

Chapter Title: The Ceremony Found: Towards the Autopoetic Turn/Overturn, its
Autonomy of Human Agency and Extraterritoriality of (Self-)Cognition
Chapter Author(s): Sylvia Wynter

Book Title: Black Knowledges/Black Struggles
Book Subtitle: Essays in Critical Epistemology
Book Editor(s): Jason R. Ambrose, Sabine Broeck
Published by: Liverpool University Press. (2015)
Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1gn6bfp.12>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://about.jstor.org/terms>



Liverpool University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Black Knowledges/Black Struggles*

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)

[JHU talk req. reading: 202-223;
optional, 240-245]

•••

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 autopoetic, “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 autopoetic 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/intellectuals 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!"

...

[end of talk reading; optional
cont'd on next pp.]

(optional reading: pp. 240-245)

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/Overtturn, 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 posable 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 Categorical 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.