

*CHAPTER V*

## ***CULTURAL REVOLUTION***

In dreaming, the human brain works fast, conjuring plots and actions that would be not only physically impossible but also temporally prolonged. Persons who have narrowly escaped an abrupt death sometimes exclaim, "My whole life passed before me in an instant." Many creative artists and inventors, whether in the physical or social field, refer to their visualization or conceptualization of a total product in a moment of "intuition."

Such occurrences point toward a theory of cultural hologenesis: if human, then holistic thought; if holistic thought, then holistic behavior; if holistic behavior, then collective instant culture, or at least a culture that develops as rapidly as the acting out of dream and thought sequences can be managed.

A culture - a group mode of mentation and behavior - arose promptly with homo schizo. Just as man became psychologically holistic upon his origination, so did he become culturally holistic. Human culture was global from its beginnings. Culture was schizoid and remains so.

The expansion of homo schizo geographically and culturally proceeded rapidly. Three hundred people, the number achieved in the first fifty years by the scenario of the last chapter, could, under optimal conditions, reach into the billions within a thousand years. Some millions probably did breed. His spatial movements, again if under minimal constraints, could carry him in ever-widening circles to the farthest points of the globe. Like population, spatial occupation probably did proceed exponentially.

For reasons given in my study of *Chaos and Creation*, it is unlikely that the point from which he was launched upon the conquest of Earth and its denizens is presently meaningful; the continents and the aquatic basins have shifted. His point of origin may be set at present-day zero degrees latitude, zero degrees longitude, without contravening any mass of evidence to the contrary. Neither the Iranian Plateau nor the rift valleys of Africa are any longer candidates for the spot. The mouth of the Mediterranean and the Caribbean Sea, if these were joined instead of being separated by the Atlantic Ocean, would be a likely homeland, but to argue the issue farther than we have done in the last chapter would lead far afield.

### PROTO-CULTURE

The question is, how could homo schizo, granted his rapid increase in numbers and territory, accomplish the acculturation of which we speak? We know something of his psychology. How would this originate a culture?

What we have to demonstrate is that within a century or two, the major structures of culture would be necessarily, recognizably, and irreversibly present wherever the human race was found. These would be implicit in any one of many things that must derive from self-awareness: speech, tools, voluntary organization, religious symbolism, new constructions, movable property, fire tactics, time-factoring.

The first culture was a set of wild moves in all directions guided by displaced instincts and an intense need to stabilize the psychic world. It was like the output of a newly designed computer that had to be newly programmed to process data that had to be freshly gathered in order to satisfy the new program.

Usually the search for culture begins with a search for tools, because tools can be hard and enduring, and because they exhibit a deliberate human effort to command materials to effect a purpose. We should acknowledge first, though, the inevitable and greatly convenient built-in tool kit of a human. The first human was a tool-user whose body was his portable tool-kit. The hands of the ape are not put to many of their human uses. The human made tools of his fingers, hands, arms, feet, back and shoulder muscles, tongue, spittle, voice-box - indeed of all his senses and organs that he could command. Even today in a highly technical society where there is 'a tool for every purpose,' the built-in tool-kit is continuously in use in ways far exceeding the imagination and capabilities of the primates. One can indeed conceive of a culture without artifacts. But in reality man must go on to make other tools. He has no choice.

Like man's anatomical tools, his mechanical tools are projections of nature and analogies to it. They exhibit a sense of the future and represent the obsessiveness of humans. The tool is pragmatically rational if, in addition, it is functional (efficient) and conserves resources. A tool, then, is a socially transferable physical object believed by its user to confer a larger control over the world than he could otherwise achieve. A mechanical tool is a type of social tool, also, and there is some merit to defining a social tool as an organization of other people believed to add to the user's control of the world.

Who ports a club, supports a culture. He remembers to carry it, and foresees a use for it; so he has memory and foresight. The club is a versatile tool against living things and obstructions; it extends the arm and gives leverage. It has to be produced; a skill is involved, so we have *homo faber*. It is one's own, so we have a property right. It is a coercive threat; it is a sign of fight more than flight, so it communicates a sign of power and authority. As the "batons" of upper-paleolithic man evidence, the club converts readily to a work of art, employing symbolism of lines, geometry, living things, and carved depictions of the phallus. The club reaches into the sky to connect with shooting stars and comets, as in the snake-entwined rods of Hermes and Moses.

Thus the simplest tool, the club, represents the major areas of human interest: skill, subsistence, economics power, safety, authority, sexuality, religion, and aesthetics. It is required, however, that it be carried. If we knew when the club was first carried, we would have a sound basis for fixing the gestalt of creation in time. Alas there is no earliest club; wood rots quicker than bone; we have only the aforesaid early bone batons. We have practically nothing belonging to the earliest man, nor ropes, skins, bamboo constructions, and so on; all subtle evidence is gone, leaving chipped stones and stone mounds.

Our statements, such as these about the club, must be highly speculative, anchored mainly by a theory of human origins and nature, and by retrojections of tribal practices today. Tool kits of different cultures might be counted. Leroi-Gourhan has estimated the oldest cultures, the Acheulian, to have possessed 26 stone tools, the Mousterian Neanderthals to have 63, and the succeeding modern type to have 93. These kits do not include all of the tools by any means - not skins, vines, ropes, gut, shells, bamboo, leaves, clubs, wood levers, wood slides, bones, hair, fur, paints, glues and so forth. E. H. Man's survey of the isolated and simple-living *Andaman Islander* a century ago revealed no more tools of the stone type but more made of the material that would have been destroyed by time and nature. Such tools might raise the given numbers by a factor of five, giving 130, 315 and 465

which, averaging (for who can say what determined the ratio in each case), gives some 300 tools in earliest known human cultures. Then add the tool chest in the human body. We can take it for granted that the earliest human who used *any* tools, used *many*.

With such material uncovered from, or imputed to, paleolithic man, a world of intellectual, emotional, ritualistic and mundane variety can be contemplated. An engraved ox rib from Pech de l'Azé was called Acheulian and dated at 300,000 years by F. Bordes, and in 1982 Pietro Gaietto published in Genoa a treatise on pre-historic sculpture.<sup>134</sup> There he moves the earliest artistic works of mankind "a million and a half years" back to the pebble culture of australopithecus and homo erectus. He argues that the earliest busts and menhirs are as decipherable as the earliest utensils, and exposes abundant evidence of artistic mentation in material of a type hitherto disregarded and cast aside by paleoanthropologists.

Appearing first in what may be artificial modifications of naturally suggestive stones, they develop successively in pre-Neanderthal, Neanderthal, and homo sapiens excavations. Working independently, L. G. Freeman and R. G. Klein, University of Chicago anthropologists, announced a year later the discovery at El Juyo (Spain) of a sanctuary containing a probable altar, weapons, house-hold tools, animal relics, and a stone sculpture. The sanctuary was dated at 14,000 B. P. and the bust depicted a two-faced creature, half smiling man and half cat. It resembles a number of Gaietto's sculptures.

Gaietto's controversial findings conform to my theory here, lending more evidence 1) of the humanness of the hominids, 2) of cultural hologenesis, 3) of a persisting interest, amounting to an obsession, in two-headed and two-faced persons, that may denote wonderment over the self-awareness of homo schizo, 4) of concurrent cultural and physio-psychological human genesis, and 5), although he does not question the conventional long-term chronology, of the cultural homogeneity of paleolithic beings and therefore of a short elapsed time since humans quantavoluted.

Even though he believes in darwinian gradualism in human development, Andre Leroi-Gourhan can say of his study on prehistoric religions that

Man, from his formation up to our times, began and developed reflection, that is, the ability to translate the material reality around him by means of

---

<sup>134</sup> A. Marshack, *Amer Sci*, March, 1976 and *Curr Anthro* (1976) 278; Gaietto, *Prescultura e Scultura Preistorica*, E. R. G. A.: Genova.

symbols... There is no good reason to deny to paleolithic man a preoccupation with mystery, if only because their intelligence, of the same nature if not of the same degree of *homo sapiens*, implies the same reaction in the face of the abnormal, the unexplained. Here, facts exist, many of them, which show that from his first moments, *homo sapiens* (or his immediate predecessor) behaves like modern man. The indicators involve not only religion, but also techniques, habitations, art, self-adornment; they create, by contrast with that which precedes, an intellectual ambiance in which we recognize ourselves at first glance.<sup>135</sup>

He is saying that modern man has been basically unchanged from his beginnings. But the beginnings for him go back millions of years and we assert that the evidence of a long period is almost entirely wanting.

S. A. Semenov, in his work of 1973 on *Prehistoric Technology*, attempted an analysis of the stages of technological development followed by mankind. He perceived seven tendencies, which he believed to have followed one another over a long time. First a manufacturing process was invented to reduce the angle of edges on stone. Then smoother blades were evolved to reduce friction. Next, the mechanical power of tools was increased by elevating the amount of force that could be applied to the instrument. Steps were then taken to increase the rapidity with which the tool can be exercised while working it. Specialization was afterwards introduced to evade the limitations of a general tool and accomplish better the foregoing processes. Later, the physical-chemical properties of the instruments were enhanced by using fire, sunlight, and water to alter the properties of rope, wood, and bone. Thereupon, abrasives and saws were invented to increase friction, and the pestle and mortar were employed to pound materials.

We note that the principles of force, involving portage (pushing and pulling), the lever, elasticity of matter, gravitation, and chemical combustion, were incorporated in the processes. Too, wind, sun, and fire were used directly to play upon the materials and convert them. Animals, furthermore, were induced to dig, carry, and turn devices, much later on, it is thought, and animals too were exploited, as with bird-eggs and bees honey.

Yet there is no rigid requirement that these inventions should follow one another in all cases, or, if they did, that they should not have followed one another quickly. It is the counting of time that lends an evolutionary atmosphere to the proceedings. A more rapid counting, on quantavolutionary theory, would accomplish the same developments in several hundred years. Much depends upon intensity of motive and self-awareness, once the time element is laid aside. The concept of the gestalt of creation, we have argued, supplies such strong motivation and awareness.

---

<sup>135</sup> *Les Religions de la Préhistoire*, Paris: Presses Universitaires, 1967, 6, 7, 146-7.

We go further and claim that in his first years on Earth, homo schizo must have achieved much in the way of tools and culture. It is safe to say that, if at all human, that is, if self-aware, hence finding many objects and animals of interest and striking for control of the world, homo schizo would in short order arrive at a complete culture-kit.

I have already shown that, to paraphrase Bonaparte's remark about bayonets, a self-conscious person can do anything with a club plus sit on it.

Also, you can digest any organic material that you can find and eat, raw or processed. Processing includes to stew, heat, bake in ashes or sun, salt, soak, pound, powderize, and pre-masticate.

You cannot gather plants without noticing that they grow from seeds, and that seeds and bulbs are edible, and that time after time your favorite location will renew itself.

You cannot chase animals without catching their young, then raising them until they are ready and needed for food. (Modern women have been noticed to nurse suckling pigs, until these can eat other food.)

You cannot have a garbage pile without observing that rodents, birds, and tasty insects feed and breed there.

You cannot handle fire without preserving it, using it for roasting, and being 'spiritualized' by it.

In skinning an animal before eating it, which can be done with one's hands, though a sharp rock is better, you cannot help but sit on the skin or use it as a muff or blanket or haft.

You can frighten and inspire responses by hooting and whistling, and whipping branches in the air, and if you frighten other beings and they you, can readily try to impress inspirited locales, like caves and sky, where you imagine there must be live things, to keep them from frightening you.

You cannot gather eggs without finding young birds whose wings you can break and which can be kept in a loosely covered hole until grown.

You can get agreement with others by recalling and using sounds in common, and can convey known sounds from one person to another from one day to the next or one place to another - a message.

You can model your indecisive behavior on your remaining instinctive behavior and animal behavior, unknowingly setting up the paradigm of logical and pragmatic thought about causes and effects.

Should not these necessary immediate implications of proto-human brainwork be incorporated into appraisals of earliest man? No evidence contradicts the statements; why, then, should a creature be put to climbing the rungs of a ladder for four million years or forty thousand years, for that matter?

Probably the ideology of classical anthropology was at fault. In order to "discover" proto-man, the amateurs ventured forth among the most "savage" tribes. The most "savage" would be the poorest in property (the heyday of the bourgeoisie was then) and the "simplest" (rococo-type art permeated the Victorian age). So the students referred to the peoples who were "hunters and gatherers."

Instead of penetrating into and evaluating the mentation of these peoples, explorers and reporters placed them into the category of primeval man, who had to be one step above the apes and who had just climbed down from the trees. Probably there was in this theory, such as it was, an element of ethnocentrism. The British geologist Ager has noted that the nomenclature and systems of rocks in the world have had a suspiciously prominent presence in the centers of the old British imperial posts and routes. The British invented and dominated much of early anthropology, too. A joke as hoary as Queen Victoria went, "One Englishman a hunter, two a dress-up dinner, three a club." The "most-savage" nomadic hunter-gatherer (the women gathered) was a wish-fulfillment; Tarzan, son of an English nobleman, was back among the apes.

To the contrary, proto-human had very soon a culture that was as schizoid as he was and held the essentials of most subsequent discoveries and institutions. He invented as he moved through the world, and the news about, and practice of, culture moved with him. Settled and mobile communities existed, tied into the ecumenical culture, kept posted by eccentric wanderers and by group encounters.

#### *LOST MILLIONS OF YEARS*

By extensive comparisons of primates and mammals, Robert Martin has positively related basic and active metabolic rates to body size, then again body surface with brain size.<sup>136</sup> Brain size and body size are also positively related. Man's enormous brain is partly accomplished in embryo and partly post-natally. The big spurt after birth, when coupled with the very small human litter, typically one infant at a time, leads Martin to believe that this relative human abnormality depended for survival in the process of natural selection upon the persistence of a stable natural environment and ecology. In our terms, this would imply a denial of the need for a high reproduction rate as insurance against catastrophe.

---

<sup>136</sup> Roger Lewin, "How did Humans Evolve Big Brains?" 216 *Science* (May 1982) 840-1.

The human reproduction rate, however, is compatible with catastrophic conditions; it is still exponentially high. Furthermore, only because it is working humanly and not because it is large, it is a pragmatic or "rational" insurance against catastrophic obstacles to survival. Therefore we would discount the meanings that have been offered of his correlations; there must be some significance to them, but not the one for which we are searching.

The catastrophized human mind is itself proof against catastrophe. The human, it appears to us, must have grown a larger body and brain, and heightened its metabolism, and lengthened its training period because it was already human. Stated simply and crudely, the human wanted to overcome its disadvantages and extend its controls, and did so - genetically by breeding, psychologically by practices and ideals; it invented the gods and imitated them.

Population growth rates present no obstacle to a quick diffusion of mankind. They are an exponential phenomenon. An amusing calculation recently gave to Charlemagne's fifteen children of the ninth century some 255 billion contemporary descendants, a hundred times the world's population today. (Obviously heavy intermarriage occurred continuously since his day, especially inside France.) Then, the genealogist said, Attila the Hun several centuries earlier made his presence felt in what became the kingdom of the Franks, and Charlemagne had to be descended in some part from Attila, by statistical calculation. Which would permit finally every modern Frenchman to claim descent from Attila. For that matter, many of us may descend from a fecund cousin of "Lucy," the australopithecine who perished in the ash wastes of Afar.

Anyone in the world can play a similar game. Populations, human groups included, repeatedly expanded and contracted like an accordion, in the passage of centuries. Today we are impressed by expansion. The people of India number over 700 million, twice the population of 35 years ago, and pressing hard upon the means of subsistence. Yet they are projected to double in the next 32 years to 1,400 million. A quantavolution, whether deliberate or disastrous, is foreseeable.

Man should have reached a comfortable Neolithic level of culture within a thousand years of humanization, and stayed there unless general catastrophe intervened. The Neolithic is universally acknowledged to have been an across-the-board human culture with all basic practices, institutions and techniques invented and in use; it was certainly in being everywhere 8000 years ago. Could man have been fully potentiated and activated by mutation - i.e. physiologically complete as a human - but not have behaved so as to develop his mind and culture except very slowly and incrementally?

If so, then what was retarding him, keeping him for periods of first millions, then thousands of years, from making progress towards the new Stone Age?

Might it have been perpetual dietary deficiencies? But the diet of the hunter-gatherer is excellent.

Might it have been perpetual warfare? But war has incited invention and cultural diffusion throughout history. Moreover, war may not have been continuous.

"Neo-malthusianism" and birth-control among the race as a whole or among the intelligent would be implausible.

Might it have been the difficulty of first inventions, as opposed to secondary ones? The lever, the spring, the knife, the bucket, the garment, the overhang, animal training, the advent of springtime seeding? Are these inventions which would be taking trillions of man-hours?

Continuous plagues of types known and unknown today? A generally stupefying plague is unknown.

Might it have been a world catastrophe (climatic, fall-out, solar black-out?) These would endure only briefly.

Were there recurrent global amnesias from a stupefying and dizzying electrical condition of the Earth? This is conceivable.

Might it have been frequent devastating natural disasters? Like war, disaster teaches.

Was there a catatonic fear of change - a frozen taboo against change? Changes are eventually forced, and taboos do not block all avenues of development.

Might life have been simply too easy, hence *dolce far niente*? Life (see all above) is never that sweet; and recall his eternal *angst*.

Were men too few or isolated? Not knowing about each other? Contra-indicated.

Perhaps they could not organize a division of labor? But the potentially *useless* would have a desperate motive to make themselves useful, to avoid being discarded.

"Whatever the reason, the primitivity of many tribes today shows that men do not progress except for reasons which we do not understand." But they succumb to new temptations right away - horse, ax, gun, tobacco, sugar. Further, as we argue, primitivity may not only be a mistaken idea; it may in any case be an actual short-time, youthful phenomenon. If "primitives" act young ("the childish peoples" some early anthropologists called them condescendingly) it may be because they are young, and so are we all.

I cannot completely dispose of all of these objections here. Merely to phrase them, however, disposes of many. The very nature of homo schizo as a restless, anxious, control-seeking creature answers them. The most troublesome problem, it seems, is a possible variant of the events that produced homo schizo: if a subsequent new constant of a gaseous or electrical character were to be introduced into the atmosphere, mankind might be numbed or frustrated mentally for a hundred or a million years, a prolonged Tower of Babel effect, one might call it. By a worldwide alteration of electrical fields, the human mind would be incapacitated for consistent and routine solutions of problems; it would be amnesiac; it would be fibrillating excessively and continuously. Or, conversely, the mind would be deprived of the hormones and gases required for all except quasi-catatonic operations; mankind would be a sleep-walker for millions of years.

Evidence has been already presented to show that these lost ages have not occurred; they never existed. Hence, this possibility must be preserved only to defend the theory of homo schizo in the event that long-term time reckoning turns out to be correct. I shall continue, therefore, my analysis, tending to show that human culture has not been slow in developing, but, to the contrary, rapid.

Scholars have sometimes wondered at the long ages of mental stagnation. Thus, J. Hawkes remarks, "That a tradition could continue with only slight changes of essential style over a period of between twenty and thirty thousand years, which is what our present chronology suggests, seems today almost incredible."<sup>137</sup> If this scene of the Upper Paleolithic is incredible, what then of the hundreds of thousands, even millions of years, of changelessness going before?

Thus Sol Tax comments upon "the universality of the material characterizing the East, on one hand, and Africa, Europe and India, on the other," and how their artifacts span "four-fifths of the quaternary period" with practically no change, and "a socio-cultural reconstruction of the Sinanthropus cultural material would be mathematically the same as that made for the Australopithecines." He concludes that "Certainly, the stability of attainment and the lack of change cannot ever be taken as characteristic behavior of Homo sapiens as we know him, and we must look closer to home for our first representative of Man."<sup>138</sup>

In effect, he is saying: deny man exists, as long as he is not developing for long stretches of time. Instead, Tax should be challenging the time-

---

<sup>137</sup> *I Prehistory*, Part I, 280, New York: Mentor, 1965.

<sup>138</sup> "Primitive Man vs. *Homo Sapiens*," in A. Montagu, *The Concept of the Primitive*, N. Y.: Free Press, 1968.

clocks. His position seems all the more uncomfortable inasmuch as he has acted as a leader in bringing the public to realize that primitivity is a pejorative term and unjust to the mentality and culture of 'primitive' peoples.

### *TRIBES, CIVILIZATIONS, AND TIME*

I prefer the term 'tribal' to the word 'primitive': it is less misleading. Tribal cultures are not young; they are as old as the oldest modern culture. All cultures are equally old, so far as one can tell. The tribal culture holds a stronger illusion of special gods and heroes; it claims common ancestry; it speaks a special language; most of its transactions are inside the tribe; and it has not been accommodated to a greater society. These conditions are disappearing; few tribal cultures are left outside the great society.

Until recently, many tribes were 'resting' in the Stone Age. This is a mechanical and psychological judgement, not an ethical one. As Jules Henry and others have explained, their "psychic unity" is complete.<sup>139</sup> When a culture achieves some tolerable mastery of its individual and collective minds, there is little incentive to change unless it is ravaged by nature or conquest. A scarcity or profusion of artifacts is no proper criterion of the humanness or human development of a culture. Until this century, a village with its farmers on some Greek islands would possess few artifacts, and its church would be scarcely more than a shaman's hut in Central Africa. If the Greek and African villages were compared with the Shandridar village of ancient Iraq or an early community in the Basin of Mexico or classical Tiahuanacu one could not argue conclusively that the later were more evolved than the earlier, and one would find perhaps similar difficulty in appraising their outlook and mentation.

The great civilizations began to appear about seven thousand years ago with commerce and conquest. There have been perhaps fifty of them. They take about three hundred years to gestate and last for a millennium before handing themselves over to another civilization as with the Incas, and/or dissolving, as happened with the Roman Empire. During this time, and counting the component cultures from which they were amalgamated, there may have existed about 20,000 cultures in all.

It is difficult to 'put a tribal culture back together again' once it has been absorbed into civilization. Sometimes a tribal culture will remember having been ruled distantly but not tightly or absorbingly. It shows almost no signs of having been included in a bygone civilization. Therefore it must have

---

<sup>139</sup> "The Term 'Primitive' in Kierkegaard and Heidegger," in Montagu, *op. cit.*, 89.

existed by itself since the beginning of human time, or since it split off from a tribal aggregate at some time in the past to form a related unit. The fission would have occurred because of natural catastrophe, flight from a growing civilization, internal disputes, or overpopulation and emigration.

It is unfortunate that all of these statements must be conjectural. Yet their thrust is unmistakable. There has not been enough time since the beginning of human culture for all tribes to have experienced participation in a major civilization - except for the ecumenical proto-culture to which all peoples must originally have belonged. In this case, the demography of cultures would imply recent human origins and support the theory of cultural hologenesis of homo schizo.

Elsewhere I have defined a 'memorial generation' as a unit of fifty years that would span the age of the oldest story-teller and the youngest attentive listener of a group. It is about three times the length of a reproductive generation. Some current estimates, using long-time reckoning, have human culture appearing, bit by bit, of course, for from 50,000 to 5 million years. Here we estimate that one thousand years (20 MG) is enough; and 260 memorial generations (MG), 13,000 years, is enough for the history of mankind. Fifty thousand years give 1000 MG's, and 5 million years allow for 100,000 MG's. Unless the human mind developed finely, bit by bit, with one tiny innovation following another, the human could not consume so much time so unprofitably. And what was directing this incrementally minuscule evolution? And if it burst into quantavolution in the Upper Paleolithic, what caused that event to occur?

If it were not for the accepted methods of reckoning time, scientists would probably have to agree that a hologenesis of both man and culture is logical and recent. To hallucinate further, if Solon of Athens had called on a panel of experts from Babylonia, Iran, China, India and Mexico, as well as from Greece and Egypt, in the sixth century B. C., all would have told him that man's history was short, at least since the last great catastrophe. But belief is firm in the tests that report long times for the early fossils and relics of man and life generally, and claim a long, slow ascent.

A century ago, when time reckoning was governed by our type of speculation, by the fossil record, and by the apparent ages of sedimentary rock strata, time measures were easier to assail. Today, radiochronometry lengthens human time and fixes it by elaborate chemical tests, the most critical of which are the radiocarbon dating and potassium-argon (K-A) dating to which I have made reference above.

Both tests are striving for validation in the crucial middle times between 10,000 and 100,000 years ago. It is expected and hoped that they will close this gap. Meanwhile the K-A test can be used to support very old ages for

what appear to be human remains with artifacts; and the 14C test is keeping the Upper Paleolithic age far enough back to support impressions of a very gradual human cultural development. I have given elsewhere my reasons for disputing the validity of 14C beyond 2700 years, for regarding the K-A test as quite unreliable, and for questioning most other chronometry. (*Chaos and Creation*, chap. III)

Here, I do not treat fully these tests, because the theory of human and cultural hologenesis is independent of the time-tests frame. Hologenesis could have occurred 13,000; 50,000; 200,000; 1.5 million or 5 million years ago, except that in all of these cases, an incredible amount of human history is missing. Perhaps we should hope to find it, cheered on by the late reports from micro-paleontology that have added a billion years to the two billion year age of life on Earth (but brought the age of life and the age of the Earth itself uncomfortably close to one another).

For those dates that are beyond 50,000 years, one might postulate a limited jump in human and cultural evolution, leaving a final large jump for the Holocene boundary. That is, some hominid, perhaps not even a human ancestor, could have chipped a stone, with nothing else on his mind. Given my analysis of the club-wielder, I would not know how to explain this activity. It would not be modern man, but a different species. I find this solution easier to tolerate than a gap of millions of years between a true man, a chipped stone, and the Upper Paleolithic-Holocene periods.

#### *MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS EVERYWHERE CONTEMPORARY*

Not only did primeval man quickly achieve a world-wide protoculture, but the next age, so far as we can tell about ages, reveals increasingly a panorama of cultures of equal status around the world. To distinguish this age from *proto-culture*, let us refer to it as *neo-culture* and think of it as merging the Upper Paleolithic, Mesolithic, and Neolithic developments.

Legend usually does so, and in a way so do the most ancient texts. Man is created, he is savage but human, he is given gifts of all arts and crafts, he lives in a golden age. He is destroyed, and a new age follows. If a new panel of experts were called, this time by name, say High Priest Aaron, Akhnaton of Egypt, Solon, Hesiod, Plato of Greece, and Ovid of Rome, they would probably agree to this and add much illuminating detail.

If the French scholars of the years of nationalistic jealousy were not intent upon showing the great age of advanced culture in France, they might have assigned the cave art of the Dordogne to the time of pre-dynastic Egypt, 6500 years ago. The hot breath of tourists damaged the Lascaux

paintings in a few years; before then, neither the ancient users nor the dozen thousand years of quiet cold damp were sufficient for their destruction. Nor the great climate changes that drove off the cave people and the large animals. Of their style in general, Leroi-Gourhan writes, "The nature of the paintings does not seem to have varied from -30,000 to -9,000 years before our epoch and stays the same in Asturias as on the Don River."<sup>140</sup>

Some 21,000 years of the same genre of painting. And by now he would have to say -- from England to Siberia. The older genealogy hardly justifies the assigning of ancient ages; it all was suspended by the thread of thriving ethnocentrism, until geophysics advanced a radio-carbon test for charcoal and bone.

From A. F. Spiess' *Reindeer and Caribou Hunters* (1979), we are permitted the notion that protohistorical North American hunters and Paleolithic hunters of Southwestern France (Abri Pataud) had similar relationships with their prey, despite the numerous different cultures in each setting and within the settings, over a passage of up to 35,000 years. The social adaptation of humans to animals suggest common behaviors persisting universally (relative to the ecology) over long time spans.

The mode of life of the 'hunters' of the Upper Paleolithic, which has now been extended beyond France as far as Siberia and through the Sahara possibly down to Southwest Africa, and very lately to England, may not have been the exclusive life of the times. The caves themselves were not for living. As far as one can tell, they were modelled on the cloudy vaults of heaven and the mysterious depths of the womb. The passages and chambers were artistically organized for stages of religio-clan initiation. The bison was the central totem animal.

Living, for the hunters, was outdoors, or in temporary huts, or under abris which could shelter them against the elements. They must have been connected with settlements, where the women and children and animals would have stayed. One cannot examine their artwork without grasping that at the very least they would be living in the style of the North American Indians before 1600 A. D. Repeated devastations and heavy sedimentation and sinkings have obliterated practically all traces of their villages and gardens, and perhaps major civilizations as well.

Generally the domestication of animals has been placed in the period 7-9000 years ago.<sup>141</sup> A claim is now advanced for domestication near Nairobi in East Africa at 15,000 years ago. In Patagonia, whose natives are looked upon as exceedingly 'primitive', men long ago captured, confined, fed, killed,

---

<sup>140</sup> *Op. cit.*, 85.

<sup>141</sup> R. Protoch and R. Berger, 179 *Science* (19 Jan. 1973).

and ate the giant ground sloth, now extinct, the extinction perhaps occurring when 70% of the great pleistocene mammal species disappeared.<sup>142</sup> This will certainly confuse the picture.

Meanwhile agriculture seems to be moving backwards in time reckoning. C. Niederberger finds Mexican sedentary economies with a mixed agricultural-gathering-hunting base around 8,000 years ago. "Artifactual and non-artifactual evidence from the lacustrine shores of the Chalco Basin already suggest the existence of fully sedentary human communities in this region from at least the sixth millennium B. C."<sup>143</sup>

San Pablo (Ecuador) corn kernels embedded along with associated corn designs on pottery in deep cultural remains "show a heavy agricultural population between 200 to 4000 B. C." (using 14C tests with bristlecone pine correction). These high flood plain sites are called generally the "Valdivia" culture. They are definitely not of Japanese culture type, as may be some other early discoveries of the same region. Agriculture was known throughout the world in Neolithic, and perhaps much earlier times. One may ask whether agriculture, which is not an easily diffusible set of inventions, was not practiced *in embryo* during the first ecumenical culture of homo schizo. Southeast Asia and Asia Minor are emerging with concurrent early dates.

We can quote Henry T. Lewis:

A search for the various stimuli to domestication should not involve looking for those factors which led man to discover agriculture; rather it should involve learning about those factors that made agriculture a necessary alternative in human adaptations, first as a complement to hunting and gathering, and later as a substitute for it.<sup>144</sup>

In pre-European California, hunting and gathering competed successfully with agriculture,<sup>145</sup> for example. And, again, Lewis writes: "Domestication would have begun not as a 'revolution' but, rather, as an attempt to extend and stabilize the existing subsistence strategy."

---

<sup>142</sup> C. M. Nelson, *N. Y. Times*, Aug. 27, 1980; A Smith Woodward, 15 *Natural Sci* (1899) 351-4.

<sup>143</sup> 203 *Science* (12 Jan. 1979), 140; R. S. MacNeish, "The Origins of New World Civilization," 211 *Sci. Amer.* (Nov. 1964), 29-37.

<sup>144</sup> "The Role of Fire,..," 7 *Man* 2, 1972, 217.

<sup>145</sup> Sahlins et al., *op. cit.*, 77-88; cf. MacNeish, *supra fn* 7, p. 36, where, despite rich variety of domesticated foods, only 10% of food supply came from them (ca. 5000 B. C.).

Here he is saying what I earlier implied, widespread natural disasters may have driven humans into agriculture, away from the more convenient and satisfying life of the hunter-gatherer, 'just as the Bible says.'

As for today, the same group of anthropologists agree that "it is merely a matter of time before all the cultural systems of the world will be different variations, depending upon divergent historical experiences, of a single culture type."<sup>146</sup> This exemplifies their law of cultural dominance. But it also casts doubt on any great antiquity for culture, hence for man.

Baker comments on the situation concerning prehistoric botanical domestication and diffusion, saying "Why is it that the ancestors of domesticated plants are now so rare (or even extinct)? It is hard to see how domestication of *cucurbita* (squashes) would make life any more difficult for the wild species."<sup>147</sup> Might it be that man under catastrophic circumstances takes care of his plant seeds while the wild seeds are destroyed? Might man also preempt the best areas for growing the plant, thus handicapping the wild sort? And might not the wild plants have come from an isolated botanical niche whence they were transported around the world by men? All three arguments, especially the last, appear to be valid. They would point to an early, rather than late, date for agriculture.

It is not impossible, then, that much of the Upper Paleolithic and the Neolithic were merged, and throughout the world, too. As for the Mesolithic, this usually maligned cultural epoch is now receiving accolades for its own achievements. Nevertheless, it still hardly has boundaries to distinguish it as a period, and rather is sandwiched in between the two other periods to fill the greedy stomach of time.

To support the foregoing hypothesis, it is well to stress again that many tools bridge gaps of thousands and even 'millions' of years between different epochs, leaving one to wonder at the marvelous resiliency of the stone age peoples who otherwise appear to reject invention. So that, for instance, Neanderthals executed works of art.<sup>148</sup> They also garlanded their dead with flowers in Northern Iraq,<sup>149</sup> implying an interest in horticulture, as well as religion. Neanderthal Mousterian styles of stone-working are found in Magdalenian deposits.

And a single Greek cave assigns one chipped stone from Upper Paleolithic to early Neolithic, an adjoining stone from Early Neolithic to

<sup>146</sup> Sahlins et al., *op. cit.*, 92.

<sup>147</sup> In Riley, Ed., *Man Across the Sea*, *op. cit.*, 441.

<sup>148</sup> Walter Matthes, IPEX; *Jahrbuch für prähistorische und ethnographische Kunst*, 1963.

<sup>149</sup> Ralph S. Solecki, "Shanidar IV, A Neanderthal Flower Burial in Northern Iraq," 190 *Science* (28 Nov. 1975), 880-1.

Late Neolithic and another from Middle Neolithic to final Neolithic; Magdalenians use Mousterian tools, etc.<sup>150</sup> And, once again, MacNeish, working at Teotihuacan sites, assigns one type of uniface flaked stone implement at 10,000 years of age and finds that it continues to 6300 years ago. Just before this last time, another type of implement picks up and carries on until 800 years ago. Nine thousand years are spanned by two implements.<sup>151</sup>

### *ECUMENICAL CULTURE*

There was in the beginning one human race, one language, one culture. The contrasting hypotheses seem to be losing vigor. That many cultures around the world originated independently implies that men scattered around the world and only then started up cultures from a delayed time-fuse in their brains.

Despite the tenacity with which this idea grips many people, it would appear absurd, unless one believed at the same time that humanization occurred immediately in consequence of an atmospheric change that affected the brain with some uniformity everywhere, an idea that I have not seen expressed except in these pages, and here is included as a partial and fluctuating cause of humanization.

Since we cannot agree precisely when humans originated, for certainly most will accept Charles Darwin's series of insensible gradations in preference to my theory of holocene hologenesis, how can we fix a point for the beginning of culture? As I construe the conventional argument, it must assert that the ever-extending ladder of evolution contains many rungs, some of which are physical gradations and other cultural. When a physical rung - say a straightening of the spine - occurs, the lucky straight-backed clan is different from all other men until its trait overcomes their curved spines; but, meanwhile, some curved-back clan invents a bull-roarer, which gives an impressive sound, and this artifact begins diffusing among the curved-backs and the straight-backs, helping both to survive in competition with men of either type, as with animals. Hence, at any given moment in this long period of human evolution up to the present, one would encounter a dizzying number of intersecting circles of diffusing physical and cultural traits. Too, it is a competition of all against all. The number would be perpetually large, and uniquely combined at any point in demographic space.

---

<sup>150</sup> T. W. Jacobsen, "17,000 years of Greek Prehistory," 234 *Sci. Amer.* (1976) 19, 80.

<sup>151</sup> *Op. cit.*, 64.

So the mills of evolution by natural selection and mutation would have to be working very finely, very rapidly, and continually.

Inasmuch as this theory, perhaps exaggeratedly put here, dominates scholarly thought, all coincidences of cultural traits following humanization must occur by means of independent invention, or by adoption (that is, by diffusion from one or the other source or a common third source). Hence argument always centers around these two ideas and they have been flailing at each other in their boxing ring since the beginning of the uniformitarian orthodoxy a century and more ago. The additional contestants that I would sponsor here, out of a sense of sportsmanship, namely common origination in cultural hologenesis and common experience of general catastrophe, are barred from the ring.

It is easy to see why this prejudice should occur. With a very long evolution time, it is presumptuous, if not absurd, to believe that any culture trait possessing particular recognizable form could be part of a primordial culture. That is, such a namable and tangible trait cannot be very old. The idea behind the trait may be very old and represented in some now extinct forms and cultures as well as in present-day cultures.

For instance, the taboo against incest extending to first cousins is found here and there. These cannot be primordial but must be independent inventions, according to long-term evolution; they would be offshoots of a very ancient taboo against incest that may have conquered all cultures in some form by diffusion or independent invention at some time in the murky history of man. Freud's speculation that this taboo may have occurred everywhere by diffusion as part of a guilt reaction, also diffused, originating from the murder of the leader of a single primal horde, seems too close in time and has not been accepted by the orthodox anthropologist.

The prejudice against the arising of cultural traits out of similar experiences with a common catastrophe is also easy to explain. Such catastrophes have until recently been certified by astronomers and geologists not to have happened, or to have happened so long ago that they cannot have affected whatever it is that interests anthropologists or archeologists or prehistorians; hence no further consideration is required.

The literature of prehistory is otherwise rich in the assumed effects of climate, topography, and habitat upon cultures, deriving similar cultural and even physical traits from the similar experiences of men. Thus comets terrify all cultures. But this is explained as normal fear of unusual sights in the sky. The deluge is attested to by practically all cultures. But this is explained as exaggerated accounts of flooding and high tides. On the other hand the people of the north are blond because they need to absorb sun while the people of the tropics are dark because they need to reject the overabundant

sun. (It seems not to matter that the Eskimos and Lapps are dark, or that the great tropical forest scarcely illuminate the dark people in them.)

With all of this, there has until now been little chance of emerging from the source materials with even the beginnings of a division of culture traits as we conceive of them: elements that are assignable to times of common catastrophic experiences; independent inventions that came about owing to cultural peculiarities of given peoples with some parallels to be drawn from the independent inventions of other peoples; and innovations originating among one people and diffusing to others, whether in the wanderings after natural disasters and war, or in variously motivated migrations.

For instance, fire, which had been known to, and used by, hominids and other animals, would have been reinvented by mankind. "Fire was born when heaven and earth separated," says a Mongolian marital prayer. Fire - in its modern sense of something to be used multifariously, made and remade - was invented because the created human was terrorized by new intensities of fire, because the projected gods used fire in the skies and on earth, and because the new mind could remember its use and foresee its future utility. Credit for the invention was ascribed to a god and sometimes also to a god-hero who, partly man and partly god, could arrogate credit without displeasing the gods.

The earliest town plans were built according to a celestial model, and the planners were astronomer-architects. The conditions for planning were, again, an aware and awed human group, a sky religion, a skill in retrojecting and rationalizing a celestial scene, and then a science of measurement and construction. The orientation of the towns (Greek: *polis*) and temples followed first the North-South line of the Boreal Hole, a northern-most sky opening which happened in cloud-canopy times to represent the north geographical pole (from *polis*.) In less cloudy and in bright times, measurements that were derived from the old monuments and improved by stargazing, permitted the practice to continue. The Egyptian and Mexican city and pyramid orientations were North-South. In protohistory, East-West orientations became prominent because the sky-path of Venus was East-West, and finally the Sun's regularities provided the lines of true orientation for planners.

Macgowan's study of fifty early Mesoamerican towns shows modes at  $70^\circ$  East of North and  $17^\circ$  East of North, but several pitch from  $1^\circ$  to  $21^\circ$  West of North. The earliest are truest to the North.<sup>152</sup> La Venta was dated by Hutch (1971) at around 1000 B. C. and is oriented  $8^\circ$  West of North.

---

<sup>152</sup> In A. F. Aveni, ed., *Archaeoastronomy in Pre-Columbian America*, Austin: U. of Texas Press, 1975.

The changing orientations suggest that tilts in the axis of the Earth occurred from time to time; ancient man was never whimsical about orienting his towns.

A recognizably scientific astronomy is being sought farther and farther back in time. B. A. Frolov argues that an intellectual curiosity possessed early humans everywhere. The Russian counterparts of the Stonehenge monuments are at Lake Onega, and both are sky-directed religio-astronomical instruments.<sup>153</sup> The Pleiades are called the "Seven Sisters" by aborigines of Australia, North America, Siberia, and other ancient cultures. Petroglyphs that appear to refer to astronomical constants and phenomena are found all over the world; it may be mainly the prejudice on behalf of the 'evolutionary ladder' that forbids the assignment of many such carvings to the earliest age of humanity; in some of such cases the glyphs are found among the earliest ruins of a people or are the only remains discernible. That is, the hologenesis of mentation and culture derives support from the increasingly early assignment of scientific works.

Two thousand years after humanization, a large number of humans possessed self-awareness, religion and rites, planned towns, armed forces, a full range of stone and soft material tools, special occupations, domesticated animals and plants, and complex language. They entertained a range of aspirations that followed their time sense into visions of improved life; they created the rudiments of the highest ideals of later times: freedom from fear through knowledge, individual autonomy, conquest of the environment, storage against future hunger, and social cooperation. But the high energy forces of the gods permeated history, life, and expectations. Destructions were frequent, and catastrophes, such as they already dreaded, were to recur.

During the Saturnian 'Golden Age,' which was a single Neo Age, composed of the Upper Paleolithic, Mesolithic, and Neolithic, a wide circulation of traits occurred. Still a great many isolated groups, whose ancestors had survived the earlier catastrophes, continued to live apart. They became in many cases the so-called 'primitive tribes' of historical times, philosophically and technically undeveloped relative to newly organizing large central cultures. Later catastrophes added to the number of isolated units of culture.

Humans who are tribal in organization possess an essentially primordial culture. Among them are found well-developed languages in bewildering variety; they share not only linguistic principles but verbal roots with the great languages of the world; their attitudes toward language and symbols

---

<sup>153</sup> "On Astronomy in The Stone Age," 22 *Current Anthrop* (1981) 585; cf A. C. Haddon, 10 *Natural Sci* (1897) 33-6.

are proto-historical. Totemism is common; so also complex systems of taboo. Their religious astralism varies in extent and complexity. In comparison with scientized cultures, the succession of gods is less well described in legend, though the sky god (Uranus) is found everywhere.

Customs such as head and body deformation, and the couvade, that has the father imitating the pains of child-bearing, are similar in widely separated areas, suggesting an original universal community. Elaborated stone tools, advanced symbolic designs, ceramics, an attention to the North-South axis in monuments, the practices of circumcision, cannibalism, human sacrifice, flood legends, medical remedies, and a great many other practices and beliefs point back to humanization in the creative period, followed by devastation and isolation thereafter.

The primeval kit of humankind, the set of ideas and devices that the proto-humans gained by the gestalt of creation, seems less sophisticated than it really was. The voluntariness and self-consciousness infusing the cultural complex set it apart from mammalian products and organization.

Deliberate convocations and collecting of individuals into assemblies for planning, ordering, worship, and celebrating, accompanied by speech, symbolic gestures, markings, and rituals, also constituted part of the original cultural consensus - these in communications and organization. Planting, hunting, gathering, tool devising, storing - all operated from the collectivity extended through memorial generations - such were the practical activities.

Joseph Campbell puts our position here well:

It has actually been from one great, variously inflected and developed literate world-heritage that all of the philosophies, theologies, mysticisms, and sciences now in conflict in our lives derive. These are in origin one: one also in their heritage of symbols; different, however, in their histories, interpretations and applications, emphases and local aims.<sup>154</sup>

### *AMERICAN CULTURAL ORIGINS*

Alexander von Wuthenau, in his book on *Unexpected Faces in Ancient America, 1500 B. C.-A. D. 1500*<sup>155</sup> scans the literature on Asiatic, African, Egyptian, Semitic, and European presences in cultures and races of Central America and presents his remarkable album of stone and ceramic countenances of the stated peoples. Despite conventional theory, there

---

<sup>154</sup> *The Mythic Image*, Princeton U. Press, 1975.

<sup>155</sup> N. Y.: Crown, 1975.

seems but little question that the Central Americans were a mixture of human types long before Columbus arrived.

But further, the American race had its own primeval forms. In *Chaos and Creation*, as in the present book, I argue that homo sapiens schizotypus was present in the Americas from his very first period, and despite repeated general catastrophes held on there in niches of survival, and was repeatedly reinforced across the Pacific and Atlantic oceans, with artifacts and cultural practices to remind us of these occasions.

Although this thesis is not central to the present book -- because the theory of homo schizo can be argued on whichever grounds conventional theory chooses -- it has important consequences for early American studies. As I foresee the emergent issue, it is not rampant diffusionism versus carriage across the Bering Straits, but rather how much of the similarity among races and cultures came from the ecumenical period of homo schizo and how much was transmitted via long distances thereafter.

The case for diffusionism is building up. Some of the material advanced before World War II regarding Asia-to-America diffusion is summarized in Lord Raglan's *How Came Civilization?* (Chap. XVII). He placed the world ecumenical culture of the first civilization in the region of the Persian Gulf. More recently Betty Ebers has marshaled the evidence for Japanese to Olmec (Mesoamerica) diffusion, by sea.<sup>156</sup>

In another case, an authority on early Mesoamerica, Michael Coe (31) reports the "coincidence" from Needham's studies (1959, 407) that "the Maya astronomers and those of the Han Chinese worked with an eclipse calendar of 11,960 days."<sup>157</sup> The coincidence cannot be an accident, especially when one considers that the Mayans seem to have used 'solar mansions,' like the Chinese, rather than a zodiac, to mark the progression of constellations, and, further, indicated constellations, in the manner of Han China, by circles connected with straight lines, which was not seen in Europe until 1785.

Acceptance and progress of pre-Columbianism are blocked mainly by uncertainties over the timing of intercontinental transactions. For example, Posnanski and Bellamy go beyond 15,000 years in reconciling Tiahuanacan (Bolivian) remain with Pacific Island and Mediterranean-Caribbean traits.<sup>158</sup> The Atlanteans range from 11,000 to 3,500 years ago. The Asianists for some time held to 12,000 by land and nothing by sea; then neo-Asianists

<sup>156</sup> "Yes, by Land, and No, by Sea," *Amer. Anthropol.*

<sup>157</sup> Michael Coe, in Aveni, *op. cit.*, 31.

<sup>158</sup> Arthur Posnansky, *Tiahuanaco, The Cradle of American man*, N. Y.: Augustin, 1958; H. S. Bellamy, *Built Before the Flood*, London: Faber, and Faber, 1943.

ascribed East Indian and Japanese contacts to materials of Mexico, Ecuador, and other parts. These ranged well back into fabled times of sunken Pacific continents, but they also surged forward into the end of the classical period; even Alexander the Great's lost fleet found a new role in a culturally fecundating voyage through the southern oceans to the western shores of the Americas.

Meanwhile, evidence of Phoenician, Egyptian, West African, Jewish, Roman, Celtic, and Viking contacts ranged from New England to Middle Eastern America in the North and down to Brazil in the South. Indications of a European or Eur-African presence in the centuries just before Columbus are not wanting.<sup>159</sup> The idea that the Americas were a virgin to the Old World before Columbus deflowered them is an anti-historical myth.

That there were many contacts seems clear. One has only to read Ameghino's survey of pre-Columbian encounters of the two regions, written a century ago as I mentioned earlier, to comprehend that, while he may have been naive, the contemporary scholar has been unreasonably skeptical. Moreover, much evidence has seen the light since his time.

As to the troublesome question concerning when these contacts took place, here we propose that the Americas have been in touch with the rest of the world throughout the history of mankind, except in the periods of great natural turbulence, with the contacts swelling in numbers whenever a few hundred years of technical development and cultural organization would occur. Whenever a catastrophe happened, which cut off peoples by splitting continental blocks, lifting mountains, creating great rivers, or interposing new climates between them, the isolated cultures developed very rapidly, requiring only a few centuries to exhibit different cultures, languages, and ways of life.

Let the editor of a recent collection of studies on trans-oceanic contacts summarize the situation for us:

Clearly, the present status of our knowledge of American archeology does not allow us to attribute the origins of New World civilization to diffusion from the Old World with assurance. Equally, however, it does not demonstrate the independent origin of New World high culture. Just as the zero occurrence of artifacts originating in the Old World and found in America may be taken as a strong argument against the diffusionist explanation, so the early occurrence of a complex of Old World-like traits -- often very sophisticated -- in early levels

---

<sup>159</sup> Cyrus Gordon, *Before Columbus*, N. Y.: Crown, 1971 and *Riddles in History*. N. Y.: Crown, 1974.

of nuclear American civilization casts a strong reflection against the independent origins hypothesis.<sup>160</sup>

This points to a very early heartland culture; then came divergence and sporadic exchanges.

I would suggest, concerning said passage and the same anthology of studies, that we should be looking for several periods of transference of traits; in *Chaos and Creation I* suggest six of them. Artifacts and usages can then be assigned by ages and the outcomes tested (for their logic and verisimilitude). Basic social forms, early ceramics, boat design, the lodestone compass, the pyramid, Semitic, Celtic and Roman relics, and many other kinds of evidence exist with which to clarify the periods of intercourse.

To summarize, a hypothesis of ecumenical world culture in the earliest times, attaining quickly the Neolithic level, is supportable. Inventions require heavy motive power, both in the phase of mental gestation and of social adoption. The motive power must operate within and among individuals. Basic inventions came in rush following the gestalt of creation. They flowed from the psychology of the new human species, originally a small group. They were tied immediately to astral gods and figures and to animals as well; this identification lent memorial power to the inventions and authority to the thrust of their diffusion.

Acting in the name of their gods and totems gave authority to the imposition of practices. The same aggressiveness that ultimately eliminated the hominids also foisted upon them the basic inventions. Those who grasped the meanings of the human culture, or at least could practice it, survived. The aggressors possessed ideology, skills, and zeal. No species could stand against them.

In this manner an ecumenical or universal culture was quickly created and diffused among a variety of human racial types. Potentiated genes were diffused and came to the fore quickly in adapting to a changing world. Culture traits were imposed under the most stringent conditions. It was the greatest age of evangelism in the history of mankind. Within a thousand years of increasing natural terror, most basic skills would have been adapted from nature, developed, put into a framework of ideas and imprinted upon society.

---

<sup>160</sup> Riley, *op. cit.*, 457.

## CULTURAL INTEGRATION

The Dogon people of the Upper Niger region of Africa have come to public attention recently.<sup>161</sup> Marcel Griaule's exposition of their secret lore has been presented by his collaborator, Germaine Dieterlen.<sup>162</sup> The Dogons have a rich astronomy. They know that the star system, Sirius, contains a bright star and also a dark, dwarf star, although it cannot be seen by the naked eye. Robert Temple studied exhaustively the sources of this knowledge and ventured the idea that astronauts from Sirius may have once have visited Earth and imparted this knowledge. Or else the dark star may have once exploded in a super-nova and was remembered. A third possibility is a one-time proximity of Sirius, which would imply a vastly accelerated expansive movement of the galaxy. Or a telescope. I incline towards the super-nova view.

The Dogon were probably survivors, with the ancient Egyptians, of the vast 'Triton' (Sahara) civilization that was destroyed about 6,000 years ago. In isolation, they have kept their knowledge accurately, obsessively, secretly. It took Griaule 16 years to hear the lore from them.

The Dogon culture shows clearly the fundamental law of cultural anthropology: All aspects of a culture are interconnected:

The smallest everyday object may reveal a conscious reflection of a complex cosmogony... Thus for instance African techniques, so poor in appearance, like those of agriculture, weaving and smithing, have a rich, hidden content of significance... The sacrifice of a humble chicken, when accompanied by the necessary and effective ritual gestures, recalls in the thinking of those who have experienced it an understanding... of the origins and functioning of the universe.<sup>163</sup>

And we can quote the social theorist Cassirer also:

If a man first directed his eyes to the heavens, it was not to satisfy a merely intellectual curiosity. What man really sought in the heavens was his own reflection and the order of his human universe. He felt that his world was bound by innumerable visible and invisible ties to the general order of the universe - and he tried to penetrate into this mysterious connection.<sup>164</sup>

<sup>161</sup> Robert Temple, *The Sirius Mystery*, London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1976.

<sup>162</sup> Marcel Griaule and Germaine Dieterlen, *Le Renard Pâle*, Musée de l'Homme: Paris, 1965.

<sup>163</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>164</sup> *Essay on Man*, New Haven: Yale U. Press, 1944, 48.

All the pieces of human culture resemble or hook on to each other. Social and body symbolism are international, for example, as Mary Douglas has shown,<sup>165</sup> also cosmogony and sex, diet and religion, and so on. Exceptions come from intrusions and novelties: these are rejected; but if lent power, persistence, and utility they will work themselves into the cousinship of culture traits. The discovery that this is so belongs to modern anthropology, to field workers such as Ruth Benedict, Margaret Mead, and Clyde Kluckhohn.<sup>166</sup> The discovery is in the air and an alert historian of science shares it. Thus Santillana writes : "As we follow the clues - stars, numbers, colors, plants, forms, verse, music, structures - a huge framework of connections is revealed at many levels. One is inside an echoing manifold where everything responds and everything has a place and a time assigned to it."<sup>167</sup>

Many studies pursue the First Law of Anthropology. Yet few ask why it should be. Why is a culture - Womburi, French Canadian, Hopi, Greek, or English - integrated?

"Because the human likes to be consistent." But why does he seek this consistency ?

"Because the human mind has to explain itself." Why so?

"Because all things *are* connected to the stars via the cosmos!" But in an industrial culture, millions of chickens are dispatched automatically without obvious connection to anything but the market for chickens.

Actually, all three theories hint at the best explanation. The human must be consistent in connecting all things, because, in the times following creation, culture burst forth spontaneously in all of its manifestations; all the objects of the world were not only to be seen, but also to be reflected upon, that is, to become objects of thought. Cultural consistency came before its rationalization. And each culture is of course culture-bound, viewing the world in its own way.

Since the days of creation must be obsessively remembered and repeated, as we shall see, they continue to force upon man their original togetherness. They supply the motive force for performing the greatest and the smallest tasks of society.

Then, too, since the burst of revelation and discovery was tied into the outbursts of the gods, all that is thought about becomes tied to the gods.

<sup>165</sup> *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology*, N. Y.: Pantheon, 1970.

<sup>166</sup> Cf. Kluckhohn. *Mirror for Man*, N. Y.: McGraw Hill, 1954.

<sup>167</sup> *Op. cit.*

Whereupon the human must realize this fact, confess it, and lend it importance, or else he will be guilty of blasphemy, ingratitude, and neglect of the gods. Hence he must excuse himself and his actions. Such is the explanation offered here of the First Law of Anthropology.

Every culture is integrated and coordinated within itself; this we know from the comparative study of existing cultures. All culture arose hologenetically, and diffused with the original homo schizo. But, in any event, they could not be radically different, because human nature sets limits on what a culture can do. We can hardly conceive of what might be different about cultures, because they are part of our very nature. Louis Wirth used to lecture that men differ in every way that it is possible to differ. If they do not differ otherwise, that is because it is impossible to do so. If it were possible, we would not know it. Further, there is no practice in any culture that lacks a homolog in every other culture.

The pattern and limits of culture began with and must follow the schizotypal nature of individual humans as they transact among themselves and with the world. Therefore, we can expect to trace the syndrome of schizotypality through any given culture and all cultures taken together.

The recent insistence of some sociologists and ethologists upon the predetermination of human behavior does no more than make sense of the view that humans are culturally determined. Nature and nurture are inextricably bonded. One misleading view, which has flourished in many forms, is that culture is a thick varnish laid upon a brute to contain and rule him. To the contrary, humans are born to rule themselves and must spend their lives in trying to do so. They cannot ignore the problem of control. They must try promptly every conceivable means of doing so, whether this means reaching into their own nerves and muscles for the purpose or stretching outwards into the environment and then reimposing controls *via* a group and its culture.

Modern empiricists are often repelled by the mythologist who says that the ancients connected all with all. They cannot pursue the line of thought that connects everything - lines, crosses, comets, sceptres, circles, megaliths, and seemingly everything else - with a phallic symbol, for example. Or an eye with a comet, lightning bolt, an electric arc, a giant, a mountain, and so son. Anthropologists should make such connections as a matter of course; it is surprising when they do not.

There are two main reasons for granting that the earliest humans possessed a holoculture and thought in terms of it. One is the evidence itself, so voluminous that a thick book could be prepared of all the demonstrable, deliberate connections of the *membrum virilis* in tools, arts, stories, beliefs,

and rites. But if the evidence is not overwhelmingly convincing, the quantavolutionary theory of early man should be. For the original humans - and even the unconscious among the humans today -- thought in holistic terms. It is one of the lessons of logic, dutifully repeated in its textbooks, that 'analogy is not proof.' But to the first homo sapiens schizotypus, and to humans of all times, analogy *must be* proof. The most marvelous sense of power, intellectually and behaviorally, comes from the association of the tiniest events and observations with the nature and conduct of the great universe.

Here the anthropologists, the mythologists, the pre-historians do agree. All things are tied together: a sacred universal bond exists among all things. One may imagine that millions of hours went into both fantastic and carefully considered leaps in order to form all sights, sounds, and experiences into a meaningful whole.

The ability and need to see all in all is fundamental to the newly created human. The scientifically and technically useful ability to concentrate upon only a single special aspect of a thing derives from the obsessive compulsion to repeat.

The two needs spring quickly from the urge to control. Fearfully and paranoically, the humans saw in everything the thing that would threaten (or, ambivalently, save) them. Fearfully and obsessively, humans had to rehearse and redo what they had experienced, keeping everything the same and in order.

*CHAPTER VI*

## ***SCHIZOID INSTITUTIONS***

Totem and taboo organize and report 'right' and 'wrong' for the people of a culture. They control one's selves by setting up a bank of animated displacements, publicly symbolized, and preventing one's selves from disturbing the assemblage. It would seem to be a normal way for homo schizo to behave. It does not matter that the terms are reserved for 'savages'; 'civilized' cultures can and do employ the totem and taboo. Most of this chapter, once it moves from the opening theme, plays upon their variations.

Totems and taboos are convenient ways of repeating and organizing obsessions. They are group elaborations of the schizophrenia of original humans. Both are found in all cultures and in varying degrees of weight. In large-scale cultures they are part of religion and bureaucracy.

Taboos are sacred prohibitions, whether received directly or indirectly from divine authority. The 'Ten Commandments' include taboos. The name of Yahweh was taboo. At one time it might be pronounced only once a year. Violation of taboos is commonly supposed to have fatal results. Yahweh frequently concludes his injunctions with the phrase "... lest you die."

The totem, more strictly, is a symbolic identification of a human group with an animal or plant, which represents a divine force. Because animals (the owl, for instance) and plants (the sacred oak) were tangible, near at hand, and well-known, they could readily be fitted into the scheme of delusions; a communication system, largely imaginary, is set up between the life-form and its human patron.

In joining with a totem, a human group acquired a talisman and group representative. The totem life-form operated in the sky and on earth to the presumed over-all benefit of its sponsors. Once the sun (earth) rotated too fast; the great rabbit, said some American Indians of the Great Plains, lassoed the sun and halted it, not releasing it until it promised to go slower (perhaps the rabbit was a cometary image.) But a totem also imposed limitations upon behavior by means of taboos, rites, and penalties.

Totemism came to be a set of specialized practices with regard to a species or even a particular animal or plant. It arose with the help of certain celestial behaviors that were for various reasons interpreted as animate behaviors within the celestial environments. The important illusory behaviors of the animation in the sky are carried down to Earth and cemented by analogy to the organism's earthly behavior. Thenceforth a set of attitudes to the life manifestations are produced that give birth to totemistic practices. As the human draws apart from the 'lower forms of life,' the totem and the taboo dissolve into sublimations.

A totem provides a complete schizotypal system: the injection of divinity into an animal denotes a cognitive disorder, a hallucination, a misplaced metaphor. The exclusiveness of the totem and its group towards other totem groups in its associated taboos reflects the schizoid aversiveness to others; the worshiping and cannibal sacrifice (sometimes) of the totem animal emerges from ambivalence; the numerous rituals and rules connected with the totem convey compulsive obsessiveness; and the secret and enduring aspects of the totem group's practices, going back to the totemic primal incident, display catatonism.

Enrico Garzilli writes of Faulkner, Joyce, Pirandello, and Gide in their searches for "the real self," notable names, to be sure, pursuing at the pinnacles of literature the primordial search for oneself within the polyego.<sup>168</sup> He explains that the word is the self; becoming human is to become a word. Hence the importance of such ancient expressions as begin the Gospel of John: "In the beginning was Word; and Word suffused God; and God was Word." (My rendering.) We sense here the power and control exercised in the first naming of something and agreeing upon it with others. We should understand, too, here, that "Word" is "Logos" or "the enlightened life of mind."

---

<sup>168</sup> *Circles without Center: Paths to the Discovery and Creation of Self in Modern Literature*, Cambridge, Mass: Harvard U. Press, 1972.

## SPEECH AND LANGUAGE

C. Levi-Strauss is of the opinion that "language was born all at once," thus supporting our position of hologenesis. He goes on to say that "whatever the moment and the circumstances of its appearing in the range of animal life, language has necessarily appeared all at once. Things cannot have begun to signify gradually. After a transformation the study of which has no relevance in the field of social sciences, but only in biology or psychology, a change has taken place, from a stage where nothing had meaning to a stage where everything had."<sup>169</sup>

This is a surprising use of the word "relevance." Once we have understood what was happening biologically and psychologically, we comprehend what was happening socially. A quantavolution introducing language must concurrently involve a grasping for logic, for control over memory, and for the social consensus on meanings from which culture sprouts. We have already spoken of what was happening biologically and psychologically: the hominid's brain was beset by delays in instinctive reactions, building special sub-centers, and displacing throughout himself and the world outside. The internal code of language was springing up and erupting here and there into public language.

According the Edward Sapir, too, language was formally complete from the beginning and existed from the beginning of man. H. Kalmus claims an "explosive" origin of speech, too, but then limits the speed to "hundreds of generations,"<sup>170</sup> a retreat to appease the millions of years of mankind awaiting fulfillment. Speech did not occur word by word, grammatical form by grammatical form, over millions of years of humanization. It probably sprang up in a mixture of counting, signs, and ejaculations. Counting has been connected (through Lord Raglan's *How Came Civilization?*) by Seidenberg<sup>171</sup> with rituals, which fits the model of homo schizo well. "Counting was invented in a civilized center, in elaboration of the creation ritual, as a means of calling participants in ritual onto the ritual scene, once and only once and then diffused." Seidenberg explains that all people had religious numberings and taboos on certain kinds of counting. It is frequently imagined to be theft when one's name is counted. Today, a homologous paranoia underlies the hostility of many persons to the

<sup>169</sup> Introduction to M. Mauss, *Sociologie et Anthropologie*, Paris: Presses Universitaires, 1968.

<sup>170</sup> In Frank Smith and G. A. Miller, eds., *The Genesis of Language*, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, 1966, 282-8.

<sup>171</sup> "The Ritual Origin of Counting," 2 *Arch. for Hist. of Exact Sci.* 1, Berlin: Springer Verlag, 1962, 1-40.

computer, which seems to steal one's name, carry one's number, and manipulate these and hence oneself.

A person is only created when named or announced and the creative word may have been the creative number. Marshack would seem to be moving along a similar path, with stress upon arithmetic and calendarizing (the catastrophized need to watch the skies for regularities that are hoped for, and irregularities that one must prepare for).<sup>172</sup> He is also locating ever earlier symbolic forms.

Some anthropologists are proving that the chimpanzee can learn to understand words and sentences. The point of exhaustion is reached after several dozen of them are learned. If the chimpanzee has not learned to speak in its supposed eight or more million years of existence or whatever its age as a species, it is unlikely to begin now. On the other hand, if the chimpanzee had just recently been mutated, the effort might be worthwhile.

The human seems better equipped to move his tongue than the chimpanzee, but it is not the primate's tongue that prevents speech. "Basic English," a shortened selection of words for communicating in English, does well with 750 words from a possible quarter of a million. (Its problem lies in the constructions; the format or program of a language would be critical to a world tongue, and cannot be simply imperialistic.) A number of gods have as many names as would be needed to constitute a language, hundreds for every major god.

Many vertebrates and insects could manage 500 distinct sound-combinations; 9 distinct sounds might be permuted about  $2^9$  or 512 ways. Since words have several meanings, depending upon their context, a great many more than 512 'words' are possible. When these thousands of words are combined, many thousands of messages are possible, enough to make a lexicographer out of a sparrow.

In order to speak, an animal has to be "intelligent." This means that it must possess a sense of being an individual, a will to words, the things to refer them to, a capacity for time and recall, and an obsession for reiteration.

There is no speech center in the human brain; a large cortical area controls speech and is placed in either the left hemisphere (for the right-handed) or the right. This would suggest not only that speech is recent and non-organic in structure, but also that the will to speak is an inner necessity connected with instinctual blockage between the left and right hemispheres, and slowdowns in message transmission in other newly grown parts of the brain.

---

<sup>172</sup> Alexander Marshack, *The Roots of Civilization, The Cognitive Beginnings of Man's First Art Symbol and Notation*, N. Y.: McGraw Hill, 1972.

Man did not get so clever that he began to talk. He was originally so frightened that he began to ejaculate names, and to call them out obsessively, then to use them on like occasion (to compare, in effect), to admonish, to pray, and command. To his surprise, he could find others who might understand, at first perhaps only a twin, then their offspring. Nouns came first, wrote G. Vico, one of the earliest modern etymologists. And he definitely connected the earliest speech with the worship of the gods.

Following the ejaculative phase, which may have occupied only a few years, language probably entered upon a liturgical phase. Heavily depending upon exclamation, it moved to detailing situations and meanings. It undertook to express what had happened (to call the roll of disasters, so to speak), to exorcize the causes of the events, and to cover them up, making sounds of appeasement or evasion.

Much public or formal language, like liturgy, has been formal and compulsory from the beginning. It is still so, obviously in mega-societies but also in tribal societies. Maurice Bloch speaks of the deliberate and enforced impoverishment of language in traditional oratory. The language acts to control the speaker.<sup>173</sup> He cannot go beyond prescribed forms of speaking. Hence public speech is understandable only in the context of ritual, as Malinowski said, not by virtue solely of knowing its lexical units. The rhetoric cannot become revolutionary.

### GRAPHICS

Speech came promptly, but writing was not developed well until civilizations had poetry, art, religions, and social systems. A possible reason for this may also be supportive of our theory of language. It is logical that as speech is to the mouth and ear, writing is to the hand and eye. No one doubts that earliest man (or latest hominid) was as digitally adept as he was orally proficient. However, gestures, grimaces, and context could let the eye help the speaking process along.

But the hand and eye could not, like symbols, accomplish internal symbolizing or speech, which is probably what was occurring in the new creature to help him coordinate his several selves and their displacements in the outer world. That is, public speech was the extrusions of inner speech, like the small portion of the iceberg that floats above water.

---

<sup>173</sup> *Political Language and Oratory in Traditional Society*, London: Academic Press, 1975; cf. Charles Morris, *Signs, Language, and Behavior*, N. Y.: Prentice Hall, 1946.

Some people with complex languages do not write even today. Art of course takes the place of writing in respect to many messages from one's ancestors. A totem pole can take the place of much written history, depending upon the kind of history wanted. There is a clue here: a large society and an official class need explicit messages and records.

Until these criteria come into play, art can successfully block writing, somewhat as television blocks literacy. Art can say so much that, by comparison, the breaking down of pictures and symbols into writing may appear to be a meaningless and barren enterprise. Further, it may seem to be sacrilegious to openly admit that words are interchangeable tools. Hence writing was originally a holy profession, as in the Egyptian bureaucratic empire. It was carried over into government: "the needs of a centralized administration were a far greater impetus to the development of writing, among the Sumerians (cuneiform) as in Crete, than intellectual and spiritual needs."<sup>174</sup> Earliest tablets speak mostly of rations and personnel in the palaces.

But, in maritime cultures, such as the Phoenician, the pragmatic value of messages finally broke the sacred grip. Words (orally spoken) had departed so far from their origins and symbols from art, that they might be used casually in practical affairs. The alphabet was invented out of numbers, phonetics, and calendars by people who were on the move, as in boats.<sup>175</sup>

The invention of writing was an effective grasping for control of memory, behavior, and pragmatics. It delivered also a severe blow to the imagination; it caused massive disenchantment. It placed credit for works effectively upon the culture. No longer could one be taught by the gods, through subtle or at least mysterious parental and social transmission or from the depths of one's being, from inner springs. Besides memorization, one had exactness, repetition, a third party, an objectivity, a beginning of coolness and remoteness.

#### *PRIMORDIAL LANGUAGE*

Man spoke one tongue to begin with. As he diffused from his proto-patria, his speech had reason both to change and to remain the same. If there can be found a basic set of sounds and words that is common to all of mankind today, then one would have an original language, a proof of cultural hologenesis, and an indication of the recency of human origin.

---

<sup>174</sup> M. I. Finley, *Early Greece*, London: Chatto and Windus, 1970.

<sup>175</sup> Cyrus Gordon, *Before Columbus*, 103ff.

Searches for the first language have been modestly rewarding, enough so to justify a greater expenditure of time and resources, especially for computerized manipulation of data. R. Fester has proposed that "there is an original vocabulary of six archetypes common to all of humanity which still today comprises the basic of every language and which at the same time provides a clearly recognizable link between all languages." The root-words of 'Pangean,' as we might call the tongue, would be BA, KALL, TAL, OS, ACQ, and TAG. "From the moment when the genus *homo* left the family of lower animals, and thanks to his upright stance, both hands and *senses* could serve him more freely than before, the *vox humana* shared his further evolution to the Man of today."<sup>176</sup> We should, of course, disregard the makeshift ladder that Fester has thrown up here to arrive at human voicing. The words are prominent today in geography: "Indo-European, Mongolian, Phoenician, African and Ancient American geography was decidedly using the same original words."

Fester claims to have discovered that in many languages, the syllable BA pertains to human relations and subsistence; KALL appears connected with the idea of concavity and the females womb; TAL refers to clefts, to the ground, to females; OS to thresholds; ACQ to water; and TAG to height, gods, erect humans. To Malcolm Lowery, who has kindly supplied me with his translated materials, the progression by which the words related by Fester to the roots are said to drift in space and among cultures is not intelligible.

J. P. Cohane also proposed a set of root words, independently and without awareness of Fester's book.<sup>177</sup> These key words, he believes, were strongly religious in their original associations. Like Fester, he finds his examples to be most copious in geography. His words are also six in number, although others of equal importance seem to be present in his narrative. They are Oc (or Og) as in Okeanos, Kronos, Moloch, and an ancient Irish god, Oc; Hawwah, as in Aloha, Yahweh, acqua, earth; mana; ash/ az; tema, as in Thames, Tiamat, Athena; and Eber/ abar, as in Berber, Hibernia, Calabria, Abruzzi, Hebrew, Ares, Mars.

Scholars of linguistics seem disinclined to undertake the risky task of reconstructing the prototype language. Whorf spoke of "the story of man's linguistic development -- of the long evolution of thousands of very different systems of discerning, selecting, organizing, and operating with relationships. Of the early stages of this evolutionary process, we know

---

<sup>176</sup> *Sprache der Eiszeit: Die Archetypen der Vox Humana*, Berlin: Herbig, 1962, 31, 6.

<sup>177</sup> Cohane, *The Key*, N. Y.: Crown, 1969, is directly comparably with Fester.

nothing."<sup>178</sup> We can, he said, only survey the results of this evolution as they exist today. Still, Whorf was an early enthusiast for trying to trace the original ecumenical speech.

Generally, the linguistic establishment has beaten back the numerous efforts to demonstrate speech affinities, regarding them as *prima facie* absurd. Such connections would be Gaelic with Algonkin, Chiapenec with Hebrew, Othomi with Chinese, Choctow with Ural-Altaic, these being Amerindian connections. The diffusionists have fared better in proposing Old World connections: Hamites with Semites; Sumerians with Magyars; Late Minoan with Greek; Egyptian with Hurrian; Etruscan with Lemnian; Berber with Basque, etc. Justus Greenberg says that the 750 indigenous languages of Africa were originally four families, and these were originally one, and possibly related to Hamitic, says Gilbert Davidowitz. Encouraged by the theory of hologenesis of culture, I would conclude that the search for the ultimate ecumenical Pangean language will not be in vain.

#### *GROUP VS. INDIVIDUAL*

Humans of the proto-age had immediately the problem of constituting themselves deliberately into a group. The psychology of the hominid band was gone. In its place was the fearful, distracted, individuated - even multividuated - person. He must belong, yet not belong, at the same time. The favorite topic of political philosophers and economists - the individual against society - took shape.

The bond between individual and collective psychology is tight. It is both genetic and adaptive. It is fully determined. It is unbreakable. Evidence of these statements gushes from history and anthropology on the one side and from many psychological schools on the other. Just as the brain can reach to the toe to express itself physiologically, it can reach to the stars to express itself psychologically. Where it happens to reach is a cultural affair.

Just as the human is a coordinated poly-ego, so a culture, and for that matter any group, is a mega-poly-ego, that typically selects a dominating ego-pattern as its design for the behavior of its members. A special concept of organization is required to grasp that organized behavior that is an extension of patterned mind-behaviors. The genesis of external organization is in the mind(s) of individuals and their groups.

One way of expressing the holism of personal human conduct is that "private motives are displaced onto public objects." Thus, a person suffering inferiority and weakness in personal life finds superiority and strength in

---

<sup>178</sup> B. L. Whorf, *Language, Thought and Reality*, Cambridge Mass: M. I. T. Press, 1956, 84.

political activism; Harold Lasswell, following Alfred Adler, has expounded and documented this thesis.<sup>179</sup>

I do not limit our theory to this view or language. All men, given their brainwork problems, must feel weak. All men seek power according to their own private and cultural prescription. The distinction between private (individual) and public (social, cultural) is most usefully applied during special investigations in politics and law. The human bonding is without innate distinction. The human acts in a merged internal and external context. A fond pat on the hand can stop a pain in the toe; a political victory can let a man digest a thick steak, as I once observed in a study of Huey "Kingfish" Long of Louisiana.

There is no end to the process of 'private-public' interaction from conception to death. That means also private-cultural. The individual and the group march along, side by side, from the dawn of mankind. Both society and the individual are schizoid in origins, structure, and functions. Their behavior and forms are not always congruent; the symptomology is varied. Then it is that deviance (medical schizophrenia) is defined. The individuals seek to evade the society or change its laws; the society seeks to make the individuals conform; else it treats them for mental illness or jails them on account of their menacing or destructive conduct.

The process will go on as long as human nature retains the form which it assumed in the days of creation. There are perhaps some non-schizoid culturally created humans, who have evaded hybridization with the schizoid, the fate of most hominids. Even if there were none at all, the idea of their existence should be retained for heuristic and theoretical purposes. They would be well-trained primates, although not discernible as such. The schizoids, and especially certain schizophrenes, are religiously and politically dominant. With their obsessions, suspicious hyperawareness, penchant for symbolism, and their megalomania they control the world. That is, they try to control it; but the world is, by their own definition, uncontrollable. *Homo sapiens schizotypus* defines 'control,' and is insatiably anxious for control.

Human action moved back and forth along an axis of tension between the individual and the collective or social. Self-awareness was an inescapably individualist phenomenon. Never after creation could the sense of the self be exterminated. Never thereafter, then, could the collectivity perpetually and wholly dominate the individual soul. Incessant, forcible, and imaginative attempts to do so over all of history were foredoomed to fail and still are. The split self, a source of the greatest terror, could not permit its unification by the collectivity, even though the collective achieved its great resilient

---

<sup>179</sup> *Power and Personality*, N. Y.: W. W. Norton, 1948.

strength from its guarantees to the individual that it would assuage, diminish and even cure the terror of the split. There was no returning to the mammal.

So loyalty began, built upon intrinsic disobedience. And so began authority. The story of Job, in the Bible, represents the individual trying with all of his might to subject himself to the will of Yahweh. Dreadful catastrophe, initiated by Yahweh, abetted by the Devil and by hostile humans, crushes his life-values: his loved ones, his possessions, his power, his respect, and his health. An exception stands for the sixth value, knowledge, that is not removed but is the focus of the divine assault upon Job. If only he could be mentally broken into a numbness, stupefied, then he could be defeated. He would not then respond to God.

The very failure of this last form of degradation of self is both a triumph and a negation of Yahweh. That is, all must stop short of the ultimate disaster, which would effectively wipe out creation. On the other hand, once stopped short of self-effacement, the campaign of Yahweh and the Devil is lost and the human being is restored. Job is left the victor on the scene of battle. All of his values and achievements are indeed restored. The story of Job is told as a lesson in humility; actually, it is a lesson in human arrogance: the will to control God.

Job's story might be set, symbolically, at the end (ca 4000 B. C.) of the age of Elohim-Saturn. It is before the flood of Noah. By then, human ideation was as complete as it was to be until the Greek skeptics, unless some civilization, of which no trace remains, had operated with a secular ideology. Technology had arrived at a level hardly exceeded until 350 years ago. At Catal Hüyük, in present-day Turkey (6,000 B. C. ?), "orderliness and planning prevail everywhere; in the size of brick, the standard plan of houses and shrines, the heights of panels, doorways, hearths and ovens and to a great extent in the size of rooms."<sup>180</sup>

During the age following Saturn, which may be called the age of Jupiter (Zeus, Horus, Yahweh, Marduk), the list of secondary institutions and inventions becomes long. Large scale organization or centralization developed. Millions of people were aggregated and ruled by agents and delegations of authority. Kingship; priestly, military, and official classes; record-keeping; and extensive physical properties were common. Increased domestication, breeding, and herding of varied animal species reflected a projection of human organization into the animal kingdom. Large-scale agriculture is also to be viewed in the context of an administrative organization of plants and human caretakers.

---

<sup>180</sup> W. A. Fairservis, Jr., *The Threshold of Civilization*, N. Y.: Scribner's 1975, 143.

### PSYCHOLOGY OF ORGANIZATION

Basically, given the domineering schizoid prototype, social behavior (including language, religion, governance, art, etc.) contains varying elements of obsessiveness, catatonism, orgasm and sublimation. The fears of the self, of the gods, and of loss of control lead to the eternally 'shell-shocked' behavior of returning to the original traumas and repeating them, both to punish oneself and to avoid punishment by others. Deviation is tabooed, except as it finds expression in momentary orgasm and sublimation.

The only way in which language and all other inventions of customs can be developed and organized happens to be schizotypal: undeviating insistence upon repetition, the compulsion to repeat, the slavish adherence to memory and tradition, liturgies. Bleuler reports patients who will play the same musical trill or chord a thousand times and, like the esteemed citizen of the regimenting modern state, Bleuler's patient, obsessed with command automatism, will mechanically obey any outside order, will imitate others slavishly, will repeat everything he hears, and, despite a lack of feelings, do all of these things impulsively or as if compelled.

This is an effective human response to a loss of instinct and the great need for new forms of control over the self and others. Organization, even as we see it today in great bureaucracies, highly rationalized, is a catatonic gripping for a non-changing world: 'If I remain perfectly still, I will escape observation, I will not be punished, and the world itself will stand still in emulation of me.' Members of a Judaic sect freeze in whatever activity they may be engaged when the Sabbath falls and do not move until the Sabbath ends.

In its conception and supposed functioning, a typical modern bureaucracy is a marvel of deductive science.<sup>181</sup> It is hierarchy of power and control from top to bottom, with a division of tasks from broader to more narrow scope, down to the individual worker. It is regarded as a highly rational way of accomplishing large collective tasks. Yet this administrative grandeur is only the recognizable descendant of the first efforts of homo schizo to organize work, something he did half-aware but naturally. For the principle has been the same from then to now: an obsession upon a displaced target (god, a village plan, a hunt, agriculture) and an effusion of severe discipline, compulsively exercised and rationalized. Man has had to work in this way. The awareness of the principle, its statement in science

---

<sup>181</sup> A. de Grazia, "The Science and Values of Administration" *Admin. Sci. Q.* (Dec. 1960) 363-98; (March 1961) 558-83.

and law, and deductionism as scientific method all trail after its spontaneous generation.

In early organizations, the compulsion to reiterate was applied to external control and organization as it had originally been employed for self-control and the ordering of smaller groups. Authority was supplemented by deductive principle. Deductionism is the idea that from a general prescription may be derived specific prescriptions. That is, a statement, that all must be put in strict order, is followed by an enforcement system to ensure that no exceptions to or deviations from the order occur in individual cases.

Deduction is consistent with the association of different kinds of displacements and the compulsion to reiterate. It permits free play to authority to expand its scope of activity and its human domain. It leads to all avenues of life. It externalizes the subjective, by providing security, letting the inner self relax, and divesting the self from its preoccupations with itself into 'objective' external occupations. It relieves the smaller social organizations of their involved and intricate rites and rules, moving them out upon the larger stage of a kingdom.

Constructions of many types became possible. Monuments, settlements, populations, armies, and record-keeping all grew in size. A bureaucratic (usually theocratic) state might be discerned, successful in its aggrandizement of human activities, and containing within its larger order the orgiastic practices of religion and warfare, the sublimatory development of the arts and crafts, and the negativism and retardation always imminent in human populations.

Bureaucratic states might collapse from natural disaster, or from competing states, or even from long-term demoralization. Deductionism is rigid and restrictive. It puts constraints upon ambitions, social differences, and new experiences (orgiastically impelled). It is prey to apathy.

Nonetheless such social forms as the bureaucratic kingdom must be called a civilization. The surrounding and preceding forms might also be called civilizations. When, then, did civilizations begin? Civilization is premised as some condition beyond humanization. The human could not elect civilization; he was driven to it by his fundamental character; what was needed was a respite from catastrophe and a space of a few centuries.

Civilization marked no qualitative change in the human character. It is an enduring, well-grounded way of life for a large number of persons containing elaborated and sublimated second-order effects of humanization. If more severe strictures are put upon the term, no significant benefit in logic or theory accrues. Writing is civilized, but provokes no great change in human character or ideation. Deducing commandments from a

generalized authority is not exclusively a civilized practice. Peacefulness is not exclusively a trait of civilization. If it were not for the catatonic motif that freezes many cultures at a first-order stage or in a 'fallen' stage, the word 'civilization' could be logically applied to all human organization.

The catatonic response to disaster may be presumed to account for a number of 'primitive' or 'retrograde' peoples and subgroups of larger populations, such that the elaboration which is the hallmark of civilization does not proceed. This catatonism is negative and refuses change. It fights the battle for world control within the person and the small clan or tribe. Its overburden of constraints, rejections, and taboos miniaturizes and trivializes. The externalized, exo-tribal culture is actually abandoned and condemned, leaving the members of the group motionless, aghast, face to face with awful eternal threat.

#### *MEGALITHS AND MEGALINES*

People built megaliths around the world, probably beginning six thousand years ago. A megalith is a worked or cut stone that weighs, say, over 10 tons, which alone or in conjunction with other stones mediates religious sentiments among the group and with the gods. The stones stand for ancestors, gods, holy circles, sacrificial altars, astronomical pointers, centers of convocation, and tombs. The efforts required to erect them demonstrate both strenuous collaborative discipline and fervid emotions. They are large to demonstrate the peak of divine fealty of which the group is capable and to stand firm against the elemental rages of nature.

That they are often isolated from their quarries or sources, have been reconstructed again and again, have been abandoned by or remain from a disappeared culture, and are fallen, split, and cracked indicate that the fears of their builders were well-founded. The builders were dispersed or annihilated. When recently the megaliths were rediscovered and studied, they were considered mistakenly to reflect a peak level of technology of their builders. Actually, many of them may represent the work of marginal surviving elements from civilizations that peaked at higher technical levels but whose centers were eradicated.

The Olmecs of the Mexican lowlands used basalt quarried from eighty miles to the North to build their monumental sculptures. Single stela and single heads weigh from forty to fifty tons. "The scale of the operation