

The Ecumenical Institute: Chicago  
Summer '71 Planning Unit  
June 17, 1971

### SOCIAL THEORETICS

At this point, relative to the summer and the triangles it's half way distant-- not only on catching up on where we are on the work in the triangles, primarily in terms of the work that's gone into them, on where they are solid or what they represent although that still isn't final, fiddle a little with how they are going to be used this summer or what is the work that still needs to be done. What's coming around, I think, the one thing is the work that Gene did yesterday on establishment/anti-establishment and the other thing is the triangles basically that you've got on 3x3's and just needs to be put on triangles. We may not have the latest work on the political, but you'll be able to keep up with what I'm talking about.

For me the serious work in preparation for summer began in the winter quarter, with the winter quarter PSU's in the Permeation Division and during that time we did not raise whatsoever the question of the economic, political, and cultural, except as something that we fiddled with in 5th City back some time. This spring it became obvious that that was a major job and that had to do with getting the utterly, radical total common content out of which people could operate. The way that came to me back when I was teaching school and teaching Imaginal Education courses in which on Sunday morning you faithfully tell everybody that for them to be responsible, they have to build a model and problemat, and goals, and strategies and tactics for their local school and you watch weekend after weekend people doing that. That was when I read an article by Illich in which he suggested that probably the social structure known as schools probably wasn't too helpful on the global scene. That caused a kind of collapse in which the question got raised and gets raised for anybody who is engaged in this particular phase in society, What is it that you're making proposals about relative to the future? It's clear to make proposals in terms of our nation, for the U.S.A. to work better, is relative to whether or not the U.S. of A. ought to work better. So you're fiddling now in these triangles for me between getting enough abstraction to be universal while you're trying to maintain enough concretion to be helpful relative to proposals and relative to contradictions. It's very easy to take the economic, political, cultural, and talk about highly abstract going-onnesses going on around all those poles and work down to the 6th or 12th level even. We've got an amazing facility for doing totally abstract work. It would be much harder instead, of economic, political, cultural to put in factories and governments and churches or something like that and that kind of concretion and work it down and yet that sort of thing would be much more helpful. The struggle that's still going on with these triangles is how do you bridge the gap between universality, in the sense of these things talking about the basic social processes, and concretion relative to knowing what you are talking about. You can say clearly that the economic, political, and cultural go on in every dimension of humanness. If you get yourself into the trap of saying, oh, the economic, political, and cultural, well, good, the economic has to do with factories, but then instead of talking about factories, you say that has to do with economic and political and cultural in factories and the political in factories is union meetings then you say that the economic and political where you don't have a way to analyze anything specific where you're just analyzing abstractions further on down, that doesn't help you. That is meant to be a context to say that the work on the triangles isn't complete.

When you're working on triangles, "If you're not an Indian being shot at by the White man, you're a White man being shot at by Indian," I think.

The model itself--there are probably four ways of talking about what's gone into the triangles and probably the first thing that we got clear on is that the triangles were out to pull together the accumulated reflections of human beings from the time consciousness began, from the time people started to reflect on the social processes. These triangles are nothing but a rational articulation of the sociological sciences. They're a reflection on the social processes of human society, but you're out to order the accumulated ideas. The symbol of this is this table full of books. I was amazed. There are something like 50 books that were pored through to get the triangles built to the extent that they're built and they're not built well yet. Probably 30 or 40 of those books went into the building of the cultural. The economic and political are not as stable as the cultural primarily because the amount of study and reading hasn't gone into them. We've talked about these triangles as manifesting an anthropological approach. After sociology did its basic theoretical framework, back, I suppose, the early part of this century, it launched off into various technical areas of statistical sociology where they had a few tools and used them to analyze everything under the sun. So sociology, economic, political, science haven't been overly helpful. It was about that time, somewhere around 1930, that anthropology shifted from the interesting investigation of primitive societies to an emphasis on cultural universals, What are the universal social processes that go on in every society. We didn't discover that until about 6 weeks of work had gone into the triangles already. But you're out after getting said the universal processes. You pick up a book, like this one was in the Research Office called Man and His Work by Melville J. Herskovitz. Because it has an orange and green cover and is in script instead of print, we just left it for a whole month in there because it looked so crummy from outside. Anyway, you open it up and find him saying something like, "In society there are certain imperatives to which there are responses that every society makes. The responses are economic, political organization, education, and social control." And that's kind of exciting when you've been doing education, symbol and style and economic and political for a long time. Especially when he says, "In scrutinizing these two tables we are struck with the omission of any reference to religion or the esthetic elements in culture."

You are not out in the first instance, justifying the work you're doing, but you begin to see that you're out to do is pull together not create something new, but pull together the universal function, the universal processes in society in a way that makes sense to human beings. We've talked about a new liberal arts education where the first day you come in the professor puts a triangle on the board and writes social in the middle and tells you to work it down 6 levels and come back at the end of a year and then you come back and he says, "All right, now you take another year and write sentences." Then he gives you a year of independent study and then you have to come back and clean it. Something like that would give any human being an inclusive education in the social sciences. I will guarantee it.

The values that we've held in working on the triangles is, first of all, that at every point that they be inclusive in terms of social processes. The question is always "Haven't you really just taken one third of that and not dealt with the whole thing?"--that they articulate totally. The second then has to do with consistency. We struggled for a long time in terms of practices of how you maintain consistency, in terms of wording, not that you're out after wording, but you're out after a gimmick that keeps you mind--I'll come back and talk about a sentence method that we used. The third, probably, is, do they hold the traditional wisdom? That is to say, where you had a choice between making up a category that fit a triangle and cleaning up a category that had been used for the last 1,000 years, you cleaned up the category that had been used for the last 1,000 years and pushed that in there. You aren't out after setting up a new set of categories but organizing the kind of categories and formal ideas that are already in history. Fourth, and I suppose this

is where the primary struggle is, in terms of the practicality of the triangles, is it helpful to have final meanings of in the wisdom section relative to writing proposals. Could you write a proposal on that? When you've articulated the 27 things under language, are those helpful kinds of descriptions that would let you see what the problems are and write about them? was the fourth value that we attempted to hold. Then, and this became clear pretty obviously, if you go back to what Gene said in terms of dynamical sociology, the second step is toward relations which has to do with activities. The first step has to do with nailing down the point on the triangle. The first work back at the beginning of the quarter, when it got clear that you were talking about social processes and not something else, ran off chasing after the dynamical relations, which meant when you went to get clear on the economic triangle, you jumped on that, it squirted over here or it squirted over there and you had no way of pinning down what you were talking about. Probably down to the third level that kind of squirting has been eliminated, but still when you get down to the 5th and 6th level in economic it seems like the whole cultural is at the 7th level. And this was just a big discussion yesterday, as to how it is you nail down those points. How it is you see to it that you are not talking about a vague going-onness that's going on in that area, but how you get the 1, the 2 and the 3 that hold that so that you can talk about the relation. Our edge, relative to sociological methodology has to do with dynamical sociology, not simply building triangles, but until the job of nailing these down is done, you can't do the relations. That's part of what they discovered yesterday when they tried to work further in that area.

The rationale around the triangles, which we've got to find a number of different ways to articulate, has to do with the foundational, or the that-without-which that goes in the lower left hand corner, and then the communal or the particularly social dimension of that dimension and then the ideal or the that-for-the-sake-of-which. The that-without-which in terms of the political is order. Save you have some kind of order in society or peace, you don't have any kind of political anything. The peculiarly communal or the social has to do with justice which is the continual maintaining of the political order, the continued rebuilding of the whole political situation. And that-for-the-sake-of-which or the ideal is welfare, not in the sense that welfare is better than order or justice, but in the sense that human beings form political organizations for the sake of bettering their common welfare. That gets spelled out clearly in the U.S. Constitution and Declaration of Independence in terms of that kind of dynamic.

That pretty well, I think, sets a background in terms of what it is that we've been trying to hold with the triangles.

I was planning to talk a little bit about working down, maybe to the third level so that we could talk about where uncertainties are. If you put those triangles that you have in front of you together, which means the 6th level triangles are about an inch on the side, you have one social triangle that is ten feet, eight inches. Which gives you an idea of the detail and the finesse that has gone in that is already compiled in those triangles.

Now probably the first key that dawned on us is that you're talking about the social dynamic which is the process of maintaining commonness. That the key to getting at a society, in terms of understanding what it is that maintains that society which is what maintains the commonness in that society. Or, it's the maintaining of the commonness that holds human beings together. That in terms of the economic or basic life support and the political in terms of basic human organization and then the cultural in terms of basic human consciousness. In the economic, and I just started getting clear on this the other day, has to do foundationally with resources. A human being working by himself can turn out roughly one horse-power hour's worth of energy in a day, which means, a human being working by

himself never gets much above a very low subsistence level, and has to deal with scarce natural resources, scarce human resources and scarce technological resources. The category of scarcity is foundational in the whole area of the economic. The economic has to do with making choices relative to desired ends out of something you don't have enough of. If you got enough of them you don't need an economic system to deal with them. But, the peculiarly social dimension of the economic or the life support system is production. It's the taking of the resources and accumulating them as capital--capital accumulation where they're available. If you're a fisherman you can either catch one fish an hour by hand, which means you get 8 fish a day, which means you can eat 8 fish a day, or you have to catch 16 fish and then not catch any fish one day so you can make a net-"capital accumulation". And then (I shouldn't have started here because it's still floating a little at this level.),, this peculiarly social then has to do with the organization of the forces of production or the ability to specialize, that if we can make a deal so that K does the fishing and I build the hut, we can get a lot more work done in total than otherwise, and that has to do with productive organization. Finally, in terms of the basic pattern, on the top of production, or the manifestation of technology in terms of production, has to do with the fundamental patterns or plans, or you almost want to say common images, out of which production is allowed to operate. And the process of the creating and the maintaining of those fundamental kinds of patterns. In terms of distribution or arranging the common, foundationally has to do with claims or with ownership, that foundational to any kind of distribution of any economic good is that it has to belong to somebody before anything can be done with it. The peculiarly social has to do with the whole mechanism of exchange. You're talking about systems of barter or money as a medium of exchange and then finally the category of the allocation criteria or control, where society makes decisions, taxes, relative to the common good, they aren't political decisions, they're economic decisions, that have to do with making decisions about the transfer or about the distribution of the economic goods so as to maintain the stock of resources in being. If you have slaves, at some point you just decide, while they don't want anything, that you're going to feed the slaves so that they can be a part of the resource stock.

I want to get to the political, having to do with order or maintaining the common defense, which is the external relation. Every society has had an army. There have always been ways, if you had an argument with a neighboring tribe, to conciliate that argument. Maintain the order in external relations. Here in terms of domestic peace, maintain the internal order in terms of law enforcement or whatever. The jurisprudential basis, or just the category of basic law as just that which maintains order in the society. And this is just getting it down to the level which you have. In terms of corporate justice, foundational to justice is the legislative process or the law-making process, or, the way the political organization gets reordered and constantly justice gets maintained is by the continual remaking of the consensus. Every society has had a way by which laws get made. The judicial, every society has had a way of taking particular situations and naming the injustice and the justice, whether it be by the chief performing that function or whatever, and then on the top in terms of the executive, authority or the symbolic leadership in just administration of the laws of society. At the top in terms of corporate welfare, we pulled pretty straight out of our own heritage in terms of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Preserving the body politic is what you have on the paper in front of you, the Human Liberty and the Creative Pursuit. Here you're talking about rights. Society is set up to maintain rights. First, in terms of rights of individual and indeed every group and indeed that whole society has the right to preserve or maintain its basic rights. This weekend that pushed in terms of seeing that you weren't just talking about individual rights, but you were talking about the rights as well of the social group within the society. Then, the political rights, liberty, the right to participate some way in the decisions of the society.

the right to certain kinds of freedoms--the freedom to not house troops, the right to bear arms, would go under here. In creative pursuits. Here, every man in society has the right to significant vocational engagement. He's got the right to freedom of religion. He's got the right to freedom of speech is the kind of thing we're talking about up there. Not, in terms of particular content, but rather that every society has had a way of maintaining the welfare of the basic rights in a society.

Up on top, the cultural, Sense, Style, and Symbol have become exceedingly broad categories where sense covers the scientific innovations, anything that has to do with knowing. These have almost become synonymous with knowing, doing and being. On style, as we've talked about style, we've talked about that as having something to do with the individual. You know, I have a style, or I manifest a particular kind of style and that's got to do with how I dress and whether I wear earrings or not. That's not what we're talking about here. And the same things in terms of Symbol, you're talking about social processes. It has nothing to do with either theology or the scientific revolution in Sense, or the New Religious Mode, in terms of Style. You're talking about the process of maintaining or transmitting the communal wisdom in terms of the Useful Skills like every society has a way to have everyone in that society read, write, and speak. Learning how to walk goes there, though that's a little bit overly foundational in terms of the common wisdom. Ideas, maybe is a better word, the word that we've got here now is Communal Knowledge. That basically is the cultural curriculum, in terms of the sciences and the humanities and then replace theology on top with the basic methods. This was a interesting breakthrough, we've got the category Final Meanings, which relative to this Wisdom triangle was much harder to get a hold of, much more difficult. If you look at it, they don't sound like sociological words, whatever. What we discovered as we worked was that the point of collapse in terms of the educative processes in societies are up here. Every society has had a way of creating English gentlemen. "Building character" might be a way to say that. In our time it's this pole of the Communal Wisdom that's collapsed, or cynicism gets manifested when we talk about creating gentlemen and ladies, as opposed to creating people who can read or people who are intelligent. The points, for me on this triangle where the largest arguments came and where the most unclarity are indications that those are the places. Down here on Order, the continual struggle to name concrete things like police, prisons, etc. as opposed to naming romantic wish dreams about what would be nice, tells us that maybe we've been spoofed. We've been radically spoofed here.

In terms of style, we are talking about the social processes of creating style. First of all, those styles in terms of Cyclical Roles--creating the youth style, or creating the adult style, creating the elder's style. The social process by which, you know, signs of that are when you're 21 or 18 you can vote, or an adult should not do childish things. The whole role of the elder took a long time to get a hold of. The article on "Death as a Non-scheduled Status Passage", was not helpful. On the right hand pole of style you're talking about sexuality or basic maleness and femaleness. The category there is creating the Procreative Patterns in society in terms of sex and marriage and the family. On the top, Joseph talks about the community status organization or the appropriate styles in relation to the society as a whole. Now, we're getting up into civils, community organizations, community dynamics I think it is on your paper. Society has a way--when a guy from the West Side can't get a job that's partially an economic problem, but it's partially a problem in relation to style. What you began to see several years ago in the whole stew about unemployment in the inner city was that somebody from the West Side hadn't necessarily been pushed into the kind of pattern of behavior that allowed him to be employed or the problem wasn't whether he could do the job, the problem was being trained to get places on time, being trained to do this or do that, being trained in a certain way to dress. All of which has to do with maintaining the commonness in the society.

In terms of symbol, that's where the breakthrough came as we worked, in fact while we did the final cleaning. In Symbol, our traditional categories are Myth, Rite, and Symbol and as we worked down to the 5th and 6th levels it became more and more apparent that you weren't talking about myth in the sense that everybody lives out of a myth or you weren't talking about rites like shaking hands, and you weren't talking about symbols like stop signs and words, that you were talking about religion and so we pushed that up to the top, mainly with the help of Luckmann's Invisible Religion, and down here in terms of the foundational we put Art and in terms of the social put Language and here pulled in a lot of Langer. We used Cassirer's books on socio-linguistics. From religion, people like Eliade, Durkheim's Elementary Forms of the Religious Life.

Now that kind of lays out in the broad. You have to be clear on one level further down. This is the first, second, third level. You have to be able to articulate the fourth level in order to understand the whole social process. The 5th and 6th levels, you can hardly begin to talk about them unless you're within the economic or within the political or within cultural. Up here, in principle, except for the work in symbol, the work is done down to the 6th level. In principle the political, except for cleaning again relative to that category of practicality, has got to be done. In order to be inclusive you've got words and things here that at the 5th level that just aren't helpful like Universal Context that has to do with how you make a political decision or Symbolic Head under executive Authority at about two levels down doesn't hold sixth level category under something as technical as that. It's too abstract and wouldn't be helpful in creating a proposal. Cleaning like that's got to be done. And that's what you've got before you. In the economic when you get the next level down in each of these areas it begins to swim. Some of us working in it are slowly beginning to get clear as we read and read and read, but there's still a good bit of work to be done. What we're going to be doing is working--it looks like our primary work this summer is at the 4th, 5th and 6th level. At the 4th level they are pretty well set.

--Jim Wiegel

You people have got to hunt the final form of these lectures.

What Wiegel did interested me, a great deal. The part that has to be done more on is grounding, but he altered my construct in that after I would do the grounding, he brought methodology on how we arrived at this, which I thought helpful and really belongs in this lecture. I'll show you where I changed mine. The third thing is general content. The sources of that would have been my fourth one, then, what I want to call for the moment just the rough master relations or the dynamic, without going into dynamical sociology.

I want to illustrate a couple of matters here. We not only have to ground this in humanness, we've got to get this grounded in history. To say this as a preface--though if I were going to give the lecture I would fight hard here--but more for utilitarian purposes, and that's to shut up the romantics, we should have gone to every culture and got their insights, you know. Now the joker in that is that if you approach it that way, all you're doing is patching up the old system. If you're going to radicalize the social then if you live in Japan you damn well go through Japan to the bottom, you don't mess around with this other. If you live in the West you go through the bottom to get to the foundation. After you get to the foundation then it is that you begin to allow these other insights to push in. The job is getting through the bottom of some. Then you have some chance of a radical new social gospel (well, yes, it's going to be that) social vehicle. That's the only way you're going to get to the universality, for the first time in history, of the New Social Vehicle. You aren't going to go out this way. You just patch up.

You're going to go this way and then into that. Allow all of the wisdom of the world to come, and it's about that time when hopefully people in the East and in Africa and in Latin America, and I mean awakened spirit people (to hell with the God damned experts--I'm getting more and more angry here) will have begun to do that kind of a job there and then one day, wouldn't it be great if it were four years from now; you could get a body of us meeting with a body of Japanese and Philippineos and Indians and Africans that would begin to bring together our attempt to blow the bottom out. Something like that's got to be said, but that's almost beside the lecture.

In the West, I have to begin with Aristotle. To get us up on our history, that's where we began. You got Aristotle smeared up all over this blackboard, but in a highly altered sense. Maybe the best place to begin to get ahold of Aristotle is Thomas Aquinas. He operated with really only three social constructs, but I'm going to put four. Begin with the individual and the family, and the state, but in your thinking sociological let's cut off that individual. Then he drew a line here and put the church. Don't let any of your silly shriveled up Protestantism get in your way. This is Medieval thinking, it's got nothing to do with Roman Catholicism. This community he called a natural community, and the moment he named it that way he was dealing with dynamics, although he thought structurally. This he called a perfect community. The difference between a natural and a perfect community is a natural community was a part of what it means to be an individual. I mean, to be an individual you were in a family, that's why it was a natural community, no matter what the form of it. The reason why it is not a perfect community is that it is not sufficient unto itself. Now the state, let's put it the tribe, but he meant organization, was a perfect community, was sufficient unto itself. The family alone could not maintain itself, as he saw it. The state could maintain itself, therefore, it was a perfect, natural community. Then the third community was the divine community, and that's the church, but again don't let your petty theology get in there, that just came straight out of Aristotle. This represented the rational man, or for Aristotle, man was a biological creature, he was a sociological creature, he was a rational creature. He didn't have to think twice to discover which one of those dynamics was the crucial. Now, a very interesting thing, it was not until the rise of the modern world or the rise of the bourgeoisie, and I even put that back as early as the 8th Century where it began its rise with the Crusades, but the economic community did not come into being in the West as a community that stood on its own bottom, until bourgeoisie man was fully developed, let's say after the Industrial Revolution, although you can see traces of it coming for centuries beyond that. If you like to look at the wonders of history, I think it is a fantastic wonder that we added the economic community. It's just an unbelievable wonder. And with the drive of it because it was a new child, it soon took over the whole damn thing in the West. One of the reasons why Aristotle did not see the economic community is the family actually was the economic community. When you talk about dynamics, that dynamic of the economic community was just there in the beginning, just period. Anyway, the relationship between these was the hidden dynamic within the structure. The state's function fundamentally was to protect the rational community. Isn't that interesting? Now in our day this has flipped at least into the educational community and the religious community. I suspect, that maybe there is something like a new kind of community or maybe order, like the economic order, coming into being in our day that has to do with style. You feel almost psychotic when you say a word like that but if somebody had said this about the economic community back in the 19th Century, they'd of felt more psychotic than you and I feel psychotic when we say that something you never even dreamed of, and mark you, the economic community they'd never even dreamed of. I mean, society was a full, complete absolute, you know. After these communities come into being then you see that dynamic was there in the beginning, but you don't see that until the order shows itself as an order. If we are right

in saying that the emerging generations are consumed with style to say nothing about other generations today, then you begin to smell something that you never even dreamed of coming into being and you and I couldn't even begin to guess the form of it. See? Anyway, that's what it means to be somewhat futuristic in relationship to this kind of analysis as well as being somewhat archaic, and you have to be both I suspect to get a feel after that. Anyway, here is sort of the abstract triangle they worked with, but this is what we are working with also in this. This community over here represents the self-preservation. When man is concerned with preserving himself, to use Aristotle, he sees that he's got to have order, or he doesn't. And, that the preserving the self and the ordering the self in order to preserve the self is for-the-sake-of the consciousness of consciousness or for man becoming man, or human.

Now, we have to put it a little bit different way, though we've got some real hard problems here. You don't go around telling people about these problems unless they bring them up this summer, or unless they get so far down the road to see that anybody who built these triangle models would have problems, then you take your hair down. You see the difference between walking out your insecurities when you start to teach as ever against growing people up enough so that they can genuinely participate in your insecurities plus their own, which they would have had if they had of started it. This is nothing but a secret of pedagogy which all of us are aware of.

Man is, to use Marx here, a material creature or a physical creature, if you like. The state was always an artificiality, what Aristotle called the state, but for us this corner is not an artificiality because we see the sociality of man as Aristotle couldn't even dream of seeing it. In our day, if David McCleskey be right, we grasp the revolution of our time under the rubric of the consciousness of consciousness, or anybody who theorizes the revolution defines man in terms of what he thinks is the critical aspect of the revolution. Do you see this with Marx? Do you see this with somebody like Jefferson or the leaders of the French Revolution? When I suggested that in our kind of work here, you have a hidden anthropology and a hidden mythology on the upbeat of it, then your anthropology is built in. What fundamentally we mean by man is that he is conscious about his consciousness of consciousness. Fundamentally, down underneath it all.

Jim touched on the sources as he was giving the content. These (economic categories) are the crucial categories. They came out of both Karl Marx and Adam Smith. They use a little different terms, the resources of production, the instruments of production, the relations of production as over against resources, production and distribution, in Smith. It is very clear where these categories (political) came out of the French and American Revolution, particularly out of our own Constitution and the Declaration of Independence. Where these particular words came, I'm talking about the history of us at the moment. As far as we're concerned, we invented these: Images and Styles and Symbols. Which is another way of saying, I don't know where they came from. I'm making a personal confession. I don't mean we made them up, but I have never found anyone who pulled them together like that. If they came from Herskovitz, I'm willing to say, "Fine." Which points to one of our problems which is this. If you do not see all of this as abstractions, this is the area of knowledge and wisdom, this is the area of mores and customs, and this is the area of signs and symbols. So that though you are dealing with sociological entities here, what you are after is practical sociological entities. Here you are dealing with mores and with customs. You are not dealing with practical social structures though they are embodied in those. As long as you see that these are embodied customs and mores you'll have no problem in relationship to the stored up wisdom and to the world view, and this is the word view. You ought to fool when you begin to do the



sources and this is not to do the dynamics. I'm just pointing again in terms of rooted in humanness. This (order) is the basis of these two that is, if you don't show up alive you've got nothing to do. This is the organizing power. This brings the rationality of man in both directions. This is basically the defense, and it's the defense both ways. What I'm trying to point to is that there is a basic dynamic in trying to root this in humanness that just begins to show itself.

I'm convinced that you've got to do levels 0, 1, 2, 3 if you're going to do this lecture.

In terms of sources, you're not out to say who else says it. Here you're trying to say what was it that coughed this up into our midst.

One little last word. (In relation to the categories of Art and Language) The first art form is aaaaaah or ooooooh or ouch. That's art--the beginning of language. You know good and well you couldn't have drawn a deer on the thing-a-ma-jig if somebody hadn't invented deer. Now, keep it where it is, but when people get into the dynamics, they may discover that it's out of place.

---JWM