

16.x.'69

Form, cont. All humanly created structures have form. To say that a poem is "organic" is a tautology. (Which would seem to demolish the last 20 yrs. of literary criticism!) Whyt, Op. cit.: "Every particular form has its own special significance within the universal order of which man is part." No hierarchy.

Charles Olson: Letters for Origen. Re Boulez (1952): "Serial structure frees from all melody, all harmony, & all counterpoint, since serial structure has caused all three essentially modal and terminal notions to disappear." Once you get all the tones in the European tonal structure, you can say that all the tones in the equal tempered scale have equal relevance. There is no key center, therefore no lineal structure., but a totally spacial time-sound structure. (Olson probably got this quote through David Tudor.) "Techne as a root means an art. Technics, the doctrine of arts in general; ∴ technology is the science of the arts." The Greeks believed this (no "division of labour") Also important for Marx. In the West, once a man says "I am an artist", the chances are he won't do anything else. Artist vs. consumer. Cage & McLuhan quote the Balinese: "We don't have any art, we just do everything very well." Marx says the same thing in the 1844 paper. We must find a methodology which doesn't separate art from science, but rather describes the structure of energy & systematizes it. (C.P. Snow is the Benjamin Britten of philosophy.) Olson in Op. cit. & in Projective verse talks about composition by field as opposed to linear composition. The page is a field of action. (Cf. magnetic fields, Clark-Maxwell's magnetic field theories, etc.) Olson had read Wittgenstein & had studied math & topology. Once you say "totality", you are interested in juxtaposing information to make a composition by field (Boulez: "cluster of force") Cf. also visual concrete poetry, Franz Arp. Korzybski: finding yourself in your total environment is the basis of sanity. Schizophrenia is often the result of slavery to cause-&-effect structures (Laing). Korzybski: "In the physiological theory of sanity, order becomes paramount, Processes in function involves a series of states, by necessity exhibiting order. Adjustment to life conditions means adjustment to processes, & a physiological theory of sanity must be based structurally on four-dimensional order, where space & time are entities indivisibly interwoven." So sanity might involve a proper space-time training at an early age. R.D. Laing, The Politics of Experience: the patient orients himself inside a spacial structure of his events, so that he becomes a continuous event in a set of continuous events. This is very unlike Freud, who searched for origins (romantic retracing).

B Louis Agassiz: Essay on Classification, 1857. "If it can be proved that man has not invented but only traced this systematic arrangement in nature, then these relations & proportions which exist throughout the animal & vegetable world have an intellectual & ideal connection in the mind of the creator; and

COMMENTS

this plan of creation which so ~~claims~~ itself to our highest wisdom has not grown out of the necessary action of physical laws, but was the free conception of the Almighty Intellect, mature in his thought before it was manifested in tangible external forms; If, in short, we can prove premeditation prior to the act of creation, we have done once & forever with the desolate theory which refers us to matter as accounting for all the wonders of the universe, & leaves us with no God, but the monotonous unvarying action of physical forces, binding all things to their inevitable destiny." Watch the language - laws of matter = desolation. This essay ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ published two years earlier than Origin of Species. The same question - how do you prove teleology by biology? Note that the quotation above is in one sentence; cf. Faulkner, Mann, Proust. Agassiz cont.: "Mistaking for a causal relation the intellectual connection observable between serial phenomena, (materialist physicists) are unable to perceive any difference between disorder and the free, independent, & self-possessed action of a superior mind, and call mysticism, even a passing allusion to the existence of an immaterial principle in animals, which they acknowledge themselves in man. It is further plain that the laws which may explain the phenomena of the material world in contradistinction from the organic cannot be considered as accounting for the existence of living beings, even though these have a material body, unless it be actually shown the action of these laws implies, in their very nature, the production of such beings." He wants to think (as Marx says) of God as the "first manufacturer". Marx rejects this because it would be a teliological justification for a theory of productivity & consumption in the universe. . . Agassiz is a "romantic Christian biologist". The manic hunt for origins is also apparent in Wordsworth & Coleridge, & becomes obsessive in the C19th; ironically, it reaches a peak just as it is about to be discredited by Heisenberg, Wittgenstein, & Korzybski. The pre-C20th thinkers under discussion made a visible selection of evidences for their desire. Furthermore, they are all writing dramatic literature, which is usually an agon, not only to predict, but to fertilize. So Agassiz' "almighty intellect" is in fact the "origin of the drama", the "invisible cause of the invisible action", the "pre-meditating cause of creation". Darwin's "necessity" = Greek dike. This is the basis of the Western dictum that necessity is part of the production system we call creation. (See Kenneth Burke, The Philosophy of Literary Forms: Studies in Symbolic Action. He proposes a five-term structure of act, scene, agent, agency, & purpose. This serves to investigate all phenomena studied by the social sciences. This is a convenient alternative to treatment of human acts & relations in mechanistic metaphors. See also Terms for Order, ed. by Stanley Hymen: "Ritual Drama as Hub".)

B (P24) P.B. Medawar, The Art of the Soluble, 1967: "As Spencer's thought developed, he came to think of evolution, in Darwin's sense, as no more than one manifestation of a far grander & more

pervasive process, & out of this conviction his system grew." (Today we realize that philosophers devise systems because it gives them a nice comfortable feeling inside.) "First Principles (1862) was an attempt to show that the concept of general evolution followed inevitably from the laws of indestructibility of matter & the conservation of energy. Spencer's argument is unimportant & unconvincing, its sole purpose being to justify his expectation of finding evolution at work everywhere. The universe evolved, and the solar system & earth within it. Society is an organism: society evolves. Moreover, the law of evolution itself holds the inner world as it does the outer world: mind evolves. Therefore evolution is a universal process of things. 'Evolution becomes not ~~XXX~~ one in principle only, but one in fact.' " What this did was to establish competition as a law of life, which was exactly what was wanted by capitalist society.

- B. (See also Medawar, Induction & Intuition in Scientific Thought.) "The task of scientific methodology is to piece together an account of what scientists actually do. Einstein, in an essay on the method of theoretical physics in 1935, wrote, 'If you want to find out anything from the theoretical physicists about the methods they use, I advise you to stick closely to one principle: don't listen to their words, fix your attention on their deeds.'" Deeds in this context means action towards purpose. You choose what you want to experiment with. Einstein at the end of his life was in a terrible state because there was so much information coming at him that no one in high places would take any notice of. He wrote to Churchill, Roosevelt, Truman, et al., without effect. There was even a move in America to shut him up. And two days before he died, he wrote to Velikovski, agreeing with him finally that the world was a structure of catastrophe. There is also hearsay evidence that he got onto Reich. See also Einstein, The World as I See It. . . . Medawar goes so far (Mottram does not) as to say that the systems of Darwin & Spencer were self-deception: "Darwin's self-deception is one that nearly all scientists practise, for they are not in the habit of thinking about methodological policy. If taunted, a scientist will probably mutter something about 'induction' & establishing the laws of nature, but if anyone working in a laboratory professed to be trying to establish laws of nature by induction, we should begin to think he was overdue for leave." Darwin, letter, 1860: "I have an old belief that a good observer really means a good theorist."

- B. Buckminster Fuller, Ideas & Integrities: essay, "Total Thinking" (also B.F. Reader, p. 297) Unlike Agassiz, Fuller isn't scared of the idea that there is no difference between animate & inanimate (single energy structure), but he is worried about what we do with it. "Man, in degrees beyond all other creatures know to him, consciously participates--albeit meagerly--in the selective mutations and accelerations of his own evolution. This is accomplished as a subordinate modification and a component function of his sum total relative dynamic equilibrium as he speeds within the comprehensive and complex

interactions of universe (which he alludes to locally as environment)." If you say "environment", he says, you're saying "universe"--which really puts him in the second half of the 20th! Fuller calls the earth a space ship (but does that mean it's coming from somewhere & going somewhere?!). "As no energy may be lost of universe" (19th thinkers paid insufficient attention to Conservation of Energy) "and as all parts of universe act, theoretically, upon all other parts, man may accomplish modification of his particular evolution only by relative modification of the aspects of universe. The picture is of universe as a kaleidoscope of sum-total symmetry only, the relative aspects of which may be dynamically and infinitely reordered without exemption of, or addition to, the component totality." (p.297) This relates to John Cage: there is a structure of order which has to do with electromagnetic energy, within which there can be "dynamic & infinite reordering". It's a bit like Buddhism: "everything" is there & you gain access to it. The basic theory of tantric art is that you can listen to music (e.g.) which reorders the energy in your own structure. "Every shift (in the energy balance accomplished by man at earth's crust) affects all universe. Though fantastic, this is the scientific truth." I.e., even thinking alters truth. Fuller has a center at Southern Ill. U., along with Cage, Norman O. Brown, & McLuhan, where they are trying to work out the applications of "total thinking". He is talking about "general behaviour laws of the energetic universe" whose interactions in turn become subject to increasingly reliable predictions by man." I.e., they are not reliable until you have all the information together. If you try to move linearly, you're driving along a straight road looking in the rear-view mirror to see what's coming, when it's already been. (McLuhan) Fuller inherits both Heisenberg & Wittgenstein. "Both the frame of reference & the observed are in obvious continual motion and persist as individually composite dynamic continuities." He speaks of "the whole dynamic assemblage", as in contemporary art & music; "this schematically kinetic tapestry", i.e., not a fixed web structure, is Fuller's advanced concept of Relativity. (Einstein believed in God, that he was a mathematician, & that the Theory of Relativity would be, in fact, divine.) "Now at last this dynamic is significant because pivotal to the everywhere severe world-wide reorientation of all men's everyday affairs from a static to an a priori dynamic frame of reference." "The reorientation is severe because it is more than an uprooting. Realization of relativity spontaneously evokes a springing, to dive from a then vanishing springboard into an infinite dynamic sea where man must learn to swim tirelessly, naturally, before he sinks, but only because what he used to think was that he ought to 'sink' rather than be attracted by dominant neighbors. . . . If there is no inherent 'down' in the universe, man cannot sink. This is not a semantic abstraction." "Human egos are multi-concentric frequency halo systems."

Recap: Wittgenstein, Tractatus, 2.0131: "A spacial object must lie in infinite space." "A point in space is a place for an argument." Schoenberg: "The unity of musical space demands

an absolute unity of perception. In this space there is no absolute down, no right or left, forward or backward. ~~Text~~ ~~imaginations~~ Every musical configuration, every movement of tones, has to be comprehended primarily as a mutual relation of sounds, of oscillating vibrations appearing at different places & times. To the imagination or creative faculty, relations in the material sphere are as independent from directions or planes as material objects are in their sphere to our perceptive faculties." ("Composition with Twelve Tones", in *Style & Idea*, 1950) . . . Boulez, Polyphonie X: a work of discontinuity structured as circularity; no fixed beginning, middle, or end.

Technology, fear of, as related to "tragic" systems

B Jacques ~~Elleul~~, The Technological Society, 1954, trans. 1964.

See especially Chap. 2, "The Characterology of Technique". He defines technique as "any complex of standardized means for obtaining a pre-determined result", which converts spontaneous and unreflective behaviour into behaviour that is deliberate & rationalized," "concerned with the immediate consequences of setting standardized devices into motion." There is a basic wariness in the language. This is also important for McLuhan, who is concerned with a basic change-over from writing to printing, i.e. repetition, which Elleul is discussing, as opposed to spontaneity & reflection. "He who maintains that he can escape technique is either a hypocrite or uncounscious. The autonomy of technique" (McLuhan: "Autonomy of television") "forbids the man of today to choose his destiny. It is not a kind of neutral matter with no direction, quality, or structure; it is a power endowed with its own peculiar force. It refracts in its own specific sense the wills that make use of it and the ends purposed for it." Because technique includes use & purpose, & because that use & purpose are built into the technique, the autonomy is dangerous. Once there is a consensus of assumption that we don't examine it, that we take it for granted, it becomes autonomous. "Refracts" = distorts. "The second consequence of technical autonomy is that it renders technique at once sacreligious & sacred." Taboos are involved. Sacreligious in sociological, not theological sense: what you think you must not touch. "Man can't live without a sense of the secret." "Marx everywhere has a basic image of stripping, unveiling, exposing: it is main dramatic metaphor. Man's task is Promethean: to unveil power & seize it. Das Kapital is an extraordinary work of erotic drama: vampyrism, werewolves, gorgans, things that suck blood & turn you to stone, (Cf. gothic novel tradition.) egg-addling. There has been a conspiracy to make things secret, which you must break through. . . "The psychoanalysts agree on this point. The invasion of technique de-sacralizes the world in which man is called upon to live. For technique, nothing is sacred, there is no mystery, no taboo. Autonomy makes this so." The Sacred is "what man decides unconsciously to respect". "The taboo becomes compelling from a social standpoint. There is always a factor of adoration and respect which does not derive

from compulsion and fear. The mysterious is merely that which has not been technicized." Mumford, too, wants something which is a vitalistic impulse, not technology; "that primal impulse". He likes ball bearings & circular things, because they don't look like technology; he likes Gaudi because of the curves & mess.; & Brancusi: sacralized technique. "Thrusting upward", secularized divine impulse. See also Georges Bataille, Eroticism (Amer title: Death & Sensuality), Calder, 1957: basic conflict of transgression. Not "challenge & response" Hegelianism, but breaking taboo, crossing boundaries. Sex & excrement are involved: at what moments does the body break? This, for B., is the origin of the sacred. To say that Darwin, Marx, & Freud are fascinated by excrement does not mean that they are coprophiliacs. (Cf. Brown, Life Against Death, "Filthy Lucre": Why does Luther "invent" Protestantism while he is constipated? From what kind of body are systematics invented? Darwin married a wife who would care for him as an invalid; Marx wrote in a letter that he hoped that readers of Das Kapital would remember his carbuncles!) Bataille opposes orgy/play/sacred with work. (labour = energy expenditure). This is central to Western civilization, but totally false. (Fuller challenges)

Archaeology & anthropology, in 19th & 20th centuries, get played back into anti-progress structures: every culture is to be approached, not as a point in an evolutionary progression, but as an event in a simultaneous world (McL: the past is now). (Olson re Mayan temple site: maybe they chose it because they liked the view!) Hermeneutics = the art or science of interpretation (not exegesis or practical exposition). Heuristics = "serving to find out"; acts of discovery rather than acceptance. Used in analysis of myths & cultures; not ascribing actions to "human nature".

Olson, Duncan, Ginsberg accept the fact that they live in a global structure of simultaneous cultures, which can be used at any point for any purpose. Wherever you go, human beings are inventing continually structures of myth & culture. They are all ways of describing what you see when you stand upright on the earth & look up at the sky, across at the earth & your fellow human beings, & tell stories to yourself & others about what you see. Gods represent the desire of the human to invent a certain kind of energy center.

What is involved is a critical study of gods, kings, priests, & projections of human needs, such as the need to imagine transcendental possibilities. Nietzsche's Superman was a corruption of this (in a linguistic sense).

Shelley, in Prometheus Unbound,⁽¹⁸¹⁸⁻²⁰⁾ uses the Prometheus myth (though he was an atheist) as a means of describing the seizure of power & authority, which is why Lenin & Shaw were interested, & why Marx, in the preface to ? identified with Prometheus. In 1841 Marx, in Preface to his doctoral thesis on the philosophies of nature, called him "the holiest saint & martyr in the philosophical calendar". Quotes Aeschylus: "In simple words, I hate the pack of gods."

Olson, Duncan, et al. are creating epic structures which include gods, & myths, as part of human creation. This is partly what Olson means by the "human universe". It is also what Blake was doing in 1820 at the end of Jerusalem: we can now create the human city because we have gone through the process of finding out what we require.

Tragedy. We must examine the idea that this is the height of human action. Alain Robbe-Grillet, For a New Novel, 1963. If you can approach any system as a drama (Kenneth Burke), with agent, action, scene, agency, etc., you can look at Darwin, Marx, Agassiz, Fuller as "actions" (Aristotle) with "plots". Darwin's history of evolution, e.g., is a plot structure. Conversely, any structure of a novel is a plot of the universe. Dickens' Our Mutual Friend is a structure with 47 main characters; when they have all met each other, the book stops (or congeals). The image of "crossing paths" is explicitly mentioned in the novel. The epilogue is "what happened afterwards": he can't leave them alone. Everything is tidied away, it is a closed universe. Or Daniel Derronda: everything is locked. Novel plots are always cosmological, the vision that the writer has of everything.

"A Future for the Novel" (or "A Path for the Future Novel", in Calder & Boyers ed., Snapshots & Towards a New Novel, 1965, p. 43.) "Instead of this universe of signification (psychological, social, functional), we must try then to construct a world both more solid & more immediate. Let it be first of all by their presense that objects & gestures establish themselves, & let this presence continue to prevail over whatever explanatory theory that may try to enclose them in a system of references, whether emotional, sociological, Freudian, or metaphysical." (p.54) He calls this "the tyranny of signification". "Objects will gradually lose their instability & their secrets" (Marx: unveiling vs. Elleul: preserve secrets as defense against technology) "will renounce their pseudo-mystery, that suspect interiority, which Roland Barthes has called "the romantic heart of things". Don't write, "the villiage snuggled in the valley", or "a violet by a mossy stone", as if it were hiding away (instead of, ecologically that's the best place for it).

Roland Barthes, Writing Degree Zero: uses Elleul's word, "neutral" as a value. Barthes is a structuralist. He calls for "no system of references", no tyranny of significations. His example is Camus' The Outsider

Robbe-Grillet: "No longer will objects be merely the vague reflection of the hero's vague soul, the image of his torments, the shadow of his desires. Or rather, if objects still afford a momentary prop to human passions, they will do so only provisionally, and will accept the tyranny of significations only in appearance, "derisively" one might say, the better to show how alien they remain to man." (p.55) "We thought to control the world around us by assigning it a meaning; and the entire art of the novel in particular seemed dedicated to this enterprise." (p. 56) What separates this new tradition from the old (Balzac, etc.) is "the destitution of the old myths of death". "The

writer's traditional role consisted in excavating nature, in burrowing deeper & deeper to reach some ever more intimate stratum, & finally unearthing some fragment of a disconcerting secret." All the major novels of the 19th are detective novels, from Brockden Brown, Poe, William Godwin (Caleb Williams) straight through to Dostoyevski: unravelling, disclosing, not describing. "Thus the world functioned as a trap in which the writer captured the universe in order to hand it over to society. The revolution which has occurred is in kind; not only do we no longer consider the world as our own, our private property, designed according to our needs & readily domesticated, but we no longer even believe in its depth." I.e., that there are significations & interiorities that you bring out.

B Robbe-Grillet, "Nature, Humanism & Tragedy" (1958) (p.75) Concerns the end of tragedy as a viable concept. ~~Quotes Barthes,~~ (See also Karl Jaspers, Tragedy is not Enough.) Quotes Barthes: "Tragedy is merely a means of "recovering" human misery," (The French word includes recovering, establishing, putting down as a viable concept) "of subsuming & thereby justifying it in the form of a necessity, a wisdom, or a purification. To refuse this recuperation and to investigate the techniques of not treacherously succumbing to it (nothing is more insidious than tragedy) is today a necessary enterprise." (p.75) Robbe-Grillet: "On the pretext that man can achieve only a subjective knowledge of the world, humanism decides to elect man the justification of everything, a true bridge of souls thrown between man & things. The humanistic outlook is preeminently a pledge of solidarity. In the literary realm, the expression of this solidarity appears chiefly as the investigation worked up into a system of analogical relations. Metaphor, as a matter of fact, is never an innocent figure of speech." (p.)

This relates to the effect on American literary criticism of T.S. Eliot's "The Dissociation of Sensibility". The way to reply to Eliot is to state that no metaphor is innocent. If you hang onto the metaphors of Donne, etc., without realizing that they are making analogs between man & the universe, you don't know what's going on (which Eliot doesn't). Once you make an anthropomorphic analogy ("the ship plowed the waves"), you're caught. It implies "an entire metaphysical system". When the Royal Society at the end of the century called for an end to metaphor, this meant to Eliot a "dissociation of sensibility" because he felt that what was contained in a metaphor was an "associated sensibility", which meant a unified one. What was happening was that the Christian universalism which you see in Shakespeare & Donne, which enabled the metaphors to be made, was slowly disintegrating & being replaced by a non-metaphorical structure. He wanted to maintain a constant relationship between the universe & the beings that inhabit it. (This is also the pathetic fallacy of the romantics: there is a relationship between you & "leaves" which is always steady.)

Robbe-Grillet: "It is no accident if nature precisely (mineral, animal, vegetable nature) is clogged with anthropomorphic vocabulary. This nature (mountain, desert, forest, sea,

valley) is simultaneously our model & our heart. It's within us and around us. It encrusts us, judges us, & insures our salvation." (the Old South) "To reject our so-called nature & the vocabulary which perpetrates its myth is not to deny man; it is to reject the pananthropic notion. . . It is no more, in the last analysis, than to lay claim, quite logically, to my freedom. All analogies are just as dangerous as the anthropocentric analogies, and perhaps the most dangerous of all are the most secret, those in which man is not named." The idea of nature leads infallibly to that of a nature common to all things, i.e., to a "superior" or "higher" nature. "The idea of an inter-iority always leads to the idea of a transcendence." This is the theory of Vitalism (Mumford et al.)

B We are concerned with something which emerges from Wordsworth, Emerson, & the tradition from Carlyle to Nietzsche to D.H. Lawrence (& Spengler) which can be called the Vitalist Tradition. It is delineated in Eric Bentley, A Century of Hero Worship (Eng. ed.: The Cult of the Superman). He discusses the important 19th idea that certain men are "men of destiny", who embody in their genius the vitalistic transcendent ~~axixx~~ urge of the universe (Napoleon, who was a great hero until he crowned himself & upset Byron). The hero who embodies so much vital energy that he is to be followed, because he is the "agent" of history (using Burke's terms: act, agent, scene) Shaw's play re Napoleon is called Man of Destiny. De Gaulle self-consciously enacted the theory. Bentley's criticism of D.H. Lawrence is salutary: the central image in Lawrence is the centaur, the man-horse.

Tragedy says that man, captured inside these concepts, is living life as a test, an ordeal, in which victory consists in being completely vanquished by the destiny-process: "the last invention of humanism to permit nothing to escape". You "recover" misery, put it down, & become entrapped by it. Which is why Robbe-Grillet lays claim to his freedom: The function of solitude: "I call out. No one answers me. Instead of concluding that there is no one there, which could be a pure & simple observation, dated & localized in space & time, I decide to act as if there were some one there, a someone who, for one reason or another, will not answer. The silence which follows my outcry is henceforth no longer a true silence; it is charged with a content, a meaning, a depth, a soul, which immediately sends me back to my own. According to the habitual process, my solitude is then no longer an accidental momentary datum of my existence, it becomes part of me, of all men, of the entire world. It is our nature once again, it is solitude forever." This is what he calls "alienated consciousness" (cf. Marx), which produced the "tragic sense of life". It "never seeks to suppress the distances; it multiplies them. The distance between man & other men, between man & himself, between man & the world, between the world & itself. Nothing remains intact, everything is lacerated, fissured, divided, misplaced; everything is contaminated. The systematic tragidification of the universe I

live in is often the result of deliberate intention. This suffices to cast a doubt on any proposition tending to posit tragedy as natural & definitive." (Refer back to Barthes quotation.)

See end of Tape I, Side I, for related discussion of de Toqueville, & a sampling of the content of Mottram's previous course, "Self & Community".