

5.III.1970 The City (Pound, Fuller, Mumford, Goodman, Brown)
Pisan Cantos. In Motive & Method in Cantos of E.P. (ed.
Leary) Pound is reported as saying at St. Elizabeth's Hospital:
"My Paradiso will have no St. Dominik or Augustine, but it will
be a Paradiso just the same, moving towards final coherence.
I'm getting at the building of the City--that whole tradition."
We want to consider the building of the city as a kind of coher-
ence, a way of synthesis.

Myths of the city: Pound, Olson, Duncan reexplore what
it is when human beings make something on the earth's surface,
rather than boring a hole in the earth and going inside, or
going up a tree. (Unless ~~you~~ decorate it or build a tree house:
then it starts to become a city!) We are talking about trans-
forming a cave or a tree or a hill into a man-made container.

Hindu myth of Meru (used by Yeats), one of earliest myths
of the Sacred Mountain, or mound: either choosing or making a
hill that rises above the earth to the sky. The city & the
mountain are Pound's images of paradise: Taishan (Chinese),
Dioce (Herodotus), & Wagadu (Africa, mentioned by Frobenius).
The mountain is one of the human myths of aspiration towards
ascent, transcendence from the earth-bound and from death.
Among the alchemists (Olson, Duncan) the mountain is hollow
and the interior heat is the heat for creative aspiration
(the Philosopher's Oven). The vertical axis of the mountain
goes through the world's axis: i.e., the city isn't an excrescence.
(In 19thC discussion the city=wicked.) Equated with spinal
column--standing upright (transition from ape to human). Also
a kind of temple; i.e., a place where humans put things they
consider sacred. Famous temple mountains: Ziggurat of Mesapo-
tamia, Ankor Watt, Barovadur (?) in far east, mounds in pre-
Columbian America. (cf. Swiss gold storage, Morman plan to
"file" everyone in mountains). Parallel with trees, "roots &
branches" (Duncan), expanding humans from earth into sky. The
peak is the contact between earth & heaven (euhemoristics), the
axis that binds the cosmos together. The Hindu Meru was made
of gold and placed at the North Pole, linked to pole star.
(Cf. Columbus believing that he had discovered the earth's
"nipple"; mountain built on earth's "navel".) Hindu castle
of Indra is built on a mountain. Olympus is different. If
one thinks of gods as projections of exceptional human attributes,
of control of energy, then Olympus becomes the home of those
projections. By the time you get to Rome, it's the human
city which is built on hills, not the home of the gods: a
major difference between Hellenistic & Roman cultures. (The
Grail is associated with the mountain of salvation, Montserrat,
which is difficult to find--a major difference between Hindu
& Xian traditions.) Meru also had the shape of a seven-sided
pyramid. (How many sides has the city, is it circular, what
is the shape? Morphological discussion of shape of city is
usually quite irrational.) This was said to correspond to
seven planetary ~~spheres~~ spheres, seven essential virtues,
seven directions of space. Essential point is that this was

How FAR
BACK?
PRE-COLUMBIAN
ICAN?

considered to be a construction of one-ness, a container of the required synthesis.

The city is a form or myth of space & height which is a container of value and aspiration. City=mountain=temple.

Re irrationality: cities were always founded in accordance with doctrine, never arbitrarily. But it might be irrational doctrine.

For Jung, the city is a woman symbol (on what evidence?), a feminine principal which shelters inhabitants. OT often speaks of cities as women; mother goddesses often decorated city walls. There may be other reasons; e.g., fertility proptiation. Given subsequent inferior position of women & suspicion of women in many cultures, there seems to be something inherently wrong in Jung's interpretation. There is contrary evidence, Romulus & Remus, for instance.

In Cantos, vision of city is possibility of earthly paradise, not City of God (see quote at beginning). In Canto XVI, after corruptors of civilization in hell, Pound offers counter-vision: entered the quiet air

the new sky,
the light as after a sun-set,
and by their fountains, the heroes,
Cantos, p.73 Sægismundo, and Malatesta Novello,
and founders, gazing at the mounts of
their cities.

After hell, corruption of usura, there emerges P's definition of hero (=city-founder). Canto XVII: "cities set in their hills" (p.80). Canto XXVI: Jerusalem, painted by Carpathio (pp. 132-3). Vision of city in the mind (Blake: Jerusalem as ideal of human-made city.) (Plate 96) In Thrones, city becomes throne of "spiritual power", the inclusive attainment of civilization; the web that Penelope weaves as a home for Odysseus (Jung). It is where the hero comes to found, parmanently, what he has learned. Canto CXVII: Demeter becomes queen of the city; cities are "temples of light". Continuous relationships between architecture, music, & light. Forms of illumination. These cities are not museums (cf. Joyce, McLuhan: museum as parody of city. Beginning of Finn Wake: "This is the way to the musiroom" (sp?) The book is perhaps a huge parody of a museum. Joyce is concerned with the living city, the human temple, the university, the Paideuma, so that we all become heroes of our cities.)

In a sense, the Cantos are an image of the city, a place where what you hold to be valuable can be taken and used. One of his aims is to project the possible polis. In Canto LXXIV, Mt Taishan@Pisa (p.453); whiteness of both is part of recurrent statement of light & clarity & candor (Meru was shaning white when seen from a distance.) There is a polar axial image of totality & clarity here, which is the meaning of Paradise. So Pound's idiogram of the total light process; i.e., the sun-and-moon together, could be a city. "To build the city of Dioces whose terraces are the colour of stars." (p.451) This is the city of King Dioces in Herodotus, seven-walled, & shaped like Purgatory (City of Ekbatan (sp?), founded in 6thC BC by legendary

king of the Medes). Herodotus describes it as having seven concentric walls, each of a different colour, with a citadel center as treasure-house.

3rd city in Cantos is Wagadu, an African city mentioned in Frobenius, Monumenta Africana; remade four times after destruction, caused successively by vanity, falsehood, greed, & dissention. Each time the city's name changed; each time the gates faced in a different direction; and each time it gained in strength, so that the image of a possible city, in this myth, accumulates. The myth celebrates man's ability to build a city so that it increases in splendor each time it is rebuilt. Each of the causes of its downfall brings benefits. "For every man will then have the Wagadu in his heart and every woman the Wagadu in her womb." What Frobenius recognizes as an African Paideuma, Pound puts in its place beside the Chinese & European examples. Through this method, Pound gains confidence in the human ability to build a city in a disastrous time. (We are not concerned here with Utopias, but how, in a difficult time, you gain and keep confidence.)

In making a city, we are involved with relationships among men, objects, and enclosures. Brown, Life Against Death, Chap. 15: The City Sublime, Immortality, Human Body, Excrement. At this point he is still radically Freudian. Difficulty: once you equate civilization ~~as~~ with repression/sublimation, the city becomes a defense against energy. Marx is involved here: objects substituted for the body, in such a way that "the dehumanization of man is the alienation of his own body". By this technique he acquires a "soul". Immediately this is "located"; increasingly, says Brown, in things. Money becomes the world soul and gold becomes the totemistic, fetishistic of value. (Pound's image of gold gathering light to itself.) Brown here quotes Spengler: the significance of gold is the gleam when man brings it out of the earth. (Wagner's Ring is partly about this: what happens when you identify value in that way.) "The gleaming gold takes away from the scene the life and the body, their substantial being." Brown: "Money is the heart of the new accumulation complex; the capacity of money to bear interest is its energy; its body is that fundamental institution of civilized man, the city." (p.281) What, then, might the idea of the resurrection of the body be? Brown takes most of the book to sort out Freud, then goes on in Love's Body to develop alternatives.

What we are considering here is the change in the structure of the myth of the city in two American writers, Pound & Norman O. Brown. Pound identifies money as "the heart of the new accumulation complex" as "the hell of usury".

When you put together Freud and Spengler, it is very difficult to imagine a way out (which is the title of the last section of Brown's book), from the despair & pessimism of their image of the city. Spengler identifies the megalopolis as "city as world", which annihilates the country; i.e., it's sheer weight annihilates nature. Straight through to Mumford there is the feeling that the city is a malign accumulation.

522 New Approaches to E.P. 172-3

(Cf. McLuhan: once you have a satellite around the earth, it ends nature.) Then you have a "man-made object". But then you must decide whether this is a malign act. If the whole world becomes a city, is it still a sacred energy container?

Buckminster Fuller has made a world map which depicts the earth's land mass as an island, a "world city". This runs counter to those who regard what man makes as hubristic, against the gods. There is a great shift in the word "creativity" between Milton and Thomas Grey. In Milton's time, the word could not be applied to human beings; this was blasphemy. But somewhere near 1746 this changes. (Why?)

Brown, using Marxist techniques, goes on to discuss the city as a place based on surplus. (Das Capital is essentially about the city as the sacred institution of money.) It is very dependent on agrarian labour outside its boundary. It depends on surplus; it makes its surplus out of agrarian surplus; hence banks and high finance. (This transfers easily to industry: the idea that the city drains the energy from things outside it. Of course this is late & pollution is involved as well.) Cf. "the City", London, & the priests of the stock exchange. . . You can't build a city until you have energy to spare, & somehow you accumulate it. Henry Adams noted that in the building of Chartres Cathedral, it became a city structure; they had to put the land around into it, & it became an economy. Brown notes that the city is always a sacred space: "Come let us build us a city, and a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven." (p.282) Brooks Adams, in Law of Civilization & Decay, talks about the sacred city & its medium, money (a source for both Brown & Charles Olson). In Brooks Adams, & elsewhere, this leads one to a study of metallurgy: at what point does it become sacred surplus? (& therefore sacred waste) Cf. Veblen, Theory of the Leisure Class, "conspicuous waste". This is the moral point.

Brown's summary paragraph: "The city is a deposit of accumulated guilt. . . ." (for rest or paragraph, see p. 283) Once you establish city as an accumulation of its history, a debt with a rate of interest (the sins of the fathers . . .), you have a moral question: what kind of surplus wealth is created there? What is its use? Here one must criticise Brown for the implication that, once you have explained it, there is nothing you can do about it. One must realize, for a start, that if history is based on sublimation, then there is nothing to do about it. Second, if you accept the idea that you do inherit the sins of the fathers, this also stands in the way of a solution. One is, in fact, guilty only if one does nothing about it.

Wright's image of city as tumor can be related to Vision+ Value series, where Kepes pairs microcosm/macrocosm photos. This is fascinating, but perhaps morally spurious.

Brown, in this paragraph, also quotes from Mumford's Culture of Cities. One of the main problems in Mumford is to get through his assumptions (1) that the city is a far-gone case of malignancy and (2) that it is a necessity.

(Tony Dunn: Mumford believes city to be a repository of

civilization at a higher level, which leads him to an eliteism which is difficult to pin down.)

Mumford never really makes up his mind, and it is difficult also for Frank Lloyd Wright to find ways of "taking off the curse". The City in History is like an effort to clear away the disaster by accumulation of "crystalized surplus": he writes about this again & again, and the books get bigger & bigger. (Dunn: The conflict comes out both in his prose style & in his dialectic, in which he balances pros & cons. It is difficult to extract his pastoral ideology without reading several of his books. It is like a mediaeval debate.) There is the feeling that he is describing an inevitable process. Cf. McLuhan. Both are ideologically determined.

There is a difficulty at the end of Brown, when he suggests that changes in attitudes towards ~~towards~~ repression can lead to changes in society. There is a single reference to Reich, which is ~~repre~~catory. There is also a monstrous quotation from Keynes, Essays in Persuasion: "Perhaps it is not an accident that the race which did most to bring the promise of immortality into the heart and essence of our religions has also done most for the principle of compound interest." (Brown, p.286) As if you can talk of the Jews as a race, & as if usury were restricted to compound interest & Jews.

What Brown does not enquire into is the relationship between laws, inheritance, & usury in the city (which has nothing to do with Jews). One must look at the ways in which Jews got associated with hoarded energy. This is one of the origins of anti-Semitism. Luther realized this, as he also realized that the Vatican was a center of hoarded energy. (Pope=money=excrement=devil) The correction to Keynes is the fact that any hoarded energy area is a center of criticism when it is set up as a relationship between law, inheritance, & usury. It has nothing to do with race. And one should know that the Jewish bankers were being used by non-Jewish rulers during the Thirty Years' War to decimate Europe.

Joan Robinson's statement which Brown rejects (p.283), that the gold fund is a "free gift", is closer to the truth (Dunn: though there is a dangerously self-sacrificial implication). Brown's sneering reference to Reich's "character-arming indicates that he has no idea of the crucial relationship between work & sex as economic basis in Reich.

What one needs is a realization that it is possible for an unrepressed man to overcome guilt and anxiety, be free from the money complex, & recreate the city. This man, says Brown, "will be a ~~xxx~~ body freed from unconscious oral, anal, & genital fantasies of return to the maternal womb, rid of the nightmares which Freud showed to be haunting civilization." (p.) And adds Mottram, he would also be freed from scarcity; i.e., "total need" (Burroughs) Perhaps the only definition of ~~xxxxxxx~~ evil. Once you have the conviction that energy is scarce, someone comes along who claims to be able to control it. This leads to "I know what your needs are".

Brown projects the idea of the freed sexual body which would obviate the old idea of the city & create a potential for renewal. But that is all he can do at this point. (In the last section of the book he traced the history of ways in which the body has been transformed, including the ideas of Blake & Hegel. Note that he includes not only the necessity of freeing the body from repression, but also of restructuring one's thinking. He includes works we have already examined: Needham's Science & Civilization in China, Whitehead's Fallacy of Misplaced Concreteness (cf. fallacy of location discussed in "Boundaries", Love's Body), Goethe's "Essay on the Metamorphosis of Plants". The last chapter is like a rag-bag of things which he knows should be looked into, and is in fact the area we have been examining in this course.

There is an interaction, says Brown, between psychology and natural science, from no single point of view. This, of course, is the basis of modern comprehensiveness. In fact, Brown seems to be moving towards Buckminster Fuller's "comprehensive anticipatory design science"; i.e., you design the body and the city as a work of art. Brown: "The resurrection of the body is a social project facing mankind as a whole" (p.317) (See text for rest of quote) At this point he calls for a re-examination of Marx's philosophical & economic manuscripts in psychological terms, not realizing that Reich had done just that.

The idea of the resurrection of the body as a social project is important; it is what political economy is about. Which brings us back to Buckminster Fuller, who would replace politics with a re-circulation of materials throughout the "world island". Fuller, unfortunately, seems to be controlled by the fallacy that if you have a technological utopia, psychological changes will take place steadily and automatically. He refuses to discuss conflict ideologies, models of inherited psychology, & their relationship to redistribution of raw materials in the world island. It is overly optimistic to believe that changes in the technological environment lead automatically to changes in the models of human nature. But at least it is preferable to Brown's entropic evaluation of the body & the body politic. Fuller suggests that there is a possible anti-entropic action which begins by describing the globe as a world-energy network, which "does more with less". For instance, you don't need to mine any more raw materials, because there is enough already in circulation which could be reclaimed. Fuller has gone into Harlem communities and suggested that nothing be defined as waste, as a way of counteracting their relationship to white economy. We should all, he says, become "comprehensives". Thus the population could grow without Malthusian fears; the world can for a long time support the "population explosion" without fear of scarcity. (Australians seem to believe that man is defined in terms of "village masculinity", & that women are subordinate. Which might explain their censorship.)

"Easy Rider" puts its faith in agrarian communes--which

are, in fact, living on the waste of the cities. This is a useable principle, but such communities are not independent. Meanwhile, the main structure of the country remains a semi-fascist industrial democracy. (Note: Russia is sending tungsten to America to help fight the Vietnamese!)

Fuller is positing environmental change towards material happiness with out (1) considering the nature of the power structure within which this takes place and (2) taking sexuality into account. He takes it for granted that abundance means happiness, and that this includes the "resurrected body".

Brown: "From Politics to Metapolitics", Caterpillar No. 1, 1967. With this we return to ideas of division (cf. Blake, & Paterson IV); boundaries & the self. Fuller envisions global mobility, without nationality: the world city replaces the localized city & the localized self alike. ~~Blake~~ Brown, in this essay, refers to Blake's idea that the Fall was a fall into division, & that the way to overcome this is to create Jerusalem. To overcome alienation & schizophrenia, says Brown, you unify what relevance there is in Marx & Freud: Psyche & Eros bringing about the revolution (!) Marx: "The head of this emancipation (the revolution) is philosophy; its heart, the proletariat." There is an increasing conviction that the new body, the new city, comes about by the descent of intellect into the proletariat. In Robert Duncan's poetry, this becomes the resurrection of Adam as the newly-formed "whole man". (Cabala: pre-lapsarian Adam is torn apart) These are alternatives to perpetual conflict: Brown would call them Dionysian, as opposed to Apollonian. He is searching for a way out of fratricide, suicide & war.

Brown is very suspicious of "engineering". Suppose one says that the "resurrected body" is behavioural engineering, & that Fuller's world city is environmental engineering. This still omits the question of the power structure in which the process takes place. The process could end up as in the Iron Mountain Report, or B.F. Skinner's Walden Two.

Brown suggests a Utopia combination of Buckminster Fuller and John Cage: My utopia is

(p. 79) an environment that works so well
that we can run wild in it
anarchy in an environment that works

the environment works, does all the work
a fully automatic environment
all public utilities
or communication-networks
(the engineering contribution to unification;
unification is also a matter of engineering)

My teachers in utopian engineering are John Cage
/and Buckminster Fuller

When you read this essay, look for this combination of Fuller & Cage. Cage's contribution (which we'll look at next term) is the idea of randomness, of chance: getting yourself into a position of observation. You can compose music the same way that you collect shells as you walk along a beach. This is a kind of basic morphology.

"Thought as work can be buried in machines & computers" (p. 80) This gets beyond the Marxist hang-up on work. "The work left to be done is to bury thought." "To put thought underground as communication-network, sewage system, power lines / so that wildness can come above ground." Then the human beings can begin building the city. A new conception, if you like, of the idea of Coere & Persephone: energy is replaced where it came from. Brown is trying to correct the long dream of control, meaning malignity: the idea that the City is always Babylon, that the reality-principle must govern, that you must follow the logic of the sentence, that you must "go underground". (Cf. "The Myth of the Underground" in Etc. from Persephone to the Hippies.)

At this point Brown re-states Hegelian dialectics as a useful method for "intellect seeking union with energy" (p. 84) (Psyche/Eros again). The problem is that dialectics is usually confined to a single field. Brown suggests that it could be used between fields, as a process of metamorphosis (Pound's myth).

"Poetry is the visionary form, or explosion / which overthrows the reality principle." (p. 92) This is the non-point-of-view which Fuller is also concerned with. One may attack Fuller from a political point of view, but not on the idea of a multi-point-of-view transformation of energy to counteract scarcity, & the Freudian reality-principle, & to suggest that we might live together on the world-island.

Brown quotes Joyce (p. 93), who becomes increasingly the man one has to read.

Paul Goodman, Communitas. This is an earlier treatment of some of the same themes. It's advantage is that it has drawings. Paul & Percival Goodman start with the suggestion that we might divide the economy into two sectors: subsistence & luxury. The first you would receive free in return for six working years' work, which would decrease with technological changes. The second you could take up voluntarily, to use the money for travel, etc. There would be different currencies in the two sectors, and the individual would be free to live at the subsistence level. (Chapter 7, p. 188) Human freedom would be increased by reducing the threat of starvation, & by getting away from the idea that you ^{are} compelled to model yourself as a man by means of a certain amount of consumption & work. Coercion would be reduced to "a small fraction of the social labour to produce the subsistent goods & services." (p.) He attempts to define minimum subsistence, minimum consumption, m. housing. He asks questions about "the changing nature of habitual satis-

WIKIPEDIA
YOU WANT
TO CHANGE
IT?

factions in a new economy". This is a problem which Fuller does not talk about. Given the effect on habitual satisfaction of the interiorization of the external environment, this is very important. (Note: this is very concise, so examine carefully. JLW) He also discusses boredom as incentive (cf. Fromm on the guaranteed income). P 212

The new city will be a community in which environmental problems really are pragmatically worked out. As in Brown's essay, the present environment of work & power will be placed underground & made invisible.

But Goodman has great difficulty in envisaging anything but a very small-scale, small-town environment. He advocates the "Quaker/anarchist" vision of "people confronting one another." It will be a non-linear, abundant space; not left to occur or not occur, but invented. He envisages a new relationship between work, skill, & leisure, "not left to experts & their authoritarian handing-down of decisions". (This confronts Fuller, in whose world solutions tend to be from above.) Happiness, he says, "does not depend on physical planning, although it helps considerably". The Bauhaus, F.L. Wright, & Louis Sullivan held to the doctrine, "form follows function". (Fuller also, in this respect, sounds like a Bauhaus man.) "But let us subject the function itself to a formal critique. The problem of community planning is not like arranging people for a play or a ballet, for there are no outside spectators. There are only actors. Nor are they actors of a scenario, but agents of their own needs." (And there is the answer to Herman Kahn & the Hudson Institute!) This is the basis of Situationalism. P. 19

This relates to Cage et al.: the ~~sixy~~ new city is like an Event or a Happening: it is a situation: an attempt to find a style rather than a scenario. (Cf. Jacobs, The Death & Life of Great American Cities.) continuous

Communitas is a manual of plans, and is explicitly a criticism of the Ruskin/Morris tradition of reaction against industrial technology, which makes its own selection of pre-industrial values and calls them "Values". Furthermore (& this is politically important) the changes tend to be made for the middle class, "since they always draw heavily on the social wealth of everybody for the benefit of those who are better off, since the poor can afford neither the houses nor the automobiles on which urban development so often depends". This is what so often happens in "urban redevelopment": you re-plan the city for the benefit of those who can afford the rents in the redeveloped areas. The middle class associates its values with pre-industrial values, so you clear an area to accommodate them, and call it planning ("He makes a solitude and calls it--peace!" Byron. JLW)

The book examines what Goodman calls "the cultural schizophrenia of the middle class", i.e. "the man who returns from work in the industrial or business center of the city to the garden suburbs and "raises his alienation to a principal". This means that all hope of reintegration on the class level

LIVING
THEATRE

B

*

or the city/country level is finished, because this alienation has become a psychological principle of existence. (This, of course, is another instance of the external environment being internalized as moral & psychological principle.)

At this point Goodman also criticizes le Corbousier's maxim, "The city that can achieve speed will achieve success." C. maintains wealthy & non-wealthy classes in a state of economic competitiveness, & does not envision the city as a place of various locomotive points of view: walking, auto, plane. He builds his city from a single point of view.

But even Goodman must be related to Jaques Eluill's (sp) idea that technological autonomy is a danger.

Fuller is criticized on p. 77: "The Comprehensive Designer is preoccupied with anticipation of all men's needs by translation of the ever-latest inventory of their potentials." One has the horrible feeling that it is like a Dickens novel! That you say everything about everybody and then end with an epilogue which makes quite certain that they won't have any other lives but what you want. Which is the classic ~~bourgeois~~ bourgeois novel. It's as if Fuller were translating C19th three-decker novels into C20th technology, writing War & Peace over & over, saying "not only is this a novel, but it's history" of the future". You get it in Balzac too. So read Fuller as a novel--no problems!

But back to Goodman/Fuller: "The designer is the 'integral of the sum of the product of all specializations'". (p. 77) Clearly Fuller's idea of the Dymaxion house as an independent mobile social unit, & his idea of environmental control, are good. But Goodman's criticism, dating back to 1947, is that Fuller's assumptions are behaviouristic. "There is nothing said about the ordinary communal activities of political initiative or non-scientific communication; even sex seems to have no social side." (p. 81) (Brown, in Life Against Death, can also be criticized on the latter point.) "What standards of personal and social satisfaction do in fact spring from an advanced technical attitude?" (p. 81)

Chapter 6 tackles Fuller's society which, says Goodman, consists of architects, common labourers, & consumers. He calls it "a wishful control of everybody else by the self-effacing universal architects, or comprehensive designers." This goes too far, in that Fuller is not a deliberate fascist. But there is in his work the implication that there will take place the desired changes in the political & social structure by means of technological change, so that the desired democratic egalitarian structure will emerge. (Cf. McLuhan's belief that the Second Coming of Christ will occur when the central nervous system is externalized in the electronic environment. "The kingdom of heaven is within you." JLW.)

This is a transcendentalist idea: that once you have total organization you will have total transformation. One of the most difficult tasks is to imagine environmental control (which you must, since the alternative is ~~laissez~~ faire) in such a way that the New City will emerge. One must, I think, include the

But of
emptiness

sexual information from Reich et al, and work out the ratio between different types of energy expenditure. Goodman's concept of a limited specified obligation to work is useful, since it leaves a man free to define himself in other ways as he wishes. This cuts straight across Fuller's idea that, by producing the world island environment, you supply everybody's potential needs, which is romantic transcendentalism. When Emerson talks about social matters, he reveals a 19th Utopianism, which has everyone living at the transcendental level of egalitarian daydreaming, because their needs have been anticipated in similar ways. Everyone goes about in a sort of Zombie drift. (But then I'm in danger of Poundian aristocratism: the belief that you need a sort of aristocratic structure in order to be lively.) This relates to the Romantic poetical ideal of the poet as non-landed-gentry aristocrat, who only bosses other people through their brains and their nervous system!

In conversation with Fuller, the word that keeps coming up is "nature": the idea that there is something called nature which will make things come out all right. This is the Ruskin/Morris tradition which Goodman criticizes. McLuhan realizes it is no longer there once you've put the satellite around it.

If you are going to posit "basics" which can be relied upon, you've got to be careful not to make them alabris to limit what you are going to allow.

If you want to relate all this to Frank Lloyd Wright, look at the structure of Broadacre City, in terms of his Jeffersonian regional planning ideas. Note the language: Broadacre has a sort of gentry feel about it, like Mansfield Park. You can't imagine a housing precinct in the Bronx called Broadacres. If you examine the structure, it is in fact a mixture of corporate capitalism & limited private ownership, a very confused political integration of the urban & the rural.

Goodman challenges it through TVA, which he takes as an example of "multiple-use enterprise". But, he points out, it was wrecked on the need to "price" everything, to measure everything by the fetish. You had an excellent continual emergence of ingenious inventions within the TVA, & a certain amount of regional autonomy, but continually cut into by the measure of capitalism. (Cf., in England, the fact that the postal services & the railways are continually cut down because they "don't pay".)

B Finally, look at Goodman's Growing Up Absurd, Chap. 11, "The Missing Community". Here he describes the "natural" community (which, of course, is invented). There are dangers in Goodman (e.g., what he thinks of as a building), but he is a useful antidote to the Ruskin/Morris syndrome.

B See also Lawrence Holland (ed.), Who Designs America? papers from a Princeton conference, with an excellent intro by Holland.