liberal democracy can only respond to the interests* of the middle classes. Aristide's attempt to respond to his poor electoral mass base threatened therefore, the *very logic* of Liberal democracy; hence his U.S. France/Canada overthrow, with the aid of the Haitian middle classes.

as if it were a mode of standardized, homogenized globally incorporated economic production, able to materially provision not merely *Man's* referent middle-class *we*, but also that of the ecumenical “we of the horizon of humanity,” the Report’s author’s logical acceptance of this normative over-representation, led to a second derivative contradiction.

This is so in that, although it documents the fact that as the catastrophic disruptions being brought about by global warming and climate change, have begun to be felt, they have begun to be felt *unequally*, that is with the major costs, already being borne by the poorer peoples and regions of the planet, this at the same time as their comparative data also make it clear, that the *unequal differentials* of the costs, that are already being borne, and that are expected to rapidly accelerate in the future, lawlikely follow the Western world system’s (in, from the nineteenth century onwards, its bourgeois configuration), already institutionalized *Color Line* cum *developed/underdeveloped* Lines (as themselves part of that system’s order-stabilizing projected “space of Otherness” complex of Divides, including centrally its White/Black and Rich/Poor Divides), and thereby with the highest costs coming to be borne by those on the *negative side* of the *development/underdevelopment* Line,¹²¹¹²²—nevertheless the Report’s *isolation* of the processes of global warming and climate change *from* the interconnected system of *underside costs* to which it belongs, (if due conceptually to our present episteme’s divide between the

¹²¹ This, as in the case of Black Africa, which although only responsible—as the least “*developed*” continent—for 3% of the contribution to the processes driving global warming, has nevertheless already begun to pay the price of accelerated drought and large-scale desertification as are other countries such like Bangladesh, Nepal, India and China, who are paying the price with large-scale floods together with the poorer parts of the U.S. and the Caribbean, who pay the price of intensified hurricanes. This price also includes social conflicts, for example, the ongoing land-grab from, and genocidal “ethnic cleansing” of, Black African Muslim agriculturalists by Arab identified Islamic Janjaweed militia in Darfur Sudan has also been made possible in part by the spreading drought driving “process of desertification,” now effecting the latter who are cattle-keeping pastoralists.

¹²² For example, the ongoing land-grab from, and genocidal “ethnic cleansing” of, Black African Muslim agriculturalists by Arab identified Islamic Janjaweed militia in Darfur Sudan is also made possible in part by the spreading drought driving “process of desertification.”

natural sciences and what are called “the human sciences”), necessarily leads to the partial, not to say the irrelevant, nature of its policy prescriptions.

Seeing that, because this interconnected series of underside costs, can *in no way* be addressed by the Report’s prescriptions for dealing with only *one*—if the most intractable—of these costs, this means that the fundamental principle of causality that underlies the overall system of *underside* costs—a system recently identified by the environmentalist research scholar, Gerald Barnley as that on a planetary scale, of a dynamically interacting single *global problematique*, must necessarily be overseen, indeed, remain, normally unseeable. Give that it is our specific mode of material provisioning, that of our present *techno-industrial* mode of economic production in its Free Market capitalist modality, and therefore as such, one indispensable, from the mid-nineteenth century onwards, until today, to the dynamic enactment of the West’s second reinvented concept of *Man* in its now bio-humanist, *homo oeconomicus* prototype terms, together with its systemic over-representation as being isomorphic with the being of being human, that has lawlikely led to Barnley’s *global problematique’s* interconnected series of underside costs, including centrally that of global warming and climate change. These as *costs*, that are the lawlike underside conditions of its (*Man’s*) now planetarily extended, homogenized (now post-Sixties Internet standardized) ongoing dynamic enactment (in iconic “American Dream” terms) and stable replication; the costs therefore of our present single *poverty-hunger-habitat-energy-trade-population-atmosphere-waste-resource* global *problematique*.¹²³ Yet, whose continued enactment, which must remain non-recognized as the *cause* of its costs.

¹²³ Paul Hawken, the environmental activist, documents in a recent book the dynamic reality of Barnley’s interconnected underside costs—that is, as a system in which while on the one hand, “species extinction, together with degrees of human poverty continue to abound,” profits dialectically “continue to soar”—for example, today (i.e., 2007) while “[t]he world’s *top 200 companies have twice the assets of 80 percent of the world’s people*,” the

This given that because according to the laws of human auto-institution, as they are can be seen to function in the case of the Baruya, *the telos* of each human society, *is the mode of institution* of its cosmogonically chartered sociogenic genre of being human (each in terms of its sociogenic code of symbolic *life/death*), this correlatedly with its fictive mode of kind, therefore, with each such society's specific mode of material provisioning, having to be an indispensable function of that telos, this means that this is no less so, in the case of our contemporary economic and social order's hegemonic mode of autopoetic institution in the genre-specific terms of the biologically absolute, and bio-cosmogonically chartered answer that *Man as homo oeconomicus* must give to the question of who we are.

It is therefore the "general wrong" of this *global problematique* and the imperative nature of finding its solution, by means of its bringing to an end, in response to which, together with the correlated "particular wrong" of Epigraph 4, (as *the* wrong which also makes Bishop's poetic Ceremony non-findable), that the Ceremony Found's new revalorizing answer to the question of who we are, *initiates* the recognition of this hitherto non-recognized principle of causality. That is, as that of the *autopoetic*, because *cosmogonic-sociogenic causal principle*, which drives all our human behaviors, in genre-specific terms; those, therefore, of our cosmogonically chartered, symbolically encoded, prescriptive sociogenically encoded forms of symbolic *life/death* and their correlated fictive modes of *kinds*, whose autopoetic institution they make possible. In effect, the retroactive causal principle of each group's (Yaganisako and Delaney's) "representation of origins" as the Weberian "web that we spin for ourselves," *and outside of which*, if we are to be

same dynamic also ensures that "that asset base is growing 50 times faster than the income of the world's majority," itself as an acceleration proportionally linked to that of increasing global warming and climate change. Paul Hawken, *Blessed Unrest: How the Largest Movement in the World Came Into Being, and Why No One Saw It Coming* (Viking Press, 2007).

the *we who we are*—that is, an always *fictive* mode of a referent *we*¹²⁴—we cannot live. Nor outside the always already mandated sociogenically encoded terms auto-poetically instituting of us as that *we*, can we ever normally know our no less always already cosmogonically chartered order of social reality and/or autopoetic living system, outside the genre-specific “perceptual categorization system” or mode of knowledge, production that it needs for its own enactment and stable replication, as such an order of social reality, and/or autopoetic living system.

Consequently, if as Godelier’s analysis of the Baruya makes clear, although he, as a non-Baruya, could gain the kind of *outside* knowledge of their societal order, and autopoetic living system, which enables him both to recognize one of the costs paid for *its* enactment, that of the empirical reality of the violence shown to the women by the men, including their deprivation from any access to the levers of power, and as well, to see that this form of injustice inherent in Baruya society, is itself, chartered and legitimated by the mythic complex, or “representation of origins” instituting of the Baruya as a people, nevertheless, they (the Baruya) *could have knowledge* of their social reality *only* from the *inside*. That is, in the *emic* terms of the mode of knowledge production indispensable to the enactment and stable replication of their genre of being human, their *fictive* mode of kind, and of the societal order/living system, which is the condition of their being who they are, this according to the laws of human auto-institution, this is no less the case with respect to the “human sciences” of our present bioepistemic mode of knowledge production. That is, as disciplines whose domain of inquiry is precisely our present planetarily extended order of social reality as that of the West’s macro-world system, in its bourgeois configuration, and as an autopoetic living system, now incorporating, willy/nilly, of us

¹²⁴ Yet with the caveat that in all forms of highly stratified society such as ours, it is not merely the *ruling ideal class* as Marx proposed, that are those of the ruling class. So also and more comprehensively so, are the *ruling representation of origins* (which gives rise both to the *ruling ideas*) are always, as in the case of the Western bourgeoisie, the representation of origins chartering of the ruling group’s ruling status or “oecconomy of greatness” in Adam Smith’s apt phrase.

all. Thus the specific hitherto theoretically irresolvable issue that I have defined as that of the West's *aporia of the secular*. In that if by its unique relativization and desupernaturalization of the forms of extra-human agency onto which we had millennially projected our own agency, the West had enabled the two levels of non-human existence and their domains of inquiry, to be freed, by means of the natural sciences from having to continue to be known in the cognitively closed, abductive terms called for by *the* existential imperative hitherto instituting of us as hybrid living beings and thereby as a third level of existence, its reprojection of its own human agency, onto two other (invented) forms of now purely secular extra-human agency, and reenactment of the same millennial existential imperative had entailed a corollary. This that the order of cognition of our present disciplines of the Social Sciences and the Humanities [Fanon's "human sciences" in Epigraph 6) has had to, and lawlikely so, continue to function as the contemporary expression of that first invented and millennially conserved order of cognition; that is as one first invented, by those classified by our present system "human sciences" order of knowledge, one that we have inherited from them, as "primitive".¹²⁵

That is, as a form of cognition which responded and responds to the fact that once according to the laws of human auto-institution, the cosmogonically inscribed/chartered, sociogenic code of symbolic *life/death*, autopoetically instituting of our genre specific fictive

¹²⁵ Paul Feyerabend has identified this first form of traditional cognition in his book, *Farewell to Reason* (London, New York, Verso, 1987), and which is the same form of knowledge production, identified by A.M. Hocart as that of a macrocosmic/microcosmic system of thought common to all societies (in his 1936/1970 book, *Kings and Councilors, etc.*) and by Gregory Bateson in his 1979 book, *Mind and Nature, etc.*, as an abductive order of thought also common to all human societies, but which is to be seen *in its most pristine* form, in the *totemic* religious thought of the indigenous (i.e., pre-settler, pre-immigrant) peoples of Australia. While this same form of thought was identified by P.F. Moraes-Farias (in a 1980 essay as one that is based on a "knowledge of [order-instituting] categories," rather than on "knowledge of *the world as it is*"). As Feyerabend writes with respect to this:

To say that a procedure or a point of view is objective(ly true) is to claim that it is valid irrespective of human expectations, ideas, attitudes, wishes. This is one of the fundamental claims which today's scientists and intellectuals make about their work. *The idea of objectivity*, however, is older than science and independent of it. It arose whenever a nation or tribe or a civilization identified its way of life with the laws of the (*physical and moral*) universe" (Emphasis added).

mode of kind, has been institutionalized, thereby determining the mode of institution also of the social reality of the specific autopoietic languaging living system, which is reciprocally, that is, circularly and recursively, that genre-specific code's condition of existence, as the former is of its, then the overall system, because now self-organizing itself about the It of that specific sociogenic code of symbolic *life/death*, must lawfully enact itself, as in Francisco Varela's terms, a *higher level* system.¹²⁶ Therefore, one to which, given the systemic closure, both cognitive, aesthetic, and organizational, that is the condition of each such self-organizing living systems' autonomous functioning, its subjects, whether at the purely biological level of bees with respect to their beehive, or in that of ourselves with respect to the hybridly *Word/Nature* [*logos/bios*] human level that is own—*can normally have no directly cognizing access*. **Access that is, from a *metasystemic* perspective, and therefore, *outside* the terms in which the system *must be normally known from the inside*, by its subjects, in the *good/bad* “perceptual categorization” terms that are adaptively advantageous to the securing of the well being of its sociogenic code or prototype of being human, together with that of its correlated mode of fictive kind or *referent we*; terms therefore that are indispensable to both the code's and the overall system's symbolically encoded intentionality of stable replication.**

Therefore, with our inability to have cognitive *access to the higher level system* of which we are subjects—as an inability, that in our secular case was to arise from the West's *reprojection* of our human agency onto agencies that were no less extra-human if now desupernaturalized, and therefore as such, an inability linked to the fact that we too, as secular Western or westernized academics and intellectuals, must nevertheless also continue to make the empirical reality of our collective human agency as “opaque to ourselves,” doing so as lawfully

¹²⁶ Francisco Varela. *Principles of Biological Autonomy*. (1979)

as the Baruya's religious-intellectuals or "grammarians,"¹²⁷ continue to make opaque the reality of their own agency to themselves. Yet, as an inability that in our case, as in that of the Baruya, leads to the real life consequences, ones directly due to our present mode of knowledge production, whose overriding telos is that of (as is that the Baruya's) the rigorous elaboration, (indeed, the *work* of providing¹²⁸) the genre-specific order of knowledge indispensable to the stable replication and enactment of our present genre of being human, its *fictive* modes of kind, and overall, the global social reality of its autopoetic living macro-world system. With this telos thereby entailing, that, as in the case of the Baruya's dynamic of gendered inequality, the *increasing inequality* reported by Hawken, together with that of Barnley's overall *global problematique*, including that of the also increasing processes of global warming and climate change, continue, on a daily basis, *to sacrifice* the interest of the referent "we" of our *species being*—as that of the Derrida's "we of the horizon of humanity"—to the existential imperative of securing, and stably replicating the genre-specific interests of ethno-class *Man*, its prototype of being human, of *its* referent *we*.

In this context, if it is precisely the making possible of such a metasystemic, indeed metacosmogonic perspective, as an *outside perspective* that the Autopoetic Turn/Overturn, as the proposed praxis of Césaire's new and hybrid science of the Word-as-the-Fanonian-sociogenic-code, will set out to effect, indeed with such a perspective coming to be defining of what is to now be *its* new *Studia*, it can only do so in the framework of the Ceremony Found's new post-humanist Account of Origin. That is, as one whose projected *class of classes Origin-Model of Auto-institution*, because able to *contain* the magma of all "local" Origin stories/Accounts and their genre-specific respective autopoetic "representations of origin" as

¹²⁷ See for this concept Asmarom Legesse, *Gada: Three approaches to the Study of African Society*. 1973.

¹²⁸ See in this respect, the pathbreaking essay by Demetrius Eudell, "Modernity and the Work of History," in A. Bogues, ed. *After Man, Towards the Human: Critical Essays on Sylvia Wynter*.

member classes of its own, will thereby enable its new Studia's, *relativizing* of our present globally hegemonic "part science, part myth" Origin-Model/Account or biocosmogony of Darwinian Evolution (as defined in terms of [the trope of] "the unerring powers of Natural Selection")—by revealing it to be but *one* (if the first purely secular) *member-class*, of the Ceremony Found's own *classes of classes*.¹²⁹ As a *relativization*, that will then further enable the new Studia's systemic *separation* of the being of being human-as-a-species, *from* that of our now globally homogenized, conceptually and empirically institutionalized hegemonic genre and/or prototype of being human, as that of the West's *Man* it its now second reinvented Liberal-humanist *homo oeconomicus*, conception. Specifically, in its bourgeois or ethno-class self-conception as optimally "virtuous Breadwinner-cum-taxpayer-cum-"high-worth Investor," and, more recently, in fundamentalist Neo-Liberal terms, as optimally as *the financial bourgeois*, i.e., as *capital accumulator* and affluent *over-class* savvy consumer, yet even in this predatory form, still over-represented as if its genre-specific interests and conception of the common good (that of, in the still iconic *ruling ideas* terms of Adam Smith, "the wealth of nations"), could in anyway be isomorphic with what *the* interests and "common good" of the *class of classes* of our species being whose referent *we* is that of the *we* of the "horizon of humanity" would necessarily have to be, as the Studia's further deconstruction of this rhetorical strategy of over-representation will make apparent.

¹²⁹ See for this the formulation made by Whitehead and Bertrand Russell with respect to be difference that exists between a *class of classes* (i.e., "machinery") and a mere *member* of the class (i.e., tractors, cranes, etc). In this context, the rhetorical strategy, that cited earlier, and as defined by Paolo Valesio as that of the *topos* of iconicity, by means of which the West's humanist invention of the concept of *Man*, at the same time over-represented that concept as if its *member class* answers (i.e., civic humanist and Liberal humanist) were isomorphic with the *class of classes* of all the answers given by a multiplicity of human groups to the same question, has enabled the West to institute its world-systemic domination on the basis of its conceptual and empirical globally institutionalized *absolutization* of its own genre-specific *member class* as if it were isomorphic with the *class of classes* definition(s) of our species being.

Consequently, given that the goal of the Ceremony's Found's proposed new Studia is a goal or telos now being sought to be implemented, in response to a historically new, extreme and hitherto unprecedented *form* of the same millennial existential imperative, yet one which because defined now by the almost unthinkable yet looming possibility of our eventual extinction as a species, now calls, even more imperatively for our Autopoietic Turn *towards* the non-opacity of our consciousness, to the empirical reality of our collective human agency, and, thereby, for our now our fully realized cognitive autonomy as a species. The recognition therefore, *that which we have made*, we can unmake, then, *consciously* now, remake.

With this emancipatory recognition, itself being makable on the basis of the recognition of this new principle of autopoietic sociogenic causality, as itself a recognition which by enabling *inter alia*, both the *relativization* and the deconstruction of *Man's* bio-cosmogonically chartered *naturally selected/dysselected* code of symbolic *life/death*; and correlated space-of-Otherness complex, as abductively projected onto the order-stabilizing Divides of the *Color/White/Black/Rich/Poor, developed/underdeveloped planet of the suburbs/planet of the slums Lines*, will initiate the processes of the *de-extra-humanization* of all the entities and/or concepts onto which we have hitherto projected our own empirical agencies, and, thereby, the unblocking of the systemic mechanisms by means of which our present order's now purely secular form of the traditional existential imperative, has functioned to keep our own collective agency opaque, to what is our now normative symbolically encoded ethno-class order of consciousness, and, therefore, opaque to ourselves.

It is in this reference frame, that the Ceremony Found's new answer and its Origin Modle's projected laws of human auto-institution, that are as specific to our third and hybrid level of reality, as Newton's laws of gravitation are specific to the physical, and Darwin's (now

re-thought and revised) laws of Evolution are specific to the (purely) biological level, because also revealing such laws to function for our contemporary Western world systemic societal order, as they have done for all human societies, if so functioning, hitherto, outside our conscious awareness, serve to “find the ceremony” able to breach the divide between White and Black, and, more comprehensively, between the White/non-White Color Line, by revealing it to be, like all the other variants, of the complex of our present projected “space of Otherness complex”, an *unbreachable divide*, whose unbreachability is itself only a function of the systemic enacting of the code of symbolic *life/death* (as that of the *naturally* selected-eugenic, humans as *naturally dysselected/dysgenic*) humans. That is, the code, in whose terms, we have hitherto autopoetically instituted preconceptually experienced and performatively enacted ourselves, as *good* men and women of our genre-specific (Western and westernized) ethno-class kind—doing so in *all good conscience/consciousness*.

Consequently if the now meta-systemic and meta-cosmogonic perspectives, of the Ceremony Found’s proposed New Studia, will set out to provide the new cognizing basis of, at long last, the autonomy of our consciousness and therefore its non-opacity with respect to the reality of our human agency, that they will, as such perspective, make possible, in doing so, an unprecedented rupture in the dynamic of our millennially extended human history.

That is, the *discontinuity* that will be now that of our Second Emergence—this time not from the Primate-type mode of the total subordination/restriction of our inter-altruistic eusocial behaviors to a level of cooperation whose narrow limits have been preset by our species-specific replicator DNA code, but instead, *from our hitherto subordination*, normally, *to our own autopoetically, and thereby humanly invented* cosmogonically chartered replicator sociogenic codes of symbolic *life/death*; these as codes which even when, at special axial periods in history,

they have indeed been transformatively reinvented, (as in the case both of the post-medieval, Renaissance humanist West, as well as in that effected by Liberal humanist Great Britain), have nevertheless been effected according to laws which functioned outside our conscious awareness, therefore as such, ones that had called for the continued opacity to ourselves of our own agency.

It is therefore this unprecedented Second Emergence rupture, one reenacting of the First in new but complementarily emancipatory terms, that is therefore intended, to be effected by means of Césaire's proposed new and hybrid science of the Word-as-the-code, and whose proposed praxis is that of the Autopoetic Turn/Overturn. This latter as a praxis that will take as the objects of its inquiry, our always humanly invented, sociogenic codes of symbolic *life/death*, together with their enacted *second set of instructions*, as mandated and inscribed by our (always, also humanly invented then retroactively projected) cosmogonies, "foundational myths" or *representations of origin stories*, which have hitherto served to also project our own autopoetic agency onto (also humanly invented) extra-human Agencies; its object of inquiry, therefore, as that of the processes, and invented socio-technologies, by means of which we have, from the Third Event of our origin as a uniquely hybrid species of living being, autopoetically instituted our genres of being human and *fictive modes* of kind, doing so however, according to laws which have hitherto functioned outside our conscious awareness; thereby, outside any possibility, hitherto, of our fully realized autonomy of agency.

"And truly what is to be done is to set man free."¹³⁰

This as the telos of the New Studia therefore, whose *hybrid* (i.e., the study of the code, of its cosmogonically chartered *ordo verborum*) and thereby of its *second set of instruction, as non-linearly and intricately calibrated* with the "study of nature"/the *ordo naturae*), as that of the functioning of Goldstein's *natural opioid* behavior regulatory system itself activated, in the

¹³⁰ Fanon. Epigraph 6. 71.

terms of the specific *positive/negative* system of meanings of the code, which it then *implements* as a living entity, that of the *code-made-flesh*, will call for its praxis of the Autopoietic Turn/Overturn to function in a hitherto unsuspected, transdisciplinary, trans-episteme, trans-cosmogonic modality one of which, as Césaire insisted, “only poetry”—and *its* modality of functioning, as in Bishop’s:

The ceremony must be found
Traditional, with all its symbols
ancient as the metaphors in dreams;
strange with the never before heard music, continuous
until the torches deaden at the bed-room door....¹³¹

—“can give an approximate notion of.”

Sylvia Wynter
August 25, 2007

¹³¹ John Peale Bishop, “Speaking of Poetry” in his collection of poems, *Now with His Love*, 1933; Césaire’s “Poetry and Knowledge” in Esileman and Smith Eds., *Aimé Césaire: Lyric and Dramatic Poetry, 1946-1982* by J.A. Arnold (Charlottesville, Carat Books).