

8

The Ceremony Found: Towards the Autopoetic Turn/Overturn, its Autonomy of Human Agency and Extraterritoriality of (Self-)Cognition¹

Sylvia Wynter

The ceremony must be found
Traditional, with all its symbols
ancient as the metaphors in dreams;
strange with never before heard music [...]

John Peale Bishop, "Speaking of Poetry" (1933)

When asked if he could refute the philosophical position known as idealism – the doctrine that all matter is merely a manifestation of mind – the eighteenth century writer Dr. Johnson is supposed to have responded wordlessly, by kicking a stone. Gravity is the stone that defenders of scientific realism kick: as physicist Alan Sokal said, you can believe what you like about gravity or call it whatever you want, but if I throw you out the window, you'll be just as dead when you hit the ground. Gravity here is supposed to stand for brute fact: the ground, the firm foundation of things. [...] It's not the poets and critics of scientific rationality who deny the pull of gravity (usual shorthand for the inescapable "reality" of the world) but the scientists who deny the gravity of language and its being of the world, which is why they keep trying to act like language ultimately doesn't *matter*. *Those who practice* this denial distribute its damages widely, but the joke is on them too. [emphasis added]

Ira Livingston, *Between Science and Literature:
An Introduction to Autopoetics* (2006)

¹ This part of the title – i.e., "the extraterritoriality of (self-)cognition" – is taken from Ernest Gellner's *The Legitimation of Belief* (Gellner, 1974) and was originally cited in the concluding pages of my 1984 essay "The Ceremony Must Be Found: After Humanism" (Wynter, 1984: 56).

A UN 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. [emphasis added]

Time Magazine, “A Warming Report: Scientists to Show New Evidence” (January 25, 2007)

The problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the *color line* – the relation of the darker to the lighter races of men in Asia and Africa, in America and the islands of the seas. [emphasis added]

W. E. B. Du Bois, *The Souls of Black Folk* (1903)

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.* [emphasis added]

David Leeming, *Myth: A Biography of Belief* (2002)

But who, we?

Jacques Derrida, “The Ends of Man” (1969)

Introduction

A little more than a quarter of a century ago, I wrote an essay titled “The Ceremony Must Be Found: After Humanism” (Wynter, 1984) for a special issue of *boundary 2* titled *On Humanism and the University, 1: The Discourse on Humanism*, both edited and introduced by William Spanos. My essay, together with Spanos’s far-reaching Introduction (Spanos, 1984) as well as the essays of the other contributors, can be seen from hindsight to have been written in the lingering afterglow of what had been the dazzling, if brief, cognitively emancipatory hiatus that had emerged in the wake of the social uprisings of the 1950s and 1960s. These social movements – internal to the USA, but also to its fellow Euro-American and Western-European nation states – had been effected by the synergy of multiple forms of spontaneously erupting uprisings of “otherness,” as uprisings that were themselves part of the more comprehensive, planetarily extended series of anti-colonial struggles initiated before and gathering momentum in the wake of the Second World War. And it was in the dynamic context of the vast self-mobilizing processes of the *Anti-Colonial Revolution* (Westad, 2005) that a specific form of these multiple forms of “otherness” erupted in the late 1930s on my own island of Jamaica, cutting across my childhood and early adolescence. This local eruption would determine what was to be the imperative trajectory – if somewhat zig-zaggedly so – of my life and work.

Also marking an important moment within my intellectual/political trajectory was the Black American students' *Fifties/Sixties* struggle for the establishment of *Black Studies* within the university system of the USA. This particular struggle led to my eventual invitation to teach within this newly incorporated field of knowledge, as one which provided a *Black* "gaze from below" (Gauchet, 1997)² perspective of "otherness" from which to explore the issue to which we give the name of *race*, as the issue that the Black American intellectual W. E. B. Du Bois identified in 1903 in its more totalizing, more absolute form as the "*Color Line*" (Du Bois, 1903). And, due to its founding nineteenth-century role as the systemically institutionalized, status-organizing principle of the *secular* West (and as such prophetically predicted by Du Bois to become "the problem of the twentieth century") this "*Color Line*" or *Divide* thereby had to be projected by Western and westernized academics/intellectuals as if it were a conceptually and institutionally unbreachable *Line* or *Divide* between members of the human species. In turn, and within the chartering biocentric cosmogonic-logic of this *Line/Divide*, what Du Bois defined as its opposing "lighter" and "darker" sides had therefore to be conceptually and institutionally "unwedddable." Thus, as Aimé Césaire of the Francophone Caribbean pointed out in his letter of resignation from the French Communist Party in 1956, the "*Color Line*" – i.e., of *race* as the Western-bourgeois analogue of Latin-Christian Medieval-Europe's feudal principle of *caste* – was *the issue* whose historically-instituted singularity could not be made into a subset of *any other issue*. Instead, it had to be theoretically identified and fought in its own terms (Césaire, 2010).

The institutionalized perspective of *Black Studies* in its original *Fifties/Sixties* intentionality – before its *ethnicization* in middle-class assimilationist terms as *African-American Studies* – in making my own exploration of "race" in its own specific *Human Otherness* terms possible, had also informed my contribution to the still memorable 1984 "Discourse on Humanism" volume. At the same time, the topic of that volume, as far-reachingly conceptualized by its editor William Spanos, provided a conceptual framework for the collection's range of chapters as that of the critique of contemporary

² The phrase "gaze from below" is here adopted from Marcel Gauchet in his description of Israel's monotheistic break over-against both the then empires of Egypt's and Babylon's respective cosmogonically chartering, "pagan"/polytheistic religions. As he then emphasizes, the "distinctive origin of that break" was due to the fact that what arose from this creative confrontation of "the weak with the strong" was one in which "*the gaze was from below* and was inspired more by the desperate determination *to escape the conqueror's hold*, than by the idea of revolt. *How could they imagine a power capable of freeing them from the highest power in the world?*" Thus, the "radical originality of the Israelites' response" had been therefore "*derived from the highly unusual standpoint of the questioner and the penetrating nature of the question*" (Gauchet, 1997: 108).

Academia's centrally legitimating-discourse of "Humanism." And, in my contribution, I had proposed that it was this discourse, beginning with its emancipatory and world transformative, *secularizing* Renaissance origins that had at the same time also given rise to what I have earlier identified as the first *ratiocentric* (i.e., reason-centered) form of what was later to become the full-fledged *biocentric* issue of "race." This first formation had been effected by Renaissance Civic-humanism's discursive negation of our co-humanity as a species on the basis of its "reasons-of-state" imperial scholars' projection of the neo-Aristotelian concept of a *by-Nature difference* of rationality (Pagden, 1987) between its referent "Western humanity" (i.e., of *Man(1)* redefined as *homo politicus*) *vis-à-vis* all other humans now classified and subordinated as the West's ostensible *irrational Human Others* (Pandian, 1985). This process of classification and subjugation began post-1492 with the conquered-cum-territorially expropriated peoples of the Caribbean Americas, all generically classified as *Indians*, then assigned to *neo-serf* (if politically, "free") *labor* in the hierarchically stratified semi-periphery of the then emergent Western world-system (Wallerstein, 1974; Wallerstein, 1980). And this process was to be followed by the forced Middle Passage enslavement of "Black" Africans, themselves generically classified in commodified terms as *Negroes*, and thereby assigned as *slave labor* to the underside periphery *vis-à-vis* the "core" labor center of the world-system itself.

This first institutionalized form of "race" was to be followed by the reinvented, nineteenth-century version as that of Du Bois's "*Color Line*," as a now *biocentric Line/Divide* then projected as ostensibly the expression of a *by-Evolution different* (i.e., naturally selected/dys-selected, eugenic/dysgenic) form of co-human negation within the terms of the new Liberal-humanist variant (of Renaissance humanism's *Man(1)*) legitimizing of the bourgeois reinvention of *Man(2)* as *homo oeconomicus*. In turn, the "Black" African and Afro-mixed descent peoples were now made into the iconic embodiment of this now extreme form of (*racialized*) *Human Otherness* (Pandian, 1985), as well as of the Western world-system's later nineteenth-century, territorially expropriated, and now colonized neo-periphery category of *native labor* as, in Fanonian terms, *Les Damnés de la terre* (Fanon, 1961), meaning, literally, "the condemned of the Earth" (James, 1970).

The title of my 1984 essay – "The Ceremony Must Be Found: After Humanism"³ – had therefore enacted my contribution's "fundamental

³ The title phrase "the ceremony must be found" is taken, as shown in epigraph 1, from the poem "Speaking of Poetry" (1933) by John Peale Bishop. Bishop wrote in part as follows:

The ceremony must be found
that will wed Desdemona to the huge Moor. [...]

[Sartrean] project” (Sartre, 1956) as the *negation* of the above two forms of co-human negation. For in that essay I had argued that the failure to “find a ceremony” to breach these two forms of negation has systemically functioned as the contradictory, Janus-faced *underside* of the post-medieval Western-European Renaissance’s mutationally secularizing culture’s otherwise dazzling series of cognitively emancipatory achievements. These achievements include the Scientific Revolution of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries *vis-à-vis* the physical world, as well as later the transformation of our knowledge of the living world spearheaded, if contradictorily so, in the late nineteenth century by the Darwinian Revolution. These revolutions, and the self-correcting (however eventually) cognitive openings made possible in their wake, were therefore to culminate, *inter-alia*, firstly with Western *Man*’s first footfall on the Moon and revelatory, extraterrestrial perspectival view of our planet Earth. Secondly (and more contradictorily so) by the splitting of the atom followed by that of the cracking of the DNA code of our human species’ genome. Yet *pari passu* with these dazzling natural and techno-scientific achievements stands the *underside costs* of the overall unquestionable “triumph” (Roberts, 1985)⁴ of the West’s now some 500 years’ process of global expansion, including its large-scale territorial expropriation

O, it is not enough
that they should meet, naked, at dead of night
in a small inn on a dark canal. [...]

The ceremony must be found
Traditional, with all its symbols
ancient as the metaphors in dreams;
strange, with never before heard music; continuous
until the torches deaden at the bedroom door. [emphasis added]

The above reference is, of course, to Shakespeare’s play *Othello* and its iconic dramatic enactment of Renaissance humanism’s co-human negation on the grounds of a *rational/non-rational, by-nature* and, therefore, *race-based Line/Divide*.

⁴ In *The Triumph of the West* (1985), historian J. M. Roberts makes the central point that as “[W]estern civilization had come to birth [...] in Europe, before spreading across the seas” to other regions of the globe, “the men of the West [came to ‘civilize’] the whole world *in their image* by means other than migration [...] as] their ideas and institutions [also] spread round the globe” [emphasis added]. Later he writes:

This does not mean we can smugly ignore the horrors of the past and trumpet its [the West’s] “achievements.” It is a matter of trying to assess the historical effectiveness of Western civilization so as to judge correctly its sheer impact on human development [...] for both good and ill. [...] *Our past includes a world radically reshaped by the West. That is the West’s ambiguous triumph – the difference it has made to the world. A flawed, complicated and paradoxical triumph it may have been, but it was one nonetheless.* (Roberts, 1985: 9, 12; emphasis added)

and correlatedly unstoppable military conquests of the majority of the world's peoples, as well as their/our subsequent *racialized* reduction to “native” labor roles in a now globally incorporated world-systemic division of labor. While concomitant with, and central to, these imposed processes of subjugation was the missionary evangelization, religious Christianization, and secular *initiatory* “epistemeologization” by the West of the peoples it conquered.⁵ For these latter processes functioned as mechanisms of both incorporation and *initiation*⁶ that were effected in the hierarchically dominant and subordinated imperializing terms of the West's own educationally imposed image, as an image mimetically adopted by the ostensibly “native” peoples of the world/by us.

Given the Janus-faced nature of this overall process, the non-findability of a “ceremony” able to breach the “*Color Line*”'s divide – to “wed” its “lighter” and “darker” sides – is thus the expression of what can now be more precisely identified as the hitherto irresolvability of an *aporia* or inevitable and endemic contradiction. This *aporia*, I propose, is one specific to, because the price originally paid for, the West's post-medieval *transformative mutation*⁷ effected by the discourse of Humanism in both its original Renaissance Civic-humanist and later (neo)Liberal-humanist configurations. This *aporia* I define as that *of the secular* – that is as one whose humanly emancipatory process on the one hand, and humanly subjugating processes on the other, are each nevertheless the lawlike condition of the enacting of the other.

⁵ This latter mechanism of conquest/subjugation and colonial incorporation has been incisively, if fictionally, portrayed by the Senegalese writer Cheikh Hamidou Kane in his 1961 novel, translated into English in 1963 as *Ambiguous Adventure*. In the wake of the French-imperial military conquest of the people of the Diallobe of West Africa, he describes this other form of conquest/subjugation and incorporation in the following terms:

The new school shares at the same time the characteristics of cannon and of magnet. From the cannon it draws its efficacy as an arm of combat. Better than the cannon, it makes conquest permanent. The cannon compels the body, the school bewitches the soul. [...] From the magnet, the school takes its radiating force. It is bound up with a new order, as a magnetic stone is bound up with a field. The upheaval of the life of man within this new order is similar to the overturn of certain physical laws in a magnetic field. (Kane, 2012: 49–50)

⁶ The institution of *initiation* as originally invented by the so-called “primitive” peoples of the first *nomadic* human societies of Africa is *the autopoietic* institution specific to all human societies – whether given the Greek name of *paideia*, of our Western *educational systems*, as pointed to by Kane in the previous footnote, or of our “ideological state apparatus” (Althusser, 2001).

⁷ I use the term *mutation* designedly, adopting it from Martin Nowak, the Director of the Program for Evolutionary Dynamics at Harvard University (USA) (Zimmer, 2007). Yet in my own case I am transferring it to the unique level of hybrid existence, i.e., *bios/mythos, ontogeny/sociogeny* specific to our *being human* by use of the term *transformative mutation*.

The above problematic, therefore, is one that I have been urgently struggling with since the 1984 special issue of *boundary 2*, as its editor William Spanos had himself identified in his Introduction. In that context, Spanos wrote that my essay had provided “a revisionary interpretation” which traced “the historical itinerary of the *Studia Humanitatis* from its profoundly disturbing origins in the Renaissance to its reconstitution as a disabling orthodoxy in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.” Yet he further added that my essay had also put forth a proposal for what our “post-modern historical conjuncture” urgently required; and this proposal was that of the necessity of our collective retrieval of humanism’s original “heretical essence” (Spanos, 1984). 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), then my 1984 essay had indeed put forward some important insights with respect to that proposal summarized by Spanos.

However, in my attempt to re-enact Renaissance humanism’s original heresy as it had been effected in the situation specific to the peoples of late medieval Latin-Christian Europe – and specifically so enacted by their then *Lay* intelligentsia⁸ – my “heresy” had remained incomplete. For this *Lay*-humanist intelligentsia’s then new *Studia Humanitatis* order of knowledge had effectively initiated the invention of the concept of *Man*(x)-as-*homo-politicus* or primarily political agent of the *this-worldly* telos of the *State* (Wynter, 2003) by going back to Greco-Roman classical antiquity in order to seek “pagan”/non-Christian models for their now revalorizedly inverted concept of *Man* (Foucault, 1973) – doing so outside the post-Adamic “fallen human nature” prescriptive terms of post-Augustinian medieval Christianity, from which one had had behaviorally to redeem oneself through Christ, his Church, and its Celibate Clergy, post-baptismally in pursuit of *Spiritual Salvation* as the *other-worldly* telos of the *Church* (LeGoff, 1988). These *Lay*-humanist intellectuals had therefore initiated nothing less than – within the context of our species history from our origins in the Southwest region of the continent of Africa – a new *secular* (i.e., *degodded*, *desupernaturalized*)⁹

⁸ The term *Lay/Laity*, in its origin, is a Christian term that specifically refers to *Lay men* and *women*. Within the context of medieval Latin-Christian Europe, because the non-celibate procreators of children, the *Laity* were represented as the transmitters through the *flesh* of the negative legacy of post-Adamic enslavement to Original Sin. They were therefore represented as embodying the *symbolic death of the Fallen Flesh* as over against the *symbolic life of the Redeemed Spirit*, the latter incarnated in the *celibate* category of the Clergy (LeGoff, 1988).

⁹ The term *secular* is one specific to Christian theology, as a term of “otherness” referring to, *inter alia*, the post-Adamic “fallen” world of Time. *Degodding/desupernaturalizing* are therefore analogical terms that are non-Christian-centric and, thereby, universally applicable. The *Oxford English Dictionary* gives the etymology of the English word “secular” as coming

cosmogonically *ratio-centric* (Mirandola, 1951)¹⁰ rather than *theocentric* answer to the question of who-we-are. Nevertheless, this new *secular* answer was one that *Lay*-humanists intellectuals had dialectically projected over and against, and thereby in specific response to, the extreme fourteenth-century, High Scholastic version of medieval Latin-Christian Europe's order-instituting and order-legitimizing, *theologically absolute* answer to the same question (Blumenburg, 1983).

Thus, for me to re-enact the above heresy completely – yet doing so some five or so centuries later in the terms, instead, of our now contemporary, planetarily extended, intra-human species situation – would have therefore called for me to project an analogical yet entirely new answer to the question of who-we-are over and against our present globally hegemonic, (neo)Liberal-humanist cum monohumanist answer. In addition, the re-enactment of this heresy would have also required a correlated proposal with respect to a now *ecumenically human* order of knowledge – a *New Studia*

from the Latin term *saecularis*, that is, from the adjective correlated with the noun *saeculum* meaning “generation, age” and, more generally, the “World” as opposed to the “Church” (1971: 365). As the realm of “fallen” Time, the *secular* realm's illusory nature necessarily condemned its *Lay* subjects to the whims of Fortune. In opposition existed the transcendent, *divine* realm to whose Eternal Truth only the Church and its theologians could have cognitive access.

In the wake of the Renaissance – from within the perspective of the autopoietic field of the West – the semantic shift that was to take place was one in whose inverted terms *true*, i.e., empirical “reality” would now belong to the *secular* realm, while the *divine* realm of the Church, and of religion in general, would be defined as the realm of “irreality.” Yet, from the Ceremony Found's ecumenically human perspective, I instead propose that both the *divine*/religious and *secular*/degodded realms exist as two *relative* modes of *genre*-specific reality – the former as *theocentric* and the latter as, first, *nature-/ratio-centric*, and then in our contemporary case as (evolutionarily) *biocentric*.

¹⁰ As Pico della Mirandola articulated in his *Oration on the Dignity of Man* (1486),

Now the highest Father, God the master-builder, [...] took up man [...] and placing him at the midpoint of the world [...] spoke to him as follows:

We have given to thee, Adam, no fixed seat, no form of thy very own, no gift peculiarly thine, that thou mayest feel as thine own, have as thine own, possess as thine own the seat, the form, the gifts which thou thyself shalt desire. A limited nature in other creatures is confined within the laws written down by Us. In conformity with thy free judgment, in whose hands I have placed thee, thou art confined by no bounds; and thou wilt fix limits of nature for thyself. [...] Neither heavenly nor earthly, neither mortal nor immortal have We made thee. Thou, like a judge appointed for being honorable art the molder and maker of thyself; thou mayest sculpt thyself into whatever shape thou dost prefer. Thou canst grow downward into the lower natures which are brutes. Thou canst again grow upward from thy soul's reason into the higher natures which are divine. (Norman, 2012: 3)

– one itself able to come to grips with the ancillary question posed by the second part of the title of my 1984 essay “The Ceremony Must Be Found: After Humanism.” This ancillary question is, *after Humanism, what?*

The following manifesto sets out to retrieve that failure – the failure, that is, to “find a ceremony” able to re-enact Renaissance humanism’s original heresy within the Janus-faced context of our contemporary, planetarily extended, intra-human, *secular* Western situation – one whose collective *underside costs* Gerald O. Barney (after Aurelio Peccei) defined as a single interconnected “global *problematique*” (Barney, 1993).¹¹ The manifesto will, however, do so by means of what is now to be the proposed Ceremony Found’s dialectically enacted heresy of, after Frantz Fanon, a profoundly “narcissistic” (Fanon, 1967)¹² and revalorizingly *new answer* to the question of who-we-are as humans. This new answer necessarily moves beyond the West’s nineteenth-century, reinvented and transumptively inverted,¹³ yet still order-instituting and order-legitimizing, *biologically absolute* answer, as one that alone makes possible “race” in its now second configuration as

¹¹ Indeed, Gerald O. Barney writes the following in *Global 2000 Revisited*:

As we humans have begun to think globally, it has become clear that we do not have a poverty problem, or a hunger problem, or a habitat problem, or an energy problem, or a trade problem, or a population problem, or an atmosphere problem, or a waste problem or a resource problem. On a planetary scale, these problems are all interconnected. What we really have is a *poverty-hunger-habitat-energy-trade-population-atmosphere-waste-resource problem*. This mega problem is so new that we did not even have a name for it until 1970 when the late Dr. Aurelio Peccei described it and named it the “*global problematique*.” (Barney, 1993: 7)

¹² As Frantz Fanon wrote in this context:

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 mechanism*. [...] And truly what is to be done is to set man free. (Fanon, 1967: 22–23; emphasis added)

¹³ 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, Bloom argues, 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,” he continues, “certain *central linkages* [...] *vital to tradition, and the crossings over in and between traditions*, keep the continuity going by means of its retroping of earlier tropes” (Bloom, 1982).

Du Bois's "*Color Line*," as well as its dually correlated (neo)Liberal-humanist *Man(2)*-as-*homo-oeconomicus* conception together with its "human science" episteme (Foucault, 1973).

The Ceremony Found's new and *ecumenically human* response to the question of who-we-are, I propose, would effect such a mutation through its *separation* of the *being* of *being human* (in its hitherto innumerable *genre*-specific particularities) from *being human* in the purely *biocentric* terms¹⁴ of our present globally hegemonic, monohumanist and secular Western, yet no less *genre*-specific, now (neo)Liberal conception as *Man(2)*. In so doing, this new answer necessarily elucidates and disenchant the rhetorico-discursive strategies by means of which the lexical concepts of *Man* and *Human*, because of their similarity of *sound*, are made to imply that their referent populations are also the same (Valesio, 1980).¹⁵ The end result of such an elucidation and disenchanting is that we as members of our contemporary, planetarily extended human community would be no longer able to be induced to take the West's prototype member class of being human *Man* and its *genre*-specific, bio-cosmogonically chartered, and sociogenically encoded referent population of the trans-nationally incorporated, Western and westernized, middle and upper-class bourgeois *We*, as being isomorphic with the *class of classes*¹⁶ of

¹⁴ These purely *biocentric* terms exist in the transumptively inverted and reoccupied place of medieval Latin-Christian Europe's *theocentric* ones, the latter of which functioned as the *a priori* ground of its pre-Renaissance, theo-Scholastic order of knowledge. This process of transumption nevertheless also took place within an extended tradition unique to the West, beginning with its origin in ancient Greece and arriving at its ultimate realization with the rise of the West to now planetary hegemony. I shall define this tradition as that of the Western *auto-poetic field*. For an excellent description of this field as it has successively transumptively reinvented itself in dialectical terms, see Nisbet, 1969.

¹⁵ Valesio refers to this rhetorical strategy in the general sense as the *topos of iconicity*. He reveals the functioning of this strategy in his specific analysis of a fragment from Heraclitus in which a specific *mode of life* – that related to the bow – is made synonymous with the *process of life* itself (Valesio, 1980).

¹⁶ For this formulation, see Alfred North 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. (Whitehead and Russell, 1910). Combined with the rhetorical strategy defined by Paolo Valesio as that of the *topos of iconicity*, we can see the way in which the West takes its *member class* concept of *Man* and over-represents itself, together with its self-definition as *homo sapiens*, as if it were isomorphic with the *class of classes* definition of our *Homo Narrans'* species being. This over-representation has thereby enabled the West to institute its world-systemic domination on the basis of, if non-consciously so, its conceptual and globally institutionalized *absolutization* and *universalization* of its own *member class* self-definition. However, I propose that the West was/is no less entrapped by the Janus-faced consequences of this *topos of iconicity* over-representation than the rest of us made by the West into its *Human Others* to *Man* – first, in its monarchical cum *landed gentry* cum slave-holding ruling-group and Civic-humanist *Man(1)* as *homo politicus* self-definition and,

what Jacques Derrida identifies as the veridical “we [...] in the horizon of humanity” (Derrida, 1969). Instead, and on the basis of a proposed new and now meta-biocentric order of knowledge/episteme and its correlated emancipatory view of who-we-are as humans (themselves as ones that will together now make possible our collective *turn* towards what I shall define as our *Second Emergence*), we can become, for the first time in our species’ existence, now fully conscious agents in the autopoietic institution and reproduction of a *new* kind of planetarily extended cum “intercommunal” community (Huey Newton via Erikson, 1973). And this new kind of community would be one, therefore, that secures the “ends” no longer of biocentric (neo)Liberal-monohumanist ethno-class *Man*(2), nor indeed that of the religio-secular counter-ends of the contemporary westernized imperialist and/or fundamentalist forms of the three Abrahamic monotheisms,¹⁷ but instead superseding them all, *inter alia*, by that of the We-the-ecumenically-Human.¹⁸

Against this introductory background, I present the following manifesto of the Ceremony Found.

Part 1. On the Hybrid Mode of Living Being that is still Trans-Genredly We-the-Ecumenically Human

The manifesto will therefore take its point of departure from Frantz Fanon’s unique “gaze from below” perspective of “otherness,”¹⁹ as itself seminally

secondly, in our contemporary case its specifically *bourgeois* ruling-group’s now reinvented terms as (neo)Liberal-humanist *Man*(2) as *homo oeconomicus*.

¹⁷ The above is particularly evident in the monotheistic counter-ends of the now neo-fascist group ISIS as Radical Islam’s techno-religious ruling caste’s projected return to a contemporary westernized form of Islam’s once imperial Caliphate.

¹⁸ The term “ecumenical,” while also referring to the “universal, global Christian Church” or “Christendom,” also possesses a more generalized definition meaning “worldwide or general in extent” or “general, universal.” This latter definition I have adapted with the phrase “ecumenically human” to mean the “universal human species,” over and against our contemporary, planetarily extended referent subset ruling-group of the Western and westernized bourgeoisie, as the embodiment of the *member class* prototype of being human *Man*. Yet this notion of the “universal human species” I also put forth on the basis of the Ceremony Found’s new and relavorizing answer to the question of who-we-are, as a species whose “universality” is *not* merely secured in purely biologically absolute terms by the empirical fact of our common genetic heritage, given that we humans share 99.9 percent of the same genome. Instead, my chapter argues that this “universality” is also secured by the Ceremony Found’s meta-Darwinian and meta-*homo sapiens* proposal that we are co-human because subject to the same *laws of Auto-institution* as a hybridly third level of existence – that is, of the human defined as *Homo Narrans*.

¹⁹ See n. 1 for that original “gaze from below” perspective of “otherness” as defined in Gauchet, 1997, while the analogy of Fanon’s own Black population’s contemporary situation with that of the then Israelites, of their priests, as captives of Babylon during the sixth

reinforced however by Judith Butler's illuminating insight put forward in 1990. And her insight is so put forward from two of the perspectives of "otherness" which had correlatedly erupted in the *Fifties/Sixties* US-based social uprisings. Writing against what she termed the "inherited discourse of the metaphysics of substance" of the nineteenth century West, Butler had proposed that the notion of *gender* roles/identities as the expression of *abiding* (or immutable, biological) *substances* – i.e., of *man* and *woman* as *noun* – should not be considered a transcultural, transhistorical, "universal" truth. Instead, these roles/identities should be rightfully viewed as "fictive constructions" that are themselves produced as "artificial effects" through the "compulsory ordering of [behavioral] attributes into coherent gender sequences." Yet, if "not a noun," Butler also insisted neither should *gender* be seen as constituted by "a set of free-floating attributes," given that its "substantive effect" is "*performatively produced* and compelled by the regulatory practices of gender coherence" [emphasis added]. And because its existence depends on such a "performative enactment" within the terms of these "regulatory practices" – thereby "constituting the identity it is purported to be" – then "*gender is always a doing*, though not a doing by a subject who might be said to pre-exist the deed" [emphasis added] (Butler, 1990).

My own leap-frogging hypothesis here, as itself put forward within the hybrid terms of the Ceremony Found's new Fanonian answer to the question of who-we-are as humans, is that Butler's illuminating insight with respect to the "fictive construction" and "performative enactment" (pre-*Fifties/Sixties*) of *gender substance* is also true with respect to the range of the other also *genre*-specific, fictively constructed, and performatively enacted roles/identities of *class substance* (including *rich/poor* and, at the world-systemic level, *developed/underdeveloped substance*), of *sexual orientation substance*, and, of course (and centrally so), of *race substance*. Second, her insight is true only because of the larger truth that constitutes all such

century BCE, is implicitly put forward by Fanon in the following passage from his *Black Skin, White Masks*:

The black man wants to be white. The white man slaves to reach a human level.

In the course of this essay we shall observe the development of an effort to understand the black-white relation.

The white man is sealed in his whiteness.

The black man in his blackness.

[...] There is a fact: white men consider themselves superior to black men.

There is another fact: black men want to prove to white men, at all costs, the richness of their thought, the equal value of their intellect.

How do we extricate ourselves? (Fanon, 1967: 9–10)

fictively constructed and performatively enacted roles/identities, together with their respective “coherences,” as mutually reinforcing functions – *the truth*, that is, of our *being human* as “always a doing,” of our *being human as praxis* (Wynter, 2008).

This proposed larger truth of the Ceremony Found further links to the (epigraph 5) quotation from David Leeming taken from his book *Myth: A Biography of Belief*. For if, as Leeming points out, we humans make use of *cosmogonies* or origin stories/myths in order to “tell the world” and ourselves “who we are” (Leeming, 2002), we are only enabled to do so, however, because it is by the very means of these *genre*-specific cosmogonies that we are enabled to fictively construct and performatively enact ourselves as the *who* of the *We* that we-are. Specifically, I propose that in our contemporary, planetarily extended, intra-human situation, our *being human* in the now globally homogenized, monohumanist terms of the secular West’s *Man* – specifically in the *biologically absolute* terms of the Western and westernized bourgeoisie’s (neo)Liberal-humanist, *homo oeconomicus* conception – is now itself a no less cosmogonically chartered and encoded and, thereby, fictively constructed and performatively enacted *genre*²⁰ of *being hybridly human*. While it is only within the terms of this specific *genre* of being hybridly human, of therefore its *genre’d coherence*, that the peoples of African and Afro-mixed descent have been lawlikely fictively constructed as the “Negro”/“Colored”/ “Black”/“Nigger” embodiment of ultimate *Human Otherness to Man(2)*, as a founding underside that is then performatively enacted and systemically produced by them/us collectively as subjects/initiates of our now planetarily extended, Western and westernized world-system.

This systemically – including epistemically – produced role of “otherness” is one that would lead to the existential experience documented by

²⁰ The term *genre* derives from the same root etymology as *gender*, meaning *kind*. I use *genre* here to denote the fictively constructed and performatively enacted different *kinds of being human*, of which *gender coherence* is itself always and everywhere a function. Here I further argue that the conception of the human *Man* in its second *bio-humanist* phase of *Man-as-homo-oeconomicus* is not the human-in-itself, but a specific *genre* or *kind of being hybridly human* whose invention was initiated in the late eighteenth-century by Adam Smith and other members of the Scottish Enlightenment, even if not fully actualized until the nineteenth century. This *genre* of being human’s ruling-class code of symbolic life or “*oecconomy of Greatness*” (Smith, 1759) would be the ownership and market accumulation of the mobile property of *capital* projected as the then “metaphysical source of life” (Godelier, 1999). This specifically Western-*bourgeois* conception exists in the reoccupied place of the earlier landed gentry/slave-owning plantocracy ruling-group *oecconomy of Greatness* of the ownership of immobile freehold landed property, *pari passu* with that of the fixed labor stock of “Negro” slaves, as the incarnation of *Man* in its still first phase as the *homo politicus* subject of the State (Pocock, 1989).

W. E. B. Du Bois in his 1903 classic *The Souls of Black Folk*. For here Du Bois recognized that – although being in *class* terms a proper Western-bourgeois self, because a highly educated professional academic/intellectual – in order to realize himself as fully *American* (and, therefore, ostensibly as fully *human*), he had had to at the same time also subjectively experience himself as a *Negro*, i.e., as a dissonant *anomaly to being human* to this “proper” normative Western-bourgeois self-conception. He had had to experience himself, thereby, as a *Problem*. This existential experience in turn required that he be *normally* reflexly subjectively aversive not only to his own phenotype/physiognomy, but also to the alternative autopoietic field (or “culture” in Western terminology) of his own people, including its quite other “sorrow songs” and *lumpen* poetics of the blues and of jazz. Seeing that it is this very alternative African-derived autopoietic field that he would have been induced to normally subjectively experience, in extreme *Human Otherness* terms, as the “underside reality” or *chose maudite* central to the instituting of the *normalcy* of his proper self on the *genre*-specific model of that of the Western bourgeoisie.

A parallel recognition was also effected by Frantz Fanon through his experience as a French imperial “native” subject growing up on the island of Martinique, who like all his peers also existentially experienced it as “normal to be *anti-Negro*.” (“Don’t behave like a *nigger!*,” his mother would admonish him.) But Fanon also uniquely experienced this anomaly of *being human* within the *genre*-specific terms of secular Western *Man*(2) while a psychiatrist at the beginning of his vocation. In this context, he was confronted in specific intellectual terms with the profound self-alienation of both his “Black” peers in Martinique, but also of other colonized “Colored” *native* patients in the specific case of a then still, settler-colonial French Algeria. Fanon’s experience of this anomaly was further reinforced by his reading of an ethnographic study of a group of Africans belonging to the so-called “Pygmy” population of Central Africa.²¹ And, as he observed, because this specific “group” of Africans had managed to remain *auto-centered* since their society had been closed off from the homogenizing “flood of [Western] civilization,” they had therefore grown up exactly like French bourgeois children – i.e., like *normal* children, *normal* humans, because at the center of a self-valorizing cosmogony and mythical charter. Thus although this group of Africans possessed the same bio-genetic phenotype that would have led to their being classified by the West as “Negro” or “Negroid,” they could have *never* subjectively experienced themselves as being the *anomaly to being human* that Fanon and his “Black”/“Colored” peers and patients were to be institu-

²¹ See Father Trilles’s “L’âme du pygmée d’Afrique,” as discussed and cited by Frantz Fanon in *Black Skin, White Masks* (1967: ch. 6).

tionally made to so experience themselves. For Fanon and his peers/patients had been incorporated into and, therefore, *become human* within the terms of the *genre*-specific, chartering cosmogonic-complex of secular Western *Man*(2) on the negatively marked side of its systemically imposed “*Color Line*.” This comparison then helped Fanon make a Copernican-like epistemological break in further proposing the following in 1952 in his *Peau Noire, Masques Blancs*, translated into English as *Black Skin, White Masks* (1967).

First, Fanon proposed that the self-alienation experienced by himself and his peers/patients classified and symbolically negated within the terms of the “*Color Line*” as “Black”/“Colored,” could in no way be “an individual problem.” Rather, and against both Freud’s and the human sciences’ purely *biologically absolute* answer to the question of who-we-are, Fanon instead proposed that *being human* empirically entailed that “besides phylogeny and ontogeny stands *sociogeny*” (Fanon, 1967). For he and his peers/patients had been instituted as subjects *not* (as is normally the case) in a self-valorizing mode of cosmogonically, mythically chartered, and thereby sociogenically encoded auto-institution, but in secular Western *Man*(2)’s *genre*-specific mode of *sociogeny* – in the contradictory terms, therefore, of what I shall further define here as that of the latter’s *sociogenic replicator code of symbolic life and death*. As a result, Fanon and his peers/patients had thereby come to *be human* by preconceptually experiencing and performatively enacting themselves in the mimetic terms of “*White masks*,” as *Masks* that were phenotypically normal *only* for the specific subset of human hereditary variations that are classified as of “White” European descent.

Yet, I propose here, this reflex subjective experience by Fanon and his peers/patients is one only made possible because of a larger and universally applicable phenomenon. This phenomenon is that all human *Skins* can only *become human* by also performatively enacting them/ourselves *as human* in the always-already, cosmogonically chartered terms of their/our symbolically encoded and fictively constructed *genre*-specific *Masks*, as themselves always-already programmed by their/our respective *sociogenic replicator codes of symbolic life/death*. This given that, unlike the Primate family to which we partly belong, humans are alone able to transcend the narrow, genetically determined limits of eusocial, inter-altruistic, kin-recognizing behaviors in order to instead attain to higher levels of cooperation and organization.²²

²² See with respect to *cooperation* the commentary by Martin Nowak (see n. 7, above). Nowak refutes the notion 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 evolutionary change. To *selection*, Nowak adds the processes of *mutation* and *cooperation*, arguing that, as summarized by Carl Zimmer “cooperation is essential for life to evolve to a new level of organization” (Zimmer, 2007). Therefore, just as “[s]ingle celled protozoa had

While we are able to do so only by means of our ability – through the mutational co-evolution with the brain of the emergent properties of language and narrative/story-telling – *autopoetically to institute ourselves as symbolically made-kin* through the medium of our retroactively projected origin stories or cosmogonies. For it is only within the terms of each such origin story's mandated and inscribed sociogenic replicator code of symbolic life/death, that we are “re-born” (i.e., *initiated*) as behaviorally eusocial, kin-recognizing, inter-altruistic members of a specific, in my words, *fictive mode of human kind* – i.e., as subjects who are of the same non-genetic, artificially speciated *genre* (or *Mask*) of *being human*.

On the Sociogenic Replicator Code of Our Secular Western-Bourgeois Genre of Being Hybridly Human *Man(2)* and the New Counter/Meta-Heuristics of Fanon, Du Bois, and Cleaver

In our above, planetarily extended, intra-human context, therefore, the *overall* regulatory-practices that together constitute the *mode of auto-institution* enacting of the second reinvented, purely secular *genre* of being human *Man(2)* – in the now *biologically absolute* terms of the Western bourgeoisie's *homo oeconomicus* self-conception – are ones which necessarily call for the performatively enacted subset regulatory practices instituting of the ontologies of *race*, *class*, *gender*, and *sexual orientation as substance*. These genre-specific practices then function to enact bio-humanist *Man(2)*'s sociogenic replicator code of symbolic *life/death* as the code of *naturally selected/naturally dysselected* or *eugenic/dysgenic* humankind. Thus (to borrow from yet also extend Judith Butler), while *being human* is *not* a “noun,” neither can it be “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 autopoetic institution. As such a subject, she/he thereby reflexly and normally desires to realize her/himself in the lawlike terms of the discursively *positively marked* code of *symbolic life*, while at the same time to be normally aversive to, and thereby detach her/himself from, all that is made to embody the negation of that sociogenic self. And this

to cooperate to give rise to multicellular animals,” so “[h]umans had to cooperate for complex societies to emerge” (Zimmer, 2007). I argue as a corollary to Nowak that this process of *cooperation* is necessarily endemic to all human societies, not just so-called “complex” ones. And this process began with the *nomadic* form of small societies invented and institutionalized in Africa at the dawn of human existence some 200,000 years ago and continues even with our contemporary, planetarily extended, Western-bourgeois industrial/techno-economic cum globally incorporated *homo oeconomicus*, i.e., *Man(2)* conception, as one itself further self-defined as *homo sapiens* and over-represented, in monohumanist terms, as if it were the *being of being human* as *Homo Narrans* itself.

latter's *negatively marked* conception of *symbolic death*, therefore functions as the "liminally deviant" (Legesse, 1973)²³ embodiment of the normative self's ostensible negation of being *optimally/normally* human. And this is so whether it be as (in Lévi-Strauss terms) the "raw" life to the former's "cooked" life (Levi-Strauss, 1983); (in Aristotelian terms) as the *zoe* or "bare life" to the *bios* as the "good life" (Bull, 2007); or as (in our contemporary secular Western and westernized case) the (*Ghetto/Thug*) *Nigger* to the secular *genre* of being hybridly human of (*Bourgeois*) *Man*(2) (Wynter, 1992).

Within the cases of Fanon and Du Bois, as well as Eldridge Cleaver after both (Cleaver, 1968), they had all been therefore induced by the regulatory practices of *genre* (as opposed to merely *gender*) *coherence* to be optimally human in the terms of the secular West's *Man* in its second bio-humanist phase. This desiring necessarily also led to their being induced to be reflexly aversive to their own geographically cum environmentally adequated (Arsuaga, 2002; Sala-Molins, 2006) "Black" skin color and "Bantu" physiognomy, as the negatively marked embodiment of *symbolic death* within the terms of the sociogenic replicator code that our present cosmogonically chartered and *biologically absolute* answer to the question of who-we-are dynamically enacts. And this bio-genetic phenotype was/is negatively marked, I propose, 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* to the *symbolic life* of the *Redeemed Spirit* incarnated in the category of the celibate *Clergy* (Le Goff, 1988), as formulated within the terms of the sociogenic replicator code of Latin-Christian Europe's *theologically absolute*, cum theo-cosmogonically chartered, answer to the question of who-we-are. It is therefore with respect to the secular now *biocentric* answer to the question that Fanon and DuBois, as well as Cleaver, had initiated a new heuristics based on their recognition of these non-genetic, artificially induced yet reflexly subjectively experienced modes of desire and aversion. And this new heuristics is that of the *systemic mistrust of their subjectively experienced, yet ostensibly instinctive, natural, and self-evident order of consciousness*. In that within the terms of the specific *genre* of being hybridly human enacting of secular Western *Man*(2) in its now bourgeois configuration within which they had *become human*, they had not only found themselves desiring against, and thereby being aversive to

²³ Asmarom 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. It is through the *liminal* category's systemic negation that the *normal* subjects of the order are able to experience their shared *normalcy* (Legesse, 1973).

their “Black” selves and/or population of origin, but had found themselves also doing so *against their own deliberately willed intentionality*.²⁴

In this context, and 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* – with, I add, the systemic intentionality of its replicator code of symbolic life/death serving to structure our subjectively experienced orders of consciousness normally outside our conscious awareness – Fanon had thereby *overturned* one of the fundamentals of the West’s inherited philosophical/epistemic traditions. This fundamental is that of the ostensible *indubitability* and *self-determined* nature of consciousness as expressed by the Cartesian *ego cogito*. In that given 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 autopoetically to institute ourselves as *genre*-specific, fictive modes of eusocial, inter-altruistic, kin-recognizing kind – the terms of our eusocial co-identification as humans can never pre-exist each society’s specific mode of autopoetic institution, together with its complex of origin-narratively encoded socio-technologies.²⁵ This is so because it is by means of these processes alone that the *I* of each individual self is symbolically encoded to pre-conceptually experience and performatively enact itself in the same cloned, kin-recognizing terms as the *I* of all other members of its referent *We*. And, by extension, each such *We* or fictive mode of kind is thereby lawfully induced to share in the same mode of “collective intentionality” (Searle, 2007), on behalf of whose actualization and stable reproduction they/we are prepared, where necessary, to sacrifice their/our *biological* lives²⁶ – as lives, therefore, “born of the womb” (the *bios*) rather than hybridly of the womb *and* origin-story (i.e., of the *bios/mythos*).

²⁴ Also see for this Tim Wise’s *White Like Me* (2008), in which the radical political-activist writes that at moments he himself has reflexly responded in the same, so to speak, “anti-Black” way, yet doing so against his own politically willed intentionality.

²⁵ These “technologies,” I propose, are ones specific to what Ira Livingston identifies as “the gravity of language” (Livingston, 2006) and, therefore, of story-telling and origin-myths, rather than the “gravity” of the physical sciences.

²⁶ The notion of sacrificing one’s biological life for the well-being of one’s *fictive mode of kind* is evident in today’s Iraq, where Sunni, Shia, and Al Qaeda suicide bombers sacrifice their biological lives to actualize themselves in terms of their cosmogonically chartered *symbolic life* as Sunni, Shia, or, in the case of Al Qaeda, as Radical Islamists. This dynamic is also evident, in the main part, with the young US/American soldiers sent to invade Iraq, who everyday also sacrifice their biological lives in order to actualize, by dying for the flag, the “collective intentionality” which gives expression to their shared cosmogonically chartered, sociogenic code of *symbolic life* as “Americans” belonging to the “imagined community” (Anderson, 1983) of the post Civil-War US, fictive mode of nation-state kind.

To Emancipate Ourselves from the *Biologically Absolute* Terms of the Genre-Specific Sociogenic Replicator Code and Mode of Knowledge Production of Secular Western *Man(2)*: To "Find a Ceremony" able to Resolve the Contradictions of Our Uniquely Human, Hybrid Level of Existence

Given the above uniquely human predicament, we as Western and westernized academics/intellectuals – working in the disciplinary fields of the “human sciences” (or Humanities and Social Sciences) – therefore now find ourselves *inside* what Clifford Geertz, paraphrasing Hans Weber, identified as “webs of significance” (Geertz, 1973) that we as humans spin for ourselves. Nevertheless, because normally doing so without any conscious awareness of the fact that we do so, the issue that we academics/intellectuals are therefore collectively confronted with is this. Given that such cosmogonically chartered “webs of significance” are at the same time the indispensable condition of our being able to performatively enact ourselves as *being human* in the *genre*-specific terms of an *I* and its referent *We*, how can we then come to know our social reality *outside* the terms of the eusocializing mode of auto-institution in whose web-spinning field alone we are recursively enabled performatively to enact ourselves in the *genre*-specific terms of our *fictive modes of kind*? That is to say, how can we come to know and/or constitute our social reality outside the terms of our present bio-humanist sociogenic replicator code of symbolic life/death, as the *It* (Beer, 1980) about which our social reality orders its hierarchies and role allocations and, thereby, organizes itself as an autopoietic, “linguaging living system” (Maturana and Varela, 1992)? How, finally, can we know and constitute our social reality outside the necessarily circular and cognitively closed terms that are lawfully indispensable to the existential enactment and stable replication of our own societal order as such a living system?

For the “human sciences” of our present order of knowledge, whose domain of inquiry is precisely that of the social reality of our present Western world-system and its nation state sub-units, have themselves to be lawfully and rigorously elaborated in terms governed by the imperative of enabling the stable replication of our contemporary autopoietic and sociogenically encoded, Western-bourgeois world system (Wallerstein, 1974; Wallerstein, 1980), as the first planetarily extended such system in human history. This fact has thereby led to Louis Althusser’s insightful recognition that, as academics/intellectuals of our contemporary Western world-system, who are also its normative middle-class (i.e. bourgeois) subjects, we must necessarily function to elaborate the mode of knowledge production that is epistemologically indispensable to its replication as such

a system (Althusser, 2001).²⁷ Nevertheless, in spite of the above, Althusser continues to identify this overall system and its mode of autopoietic institution in the terms of only *one* of the indispensable, but necessarily proximate, conditions of its functioning. This condition he defines after Adam Smith/Karl Marx as the (teleologically determinant “base” or) “mode of economic production,” rather than from, I propose, the Ceremony Found’s *ecumenically human* perspective as that of each such societal order’s *genre-specific mode of material provisioning*, whose function is to provide for and secure the overall realization of a specific *genre of being hybridly human*, its lawlikely teleologically determinant *mode of autopoietic institution* and/or pseudo-speciation (Erickson, 1975).

However, this error by Althusser does not contradict his core thesis with respect to the lawlike correlation between our modes of knowledge production and the auto-institution of our social realities themselves, as a thesis which I extend here. And this is that our contemporary “human sciences” necessarily induce us to know our *social reality* overall and its third and hybrid level of existence in the same rigorously “abductive” (Bateson, 1969), “world in little” (Hocart, 1936), or “knowledge of categories” (Moraes-Farias, 1980) terms in which both the *physical* and *purely biological levels of reality* had been millennially and lawlikely known from the origin of our species history. This is so given that the latter two levels had been put by humankind under the same rules of sociogenic/symbolically encoded description as those of our social realities, thereby forming a modality of a “mutually reinforcing system of presuppositions” (Bateson, 1979) which also served to legitimate each societal order’s hierarchical structures of dominance and subordination. In consequence – and as the indispensable condition of the formation and stable replication of each respective societal order, together with each order’s answer given to the question of who-we-are by its cosmogonically chartered sociogenic replicator codes – *no ceremony could have been found* that would normally have freed human knowledge of the physical and purely biological levels of reality from the order-stabilizing,

²⁷ Althusser further illuminates with respect to the above hypothesis:

How many [teachers] (the majority) do not even begin to suspect the “work” the system (which is bigger than they are and crushes them) forces them to do, or worse, put all their heart and ingenuity into performing it with the most advanced awareness (the famous new methods!). So little do they suspect it that their own devotion contributes to the maintenance and nourishment of this ideological representation of the School, which makes the School today as “natural,” indispensable-useful and even beneficial for our contemporaries as the Church was “natural,” indispensable and generous for our ancestors a few centuries ago. (Althusser, 2001)

order-legitimizing codes of symbolic life/death about which these realities had autopoetically instituted themselves as *genre*-specific living systems.

The failure to “find a ceremony” able epistemologically to emancipate humankind’s knowledge of the physical and purely biological levels of reality from our order-stabilizing/legitimizing symbolic codes had therefore been nowhere more evident than within the autopoetic field of medieval Latin-Christian Europe. For the latter’s theo-cosmogonically chartered sociogenic replicator code of *Redeemed Spirit* and *Fallen Flesh* – as elaborated by its mainstream theologians – had been mapped onto the “space of otherness” (Godzich, 1987)²⁸ complex of the then still hegemonic Ptolemaic astronomy of Classical Greco-Roman antiquity, if in its now Latin-Christianized variant. This “space of otherness,” therefore, had been mapped transumptively upon the latter as astronomy’s ostensibly unbreachable *Line/Divide* between, on the one hand, the *supra-lunar* (above the moon) but also including the moon *region*, and the *sub-lunar* (below the moon to the cosmic center of an allegedly non-moving Earth) *region*, respectively. The end result of this projection was the occult-like transformation of the physical universe into the ostensibly non-homogenous, *incorruptible Celestial realm* and *corruptible Terrestrial realm*.

Nor was this failure to “find a ceremony” any less so in the case of the pre Western-bourgeois order of the landed gentry of Great Britain, whose sociogenic replicator code of *autonomous Rational human nature* and *subjected Irrational sensory brute nature* had been also mapped onto the new “space of otherness” complex of the ostensible divinely determined but naturally implemented Chain of Being *Line/Divide* between *Humans* and *Animals*. This mapping then further gave rise to the correlated occult-like projection of a *Line/Divide* of *perfectibility* and *degeneracy*, respectively, between the “European” variety of *Mankind* – as the embodiment of phenotypically *normal* humanity – and the “non-European” phenotypically different varieties of *Mankind* as its *abnormal Human Others* (Sala-Molins, 2006).

²⁸ In his “Afterword” to Samuel Weber’s *Institution and Interpretations*, Wlad Godzich writes:

The foundational principles [instituting of human societies] cannot be found in society at large, but must be located in a *space of otherness* that ensures that they remain beyond the reach of human desire and temptation. This space of otherness is either absolute or mediated through the institutions of the state. In other words, the society carries a heavy burden of debt to this space of otherness; it owes its meaning, its organization, its capacity to act upon itself, and thus its ability to manage order and change. This is the foundational debt of meaning that pervades all institutions, including the academic disciplines. (Godzich, 1987: 161)

Nevertheless, in the cases of both the physical and purely biological levels of reality, their respective “ceremonies” were eventually made “findable,” leading to the breaching of the *Lines/Divides* that had hitherto rendered such ceremonies opaque. First, with respect to physical reality, the “finding of a ceremony” had been supplied by the then new Civic-humanist answer that Renaissance humanism’s *Lay* intelligentsia were to give to the question of who-we-are by means of their revalorization and reinvention of Latin-Christian Europe’s *fallen Man* as a *sinful-by-nature* creature. This *Lay* Civic-humanist revalorization (on the basis of their counter theo-nominalist (Blumenburg, 1983) poetics of the *propter nos* (Hallyn, 1993)) and reinvention of the human as *rational* (Western) *Man*(τ), had thereby provided the perspective for the astronomer-priest Copernicus’ epochally new (1543) astronomy’s recognition that the “earth also moves” and is therefore, by implication, of the same physical substance (i.e., matter) as the so-called Celestial bodies, of which the Sun will now be the cosmos’s central body and the Earth no-longer necessarily degraded and fallen at the center of the universe as its dregs. And this recognition by Copernicus – through its full breaching of the projected *Celestial/Terrestrial* realm *Divide*, now postulated as realms made of the same *homogenous* substance – will likewise make possible the then new post-Ptolemaic cum Latin-Christian astronomical perspective that was to be further developed by Galileo, others, and finally culminating in the exultation by Newton – on the basis of his laws of motion and law of universal gravitation – that it was now theoretically possible to extrapolate from that which is near to us in order to comprehend *what* that which is far from us *must be* (Funkenstein, 1986).²⁹ Furthermore, the second “finding of a ceremony” – this time for the purely biological level of reality – was to be later supplied (in the empirical wake of the anti-monarchical US and French revolutions, as well as the anti-slavery Haitian revolution) by the then new, nineteenth-century, Liberal-humanist *bourgeois* answer to the question of who-we-are beginning with Adam Smith and other members of the Scottish school of the Enlightenment, followed by Thomas Malthus’s demographic-cosmogonic trope of *Natural Scarcity* with its ostensible scientific “law of population” (Blumenburg, 1983). And the comprehensive breaching of the projected *Human/Animal* “space of otherness” *Divide* would be definitively effected by Charles Darwin’s “part science,” “part myth” (Isaacs, 1983) “law of Evolution” as a law as applicable to humans as it is to animals – if only, I propose, in our species-specific case with respect to the biological/neuro-physiological implementing *conditions of being human*.

If, however, both of these levels of reality were (from these moments

²⁹ For a full explanation of this process, see my argument in the conversation between myself and Katherine McKittrick (Wynter and McKittrick, 2015).

on) gradually freed, the first increasingly so, the second still only partly so, from having to be known in abductive order-stabilizing/legitimizing terms, *this was not to be the case with respect to our own hybridly human level of existence*. Since given the existential imperative of our having to continue both post-Copernicus and post-Darwin to know our social reality in the “two cultures” (Snow, 1959) terms that we at present do, the interrelated questions with which we now find ourselves confronted are the following: How can we come to know our social reality – as distinct from the now cognitively open and, thereby, self-correcting natural-scientific domains of the physical and purely biological levels of reality – no longer in the terms of the abductive order-stabilizing/legitimizing, “knowledge of categories” system of thought (Althusser’s *Ideology*) to which our present sociogenic replicator code lawlikely gives rise, but instead come to know this reality (and *heretically* so) in the terms of “knowledge of the world as it is” (Moraes-Farias, 1980)? That is to say, how can we come to have knowledge of socio-human existence outside the terms of the answer that we at present give to the question of who-we-are as an alleged *purely biological being*, as one in whose *genre-specific naturally selected/dysselected* symbolic life/death terms we now performatively enact ourselves as *secular* and, thereby, necessarily Western and westernized bourgeois subjects – including us as academics/intellectuals? Finally, how can we come to know our social reality in the same way that Western intellectuals from Renaissance Civic-humanism and its new *Studia* onwards have come to know, and brilliantly so, the physical and purely biological levels of reality in terms of the above-cited imperatively open-ended – because self-correcting – orders of knowledge/cognition that are the physical and biological sciences? As distinct, in both cases however, from their ongoing degradation as the now neo-Liberal, instrumentalist and market-oriented techno-sciences? Not to speak of the pseudo-science of the no less neo-Liberal distortions of sociobiology and its range of offshoots – i.e., “evolutionary ethics, evolutionary psychiatry and medicine, evolutionary aesthetics, evolutionary economics, evolutionary literary criticism” (Rose and Rose, 2010), and a host of others?

To answer these series of interrelated questions, and thereby to realize what had been the thrust of the originally emancipatory openings of the pre- and well as post-Second World War *Anti-Colonial Revolution* – together with the correlated “otherness” continuum of the social and intellectual movements of the *Fifties/Sixties* in both the US and elsewhere before aborted – I now turn to Part 2 of the manifesto of the Ceremony Found.

Part 2. On *Cosmogonic/Sociogenic Causality* and the Laws of Human Auto-Institution

The Autopoietic Turn/Overturn as the Praxis of Césaire's New Science of the *Word*, of Fanon's Revalorizing Re-definition of Who-We-Are: Towards a New Order of Knowledge/Cognition of Our Uniquely Human Third Level of Existence

The proposal of the *Autopoietic Turn/Overturn* is intended to resolve the intellectual predicament I have posed above. 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/intellectuals. And I have likewise adapted the concept of the *Overturn* from the lexicon creatively generated by the “redemptive-prophetic intellectuals” (Bogues, 2003) of the now widely extended, transnational popular “planet of the slums” of the originally Jamaican, millenarian politico-religious *Rastafari* movement. Specifically, I have borrowed from this movement's underlying *counter-cosmogony* in whose logic words are semantically turned upside down – e.g., such as the use by Rastafari of the inverted term *downpression* to define the existential perspective of their *systemic oppression*, this given their largely poor and/or jobless existence.

In this context, the term *counter-cosmogony* also requires additional explanation. For I use the term in the specific sense adapted from Conrad Hyers's brilliant re-reading of the Priestly version (of chapter 1) 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 in the wake of the latter's 587 BCE conquest of the kingdom of Judah and destruction of Jerusalem. In his study, Hyers reveals how the then entirely new *monotheistic* cosmogony or origin story formulated by these priests functioned also as a *counter-cosmogony* whose narrative structures served to utterly de-legitimate the then *polytheistic*, politico-religious, cosmogonic and mythical-complex chartering of the Babylonian empire and its predatory imperial conquests (Hyers, 1984).

Not only is Hyers's reading an example of the kind specifically proposed by the Autopoietic Turn/Overturn, as an approach which takes cosmogonies and their Geertz/Weberian-type “webs of significance” as the objects of our inquiry; but his reading also elucidates the formation of a *counter-cosmogony* projected from what Marcel Gauchet identifies as the exiled captive Jewish priests' then uncompromising “gaze from below” perspective (Gauchet, 1997). This perspective led them to counter-cosmogonically project the invisible existence of a now all-powerful, single Creator God over and against the then hegemonically imperial, polytheistic cosmogony as peopled by the Babylonian pantheon of gods and goddesses, including the central

hero-figure god Marduk. Yet this single Creator God for the first time in human history had now been placed entirely *outside the cosmos*. As such, He was made to assume the novel role of *creator* of the stars and planets not as the divine entities that they had been millennially and polytheistically held to be, but instead as merely *created objects*. Furthermore, this Creator God also assumed the role of being the *creator* of all humankind, thereby reducing the rulers of the mightiest empires to being themselves merely *created beings*. In this context, the Genesis counter-cosmogony as deployed by the sixth century BCE exiled Jewish priests thereby functioned as the source of an entirely new “paradigm of justice” (Williams, 1993),³⁰ one able to transcend all the then existent imperial paradigms.

Both Hyers’s and Gauchet’s combined insights with respect to the Priestly version of Genesis thereby parallels *inter alia* the analogically also desperate “gaze from below” nature of the Rastafari movement’s own projected counter-cosmogony. For the Rastafari’s “redemptive-prophetic intellectuals” with regularity 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 the song lyrics “By the rivers of Babylon/where we sat down/and yea he wept/when he remembered Zion,” as well as in other songs such as “Exodus.” An analogical reading of the Rastafari’s adapted counter-cosmogony therefore enables the identification of what the *major elements* of our present Western world-system’s chartering bio-cosmogonic and part natural-scientific mythical-complex must necessarily be. For these elements would be ones to which the new *gaze from below*, “liminally deviant” (Legesse, 1973) perspective of those exiled in a “new Babylon” – whose lived existence and aspirations as the iconic category of the systemically made jobless/homeless category of the Poor, as one that *cannot* be included within our present “paradigm of justice” – would have necessarily had to counterpose itself in *its* now dynamic contemporary quest for a quite *other* and *superior* order of justice, over and against the now purely secular (neo) Liberal-monohumanist one which mandates/legitimizes by neo-Darwinian/Malthusian “narrative necessity”³¹ their subordination within and exclusion from our present Western world-system’s ostensibly universally applicable and transumed abductive-conception of “human rights” (Williams, 1993).

³⁰ The phrase “paradigm of justice” is adapted from an analogous point seminally made by Bernard Williams in *Shame and Necessity* (1993). Williams shows how the non-Greek Barbarian slaves logically could not have been incorporated within the “paradigm of justice” instituting of ancient Athenian Greek democracy and, therefore, its conception of freedom. For their “sacrifice”/exclusion allowed the free-born Greek citizen to realize him/herself as *free*.

³¹ For the concept of “narrative necessity,” institutionalized as if it were “natural necessity,” see Nagel, 2012: 35–69.

The concept of the Autopoietic Turn/Overturn is also here put forward in its own terms. Specifically, it is put forth as the praxis of two proposals – that of Aimé Césaire’s 1945 proposed new and hybrid “science of the Word/Nature” and Frantz Fanon’s 1952 epochal re-definition in correlatedly hybrid and, therefore, meta-Darwinian terms of who-we-are as humans. First Césaire, in his surrealist-cum-*Negritude* talk in Haiti titled “Poetry and Knowledge,” had argued that for all their dazzling achievements in knowing how “to utilize the world,” the natural sciences have nonetheless remained a “poor,” “half-starved,” and fundamentally an “*impoverished knowledge*.” This given that as the condition of making it possible for humankind to navigate the “forest of [physical and purely biological] phenomena,” the natural-scientific worldview had at the same time necessarily “*depersonalized*” and “*deindividualized*” humanity. And it continues to do so by sacrificing that about our species – i.e., what Césaire labeled as “desires,” “fears,” “feelings,” and “psychological complexes” – which cannot be purely explained within the natural sciences’ ostensibly *empiricist* and objectivist-oriented models of analysis. In turn, Césaire continued, whatever the natural science’s humanly emancipatory and far-reaching “wealth may have been” in aiding humankind, at its inception/formation and coterminous with its worldview “there [also] stands an *impoverished humanity*” (Césaire, 1996).

Nevertheless, Césaire maintained that in the midst of this “great silence,” a new form of knowledge – a new form of “science” of ourselves – is now possible, indeed necessary. Such a new “science,” he proposed, must be one that returns to the “very first days of humanity” – the “very first days of the species” on what is now natural-scientifically cum linguistically known to be the Southwest region of Africa – and thereby takes as its starting point the uniquely human capacity to convey meaning and symbols through language, i.e., through the *Word*. And it is “on the word,” Césaire wrote, that he – like the poet – “gambles all our possibilities [... as the] first and last chance” for humankind. For just “as the new Cartesian algebra permitted the construction of a theoretical physics,” he continued, “so too an original handling of the word can make possible at any moment a new theoretical and heedless science *that poetry could already give an approximate notion of*. Then the time will come again,” he concluded, “when *the study of the word will condition the study of nature*” (Césaire, 1996).

I propose that Césaire’s *new science* would necessarily have to be a new *hybrid* form, with “science” itself redefined beyond the limits of the natural sciences’ restrictedness to their specific domains of inquiry of the physical and purely biological levels of reality. This new order of cognition, as the basis of a new episteme, would have as its specific domain of inquiry that of our uniquely human third level of existence – dually *biological and meta-biological* – doing so, however, according to what can now be recognized

as *Laws of Human Auto-institution* that are as *specific to the functioning of this level of reality* as purely biological laws are specific to the functioning of the second level. Consequently, the telos or aim of this proposed new episteme is therefore the same in this respect as that of the natural sciences. This telos is that of working towards a new and imperatively self-correcting (however eventually), open-ended, order of *extra-territorial cognition* (Gellner, 1974).

Such a drive necessarily entails the following proposition: that Césaire's "science of the *Word*" – one based on the "study of nature" from *its* (the *Word's*) now determinant perspective and, therefore, whose hybrid (*bios/mythos*) praxis is that of the Autopoietic Turn/Overturn – necessarily transgresses our present order of knowledge's *normally unbreachable* "two cultures" (Snow, 1959) *Line/Divide* between, on the one hand, the physical and biological sciences (together with the range of now market cum *homo oeconomicus* techno-sciences to which they have given rise) and, on the other, the disciplines of the Humanities and the Social Sciences (or "human sciences"), the latter as ones that, as Foucault points out, although rigorously modeling themselves on the natural sciences, cannot themselves be *sciences*. Consequently, the transgression and/or heresy of Césaire's hybridly proposed study of the *Word/ of Nature* is one that can be clearly seen to be isomorphic with the study of his fellow Martiniquan Frantz Fanon's new object of knowledge as identified in 1952 within the existential context of the latter's own then parallel redefinition of *being human* and answer to the question of who-we-are in the analogical terms also of our species-specific *hybridity* – i.e., its defining the "study of the word/the study of nature" as the study of *sociogeny/ontogeny* (Fanon, 1967).

Such a study, I further propose as an extension of Césaire and Fanon, is therefore necessarily that of the always-already, cosmogonically chartered sociogenic replicator code of symbolic life/death, in whose terms we can alone both reflexly subjectively experience and, thereby, performatively enact ourselves as the only auto-instituting species of hybrid living beings – that is to say, enact ourselves as *humans*. For the only life that we humans live is our prescriptive *representations* of what constitutes *symbolic life* (Winch, 1964), as well as what constitutes its *Lack* or mode of *symbolic death*. Consequently, because each such sociogenic replicator code of symbolic life/death functions in Gregory Bateson's parallel terms as a "descriptive statement" at the level of the individual subject's *psyche* or *soul*, as the lawlike complement of the genetically enacted and conserved descriptive statement of the individual subject's biological *body* (Bateson, 1968), then the "study of the Word" as the study of the sociogenic code's descriptive statement must necessarily not only correlate with but also *determine* the approach to the "study of nature."

Within the terms of the Ceremony Found's Autopoietic Turn/Overturn as the proposed praxis of Césaire's *new science* and Fanon's *new answer* to who-we-are, this lawlike complementarity would necessarily entail the

study of the physiological/neurophysiological *implementing conditions* (rather than the *basis*) of our being able to lawlikely performatively-enact ourselves as being hybridly human. Central to the study of these bio-implementing *conditions* will be that of the *co-functioning* of each cosmogonically chartered, sociogenic replicator code's system of *positive/negative*, symbolic *life/death* meanings with the biochemical or opiate *reward/punishment* (i.e., *placebo/nocebo*) behavior *motivating/demotivating* system of the brain (Danielli, 1980; Goldstein, 1994; Stein, 2007). For this biochemical system of *reward* and *punishment* in our uniquely human case, as proposed by the above, is systemically activated by each such sociogenic code's representation of symbolic *life* and *death*. This systemic activation thereby directly leads to our performative-enactment or behavioral-praxis as subjects in the always-already, cosmogonically inscribed and mythically chartered, *genre-specific* terms of our fictive modes of kind. In turn, as the condition of the enacting of the code at both levels – that of the “Word” (or *ordo verborum*) and that of “nature” (or *ordo naturae*) – each level has lawlikely and intricately to cohere as a form of finely calibrated non-linear coherence. And they must cohere as such in order both to *activate* and together to *implement* the *genre-specific* supra-individual order of consciousness (or mode of *mind*) that integrates each human group's specific fictive mode of kind, its *I* and its *We*.

With this imperatively lawlike coherence, a logical corollary follows. This corollary is that in each human societal order, as based on its cosmogonically chartered and *genre-specific* fictive mode of kind, both Althusser's “modes of knowledge production” (its episteme), as well as its, so to speak, “aestheteme” – the latter as defined by the archaeologist McNeil as each society's mode of “representational arts”³² – must necessarily be cognitively, epistemologically, aesthetically, and psycho-affectively closed. And they must remain so if the *positively/negatively* marked meanings of each fictive mode of kind's sociogenic replicator code of symbolic *life/death* are to be stably and systemically synchronized with the neurological functioning of the biochemical or opiate *reward/punishment* system of the brain. Why? Because this synchronization itself functions as the condition of the subjects of each societal order both reflexly subjectively experiencing, as well as performatively enacting, themselves/ourselves as being hybridly human in the *genre-specific* terms of each such sociogenic codes' positive/negative

³² At page 45 of my “The Ceremony Must be Found: After Humanism” (Wynter, 1984), I referred merely to the “archaeologist McNeil,” while attributing the reference to the year 1981. I have not been able to find the exact reference as I had originally left it out of the bibliography for that essay. While an unfortunate cost of a multi-disciplinary project, I do hope that someone familiar with this reference – perhaps an archaeologist – will supply me with it.

system of meanings. For “meaning,” as the physicist David Bohm insisted, “*is being*” (Briggs and Peat, 1987). And it is so, I propose, because of its ability directly to affect *matter* by means of its positively/negatively marked regulatory practices of *genre’d coherence*.

World as “Factuality”? Or World as “Narrative-Schema,” Its “Narrative Necessity”? On Our Genre-Specific Modes of Knowledge Production and the Cosmogonic/Sociogenic Origins of Woolf’s and Woodson’s Perspectives of “Otherness”

In the case of the Darwinian *naturally selected/dysselected* sociogenic replicator code of our secular Western, (neo)Liberal-monohumanist *genre* of being hybridly human *Man*(2), both Virginia Woolf in 1929 and Carter G. Woodson in 1933 would come to parallel conclusions each from their respective relatively inferiorized and ostensibly *genetically* (and, therefore, *natural dysselectedly cum dys-genetically*) determined perspectives of “otherness.” These parallel conclusions centered around the systemic nature of the socio-technologies of *positive/negative representations* of the specific order of knowledge which produced their respective perspectives of “otherness” as abnormal *anomalies*. Woolf would do so with respect to the *gender* anomaly she experienced *vis-à-vis* her British imperial ruling upper-class male peers, who had been discursively and empirically institutionalized as ostensibly the *generic sex*³³ and, thereby, the *normal gender*.³⁴ While Woodson would do so within the context of the *racial* anomaly in whose terms he was induced educationally to experience himself like the rest of his then apartheid-subordinated US “Black” population *vis-à-vis* the “White” Euro-American (optimally Anglo-American) population. For the latter had been discursively and empirically institutionalized through the overall US-style apartheid system as ostensibly the *generic* human phenotype and, thereby, the incarnation of being both ostensibly *normally* American and *normally* human.³⁵

³³ For the concept of *generic*, see Jane Gallop’s *Reading Lacan* (1987), 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*. Equally, I argue that the secular West – in using *Man* as interchangeable with *human* – constitutes its own population as the *generic human* and its own bourgeois class as the *generic class*.

³⁴ Virginia Woolf actually uses the term *cocaine* to describe the “rush” that “angry” male professors got when writing books whose purpose was to assure them of their own male intellectual superiority – further motivating them to write more books, while also motivating their non-academic peers to build empires and “civilize” *natives* (Woolf, 1929).

³⁵ In the above context, Carter G. Woodson pointed out in *The Mis-education of the Negro* (1933) that in the curricula of US/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

While if we see these systemic *positive/negative representations* as themselves a central part of the “mutually reinforcing system of presuppositions” (Bateson, 1979) abductively enacting of the secular West’s *Man(2)* in its nineteenth century, *biologically absolute*, (neo)Liberal-humanist conception, then 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 earlier mentioned archaeologist McNeill has proposed, in all human societies from the smallest to the most extended, the role normally played by the “representational arts” or mode of aesthetic production has always been that of explaining the world *not in 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 and mythical charters – the above is no less true of our non-religious or *secular* Althusserian “modes of knowledge production.” And this is so *not* because our modes of knowledge production are ostensibly determined by Althusser’s adaptation of Adam Smith’s/Karl Marx’s “mode of economic production” concept. But rather it is so because of each such mode of knowledge production’s systemic, *genre-specific* role of explaining/describing the world of *its* social reality in the lawlike terms necessary for the stable reproduction of that reality, including its role allocations and hierarchies. As a result, such modes of knowledge production explain/describe the world *not* in the terms of *factuality*, but instead in the terms of a *narrative-schema* specific to the origin story or cosmogony chartering of each society’s fictive modes of kind, their/our respective referent *We(s)* and correlated *genre* of being hybridly human.

I propose, therefore, that within the terms of the *new answer* or response that the Ceremony Found gives to the question of who-we-are as that of a hybrid and uniquely auto-instituting mode of living being, *we humans cannot pre-exist our cosmogonies or origin myths/stories/narratives* anymore than a bee, at the purely biological level of life, can pre-exist its beehive. Seeing that if such cosmogonies function to enable us to “tell the world and ourselves who we are” (Leeming, 2002), they also function even more crucially to enable us autopoetically to institute ourselves as the *genre-specific We* or fictive mode of kind that each of us will from now on pre-conceptually

Europe – directly functioned to *motivate* the latter and to *demotivate* the former. In our contemporary context, Claude Steele and a fellow social psychologist have carried out a series of tests that prove the role that negative stereotypes play in demotivating Black and other students (Steele and Aronson, 1995). Unlike Woodson, however, Steele *does not recognize* the fact that the negative stereotypes are not arbitrary, but are lawlike representations endemic to the order of knowledge/episteme of the Western-bourgeois *genre* of being human *Man*.

experience and, therefore, performatively enact ourselves *to be* as an always-already symbolically encoded and cloned *I/We*. Consequently, if as Sylvia Yaganisako and Carol Delaney propose, given the fact that such origin stories are, the world over, “the prime locus for a society’s notion of itself,” of “its identity [...] worldview and social organization,” then the wide range of all such origin stories – including both the “now dominant [Judaean-Christian] origin story of Creation as narrated in Genesis,” as well as the *secular* origin story of Evolution – should all be treated “neither as *false tales*, nor as *possible windows into the real true origins*, but as *representations of origin*” (Yaganisako and Delaney, 1995). Therefore, the enactment of each such “representation of origin” – I propose here – must lawfully function as *the determinant* of a hitherto non-recognized principle of *Cosmogonic/Sociogenic Causality*. And this proposed principle of causality functions as the second and 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” is then circularly and empirically verified by the ensemble of individual behaviors which that consciousness serves to induce/motivate.

On “Representations of Origin” and the Cosmogonic/Sociogenic Origins and Basis of Our *Genres* of Being Hybridly Human, including that of our Secular Western-Bourgeois Conception *Man*(2), and its *Human Others*

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’ “representations of origin,” the subjects of each respective societal order must remain trapped in a normally unresolvable cognitive dilemma. This dilemma Yaganisako and Delaney have identified with specific reference to the community of (Western) anthropologists, yet is one necessarily generalizable in our contemporary purely secular context, to all Western and westernized academics/intellectuals. For anthropologists, the authors write, had rightfully come to recognize post-Malinowski that “an intimate connection exists between the *word*, *mythos*, [and] the *sacred tales of a tribe*” and the behaviors of the subjects of that tribe, “their ritual acts, their moral deeds, their social organization, and even their practical activities.” Yet although this identification then led anthropologists to “include in their [scholarly] accounts origin stories of the people they study,” these same anthropologists nevertheless “hesitate at the threshold of their own [social organization], reluctant to explore their own origin myths whether religious or secular.” This reluctance on the part of anthropologists is a lawlike one, since one that they share with the peoples they study and who are classified generically as

their “*native informants*.” In turn, the authors continue, anthropologists are akin to the groups they study in that these Western academics/intellectuals also “treat their own stories of origin” as “taboo,” “set apart,” and “sacred,” whether it be their treatment of the (Judeo-Christian) religious story of *Creation* and/or the non-religious, ostensibly purely objective Darwinian story of *Evolution* (Yaganisako and Delaney, 1995).

This latter story, I propose, functions as a “part science, part myth” (Isaacs, 1983) *bio-cosmogonic representation of origins*. For, on the one hand, its “part science” aspect does indeed correctly describe the origins of the physiological/neurophysiological implementing conditions of our being hybridly human, including the Third Event origins of the co-mutational emergent properties of language and narrative with the brain, themselves as the indispensable conditions of being the uniquely auto-instituting mode of living being that we are. Yet, on the other hand, this bio-cosmic representation of origins is also taken, and mistakenly so, to be the true *origins* or *basis* of our *being human*, and thereby serves to charter and legitimate the anthropological (and general Western academic/intellectual) projection of the notion that their/our own purely secular cum biocentric origin myth is somehow “real and true.” Thus within the abductive and necessarily mythical version of this bio-cosmogonic story of origin to which we give the name “human evolution,” the belief is that over the course of the “evolutionary development” or “history” of the modes of knowledge that our species has produced, as Yaganisako and Delaney explain, “first there were myths” that then gave way to “religions.” Yet both have now been “relegated to a dim past,” as stages that *we* have outgrown and replaced by “science” (Yaganisako and Delaney, 1995).³⁶

This *genre*-specific, Western-bourgeois representation of origins or ethno-class “legend of descent” thereby makes it normally impossible for anthropologists and Western academics/intellectuals in general to see themselves/ourselves as in any way *coeval*, as Johannes Fabian was seminal to observe (Fabian, 1983), with the other human groups who are their/our objects of study. Indeed, this representation makes it normally impossible for them/us normally to see other human groups as fully – if differently – *co-human*. To breach this projected *Line/Divide* of co-humanity would necessarily call for Western and westernized academics/intellectuals to effect their/our own Autopoetic Turn/Overturn. For such a *turn* would

³⁶ The abductive transfer of the processes of Evolution from the second level of purely biological life to the historical processes of autopoetic transformations specific to the third level of our hybridly human reality, functions teleologically to legitimate our present Western-bourgeois world system as the ostensible climax/end of history. Yaganisako and Delaney, 1995 enables us to infer this point.

force them/us to accept the *relativization* of their/our own “part science, part myth” origin-story – together with its autopoetically instituted *genre* of being hybridly human and Western civilizational *cum* nation state fictive mode of kind – by correctly identifying this narration as that empirically of *mankind rhetorically overrepresented as if it were that of humankind*. Therefore, to extrapolate from Jacques Derrida’s penetrating 1968 conference presentation “The Ends of Man,” they/we would be called upon to accept that there is indeed no “uninterrupted metaphysical familiarity” that exists which “*naturally* links the ‘We’” of them/us as *secular* and necessarily Western and westernized academics/intellecuals to the “we [...] in the horizon of humanity” (Derrida, 1969).

This over-representation of our Western-bourgeois, ethno-class referent *We* as being isomorphic with that of the “we” of the *ecumenically human* is also made possible only by the further fact that, as Derrida points out, in our academic/intellectual work “the history of the concept of ‘man’” itself is rarely if ever placed under examination. Yet, in extending Derrida, the history of the concept of secular Western *Man*’s discursively invented and objectively institutionalized series of *Human Others* (Pandian, 1985) is never examined as well. These world-systemic *Others* (to *Man*(1)) include first the peripheral *slave* labor “*Negro*”/“*Negress*” together with the semi-peripheral “*Indian*”/“*Indian squaw*” neo-serf labor (Wallerstein, 1974), all therefore represented as ostensibly *by-nature-irrational* (in Renaissance Civic-humanist terms). With these then followed from the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries onwards – this in the wake of the abolition of “*Negro*” slavery, as Pandian also notes, by a second series of *Human Others* (to *Man*(2)) all classified generically (both men and women) as *Natives* within the imperial context of overall Western colonialism. Whilst now in today’s contemporary, planetarily extended, post-colonial, post-*Fifties/Sixties*, neo-Liberal moment, these *Human Others* to (*Man*(2)) include the now institutionalized *Welfare Mom/Ghetto “Black” Others* (including their *Trailer-Park Trash*, *Wigger “White”* counterparts) as the extreme expression of the category of the *non-Breadwinning* “planet of the slums” *Jobless Poor* and, at the world-systemic level, of the category of the “*Underdeveloped*” (Wynter, 1996), all ostensibly as *naturally dysselected Others* allegedly mastered by the Malthusian origin-mythic trope of “*Natural Scarcity*.” The systemic non-recognition of the humanly invented nature of these concepts therefore then serves to ensure, as Derrida further notes, that we continue to imagine that “the sign ‘man’ *had no origins, no historical, cultural, or linguistic limit*” [emphasis added] (Derrida, 1969). And, by extension, we as well continue to imagine that *Man*’s embodied signifiers of *Human Otherness* also all themselves had “no historical, cultural, or linguistic limit” – that is, no *cosmogonic/sociogenic* and, therefore, no *autopoetically instituting* limits.

On Our Hitherto Cognitive and Psycho-Affective Closure to Our Humanly Invented, Cosmogonically Chartered, Sociogenic Replicator Codes as the Price Paid for Our First Emergence

The proposal here, however, is that in the above context this blindness with respect to the origins and limits of our present purely secular *genre* of being human *Man* and its *Human Others*, is one which functions for us according to the same *laws of human auto-institution* to which humankind as whole has been normally subordinated from the Third Event of our species Origin. This form of subordination, however, needs to be recognized within the terms of the Ceremony Found's new Origin Account enacting of a new answer to the question of who-we-are, as having been precisely *the price paid* for that emancipatory *First Emergence* defining of the Event of our species origin some 200,000 years ago in the Southwest region of Africa. That is, our continued subordination to our humanly invented, sociogenic replicator codes had its origin in an Event that was both biological and meta-biological. For, in addition to the First Event of the origin of the physical universe and the Second Event of the origin of purely biological forms of life (Prigogine, 1990), there existed, as I propose, a *Third Event*. This *Third Event* is one 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” This alternative strategy had as its condition the evolutionary formation of “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*” (Arsuaga, 2002).

These are the *stories*, my argument proposes, in whose chartering integrating-schemas and/or “fictitious worlds” our species has been enabled *autopoetically to institute itself* as a now symbolically encoded mode of living being. And through this process, we are artificially made similar or cloned as eusocially, inter-altruistic, kin-recognizing fictive modes of kind (or referent *We(s)*) beyond the narrow preset limits of all forms of purely genetically determined eusocial conspecificity. *Thus our “stories” are as much a part of what makes us human* – of our *being human* as the imperatively artificially co-identifying, eusocial species that we are – *as are our bipedalism and the use of our hands*. This is necessarily so, then, as a function of the Event of the origin of our specifically human mode of living being as a hybrid biological and meta-biological species. And as such a species, our behaviors are no longer solely determined by laws regulatory of purely biological life, but also by *laws of auto-institution* specific to our also third level of existence.

The caveat here, however, is the following. In that with our species' First bio-mutational Emergence *from* the total Primate mode of subordination to the DNA code of the genome – and with it to the genetic limits of eusocial, inter-altruistic, kin-recognizing behaviors – a two-pronged price had to be paid.

(i) The first price results from the fact that our now cosmogonically chartered, sociogenic replicator codes of symbolic life/death – as the newly hegemonic *determinant* of our eusocial behaviors – *had to be able to activate* the opiate reward and punishment biochemical implementing mechanisms of the brain³⁷ in the terms appropriate to each such code's *genre*-specific (and originally religious) creeds' "what is to be said," as well as to its ritual prescriptions as to "what is to be done." This necessary synchronization therefore called for the subjects of each such creed and its chartering origin-story normally to remain *non-consciously* subordinated to its (originally religious) schema as the condition of being who they/we are. Concomitantly, as a function of inducing/motivating the requisite forms of eusocial, inter-altruistic, kin-recognizing behaviors instituting of each such creed's fictive mode of kind, the laws regulatory of such behaviors had to be ones able to ensure that the structuring of our chartering cosmogonies or origin stories, and of the now *genre*-specific sociogenic replicator codes of symbolic life/death which they inscribe/mandate, be rigorously analogous to the purely biological laws regulatory of what Avram Goldstein defines as the "delicately regulated [natural-opioid] system perfected by evolution over thousands of years to serve the survival of all species" (Goldstein, 1994). In the case of us humans, however, these chartering schemas had to function to ensure the systemically activated *co-functioning* of the positive/reward, negative/punishment magma of meanings enacting of each (no longer *species-specific*)³⁸

³⁷ See Avram Goldstein's *Addiction: From Biology to Drug Policy*, where he writes that:

In summary, a natural opioid system exists for signaling both reward, probably by beta-endorphins 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 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 1994: 60)

³⁸ Over and against Goldstein's thesis (1994) that the biochemical behavior-regulatory system functions for humans in the same *species*-specific terms as it does for purely biological

but hitherto) *genre-specific* sociogenic replicator code of symbolic life/death with the good/reward, bad/punishment natural-opioid mechanism of the brain, as, in effect, the systemic *co-functioning* of the sociogenic code's regulatory *second set of instructions* with the *first set of instructions* of the DNA code regulatory of the functioning of our brain's natural-opioid and/or neurochemical system.

In this context, a key insight by N. J. Girardot becomes applicable in his identification of the behavior motivating/demotivating schema defining of all religions. Such a schema, he shows, projects a "general order of existence" that first postulates a "significant ill" or "affliction" (in effect, each code's *symbolic death*) which is then followed by the specific creed's prescribed behavioral-pathways put forward as the "cure" (i.e., *symbolic life*) of each such "ill." He then further gives as an example Christianity's postulate of its "significant ill" as that of post-Adamic mankind's enslavement to *Original Sin*, with *Spiritual Redemption* or salvation from this affliction only attainable by means of Christian *baptism*, followed by the new convert/subject adhering to the prescriptive behavioral-pathways laid down by the Judaeo-Christian *Church* (Girardot, 1983). Yet what Girardot identified with respect to religious systems of thought/*being human* is necessarily applicable to the lawlike way in which all cosmogonies – that is, religious and now secular – together with their behavior-programming mythical schemas, *must be narratively* elaborated according to specific rules. And this lawlike narration, I propose, necessarily also applies to our purely secular (neo)Liberal-humanist, bio-cosmogony, with its transmuted postulate of the significant ill of Malthusian-Ricardian *Natural Scarcity* that must be *Materially Redeemed* by the ostensible purely biologically born (*bourgeois*) *Breadwinner* cum nation-state subject via the institutional mechanism of Free-Market capitalism (Wynter, 1996; Stackhouse, 2001).³⁹ This is so, in that all cosmogonies and their respective

forms of life, Grassi's thesis (1980) makes it clear that the specifically *human code* would have functioned in *creed-specific* and, in my words, *genre-specific* terms. Ernesto Grassi's thesis, I argue, also holds for the functioning of our now purely secular, (neo)Liberal-humanist, bio-cosmogonically chartered creed enacting of the West's second reinvented concept of *Man* its in now bourgeois, *homo oeconomicus* formulation.

³⁹ In his Foreword to Robert H. Nelson's *Economics as Religion*, Max Stackhouse writes, *inter alia*, that Nelson's analysis showed that:

[M]any 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

schemas must be narratively elaborated according to the same good/bad (story-line) terms by means of which the natural-opioid system as defined by Goldstein functions directly and unmediatedly to motivate/demotivate the species-specific behaviors of all purely biological life forms of life.

In this context, I propose that what Girardot has identified, if not in these terms, is the reality of the empirical functioning of *Laws of Auto-institution* specific to our third and hybrid level of reality, as ones only brought into existence by means of our performatively enacted, behavioral-praxis of being hybridly human. And these laws have hitherto functioned to ensure that as the first price paid for our rupture with purely organic life, in order to institute ourselves as human in behaviorally self-programming hybridly *bios* and *mythos/logos* (*theologos*, now-*biologos*) fictively kin-recognizing, eusocial terms, we continue to remain as subordinated to our humanly invented, cosmogonically chartered, sociogenic replicator codes of symbolic life/death as all forms of purely biological living beings must remain subordinated to the biological laws and “DNA replicator codes” (Dawkins, 1983) governing of their species-specific behaviors.

(2) The second price that had to be paid for the epochal rupture in the living world that led to our First Emergence as a species has been the fact that (from then until today) the limits of the degrees of subjectively experienced, psycho-affective inclusiveness defining of each such inter-altruistic, fictive mode of kind (or referent *We(s)*) are themselves set by the limits of each *genre*-specific origin-story. Each such story thereby functions at the same time as the imperative boundary of *psycho-affective closure* defining of each such referent *We/Us* as over against the *They/not-Us*. Consequently (whether small or large-scale), all the wars between members of our species have been waged from our First Emergence until now *not* in terms of purely biological preservation, but instead in terms of the imperative preservation and/or exalted magnification (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 and against that of other groups. At the same time, as lawlikely correlated with each such *genre*-specific mode of psycho-affective closure has been the no less imperative functioning of what can be defined as that of the *law of cognitive and aesthetic (i.e., psycho-affective) closure*. Such a law functions at both the level of purely biological species-specific modes of living being, as well as analogically at the hybrid level of the *genre*-specific modes of being that are uniquely human. And this systemic closure is itself

policies. Economics can deliver us, bring about a redeemed state of affairs on earth, and lead us to abundant living – *the material incarnate form of salvation*. (Stackhouse, 2001; emphasis added)

For a similar argument, see also Brennan and Waterman, 1994.

the supplementary price paid for the rupture effected by means of our First Emergence as a species from the genetically pre-set limits of the eusocial, inter-altruistic, kin-recognizing behaviors defining of the Primate family to which we partly belong.⁴⁰

In this vein, 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 each organism must lawfully “know” and “categorize” its physical environment in terms which conserve its genetically determined descriptive statement of *what it is to be* that organism. Thus each such organism selectively knows and categorizes its environment in the species-specific good/bad terms that are adaptively advantageous to its realization and survival as such an organism. The way each organism knows and experiences reality through its species-specific “perceptual categorization system,” in turn, *can therefore in no way be concordant with the way that reality is outside that species-specific viewpoint* (Edelman, 1987). I propose here a parallel formulation to that of Edelman’s for our now hybrid mode of living being with respect to the laws of human auto-institution that govern our *genre*-specific behaviors. This parallel is that we humans have from our First Emergence also selectively known and categorized our social environments in the good/bad terms which ensure the conservation of our cosmogonically chartered, sociogenic replicator code of symbolic life/death and its second set of instructions’ descriptive statement of *what it is like to be* that *genre*-specific mode of living being. And this knowing and categorizing is done in terms that are adaptively advantageous to this *genre*-specific mode of being’s realization and survival *as* such a being.

The way in which we humans normally know, categorize, and thereby experience our social reality can thus be *in no way concordant with* the way that reality is outside our cosmogonically chartered, sociogenic replicator code’s *genre*-specific viewpoint. In turn, and in response to an existentially imperative reasons-for-being, we humans have also hitherto had to remain normally subordinated to the *law of cognitive and aesthetic (i.e., psycho-affective) closure* defining of all forms of living beings. Yet in our species-specific case, we have as well remained subordinated to our knowledge of the social reality of the autopoetic (linguaging) living system which calls for us to know this reality in the good/bad terms of each *genre*-specific code’s correlated behavior-motivating/demotivating schema. For this form of subordination is itself the condition of our performative behavioral-enactment of ourselves as each such cosmogonically chartered mode of being hybridly human (or *I*) and its fictive mode of kind (or *We*).

⁴⁰ For an excellent description of the origin of this *law* – that of *cognitive closure* – even where he does not define it as such, see Humphrey, 1992.

This autopoietic, cosmogonically/sociogenically induced closure, I propose, is the fundamental cause of the cognitive dilemma identified by Yaganisako and Delaney with respect to Western anthropologists, as well as by Derrida in the general case of secular Western academics/intellectuals like ourselves. In that once the cosmogonically inscribed/chartered, sociogenic replicator code of symbolic life/death that is autopoietically instituting of our *genre*-specific secular Western fictive mode of kind has been institutionalized, we as Western and westernized academics/intellectuals must necessarily know our social reality *not* in the “etic” terms that are concordant with the way that reality is *outside* our present *genre*-specific sociogenic code’s viewpoint. Instead, we must necessarily know that social reality as it must rigorously be “*emically*” known from the *inside*. That is, we must know it in the adaptively advantageous good/bad terms indispensable to the dynamic enactment and stable replication both of our contemporary local nation state sub-units and their fictive modes of kind, as well as of the macro Western world-system in its now bourgeois or ethno-class configuration’s planetarily extended, and no less “fictive” mode of (neo)Liberal-civilizational kind (end of 2).

It is therefore in the context of the overall price paid for the Event of our First Emergence as an autopoietically instituting, hybrid mode of living being, that the far-reaching hypothesis put forward in 1996 by the French anthropologist Maurice Godelier alerts us to the dimensions of the new mutation, i.e., the new Autopoietic Turn/Overturn, that is now urgently called for. Indeed, the imperative need for such a transformative mutation takes on added importance when linked to the “particular wrong” identified by W. E. B. Du Bois in 1903 as the negation of our co-humanity as a species via the “*Color Line*,” as well as to the “general wrong” of Gerald Barney’s (and Aurelio Peccei’s) “global *problematique*” and its intractable “problem” of the looming possibility of our and other species’ extinction as a result of the related threats of global warming, climate change and general ecological cum environmental degradation. For all of these “wrongs” collectively function as the underside costs of the *aporia* of the *secular* West, as an *aporia* generated by our performative-enactment and behavioral-praxis of the planetarily extended, secular Western, now neo-Liberal-monohumanist *genre* of being hybridly human *Man(2)*, itself over-represented in *homo oeconomicus* cum neo-Darwinian terms as *homo sapiens sapiens* as if this self-definition were isomorphic with the *being* of being human as *Homo Narrans* itself. Consequently, within *Man(2)*’s biocentric monohumanist Single Truth – as within the theocentric Single Truth of each of the three religious monotheisms of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam – there can lawfully be *no other answer to the answer* that each gives to the question of who-we-are (Gauchet, 1997).

Consequently, this proposed overall mutation that I now define at the level of our *Homo Narrans* species itself, is nothing less than that of our

Second Emergence, this time from our continued subordination – as the price paid for the Event of our First Emergence – to our own humanly invented, autopoetically instituted cosmogonies or origin narratives and their mandated/prescribed sociogenic replicator codes of symbolic life/death.⁴¹ I further propose that this *Second Emergence* mutation can only be effected from within the terms of the Ceremony Found's *new* post- and meta-Western humanist Origin Account and answer to the question of who-we-are. This proposed *new answer* necessarily moves beyond the limits of our present secular Western world-system's now globally hegemonic, homogenized/monohumanized answer and its *biologically absolute*, cosmogonically chartered and empirically enacted, (neo)Liberal-humanist, Western-bourgeois "paradigm of justice." And it is this specific ethno-class paradigm of justice against which the "redemptive-prophetic" Rastafarian intellectuals of Jamaica had projected their "gaze from below" religio-political millenarian counter-cosmogony. Thus as Bob Marley iterated in his song "So Jah Seh," the Black God Jah, as a new fount of justice, assures Rastafarians that "not one of my seeds shall sit in the sidewalk and beg bread [...] no they won't!"

Part 3. Towards the Autonomy of Human (Self-) Cognition/Agency and Our *Second Emergence*

The Projection of Extra-Human Agency as the Condition of Guarding against the Disintegration of Our *Genres* of Being Hybridly Human: The Case of the *Supernatural Agents* of the *Baruya* of Papua New Guinea

In his book *The Enigma of the Gift* (1999), Maurice Godelier put forth a novel hypothesis on the basis of his in-depth study of the Baruya people of Papua New Guinea. He proposed that as humans we have from our origin had above all else first to *produce* our societies, outside of which we cannot live as (nor indeed *be*) human.⁴² Nevertheless, he continued, for the vast majority of our existence we have at the same time consistently projected our own

⁴¹ The biologist/sociobiologist E. O. Wilson, while agreeing that as mytho-poetic creatures we live in stories, proposes instead from his *biologically absolute* perspective as ethno-class *Man*(2) that it is the *brain* which *creates* our chartering stories (Wilson, 2000). Rather, I argue that the recently discovered mythic region of the brain merely sets constraints on the patterns our chartering origin-stories/cosmogonies must follow as determined by the *Laws of Human Auto-institution*.

⁴² Thus as the historian Bill Christian points out, the *first form of nomadic* social organizations have been found on the continent of Africa. Furthermore, almost *half of human history* was lived on the continent before the first small groups of humans left some 65,000 years ago to eventually people the planet (Christian, 2004). I argue that these first groups also

collective agency for this societal production – by means of the narrative devices of our “foundational myths” or origin-stories/cosmogonies – onto millennially varying forms of *supernatural agents*, be they nature spirits, deified ancestors, gods and goddesses, or the invisible single God of the three Abrahamic monotheisms. Yet in *all* such cases, we did so for the same purpose – *that of making our own empirical human agency anti-entropically opaque to ourselves* (Godelier, 1999). In this context, Godelier’s analysis of the Baruya reveals, *inter alia*, the following with respect to the functioning of the above imperative:

(1) The foundational myth that is part of the overall mythic complex of the Baruya functions, by the very plotting of its narration, to validate the Baruya’s projection of their collective agency onto the magma of *supernatural agents* who people their Castoriadis-type *Imaginary* (Castoriadis, 1987). Such a projection then functions to mandate and legitimate not only the respective role-allocations structuring of the Baruya societal order, but also as well the inequalities between its subjects the Baruya people. Most of all, given the politically stateless or a-statal nature of Baruya society – and, therefore, the relatively egalitarian, non-stratified relationships between male members of the group – this projection, together with (in Butler’s terms) the “regulatory practices of gender coherence” (Butler, 1990) functions also to legitimate the large-scale inequalities between the men and women as an always-already, cosmogonically and mythically chartered inequality.

(2) Thus, in the case of the Baruya, the gender inequalities and practices of gender coherence – themselves a function of the overall regulatory practices of *genre* coherence⁴³ – are indispensable to the autopoietic institution of the Baruya’s mode of fictive kind, as *the* telos of both its founding origin-narrative and mythic complex as well as of the everyday functioning of the empirical society. This *genre*-specific autopoiesis thereby enables the subjects of the

invented and carried with them the matrix forms of autopoietic story-telling cosmogonies instituting of human forms of social organization.

⁴³ Although Godelier does not use these terms, he nevertheless contrasts the difference between the *gendered* form of the *divide* or *code* that tends to be central to relatively egalitarian or non-stratified societies like that of the Baruya, with that of the relatively more stratified society of East Timor. In the latter, the gendered form of divide/code is transcended by another form, one in which a specific *clan* becomes *the* governing clan over all other clans. In turn, the gender divide/code now plays a reinforcing role, as it likewise does in our contemporary Western and westernized secular societies. In our specific Western-bourgeois, ethno-class case, the gender code is transcended by the code of *class*. Yet, by further extension, both the *class* and *gender* codes are themselves transcended by the founding sociogenic replicator code of symbolic life/death enacting of the West’s *Man* in its second reinvented form, as a founding divide/code to which we give the ethno-taxonomic term *race*.

Baruya societal order to experience their respective role-allocations as ones which – because projected as *supernaturally* and, therefore, *extra-humanly* ordained – cannot normally be questioned. As a result, all subjects of the order, including those who most lose out – i.e., the women – nonetheless are normally induced to collectively continue to work towards the dynamic enactment and stable replication of that order. Why? Because the Baruya societal order is one phenomenologically experienced by its subjects, through the mediation of its cosmogonic and mythic complex, as the “true” because (until the coming of the Western colonizers) *only possible order* (end of 2).

Why this overall imperative? I propose that Godelier’s analysis uncovers a major corollary of the cognitive price originally paid by humankind for the mutation effected by the Third Event of our origin as defined by our First Emergence. This corollary continues to function for us – if in the terms of our present Western and westernized purely *secular* world-system – in the same analogically lawlike terms that it does, as Godelier shows, for the Baruya people in what would have been (before their colonization by the West) their then totally auto-centered society. For Godelier’s analysis enables us to see this corollary as that of the existential imperative of the subjects of each human society having to make the empirical reality of our own collective human agency, for the anti-entropic production and reproduction of that specific society, *opaque* to ourselves – including the reality of our empirically *being directly responsible* for the “goods” and the “bads” of each such societal order. This opacity therefore functions as the non-negotiable condition of the continued existence of our *genres* of being hybridly human, their correlated fictive modes of kind, and the dynamic enactment and stable replication of our respective societal orders as autopoetic living systems.

In turn, this existential imperative of having to make our own human agency opaque to ourselves can now be recognized as the lawlike causal principle of the specific cognitive dilemmas observed in our contemporary case by Derrida and Yaganisako and Delaney. Yet this dilemma Godelier himself paradoxically embodies as well. For while a top-flight anthropologist, he is also (like us) a Western-bourgeois subject instituted as such in the *genre*-specific, cosmogonically chartered terms of the now biologically absolute answer that the secular West’s second, reinvented concept of *Man* gives to the question of who-we-are. And within the terms of such an answer, both the *reality* and *relativity* of humankind’s *genre*-specific modes of fictive kind *cannot be recognized to exist*. For such an identification would entail the recognition of the also *genre*-specific relativity of the West’s own answer to that millennial question.

As a result of this cosmogonically induced failed recognition, Godelier is himself unable to see that what he so excellently describes in his book is precisely the autopoetic procedures and narrative devices instituting of

the *genre*-specific, Baruya mode of fictive kind *as such a mode of kind*.⁴⁴ Nevertheless, his analysis generally transcends this oversight via the far-reaching dimension of his other recognition. And this recognition is that the Baruya's existential imperative of making their empirical agency opaque to themselves also functions as an imperative universally applicable to all modes or *genres* of being hybridly human and their fictive modes of kind hitherto. Indeed, what Godelier has come upon, although not specifically identifying it as such, is precisely the functioning of the *regulatory laws governing all processes of human autopoiesis or auto-institution*. These laws have from our origin prescriptively called for the narrative cum storytelling projection onto extra-human agents of what is *de facto* our own empirical, collective agency. At the same time, the making of the reality of that agency anti-entropically opaque to ourselves functions as the very condition of our being able – as an imperatively eusocial species depending for our survival/realization on artificially induced levels of inter-altruistic, kin-recognizing cooperation – to effect the mutation that was that of our epochal *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. Instead, by means of our Nietzschean-type “*labor upon ourselves*” (Nietzsche, 2000) and its correlated second set of instructions, we humans *auto-institute* ourselves as the uniquely hybrid mode of living being that we are.

In their first matrix religious forms, these humanly invented and retroactively projected cosmogonies or foundational myths for millennia functioned to mandate/prescribe the second set of instructions of the *genre*-specific sociogenic replicator codes of symbolic life/death instituting of our fictive modes of eusocial, inter-altruistic, kin-recognizing kind. The

⁴⁴ For example, Godelier excellently describes the central male initiation ceremonies which, in an originally *warrior* society as that of the Baruya, function to give a second-birth/rebirth to the 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 for whose defense or exaltation they will now be prepared to give up their biological lives. At the same time, Godelier's description also makes clear how the initiates are made *to experience* by means of the same ritual ceremonies, including their being “fed” 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. In turn, the particularistic “we-of-the-same-womb” *genetic* life/kinship loyalty of the initiates is considered a *secondary* form of life/kinship loyalty that is contrasted to the *political* form of life/kinship into which they are being *re-engendered* by the men. The desire for the former particularistic life/kinship defined by the bio-instinctual tendency towards biological self-preservation, had to be *overridden* by the men by means of their ritual initiation ceremonies, and necessarily overridden, in my own words, by *cosmogonic/sociogenic and, thereby*, in Thomas Nagel's words “*narrative necessity*” (Nagel, 2012: 35–69).

why of this existential imperative of retroactive projection is necessarily as follows. Since our fictive modes of kind, together with their identity-instituting, cosmogonically mandated codes of symbolic life/death, are *entities* that can in no way exist in *Nature* – and, therefore, do not purely originate via bioevolutionary processes that would have enabled such modes of kind to be genetically determined and stabilized – then each human society’s projection of its subjects’ collective agency (for immeasurably long millennia) onto extra-human agents had been and continues to be a lawlike function of a specific telos. And this telos is that of *guarding against the entropic disintegration or falling apart* of our artificially instituted, cosmogonically chartered fictive modes of kind and their societies as autopoietic living systems. For such living systems are self-organized about the *It* of each fictive mode of kind’s *genre* of being hybridly human and correlated sociogenic replicator code of symbolic life/death, as the analogue at the level of purely biological life to the way in which the beehive self-organizes itself about the species-specific DNA replicator code of the bee. The projection of each sociogenic code’s original source onto extra-human agents thereby serves as the indispensable function of the stabilization of that specific code, whose positive/negative, symbolic life/death system of meanings – once correlated with and, thereby, activating of the biochemistry of the natural-opioid system in its *genre*-specific terms – is transformed into a *living entity* as “words-made-flesh.”

From the *Supernatural* Agents of the Baruya to the Secular, Ostensibly *Natural* Agents of Our Contemporary, Planetarily Extended, *Genre* of Being Hybridly Human of Secular Western *Man*

In the context of Godelier’s specific analysis of the Baruya and of his and my extended general hypothesis, the far-reaching world implications of Renaissance humanism’s original counter-cosmogonic “back to the Greco-Roman pagan classics” can now be fully understood. For this original humanism’s invention of *Man*(1) (as *homo politicus*) – as a *separate* notion from that of the *homo religiosus* self-definition of the Latin-Christian feudal, medieval European *Christian* – initiated the *relativization* of the latter’s *theologically absolute* and divinely guaranteed answer to the question of who-we-are. This first act of *separation/relativization* had thereby set in motion nothing less than the initiation of the West’s epochal *desupernaturalization* of the extra-human agencies onto which human groups had millennially projected the reality of our own collective Agency from the Event of our origin as an autopoietically instituting hybrid being. And this initiated process of desupernaturalization – one later enforced by the West’s second and reinvented, Liberal-humanist answer to the question

of who-we-are – led not only to the further ongoing *privatization* in the West of Christianity's *theologically absolute*, divinely guaranteed answer. But, more broadly, this process also effected a rupturing intervention of discontinuity with respect to the millennially extended order of human history. For this rupture necessarily interrupted humankind's continuous process of projecting the reality of our agency onto the magma of humanly invented *supernatural Agents*, as projections which from our Origin had functioned to ensure the opacity to our normative supra-individual orders of consciousness of the reality of our own auto-instituting human agency.

Uniquely in the case of the post-medieval West, the setting in motion of the desupernaturalization of our projected Agency by means of its two new answers of Renaissance Civic- and (neo)Liberal-humanism necessarily led to the formulation of the hitherto non-recognized principle of *Natural Causality* in the reoccupied place of Christianity's hitherto unchallengeable principle of *Divine Causality*. And in the wake of this formulation, the West gradually uncovered for humankind in general the reality of autonomously functioning *Laws of Nature*, making all processes of the physical and (if only partly so) of the biological levels of reality now recognizable by our species in natural-scientific terms as self-organizedly functioning *cursus solitus naturae*.⁴⁵ This new principle of causality, in turn, made possible the formation of the physical and purely biological sciences, as new orders of self-correcting, open-ended cognition that gradually freed their respective domains of inquiry from having to be continually known in the abductive terms hitherto called for in order to ensure the existential imperative of guarding against the entropic disintegration of our *genres* of being hybridly human, correlated fictive modes of kind, and respective societal orders as autopoietic living systems.

Nevertheless, the West effected this epochal desupernaturalization *only on the basis of its reprojection of its own human agency* onto two no longer supernatural, but no less extra-human, agencies, doing so now on far more dangerous – because ostensibly *natural/natural-scientific* – grounds.⁴⁶ And these rejections were chartered within the terms of the same two *secular* Humanist counter-cosmogonies instituting of their respective inventions and reinventions of the *secular* Western *genre* of being hybridly human *Man*. Within the terms of the first Civic-humanist cosmogony, the West had mapped its reprojection of human agency onto the extra-human agent of *Nature/Human Nature*. While the second Liberal-humanist reprojection of agency had been mapped onto the extra-human agent of *Evolution*, as defined within the terms of Charles Darwin's bio-cosmogonic charter

⁴⁵ This phrase translates as “in the accustomed or customary course of nature.”

⁴⁶ For an example of this discussion, see McKinnon, 2005.

in his bourgeois origin narrative, *The Descent of Man* (1871). Both forms of reprojection were to have specific consequences. For one, they served to charter the secular West's two sociogenic replicator codes enacting of each form of *Man* (as the incarnation of *symbolic life*) and of its *Human Others* (as the embodiment of *symbolic death*). And these codes were/are then performatively enacted only on the basis of the West's negation of its human subjects' equal co-humanness with all other (originally non-Western) members of humankind. Second, the very dimensions of the contradiction enacted by the West's epochal *humanly emancipatory* desupernaturalization of Divine monotheistic Agency, this on the correlated basis of its own *Secular/Natural* but still extra-human ones,⁴⁷ initiated (from then on until now) the hitherto theoretically unresolvable endemic contradiction or *aporia* of the *secular*.

Here, then, lies the cognitive impasse of the West. This impasse is one by means of which over the centuries this local autopoietic field (or "local culture" (Geertz, 1983) in Western terminology) would come to exercise to the fullest all of its new natural-scientific powers technologically to harness the forces of nature to the imperially expanding purposes of its respective ruling groups, itself as a harnessing that had been made possible only by means of the self-correcting and open-ended natural-scientific order of cognition based on the principle of *Natural Causality*. Nevertheless, with respect to its ongoing orthodox *genre*-specific cognition (in terms of the bourgeoisie's Liberal-monohumanist *Man(2)*) of the social reality of the planetarily extended system that the West has likewise brought into existence, an invertedly negative, humanly subjugating aspect would come to the fore. In that, with the reprojection by the West of its own (and indeed of *all* humankind's) collective agency onto two forms of non-supernatural

⁴⁷ The post-medieval secular West would do so on the correlated basis of its own *Secular/Natural* extra-human ones, first in the *by-nature rational* and, therefore, *naturally* free Civic-humanist *Man(x)* cum its *Human Others* defined as *by-nature irrational* and, therefore, *naturally* slave. Louis Sala-Molins gives an example of this *by-nature rational/irrational* Civic-humanist Enlightenment's *Human Otherness* symbolic conception, writing:

To pose the issue of the poverty of the Enlightenment right away, let us consider the example of the most cold-hearted form of genocide by Modernity: that which accompanied Modernity from its dawn, remained with it throughout its course and well beyond it, [...] a form of genocide [...] that banished from humanity an entire continent, on the basis of a body deemed bestial and a mind considered fit for natural enslavement. (Sala-Molins 2006: 5-6)

Yet this earlier form would be followed by that of Evolution's *naturally selected* and, therefore, necessarily *bourgeois* middle- to upper-class (neo)Liberal-humanist *Man(2)* cum its *Human Others* as *naturally dysselected*, and, therefore, necessarily impoverished, jobless, "underdeveloped."

but no less extra-human agencies, its academics/intellectuals – as well as *all of us* drawn within its now biocentric prototype image of *being human* as secular *Man(2)*⁴⁸ – the above *genre*-specific order of cognition continues to take part in and rigorously re-enact, doing so lawfully in its own bourgeois cum ethno-class terms, what has been from our origin as a species our uniquely human existential imperative. And the uniquely Western-bourgeois cum *homo oeconomicus* member-class form of this uniquely human imperative is that of also making opaque to ourselves the reality of our collective human Agency with respect to the formation, cognition, and replication of the planetarily extended cum globally incorporated, now neo-Liberal world-system societal order into which we – whether originally Western or westernized, thereby secular or non-secular – are all now both *bio-cosmogonically/sociogenically encoded* and thereby *empirically* incorporated.

Cosmogonic/Sociogenic Causality and the Non-Natural, Genre-Specific Ensemble of Behavioral-Activities Driving Global Warming and Climate Change: The Intractable Cost of Secular Western Man(2)'s "Global Problematique"

In this overall context, 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 unique form of that existential imperative – one hitherto unimaginable, yet in direct response to the now “general wrong” which we are called upon to confront and deal with for the first time in the history of our species as Derrida’s “we [...] in the horizon of humanity.” This ultimate predicament is 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 autopoetically instituting, hybrid mode of living being that we are. I propose

⁴⁸ If the multiple challenges of the *Anti-Colonial* struggles – when functioning together with those of the *Fifties/Sixties* social movements in the imperial centers themselves – had empirically and intellectually called into question the West’s prototype of *being human* in the second reinvented, *biologically absolute* terms of, (*bourgeois*) *Man(2)* as *homo oeconomicus*, Frantz Fanon was precisely to 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 1984 essay “The Ceremony Must Be Found,” to re-enact the dimensions of the autopoetic *heresy* now called for. As he wrote in his *Les Damnés de la Terre* (1961), translated as *The Wretched of the Earth*:

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*. (Fanon, 1963; emphasis added)

here that if we as humans are to collectively survive, we must actualize the *heresy* of securing the non-opacity of our own agency and, with it, the full autonomy of the new order of cognition based on the new principle of *Cosmogonic/Sociogenic Causality*. For without such an actualization, no effective “what is to be done” solution can furthermore be found to either Du Bois’s “particular wrong,” nor to the “general wrong” of Barney’s (and Peccei’s) “global *problematique*” – since both are reciprocally the causal condition of each other because enacting of the same sociogenic replicator code of secular Western *Man* in its second reinvented form.

The inability to project an effective “what is to be done” solution due to the failure to effect such an epistemic actualization is evident in what I propose to be the continued misattribution/misdiagnosis by even the most rigorous of scientists of the origin/cause of the ongoing crisis of global warming and climate change. Such a misattribution/misdiagnosis received international legitimacy in the 2007 *Fourth Assessment Report* of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) – established in 1988 by the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) and the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) – and whose authors collectively were the co-recipients of the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize.⁴⁹ And this misattribution/misdiagnosis has been continually reaffirmed in subsequent 2013/2014 IPCC working group reports of the *Fifth Assessment Report*, including that most recently unveiled to the public on March 31, 2014. This diagnosis, while rightfully attributing the etiology of the dually related crises of global warming and climate change to *non-natural* (and not merely *natural*) causes, nonetheless also systemically misattributes such activities as having purely originated from “anthropogenic forcings” or *generically* “human activities.”⁵⁰ And this misattribution/misdiagnosis has then necessarily led IPCC and other natural scientists globally to propose solutions to global warming and climate change that are couched largely in *economic* terms, as ones derived from 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”).

⁴⁹ The authors of the 2007 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) *Fourth Assessment Report* were co-recipients of the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize with former US Vice President Al Gore, the latter centrally for his environmental-activist work that culminated in the publication of *An Inconvenient Truth* (2006) and production of the documentary under the same title.

⁵⁰ The term “anthropogenic” is defined as “of, relating to, or resulting from the influence of human beings.” “Anthropogenic GHGs” and “anthropogenic warming” are other similar concepts/terms deployed by the authors of the 2007 IPCC *Fourth Assessment Report* to characterize the *non-natural* causes implicated in global warming and climate change. See section 2, “Causes of Change,” of the report (IPCC, 2007).

Yet, the fault/error of this misattribution/misdiagnosis and subsequent “what is to be done” projected solutions lay not in the rigor and precision of the natural-scientific findings of these scientists, but rather in their systemic inability to raise the question posed by Derrida of his fellow French philosophers’ own cognitive impasse – the question, that is, “But who, we?” For, I propose here, the *non-natural* activities driving global warming and climate change – as well as the economic policy prescriptions put forth as resolutions – are ones that are reciprocally performatively enacting of our present *genre* of being hybridly human as that of *secular Western Man* in its second reinvented, *homo oeconomicus*, now (neo)Liberal-humanist cum monohumanist form. And it is this *genre* of being human that the scientists of the IPCC (and other like-minded academics/intellectuals) have systemically over-represented as if *it* were isomorphic with the *being* of *being human* and, thereby, necessarily definable as the *human-as-a-species* itself.

The IPCC authors of both the 2007 *Fourth Assessment* and 2013/2014 *Fifth Assessment* reports – whose documents continue to define the terms of our contemporary hegemonic, global understanding of the origins/causes of global warming and climate change – thus take such an *over-representation* as an *empirical fact*. For, although highly trained scientists whose own natural-scientific order of cognition is an imperatively self-correcting and open-ended one with respect to their appropriate non-human domains of inquiry, as the condition of being a “natural scientist” in our contemporary society they are at the same time Western and westernized bourgeois subjects. In turn, the reports’ authors have been *initiated* 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* in its second reinvented, *homo oeconomicus* configuration. Thus, they necessarily fall into the trap identified by Derrida of conflating their own existentially experienced, Western-bourgeois or ethno-class referent *We* with the “we [...] in the horizon of humanity.”

This conflation then leads the panel of scientists to attribute the reality of behavioral activities that are *genre*-specific to the West’s *Man* in its second reinvented conception – as a *cosmogonically originating cum sociogenically encoded ensemble of behavioral activities* – as being ostensibly “human” behavioral-activities-in-general. And they make such a misattribution in spite of the fact that they do historicize the origin of these behavioral activities as having begun with the West’s Industrial Revolution from about 1750 onwards.⁵¹ Yet this revolution itself erupted in Great Britain

⁵¹ See IPCC, 2007: ch. 1, “Historical Overview of Climate Change Science,” section 1.3.1, “The Human Fingerprint on Greenhouse Gases.”

both with the growing expansion of *the largely bourgeois enterprise of factory manufacturing*, as well as with *the first stages of the political* and thereby also capitalist-economic struggles of the British bourgeoisie in its challenge to and eventual displacement of the earlier civic hegemony of the landed (i.e., hereditarily freehold) aristocracy cum gentry. Yet their political/economic struggle was as well a counter-cosmogonically chartered cum *intellectual* struggle, one that led to, *inter alia*, the Autopoetic Turn/Overturn and, thereby, the reinvention of the landed gentry's Civic-humanist conception of *Man(1)-as-homo-politicus* with the Liberal-humanist conception and now capital-owning cum purely secular *genre* of being human of *Man(2)-as-homo-oeconomicus* (Pocock, 1989; Wynter, 1996). Although not fully institutionalized until the mid-nineteenth century onwards – when its optimal incarnation came to be actualized in the British bourgeoisie as the new ruling class – this *genre* of being hybridly human would generate the prototype specific ensemble of *new* behavioral-activities that impelled the Industrial Revolution, as well as the overall West's second wave of imperial expansion based on the colonized incorporation of a majority of the world's peoples all coercively homogenized/monohumanized to serve this *genre's* own *redemptive material* telos of “economic growth” and “development.” And this *genre* of being human's redemptive telos, I propose, is *the same telos lawlikely initiating and enacting of global warming and climate change*.

Consequently, if the authors of the 2007 IPCC *Fourth Assessment Report* note that around 1950 an acceleration of the processes of global warming and climate change had begun to take place,⁵² this was not only due to the Soviet Revolution's (from 1917 onwards) forced march towards industrialization in the still (*Proletarian*) *Man(2)-as-homo-oeconomicus* conception, nor indeed also by that of Mao's China. Instead, this acceleration was also due to the range of successful *Anti-Colonial* struggles for political independence in the wake of the Second World War. And because the new entrepreneurial and academic elites of the former colonies had already been *initiated* by the Western educational system within the bourgeois terms of the *Man(2)-as-homo-oeconomicus* conception, they too would see political independence as calling for industrial-economic “development” on the “*collective bovarysme*” (Price-Mars, 1983)⁵³ model of the Western bourgeoisie. In turn, the acceleration of global warming and climate change would gain even more

⁵² See IPCC, 2007: ch. 1, “Historical Overview of Climate Change Science,” section 1.3.1, “The Human Fingerprint on Greenhouse Gases.”

⁵³ The phrase *collective boarysme* was coined for the Haitian elites by the Haitian scholar Price-Mars to identify the nature of their “failure” in the wake of the Haitian Revolution ... until today (Price-Mars, 1983).

momentum as more of the world's peoples – inclusive of those who belong to other civilizations cum religions, as in the case of Islam – began to organize industrial societies on the monolithic model of the above secular Western *genre* of being hybridly human.

The end result was that by the time of the release of the 2007 *Fourth Assessment Report*, these processes of global warming and climate change were now being driven ever-increasingly by a now planetarily homogenized/standardized transnational system of material provisioning based on the telos of the accumulation of capital as the means of production of ever-increasing “economic growth” and “development.” This system of production necessarily calls for a *single model* of normative behavioral-activities; and these activities are themselves driven by the now globally homogenized/westernized desire of all men and women to realize themselves/ourselves in the monohumanist terms of the secular West's *homo oeconomicus* conception and its single ethno-class “understanding of man's humanity” *over-represented* as if it were that of the human-in-itself. And with this, the well-being and “common good” of this *genre* of being human's referent *We* as the transnational middle and upper classes (even more optimally of their now neo-Liberal corporate multi-national business industries and global financial networks), have continued to be represented as itself indispensable to the securing of our present Western-bourgeois conception's well-being and “common good” within the terms of its behavior-regulatory *redemptive material* telos. This given that such a telos is put forth as the Girardot-type “cure” for our (neo)Liberal-humanist projected Malthusian-Ricardian transmuted postulate of a “significant ill” as that now ostensibly of *Man(2)kind's* threatened subordination to the trope of *Natural Scarcity*. Thus the very ensemble of behavioral-activities indispensable to the continued hegemony of the bourgeoisie as a Western and westernized transnational, planetarily extended ruling class, also function as ones indispensable to the continued dynamic enactment and stable replication of the West's second reinvented thereby (neo)Liberal-humanist/monohumanist conception of *Man*. And because this genre of being hybridly human must necessarily guard against the possible entropic disintegration of its planetarily extended, Western and westernized world system, together with its fictive nation states' mode of kind, *it must necessarily also guard against – within the terms of its genre-specific supra-individual order of consciousness – the bringing to an end of its also la(w)kely concomitant, planetarily extended crisis of global warming and climate change*. Indeed, *it must guard against* the very recognition of *its direct threat* to the continued livability of our planetary habitat.

This, therefore, is *the* cognitive dilemma arising directly from the West's hitherto unresolvable *aporia* of the *secular*, as an endemic contradiction that has been precisely captured by Sven Lütticken in his 2007 essay.

“Despite the consensus,” Lütticken writes, “that global warming cannot be ascribed to normal fluctuations in the earth’s temperature, [... the] *social and political components* of this process have been *minimized*; *man-made nature* is re-naturalized, [and] the *new (un)natural history presented as fate*” [emphasis added]. Yet, he continues, “[t]he truly terrifying notion is *not* that [global warming/climate change] is irreversible, but that it actually might be reversible – at the cost of *radically changing the economic and social order*” [emphasis added] (Lütticken, 2007). This “radical changing of the economic and social order” necessarily entails, I propose, the *overturning* of the now globally hegemonic, *biologically absolute* answer that *We-the-West* at present give to the question of who-we-are as humans. For it is this answer’s (neo)Liberal-humanist, *Man(2)-as-homo-oeconomicus*, bio-cosmogonically chartered sociogenic replicator code’s intentionality of dynamic enactment and stable replication of which our present Western-globalized “economic and social order” *is itself* the empirical actualization – as the actualization, that is, of our present “single understanding of man’s humanity” and the *aporia* to which its imperatively superordinate principle of causality continues to give rise.

In this context, another implication of Maurice Godelier’s in-depth study of the Baruya becomes applicable. For in elucidating (in my own terms) the autopoietic instituting-processes by means of which the Baruya collectively produce themselves as men and women of their *fictive* Baruya mode of kind, he allows us to see that their mode of material provisioning (or “mode of economic production” in the terms of our present Western-bourgeois episteme) is necessarily a *genre-specific* one. As such, their mode of material provisioning functions *not* to provision for the Baruya as *biological* men and women, but instead primarily materially provisions for them as the always-already, cosmogonically charted, *symbolically encoded* men and women of the specific fictive mode of kind that they are. Consequently, because this dynamic itself is a function also of the existential imperative of ensuring the continued enactment and stable reproduction of both their fictive mode of kind and societal order as an autopoietic living system, the following insight from Godelier’s analysis becomes overwhelmingly clear. This insight is that what we Western academics/intellectuals define in our now ethno-class terminology as “modes of economic production,” rather than being *the determinant* social factor they are now held out to be, are instead an indispensable but still only *proximate* function of the overriding telos of Baruya society. And this overriding telos is that of its *mode of auto-institution* as, in effect, the mode of production and reproduction of the Baruya’s *genre* of being hybridly human, its fictive mode of kind, and, thereby, *its mode of material provisioning*.

In consequence, I propose here that according to the *Laws of Human*

Auto-institution regulatory of our third and hybrid level of reality, this fact regarding Baruya society can be no different with respect to, in Lütticken terms, our present “economic and social order.” This means that our present hegemonic Free Market, (neo)Liberal-capitalist mode of material provisioning must also lawfully function like the Baruya’s *not* to provision the human species as a whole merely as *biological* men and women. Instead, this mode provisions them/us as ethno-class *homo oeconomicus* men and women of their/our fictive nation state mode of Western and westernized bourgeois kind, optimally inscribed as *able-to-win* Breadwinners and, as such, *able-to-consume*-Consumers and *able-to-invest*-Investors. In effect, it provisions us as the optimal bourgeois incarnation of the capital-accumulating *homo oeconomicus* masterers of the trope of *Natural Scarcity* and, thereby, as this trope’s cosmogonically chartered and sociogenically encoded “symbolic life” and redemptive “cure.”

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 *as if it were* a mode of standardized, homogenized and globally incorporated economic production able to optimally provision not merely *Man(2)*’s referent middle and upper-class *We*, but also that of the *ecumenical* “we [...] in the horizon of humanity,” the logical acceptance by the authors of the 2007 IPCC *Fourth Assessment Report* of this normative over-representation led to another derivative contradiction. For, although the 2007 report documents that the catastrophic disruptions of global warming and climate change have already begun to be felt, they failed at the time to mention that these disruptions are being experienced *unequally* across the globe. That is to say, the major costs of this planetarily extended crisis are already being borne by the poorer peoples and regions of the planet, as an *unequal differential* that lawfully follows the Western world-system’s concomitantly institutionalized *Color cum Developed/Underdeveloped Lines* or *Divides*. Yet the 2007 report’s isolation of the processes of global warming and climate change *from* the interconnected system of underside costs to which it belongs necessarily leads to the partial, if not to say irrelevant, nature of its policy prescriptions. For this interconnected system of underside costs – i.e., of Barney’s (and Peccei’s) “global *problematique*” – *can in no way be addressed* by the 2007 report’s prescriptions for dealing with only *one*, even if the most intractable, of these costs.

The recently unveiled March 2014 working group report for the IPCC’s *Fifth Assessment Report* did rightfully move to correct this 2007 omission by highlighting the interconnection between the unequal disruptions experienced as a result of global warming and climate change to the systemic processes that drive the correlated unequal distribution of wealth and

resources across the peoples and regions of the Earth.⁵⁴ Nonetheless, this same 2014 report continues to carryover the 2007 *Fourth Assessment Report's* original misattribution/misdiagnosis of the *non-natural* causes of global warming and climate change as ostensibly “anthropogenic” or “man-made.”⁵⁵ As a consequence, this means that the fundamental principle of causality that underlies this intractable crisis – not to mention the system of underside costs to which it is interconnected – is not and cannot be seen as such, *and must thereby remain normally unseeable*. And this principle must be *normally unseeable* given that our specific mode of material provisioning – i.e., that of our present techno-industrial mode of economic production in its Free Market, (neo)Liberal-capitalist modality – is one indispensable (from the mid-nineteenth century until today) to the dynamic enactment of the West's second reinvented conception of *Man* in its now bio-humanist, *homo oeconomicus* prototype terms. As such, I propose that it is this conception that has lawlikely led to Barney's (and Peccei's) *poverty-hunger-habitat-energy-trade-population-atmosphere-waste-resource* “global *problematique's*”⁵⁶ interconnected series of underside costs, as *costs* that are the lawlike

⁵⁴ As noted in IPCC, 2014b:

Differences in vulnerability and exposure arise from non-climatic factors and from multidimensional inequalities often produced by uneven development processes, very high confidence. These differences shape differential risks from climate change. [...] People who are socially, economically, culturally, politically, institutionally, or otherwise marginalized are especially vulnerable to climate change and also to some adaptation and mitigation responses, medium evidence, high agreement. This heightened vulnerability is rarely due to a single cause. Rather, it is the product of intersecting social processes that result in inequalities in socioeconomic status and income, as well as in exposure. Such social processes include, for example, discrimination on the basis of gender, class, ethnicity, age, and, disability. (IPCC, 2014b: 6)

⁵⁵ The IPCC Working Group III, as does the IPCC collectively, continued to deploy the concepts/terms “anthropogenic GHG emissions” (2014b: 6), “anthropogenic CO₂ emissions” (7), and “anthropogenic radiative forcing” (9) to characterize the *non-natural* “drivers” of global warming and climate change.

⁵⁶ The environmental activist Paul Hawken documented in *Blessed Unrest* (2007) the dynamic reality of Barney's interconnected underside costs. Hawken points out that while on the one hand “species extinction, together with degrees of human poverty continue to abound,” profits dialectically “continue to soar.” For example, while “[t]he world's top 200 companies have twice the assets of 80 percent of the world's people,” the same dynamic also ensures that “that asset base is growing 50 times faster than the income of the world's majority” (Hawken, 2007). This acceleration, I argue, is also proportionally linked to and likely parallels that of increasing global warming and climate change, because both are generated from the same ethno-class ensemble of behaviors specific to our contemporary, planetarily extended, *genre* of being hybridly human of Western-bourgeois *Man*(2).

conditions of *Man(2)*'s now planetarily extended, homogenized (and now Internet standardized) ongoing dynamic enactment (in iconic "American Dream" terms) and stable replication. And the continued enactment and replication of this now neo-Liberal monohumanist conception has remained unrecognized as *the cause* of these/*its* underside costs.

The Ceremony Found's new revalorizing answer to the question of who-we-are thus *initiates* the recognition of the hitherto, non-recognized principle of *Cosmogonic/Sociogenic Causality* as the resolution to Barney's (and Peccei's) *global problematique*, to its intractable correlated wrong of global warming and climate change, as well as to the particular wrong identified by Du Bois as the "problem of the *Color Line*" as the *genre*-specific (i.e., *Man(2)*) negation of our collective co-humanity as a species. This proposed *new principle of causality* is one therefore that drives all our human behaviors in the *genre*-specific terms of our cosmogonically chartered, symbolically encoded, prescriptive sociogenic replicator codes of symbolic life/death and the fictive modes of kind which they make possible and without which *we* as humans cannot inter-altruistically auto-institute ourselves as fictively, kin-recognizing referent *We(s)*, as in the specific case of our now contemporary "nation state" kind. Furthermore, this principle ensures that each respective fictive *We* can normally never know its no less, always-already, cosmogonically chartered order of social reality and/or autopoietic living system *outside* the *genre*-specific perceptual categorization system or mode of knowledge production that each societal order needs for its own enactment and stable replication as such a reality.

This was no less the case in Godelier's analysis of the Baruya, as it is no less the case with respect to those of us trained/*initiated* within the "human sciences" of our present mode of knowledge production. For these "sciences" take as their primary domain of inquiry our present planetarily extended societal order as that of the secular West's macro-world system in its bourgeois configuration – as an autopoietic living system now incorporating, willy nilly, of us all. In turn, the order of cognition of our present "human science" disciplines of the Humanities and Social Sciences continues to lawlikely function as the contemporary expression of that first humanly invented and millennially conserved order of cognition – now classified by the West as "primitive"⁵⁷ – yet one, however, that *We* secular Western and

⁵⁷ Paul Feyerabend has identified this first form of traditional cognition in *Farewell to Reason*:

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

westernized academics/intellectuals have no less transumptively inherited. This form of cognition is one, therefore, that responds to the millennially existential fact that once the cosmogonically chartered sociogenic replicator code of symbolic life/death has been institutionalized, then the overall societal order – because now self-organized about the *It* of that specific sociogenic replicator code – must lawfully enact itself as, in Francisco Varela's terms, a *higher level* system (Varela, 1979). And, given the systemic cognitive, epistemic, aesthetic, and organizational closure that is the condition of each such self-organizing systems' autonomous functioning, its subjects can normally have no directly cognizing access to this level of existence from a *meta-systemic* perspective. For such a perspective exists outside the good/bad perceptual categorization terms that are adaptively advantageous to securing the well-being of the societal order's cosmogonically chartered prototype of being hybridly human together with its correlated fictive mode of kind, as ones indispensable to the overall system's symbolically encoded collective intentionality of stable replication.

Therefore, our inability to have cognitive access to the higher level system of which we are subjects – as an inability that was to arise in our secular case from the West's reprojection of our human agency onto Agents that were no less extra-human, even if now desupernaturalized – is tied to the fact that we too, as secular Western and westernized academics/intellectuals, must nevertheless also continue to make the empirical reality of our collective human agency opaque to ourselves (doing so as lawfully as the Baruya's religious-intellectuals or "grammarians" (Legesse, 1973) had also continued, when not yet colonized, to make opaque the reality of their own agency to themselves). Moreover, this inability in our case (as it had also been in that of the Baruya's) leads to *real-life consequences*. In our case, these consequences are necessarily directly due to our present mode of knowledge production whose overriding telos is that of the rigorous elaboration of (indeed, the *work* of providing (Eudell, 2005)) the specific order of knowledge/cognition indispensable to the stable replication and enactment of our present *genre* of being hybridly human *Man(2)*, its fictive modes of kind, as well as to the overall global social reality of the West's autopoetically living, macro-world system. Consequently, it is this telos that thereby entails the continued daily *sacrificing* of the interest

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. (Feyerabend, 1987; emphasis added)

I argue that this is the same form of knowledge production identified by Hocart (1936) as that of a "macrocosmic/microcosmic" system of thought and by Bateson (1979) as an "abductive" system of thought, both of which are common to all human societies since the dawn of our origins in the Southeast region of Africa.

of the referent “We” of our *species being* – as well as potentially that of other species of living beings in what Elizabeth Kolbert has recently characterized as “the Sixth Extinction” (Kolbert, 2014)⁵⁸ – to the existential imperative of securing and stably replicating the now purely secular *genre*-specific interests of Western-bourgeois, ethno-class *Man(2)*, its prototype of being human, and of *its* world-system referent *We*, together with that world-system’s magma of analogically fictive and also bourgeois nation states.

In Conclusion: The *New Studia*’s Origin Model of *Auto-Institution* as
the Basis of Our Autonomy of Self-Cognition as the “Co-Authors”
with Nature of Ourselves: Towards an *Ecumenically Human*
Cum Hybridly Scientific Meta-Cosmogonic Perspective

After all the new insights that totalitarianism, nuclear warfare and mass-communication have forced us to face, it can no longer escape us, that in all his past, man has based his ideologies on *mutually exclusive group identities*, in the form of “pseudo species”: tribe, nation, caste, region, class, and so on. The question is: *Will mankind realize that it is one species* – or destined to remain divided into “pseudo-species” forever playing out one (*necessarily incomplete*) *version of mankind* against all others until, in the dubious glory of the nuclear age, *one version will have the power and luck to destroy all others just moments before it perishes itself*. [emphasis added].

Erik Erikson, *Life, History, and the Historical Moment* (1975)

⁵⁸ In *The Sixth Extinction: An Unnatural History*, Kolbert argues that in the wake of the five major extinctions occurring since the formation of life on earth some 3.8 billion years ago, the non-human living world is on the verge of a “sixth extinction” that threatens various forms of amphibians; water-based plants and animals; reptiles; birds; and mammals (Kolbert, 2014: 17–18). Yet unlike the previous *naturally caused* mass extinctions – the last of which wiped out the dinosaurs and other relatives at the end of the Cretaceous period 145 to 166 million years ago – this “sixth extinction” is being driven largely by *non-natural* processes of environmental degradation, including those implicated in the intractable crisis of global warming and climate change (124, 167–168). Yet, while Kolbert, like the authors of the IPCC *Fourth* and *Fifth Assessment* reports, misattributes/misdiagnosis this potential “mass extinction” as due also to *generic* “human” activities (2) – leading her to characterize, after Nobel Prize winning chemist Paul Crutzen, this “human-dominated geological epoch” as the “Anthropocene” era (107–110) – I propose otherwise. Instead, from the perspective of the Ceremony Found’s new answer to the question of who-we-are, the *non-natural* processes directly causal of this potentially impending “sixth extinction” are themselves driven by our continued performative-enactment of the monohumanist conception of Western-bourgeois, ethno-class *Man(2)*, through whose *genre*-specific “inner eye” (Ellison, 1952) our planetary eco/life-support system is classified as a “natural resource” to be exploited and whose destructive environmental costs are classified as a “negative externality” also within the *genre*-specific “inner eye” of *Man(2)*’s (ethno-class) master discipline of economics.

Man produces duplicate selves but cannot and/or will not recognize himself in their replicas. [...]

But to put man in his place, to account for his real existence, to reconstruct his historical development, not the imaginary version but the effective development of his practices, his institutions, his representations, is to undertake a task which [...] runs counter to the intentions and the demonstrations of every discourse, of every system of representation which does not grant man this his place. [...]

Everything that has been produced by man, everything which has sprung from his practices and therefore from his mind, his psyche, must be returned to man, everything which comes out of man but which comes to stand before him as an alien reality must go back *into* him. [...]

This would mean that not only have men to let go of their illusions by recognizing their illusory character, but above *all that they no longer need illusions in order to live, to make the societies in which they live.* [emphasis added]

Maurice Godelier, *The Enigma of the Gift* (1999): 198–199

It is precisely the making possible of such a meta-systemic, indeed, meta-cosmogonic *outsider* perspective that the Autopoietic Turn/Overturn, as the proposed praxis of Césaire’s new and hybrid “science of the Word/Nature” as Fanon’s “sociogeny/ontogeny,” will set out to effect as a perspective defining of what is to now be its *New Studia*. Yet such a perspective can only be made possible through the framework of the Ceremony Found’s new (meta-Western (neo)Liberal-monohumanist) Account of Origin. For this latter Account will function as one whose projected class of classes Origin Model of *Autopoietic Institution* will be able to contain the magma of all “local” origin stories/accounts and their *genre*-specific and respective autopoietic cum pseudo-speciation *member-class* representations of origin. In doing so, this new Origin Account will further enable the proposed *New Studia’s relativizing* of our present globally hegemonic, “part science, part myth” (Issacs, 1983), bio-cosmogony of Evolution by revealing it to be but *one*, even if the first purely secular, *member-class* of the Ceremony Found’s own ecumenically human *classes of classes*.⁵⁹

⁵⁹ This was the formulation made by Alfred North Whitehead and Bertrand Russell (1910) 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, via the rhetorical strategy defined by Paolo Valesio (1980) as that of the *topos of iconicity*, the West’s concept of *Man* is over-represented as if its *member class* “Humanisms,” i.e., Civic and (neo)Liberal, were isomorphic with the *class of classes* of all the answers given by a multiplicity of human groups to the question of who-we-are. This conflation has enabled the West to institute its world-systemic domination on the basis of its conceptual and globally institutionalized

This relativization will thereby enable the *New Studia*'s systemic separation of the *being of being human-as-a-species* (i.e., as *Homo Narrans*) from that of our now globally homogenized, conceptually and empirically institutionalized, hegemonic *genre* of being hybridly human as that of the secular West's *Man* in its now second Darwinian/neo-Darwinianly reinvented, (neo)Liberal-monohumanist, *homo oeconomicus* (cum *homo sapiens sapiens*) conception. That is to say, this newly proposed Origin Account and correlated *New Studia* will enable the separation of the interests of our performatively enacted, Western-bourgeois or ethno-class *We* – and of its *genre*-specific definition of the “common good” as that of “the wealth of nations”/multinationals – from the interests of the *class of classes* of our species being, i.e., of the referent *Homo Narrans*' “We” of the “we [...] in the horizon of humanity.”

Consequently, given that the goal of the Ceremony Found's proposed *New Studia* is one that would be implemented in response to a historically and hitherto unprecedented form of a millennial existential human imperative, one now defined by the almost unthinkable yet looming possibility of our eventual extinction as a species, our collective existential moment even more imperatively calls for our Autopoietic Turn *towards* the non-opacity of our hitherto *genre*-specific orders of consciousness and to the empirical reality of our collective human Agency and, thereby, now fully realized *cognitive autonomy* as a species. This recognition is, therefore, the fact – in Vico's *Nuova Scienza* terms (Vico, 1984) – that *that which we have made we can unmake and consciously now remake*.

This emancipatory recognition is possible only on the basis of the correlated recognition of the new principle of *Cosmogonic/Sociogenic Causality*, one that enables both the relativization and deconstruction of *Man(2)*'s bio-cosmogonically chartered, *naturally selected/dysselected* sociogenic replicator code and correlated “space of otherness” complex, as well as this code's abductive projection onto the order-stabilizing ostensible non-homogeneity of genetic substance *Lines/Divides* of the *Color* or *White/Black Line*. And this *Line/Divide* itself then serves to analogically validate the also systemically/socio-economically produced *Rich/Poor, Developed/Underdeveloped, Planet of the suburbs/Planet of the slums Lines or Divides*. This relativization and deconstruction based on this new principle of causality will therefore at the same time initiate the process of *de-extrahumanization* of all the entities and/or Agent conceptions onto which we have hitherto projected our own empirical agencies. With this thereby making possible the unblocking of the systemic mechanisms by means of which our present Western and westernized societal order's now purely secular form of the above version of

absolutization and universalization of its own *genre*-specific member class self-definition as if it were isomorphic with the *class of classes* definition(s) of our species being.

this millennial existential imperative, has hitherto lawfully functioned to keep our own collective agency *opaque* to what is also our now normative, cosmogonically chartered, and sociogenically encoded ethno-class order of consciousness and its societal order as a *genre*-specific autopoietic living system [...] to keep our collective agency *opaque*, therefore, *to ourselves*.

It is in this reference frame that the Ceremony Found's new answer and its Origin Account's identified *Laws of Human Auto-institution*, because also revealing such laws to function for our contemporary Western world-systemic societal order as they have done for all human societies hitherto, is thereby empowered to "find *the ceremony*" able to breach the "*Color Line*"'s projected non-homogeneity of genetic substance *Line/Divide* between "White" and "Black," between "White" and "non-White," and "non-Black" and "Black" – between, that is, climactically/environmentally and phenotypically differentiated (Arsuaga, 2002) *humans vis-à-vis other also such humans*. With such a breaching of this *Divide* that negates the empirical reality of our co-humanity as a species, now coming to be effected not merely on the basis of the postulate (as contemporary molecular biologists have shown) that we are biologically co-human because defined by the same genome and, thereby, made of the same *homogenous* substance. Rather this breaching will be even more powerfully effected on the basis of the new postulate that we are indeed co-human because *subject to the same Laws of Auto-institution* regulatory of our hybridly third level of existence. In turn, the Ceremony Found's new answer and origin account will thus reveal our present projected "*Color Line*"/*Divide* to be one whose unbreachability is itself only a function of the systemic-enacting of (neo)Liberal-humanist secular *Man(2)*'s sociogenic replicator code of symbolic life/death as that of *naturally selected/eugenic* versus *naturally dysselected/dysgenic* humanity. And it is this sociogenic code in whose terms we have hitherto autopoietically instituted, preconceptually experienced, and performatively enacted ourselves as *good* men and women of our *genre*-specific, Western and westernized bourgeois, ethno-class kind – doing so *in all good conscience/consciousness*.

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 species' – i.e., *Homo Narrans*' – now kin-recognizing orders of consciousness and, therefore, its non-opacity with respect to the reality of our now 'intercommunal' (Huey Newton via Erickson, 1973) human agency, they will as such perspectives also make possible an unprecedented rupture in the dynamic of our millennially extended human history. This rupture or discontinuity, I propose, will be that of our *Second Emergence*. For, unlike our First Emergence some 200,000 years ago in the Southwest region of Africa, this *Second Emergence* marks a break this time not from the Primate-type mode of

total subordination/restriction of eusocial, inter-altruistic, kin-recognizing behaviors to a level of cooperation whose narrow limits have been preset by the species-specific replicator DNA code. Instead, this rupture will be from our hitherto subordination, normally, to our own autopoetically and, thereby, *genre*-specifically invented and cosmogonically chartered, pseudo-speciating sociogenic replicator codes of symbolic life/death. For it is these codes which, while having been invented and transformatively reinvented by us humans – that is, from one *genre* of being human (or autopoetic field/“culture”) to another – throughout our species-specific history, have nevertheless been effected according to laws which have functioned *hitherto outside our conscious awareness* as the condition of the imperatively anti-entropic opacity to ourselves of our own agency.

It is therefore this unprecedented *Second Emergence* rupture, one re-enacting of the First Emergence in new but complementary and now *fully 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 praxis will take as the objects of its inquiry the story-telling, origin-narrative devices⁶⁰ cum overall *technē* (Heidegger, 1998)⁶¹ by means of which we humans have – from the Event of our origin as a uniquely hybrid species of living being – autopoetically instituted our *genres* of being hybridly human and fictive (i.e., pseudo-speciating) modes of kind, together with their respective orders of consciousness (Chalmers, 1995),⁶² yet doing so according to laws which have hitherto functioned outside our conscious awareness, outside any possibility

⁶⁰ For a discussion of these “story-telling, origin-narrative devices,” see, *inter alia*, Propp, 1968 together with Landau, 1991.

⁶¹ Martin Heidegger defines the term *technē*, as opposed to the conception of physical technology, in the following terms:

What, then, was art [...]? Why did art bear the modest name *technē*? Because it was a revealing that brought forth and made present, and therefore belonged within *poiesis*. It was finally that revealing which holds complete sway in all the fine arts, in poetry, and in everything poetical that obtained *poiesis* as its proper name. (Heidegger, 1998)

⁶² David Chalmers defined the hitherto non-resolvable phenomenon of human consciousness in the following, analogically prophetic terms:

Against reductionism, I will argue that consciousness might be explained by a new kind of theory. The full details of such a theory are still out of reach, but careful reasoning and some educated inferences can reveal something of its general nature. For example, it will probably involve new fundamental laws, and the concept of information may play a central role. These faint glimmerings suggest that a theory of consciousness may have startling consequences for our view of the universe and of ourselves. (Chalmers, 1995)

of our fully realized autonomy of agency and, therefore, *extra-territoriality of self-cognition*.

“And truly what is to be done is to set man free” (Fanon, 1967).

This is the telos of the Ceremony Found’s *New Studia*, whose hybrid study of the Word/*ordo verborum* as non-linearly and intricately calibrated with the study of nature/*ordo naturae* – this in Césaire’s implicitly proposed human-scientific cum natural-scientific “Poetry and Knowledge” (1946) terms (Césaire, 1996) – will be that of the functioning of the human brain’s natural-opioid behavior-regulatory system (i.e., its executive PFC or prefrontal cortex (Stein, 2007)), itself lawlikely activated in the terms of the specific positive/negative system of meanings of each pseudo-speciating *genre* of being human’s sociogenic replicator code, then implemented as a living entity as that of the *code-made-flesh*. This telos will therefore call for its praxis of the Autopoietic Turn/Overturn to function in a hitherto unsuspected, trans-disciplinary, trans-epistemic, trans natural-scientific cum trans-cosmogonic modality. Such a new order of knowledge Césaire insisted, exists as one which “only poetry” – *its technē* of functioning and new “gravity of language” (Livingston, 2006), 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 bedroom door.
 (Bishop, 1933)

“can give an approximate notion of” (Césaire, 1996).

Thus, with the Ceremony Found’s now hybridly human-scientific cum natural-scientific recognition of our own Agency – as one that makes possible the *extra-territoriality of our self-cognition* – we will now find that we humans no longer need the illusions of our hitherto story-telling, extra-human projection of that Agency. That therefore, we no longer need illusions – such as those which now *inter alia* threaten the livability of our species’ planetary habitat – in order to now remake, consciously and collectively, the new society in which our now existential referent “we [...] in the horizon of humanity” will *all* now live.

Works Cited

- Althusser, Louis. 2001 [1971]. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses: Notes Towards an Investigation." In *Lenin and Philosophy, and Other Essays*. Trans. Ben Brewster. New York: Monthly Review Press: 85–126.
- Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso.
- Arsuaga, Juan Luis. 2002. *The Neanderthal's Necklace: In Search of the First Thinkers*. Trans. Andy Klatt. New York: Four Walls Eight Windows Press.
- Barney, Gerald O. 1993. *Global 2000 Revisited: What Shall We Do?*. Arlington, VA: Millennium Institute.
- Bateson, Gregory. 1968. "Conscious Purpose Versus. Nature." *The Dialectics of Liberation*. Ed. David Cooper. Harmondsworth: Penguin: 34–49.
- . 1979. *Mind and Nature: A Necessary Unity*. New York: E.P. Dutton.
- . 2000 [1972]. "Conscious Purpose Versus Nature." In *Steps to an Ecology of Mind: Collected Essays in Anthropology, Psychiatry, Evolution, and Epistemology*. Ed. Gregory Bateson. Chicago: University of Chicago Press: 432–445.
- . 2002. *Mind and Nature: A Necessary Unity*. New York: Hampton Press.
- Beer, Stafford. 1980 [1972]. Preface. In Humberto R. Maturana and Francisco J. Varela. *Autopoiesis and Cognition: The Realization of the Living*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company: 63–72.
- Bishop, John Peale. 1933. "Speaking of Poetry." *Now With His Love*. Ed. John Peale Bishop. New York: Charles Scribner & Sons.
- Bloom, Harold. 1982. *The Breaking of the Vessels*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Blumenberg, Hans. 1983. *The Legitimacy of the Modern Age*. Trans. Robert M. Wallace. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Bogues, Anthony. 2003. *Black Heretics Black Prophets: Radical Political Intellectuals*. New York: Routledge.
- Brennan, H. G., and A. M. C. Waterman, eds. 1994. *Economics and Religion: Are They Distinct?*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publisher.
- Briggs, John, and F. David Peat. 1987. "David Bohm: Interview." *Omni* (January): 69–72.
- Bull, Malcolm. 2007. "Vectors of the Biopolitical." *New Left Review* 45 (May–June): 7–27.
- Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Castoriadis, Cornelius. 1987. *The Imaginary Institution of Society*. Trans. Kathleen Blamey. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.
- Césaire, Aimé. 1996 [1946]. "Poetry and Knowledge." In Aimé Césaire, *Lyric and Dramatic Poetry, 1946–1982*. Trans. Clayton Eshleman and Annette Smith. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.

- 2010. "Letter to Maurice Thorez (1956)." Trans. Chike Jeffers. *Social Text* 28.2 (Summer): 145–152.
- 1945. "Poésie et Connaissance." *Tropiques* 12: 158–170.
- 1996 [1946]. "Poetry and Knowledge." Trans. Michael Richardson and Krzysztof Fijalkowski. In *Refusal of the Shadow: Surrealism and the Caribbean*. Ed. Michael Richardson. New York: Verso: 134–146.
- Chalmers, David. 1995. "The Puzzle of Conscious Experience." *Scientific American* 2736 (December): 80–86.
- Christian, David. 2004. *The Maps of Time: An Introduction to Big History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cleaver, Eldridge. 1968. *Soul on Ice*. New York: Dell.
- Danielli, James F. 1980. "Altruism and The Internal Reward System, or The Opium of the People." *Journal of Social and Biological Systems* 3.2: 87–94.
- Darwin, Charles. 1859. *On the Origin of Species*. London: John Murray.
- 1871. *The Descent of Man*. London: John Murray.
- Dawkins, Richard. 1983. "Universal Darwinism." *Evolution from Molecules to Men*. Ed. D. S. Bendall. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1969. "The Ends of Man." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 30.1 (September): 31–57.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. 1903. *The Souls of Black Folk*. Chicago: A.C. McClurg and Company.
- Edelman, Gerald. 1987. *Neural Darwinism: The Theory of Neuronal Group Selection*. New York, Basic Books.
- Ellison, Ralph. 1994 [1952]. *Invisible Man*. New York: Modern Library.
- Erikson, Erik H. 1973. *In Search of Common Ground: Conversations with Erik H. Erikson and Huey P. Newton*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- 1975. *Life, History, and the Historical Moment*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Eudell, Demetrius. 2005. "Modernity and the 'Work of History'." *After Man, Towards the Human: Critical Essays on Sylvia Wynter*. Ed. Anthony Bagues. Kingston, Jamaica: Ian Randle Publishers: 1–24.
- Fabian, Johannes. 1983. *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes its Object*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Fanon, Frantz. 1952. *Peau Noire, Masques Blancs*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- 1961. *Les Damnés de la terre*. Paris: François Maspero.
- 1963. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Trans. Constance Farrington. New York: Grove Press.
- 1967 [1952]. *Black Skin, White Masks*. Trans. Charles Lamm Markman. New York: Grove Press.
- Feyerabend, Paul. 1987. *Farewell to Reason*. New York: Verso.
- Foucault, Michel. 1966. *Les Mots et les choses: une archéologie des sciences humaines*. Paris: Gallimard.
- 1973 [1970]. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books.

- Funkenstein, Amos. 1986. *Theology and Scientific Imagination from the Middle Ages to the Seventeenth Century*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Gallop, Jane. 1987. *Reading Lacan*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Gauchet, Marcel. 1997 [1985]. *The Disenchantment of the World: A Political History of Religion*. Trans. Oscar Burge. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books.
- . 1983. *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gellner, Ernest. 1974. *The Legitimation of Belief*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Girardot, Norman J. 1983. *Myth and Meaning in Early Taoism: The Theme of Chaos*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Godelier, Maurice. 1999. *The Enigma of the Gift*. Trans. Norah Scott. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Godzich, Wlad. 1986. Foreword. In Michel de Certeau, *Heterologies: Discourse on the Other*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- . 1987. Afterword. In Samuel Weber, *Institution and Interpretation*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Goldstein, Avram. 1994. *Addiction: From Biology to Drug Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Grassi, Ernesto. 1980. *Rhetoric as Philosophy: The Humanist Tradition*. Trans. Michael J. Kroi and Azizeh Azodi. University Park, PA: Penn State University Press.
- Hallyn, Fernand. 1993 [1990]. *The Poetic Structure of the World: Copernicus and Kepler*. Trans. Donald M. Leslie. New York: Zone Books.
- Hawken, Paul. 2007. *Blessed Unrest: How the Largest Movement in the World Came Into Being, and Why No One Saw It Coming*. New York: Viking Press.
- Heidegger, Martin. 1998 [1993]. *Basic Concepts*. Studies in Continental Thought. Trans. Gary E. Aylesworth. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Hocart, A. M. 1936. *Kings and Councillors: An Essay in the Comparative Anatomy of Human Society*. Cairo: P. Barbey.
- Humphrey, Nicholas. 1992. *A History of the Mind: Evolution and the Birth of Consciousness*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Hyers, Conrad. 1984. *The Meaning of Creation: Genesis and Modern Science*. Atlanta, GA: John Knox Press.
- IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change). 2007. *Climate Change 2007: Synthesis Report*. www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/ar4/syr/en/spms2.html. Accessed July 23, 2014.
- . 2014a. "Summary for Policymakers." In *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the*

- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Eds. C. B. Field, V. R. Barros, D. J. Dokken, et al. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. http://ipcc-wg2.gov/AR5/images/uploads/WG2AR5_SPM_FINAL.pdf. Accessed July 23, 2014.
- 2014b. “Summary for Policymakers.” In *Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Eds O. Edenhofer, R. Pichs-Madruga, Y. Sokona, et al. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. http://report.mitigation2014.org/spm/ipcc_wg3_ar5_summary-for-policymakers_approved.pdf. Accessed July 23, 2014.
- Isaacs, Glynn. 1983. “Aspects of Human Evolution.” *Evolution from Molecules to Men*. Ed. D. S. Bendall. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 509–543.
- James, C. L. R. 1970. *From Du Bois to Fanon*. Pontiac, MI: Pan African Institute for Self-Reliance.
- Kane, Cheikh Hamidou. 1961. *Aventure Ambiguë*. Paris: Julliard.
- 2012 [1963]. *Ambiguous Adventure*. Trans. Kathleen Woods. Brooklyn, NY: Melville House Publishing.
- Kolbert, Elizabeth. 2014. *The Sixth Extinction: An Unnatural History*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Landau, Misia. 1991. *Narratives of Human Evolution*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Leeming, David. 2002. *Myth: A Biography of Belief*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Legesse, Asmarom. 1973. *Gada: Three Approaches to the Study of African Society*. New York: Free Press.
- Le Goff, Jacques. 1988. *The Medieval Imagination*. Trans. Arthur Goldhammer. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- LeTreut, H., R. Somerville, U. Cubasch, et al. 2007. “Historical Overview of Climate Change.” In *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Eds. S. Solomon, D. Qin, M. Manning, et al. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/ar4/wg1/en/chr.html. Accessed July 23, 2014.
- Levi-Strauss, Claude. 1964. *Mythologiques I: Le Cru et le Cuit*. Paris: Pion.
- 1983 [1969]. *The Raw and the Cooked*. Trans. John Weightman and Doreen Weightman. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Livingston, Ira. 2006. *Between Science and Poetry: An Introduction to Autopoetics*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Lütticken, Sven. 2007. “Unnatural History.” *New Left Review* 45 (May–June): 115–132.
- McKinnon, Susan. 2005. *Neo-Liberal Genetics: The Myths and Moral Tales of Evolutionary Psychology*. Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press.
- Maturana, Humberto, R. 1980 [1972]. Introduction. In Humberto R. Maturana

- and Francisco J. Varela. *Autopoiesis and Cognition: The Realization of the Living*. London: D. Reidel Publishing Company: xi–xxx.
- Maturana, Humberto, R., and Bernhard Poerksen. 2004. *From Being to Doing: The Origins of the Biology of Cognition*. Heidelberg: Carl Auer Verlag.
- Maturana, Humberto, R., and Francisco Varela. 1992. *The Tree of Knowledge: The Biological Roots of Human Understanding*. Boston: Shambala.
- Mirandola, Giovanni Pico della. 1951 [1486]. *Oration on the Dignity of Man*. Chicago: Regnery.
- Moraes-Farias, Paulo Fernando de. 1980. “Models of the World and Categorial Models: The ‘Enslavable Barbarian’ as a Mobile Classificatory Label.” *Slavery and Abolition* 1.2: 115–131.
- Nagel, Thomas. 2012. *Mind and Cosmos: Why the Materialist neo-Darwinian Conception of Nature is Almost Certainly False*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Norman, Richard J. 2012. *On Humanism*. New York: Routledge.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. 2000 [1968]. *Basic Writings of Nietzsche*. Trans. and Ed. Walter Kaufmann. New York: Modern Library.
- Nisbet, Robert. 1969. *Social Change and History: Aspects of the Western Theory of Development*. London/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Oxford English Dictionary*. 1971 [1933]. Compact Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pagden, Anthony. 1987 [1982]. *The Fall of Natural Man: The American Indian and the Origins of Comparative Ethnology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Pandian, Jacob. 1985. *Anthropology and the Western Tradition: Towards an Authentic Anthropology*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Pocock, J. G. A. 1989 [1971]. “Civic Humanism and its Role in Anglo-American Thought.” In *Politics, Language and Time: Essays on Political Thought and History*. Ed. J. G. A. Pocock. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Price-Mars, Jean. 1928. *Ainsi parla l'oncle*. Port-au-Prince: Imprimerie de Compiègne.
- 1983 [1928]. *So Spoke the Uncle*. Trans. Magdaline W. Shannon. Washington, DC: Three Continents Press.
- Prigogine, Ilya Viscount. 1990. Foreword. In Peter Coveney and Roger Highfield. *The Arrow of Time: A Voyage through Science to Solve Time’s Greatest Mystery*. New York: Fawcett Columbine: 15–18.
- Propp, V. 1968. *Mythology of the Folktale*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Roberts, J. M. 1985. *The Triumph of the West: The Origins, Rise, and Legacy of Western Civilization*. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.
- Rose, Hilary and Steven Rose. 2010. “Darwin and After.” *New Left Review* 63 (May/June): 91–113.
- Sala-Molins, Louis. 2006 [1992]. *The Dark Side of Light: Slavery and the French Enlightenment*. Trans. John Conteh-Morgan. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

- Sartre, Jean-Paul. 1956 [1943]. *Being and Nothingness: A Phenomenological Essay on Ontology*. Trans. Hazel Barnes. New York: Philosophical Library.
- Searle, John R. 2007 [2004]. *Freedom and Neurobiology: Reflections on Free Will, Language and Political Power*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Smith, Adam. 1759. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. London: A. Millar, A. Kincaid, and J. Bell.
- Snow, Charles Percy. 1959. *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Spanos, William. 1984. Introduction. *boundary 2: On Humanism and the University I: The Discourse of Humanism*. Ed. William Spanos. 12.3/13.1 (Spring/Fall).
- Stackhouse, Max Lynn. 2001. Foreword. In R. H. Nelson. *Economics as Religion: From Samuelson to Chicago and Beyond*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Steele, Claude, and Joshua Aronson. 1995. "Stereotype Threat and Intellectual Test Performance of African Americans." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 69.5: 797–811.
- Stein, Kathleen. 2007. *The Genius Engine: Where Memory, Reason, Passion, Violence, and Creativity Intersect in the Human Brain*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.
- Time Magazine*. 2007. "A Warming Report: Scientists to Show New Evidence." February 5. www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1582333,00.html. Accessed January 2, 2010.
- Valesio, Paolo. 1980. *Novantiqua: Rhetorics as a Contemporary Theory*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Varela, Francisco. 1979. *Principles of Biological Autonomy*. New York: North Holland.
- Vico, Giambattista. 1984. *The New Science of Giambattista Vico: Unabridged translation of the Third Edition (1744)*. Trans. Thomas Goddard Bergin and Max Harold Fisch. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1974. *The Modern World-System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. New York: Academic Press.
- . 1980. *The Modern World-System II: Mercantilism and the Consolidation of the European World-Economy, 1600–1750*. New York: Academic Press.
- Westad, O. A. 2005. *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Times*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Whitehead, Alfred North, and Bertrand Russell. 1910. *Principia Mathematica*, vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, Bernard. 1993. *Shame and Necessity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wilson, Edward O. 2000. Foreword. In Loyal Rue. *Everybody's Story: Wising Up to the Epic of Evolution*. New York: State University of New York Press.

- Winch, Peter. 1964. "Understanding a Primitive Society." *American Philosophical Quarterly* 1.4: 307–324.
- 1972. "Understanding a Primitive Society." *Ethics and Action*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- 1974 [1970]. "Understanding a Primitive Society." *Rationality*. Ed. Bryan R. Wilson. Evanston, IL: Blackwell: 78–111.
- Wise, Tim. 2008 [2005]. *White Like Me: Reflections on Race from a Privileged Son*. Brooklyn, NY: Soft Skull Press.
- Woodson Carter G. 1990 [1933]. *The Mis-education of the Negro*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.
- Woolf, Virginia. 1929. *A Room of One's Own*. London: Hogarth Press.
- Wynter, Sylvia. 1984 "The Ceremony Must Be Found: After Humanism." *boundary 2: On Humanism and the University I: The Discourse of Humanism*. Ed. William Spanos. 12.3/13.1 (Spring/Fall): 19–70.
- 1992. "No Humans Involved: An Open Letter to My Colleagues." *Voices of the African Diaspora* 8.2 (Fall): 13–16.
- 1996. "Is Development a Purely Empirical Concept or Also Teleological?: A Perspective from We the Underdeveloped." *Prospects for Recovery and Sustainable Development in Africa*. Ed. Aguibou Yansané. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press: 299–316.
- 2001. "Towards the Sociogenic Principle: Fanon, Identity, The Puzzle of Conscious Experience." *National Identities and Socio-Political Changes in Latin America*. Eds. Mercedes F. Durán-Cogan and Antonio Gómez-Moriana. New York: Routledge: 30–66.
- 2003. "Unsettling the Coloniality of Being/Power/Truth/Freedom: Towards the Human, After Man, Its Overrepresentation – An Argument." *CR: The New Centennial Review* 3. Ed. Greg Thomas. Special Issue 3 (Fall): 257–337.
- 2008. "Human Being as Noun, or Being Human as Praxis?: On the Laws/ Modes of Auto-Institution and our Ultimate Crisis of Global Warming and Climate Change." Paper presented in the Distinguished Lecture and Residency Series at the Center for African American Studies, Wesleyan University, April 23.
- Wynter, Sylvia and Katherine McKittrick. 2015. "Unparalleled Catastrophe for Our Species? Or, to Give Humanness a Different Future: Conversations." In *Sylvia Wynter: On Being Human as Praxis*. Ed. Katherine McKittrick. Durham, NC: Duke University Press: 9–89.
- Yaganisako, Sylvia and Carol Delaney. 1995. "Naturalizing Power." *Naturalizing Power: Essays in Feminist Cultural Analysis*. Eds. Sylvia Yaganisako and Carol Delaney. New York: Routledge: 1–22.
- Zimmer, Carl. 2007. "In Games, an Insight Into the Rules of Evolution: Scientist at Work, Martin Nowak." *The New York Times* (July 31): F1.

**Black Knowledges/
Black Struggles:
Essays in Critical Epistemology**

Edited by
Jason R. Ambrose and Sabine Broeck

Liverpool University Press

First published 2015 by
Liverpool University Press
4 Cambridge Street
Liverpool
L69 7ZU

Copyright © 2015 Liverpool University Press

The rights of Jason R. Ambrose and Sabine Broeck to be identified as the editors of this book have been asserted by them in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication data
A British Library CIP record is available

print ISBN 978-1-78138-172-4

epdf ISBN 978-1-78138-466-4

Typeset by Carnegie Book Production, Lancaster
Printed and bound by CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon CR0 4YY

Contents

List of Figures	vi
List of Contributors	vii
1 Black Knowledges/Black Struggles: An Introduction <i>Jason R. Ambrose and Sabine Broeck</i>	1
2 “Come on Kid, Let’s Go Get the <i>Thing</i> ”: The Sociogenic Principle and the <i>Being</i> of Being Black/Human <i>Demetrius L. Eudell</i>	21
3 Respectability and Representation: Black Freemasonry, Race, and Early Free Black Leadership <i>Chernob M. Sesay, Jr.</i>	44
4 Ethno-Class <i>Man</i> and the Inscription of “the Criminal”: On the Formation of Criminology in the USA <i>Jason R. Ambrose</i>	68
5 Dehumanization, the <i>Symbolic Gaze</i> , and the Production of Biomedical Knowledge <i>Jason E. Glenn</i>	112
6 Performing Scientificity: Race, Science, and Politics in the USA and Germany after the Second World War <i>Holger Droessler</i>	145
7 Imaginary Black Topographies: What are Monuments For? <i>Lubaina Himid</i>	170
8 The Ceremony Found: Towards the Autopoetic Turn/Overturn, its Autonomy of Human Agency and Extraterritoriality of (Self-)Cognition <i>Sylvia Wynter</i>	184
Index	253