

following the Problem Solving Unit report dealing with the  
NEW SOCIAL VEHICLE

ORDER COUNCIL

December 28, 1969

JWM

Any self-conscious alteration of the social vehicle comes with what I call basic principles. Although it may not be the way it will come out, we had those to start with:

- All the earth belongs to all the people.
- All the decision-making processes belong to all the people.
- All the goods of nature belong to all the people.
- All the inventions of humanness belong to all the people.

That's where we started. If you put that in the middle or up above it or below it. I don't care which - who're dealing with a presupposed anthropology. Then beyond that, you're dealing with a presupposed mythology without which you don't have what we're after. On the other side of that centrum, you are dealing with social dynamic but that's also your box, your 4 x 4's. (That's dealing with the social dynamic) Down below that you deal with the practical processes, or the structural processes, or practices or whatever you want - without these five things you don't have what we're out to get.

We started at that center, and as a matter of fact, the whole group, right or wrong, intuitively accepted that as the principle leverage. Then we moved from that into these dynamics. I believe that was right. Without this kind of clarity that the N.S.V. document gives us of that area, we are not ready to grasp what our presupposed anthropology is. Now you don't create that. That was in us a long time ago, or you wouldn't have gotten to those principles.

I'm wondering whether what the Movement wrote in its first document, (Document I) in which it analyzed history under the rubric of consciousness of consciousness, is not the key to our anthropology. You could put that in Kierkegaardian language or a billion other ways. But, whereas Marx took the economic aspect of man, and Locke took the political aspect of man to forge their image of the social process, we've taken the cultural, and when you shove the cultural to the bottom, you've got consciousness of consciousness - or man is conscious.

How you spell your anthropology out in relationship to a social vehicle, is going to force you to spell out your mythology. Here I have great fear because I'm so very Western, and I want to come to the practices of this in a moment. I have no way to come at it except as a western man. But I trust the intuitions of the West - those which are beyond their reductionistic ideologies. If I were a man in India and could not say that about my own construct, then I would not be human, period - or he would not be dealing genuinely with Ur images. That's sort of an apology for what I am going to say.

Mythology, now I'm trying to be non-Western, always deals with the primordial, and it always deals with the post-mordial. It also deals with reality that's beyond reality, without which you do not have a primordial or a post-mordial. Every mythological image, it seems to me, embodies these three points on the triangle. When you throw that into the West, you get necessarily the doctrine of the Fall. That's easily illustrated in Christian Western thought with the Stoics' golden age and the age to come, or the Utopia ahead. When you say that, in between you have a Fall. We've often said that Marx took his basic mythology from the Christians. That's true, but it's even beyond that, from the West. For this Stoic mythology is not Christian, chronologically. Marx is going to be our guide - I tell you he's going to be our guide. He's the closest one that we can reach out and touch, who did this. We have to know

a lot more than Marx. But when he dealt with the economic, the Fall was in man's invention of private property. He had to have an economic view of man in order to get to that, and once you accept that, the rest of it follows through pretty well on his myth.

When we are dealing with consciousness of consciousness or cultural man, that Fall is extremely hard to describe. At the moment I'll have to disclose my existence in the Hebrew-Christian community and take the Genesis myth to get at this, although we have to be able to say this in a million other ways too, I suppose. You go back to the basic principles of "All the Earth belongs to all the people" and so on. Adam was given a garden. (All belongs to all.) Then, secondly, he had to create that garden. This is the naming. He was given a garden he had to create. But, there was one limitation, and without that limitation, you would not have consciousness. This is the wisdom of China, if not Genesis - Except in tension, except in contradiction, you do not have consciousness of consciousness. Now, "You dare not touch that tree." How you deal with the problem of sin under the rubrics of both pride and weakness is exciting - not easy but exciting. It was the very awe-full-ness of the consciousness of consciousness that drove Adam to touch that tree, then, he lost - or let's put that better. Here the theologizing of the Fathers is going to help. Did he lose it all? Or was it marred as Thomas Aquinas put it? Let's call it marred, for a moment. But it was marred, because that reduced his world. Sin then, is any kind of reduction of "All the earth belongs to all the people". This is like the invention of private property of Marx, that gives the Fall. Then comes history, a la Marx. History is only that where the class struggle that resulted from the Fall takes place, working toward that Utopia. Again, when you go back to the primordial - in that sense then you go beyond the class struggle. That's history. And not after it's finished. That's post history. So that history here is man's struggle for the consciousness which mythologically he had, but remember, mythologically - that means that's his essential nature, if you see this, which brings in, of course, the evolutionary understanding of sin, too, which we cannot, I think, disregard if we look at finitude and self as that without which sin under the rubric of guilt is an impossibility. Again, I'm back to the fifth paragraph of Tillich where he fools with this. Anyway, this gives the primordial the Fall, and the post-mordial, if I can use that kind of language, something like that as the mythology has got to be spelled out, and with hard-headed detail.

We have got to get on top of social theory throughout the history of the West and social theory in China, in India, in Africa - not as some assinine romantics that are beating the West over the head and therefore think they'll try Zen Buddhism for a while. No - the deep deep insight that beyond any awareness of humanness lies humanness, if you like.

The phenomenological categories - I don't suppose anybody in this room is pleased with them. But my God, we're a long way beyond where we were three months ago. You've tried on for size, many of them. I've tried on the immediate family, the contextual community, the global society, and the transcendent league, if you like. You've tried many, many different kinds, and it's almost impossible, without falling into the trap of the sociologists, anthropologists in the 19th century that made society equivalent with personality. We don't want to go back to that. But you're saying there are states of mind. There are spirits within communities, within families. How do you get hold of that? - Anyway, this question - all of that kind of stuff is there.

(GM) Joe, when you tell your myth, do you go ahead and pull up into the myth - historical elements like you interpret Romanticism as having turned away from the radical spirit in order to have emotional spirit, the Enlightenment turned away from the radical spirit in order to have a spirit of the mind; Marxism turned away from the radical spirit in order to have a technological determinism? Is this all part of what you mean by myth?

(JWM) In a way, but I guess this is what somebody over here was pushing a minute ago. Out of that myth you get your interpretation of universal history - Marx very concretely pointed at it through the increasing complexity of tools. That's the way Marx divided history. I hadn't thought of it, but the way you did that might very well be it. - of showing at each step - and we're going to be different from Marx, because he had this in him. We don't have to have that. There are different kinds of eschatological understandings - of how at each stage there was a new perversion and a new breakloose from a perversion.

(RWF) Would you say what Chardin did was more toward an anthropology or a mythology?

(JWM) A mythology. He presupposed an anthropolgy, and this is the chicken and the egg. Which comes first? In this highly rational age, you'd think that the anthropology comes first, but you don't even know about that. If we do this, this is not a job for people in diapers. This ought to be very clear. This is going to take hard, hard intellectual work on the history of society, the history of social theory in the West and in other countries - drawing together the scheme or the schemata in those areas.