The Smith of the Gods

8 - «When the paradigm of matter and spirit trembles, the concepts of causality dissolve into forms.»

80- For Tarde, “unlike Marxist political economy, the source of wealth resides neither in land, nor in labour, nor in capital, nor in utility, but in invention and in association”. Among the varied products of the extraordinary ferment stirred up by Darwin, there are two mechanisms which add to Gabriel Tarde's own idea a truly fecund novelty: evolution through the association of elementary organisms into more complex organisms, also formulated by Edmond Perrier, and evolution by leaps, by crises, which, in the writings of Cournot, spontaneously germinated in Tarde's mind, prefiguring the march of scientific evolution, the theory of form and the states far from equilibrium of the theory of chaotic determinism of Ilya Prigogine. He revisits the categories of political economy in the light of difference and of imitation, distinguishing, within the concept of labour, between the activity of reproduction and of simple repetition and the activity of creation and of innovation. Within the concept of capital, he sees the difference between material capital, the “Cotyledon”, and capital-invention. Within consumption, he distinguishes passive consumption (mere repetition) from active consumption and the invention of new norms of consumption. Within needs, he makes the distinction between organic needs and special needs. Among the latter, the “need to know” and “curiosity” promise the greatest outlets for the economic progress of humanity.

81- Karl Marx, a great reader of Charles Darwin, took up all the principles of “The Origin of Species” to translate them into political economy, foreseeing a reasoned economic and social science, to the detriment of Charles Fourier on the questions of the equality of the sexes and of respect for the environment, which Karl had qualified as “proto-socialist” ideas. This ideological lack in the scientific theory of Karl Marx can by itself justify the failure of the Marxists to maintain a revolution. Marx the psychologist, philosopher and sociologist is, in my view, more interesting than Marx the ideologue, introducing into social reflection the experience of the mirror. Noticing, while observing the attitude of one of his children in the acquisition of his image in the reflection of a mirror, that the recognition of one's own image in a mirror is in no way innate but the result of a construct made of successive layers of deductions through our relations with others, he thus opens the way to Freud's reflection on the structure of the “ego”. We thus enter the period of psycho-sociological preoccupations within a Marx-Tarde-Freud triangle, developing the questions of the recognition of the individual, of identification with the other, and of particular identities.

82- The philosophy of the nineteenth century, while renewing ties with the lights of the Renaissance and despite a severe critique on its part against the political system, was unable to influence or orient the great economic tendencies of the time, commanded by deeper anthropological realities. In 1930, in “Civilization and Its Discontents”, Sigmund Freud retraces the vicissitudes of the march of human civilisation through the ages and its slow

transformation towards a supposed future maturity. Since the sacrilegious murder of the “mythological” Father, humanity has oriented itself towards a patriarchal order of the sons, regulated by the principle of yield, which weighed heavily upon the shoulders of humanity for centuries. It is an obsession with efficiency and profit which ends up leading to the terror which Freud, as early as 1930, felt rising again. Individual and collective autonomy was largely discussed between Sigmund Freud and his friend and colleague Carl Gustav Jung. Jung's theorisation of the collective unconscious opens the door of the Freudian “Ego” to the world.

83- Simultaneously, the domain of anthropology, notably with the philologist and anthropologist Georges Dumézil, builds itself upon the principle of the embedding of the structural patterns of vital reality, which he expresses through the successive relations: “Cosmogeny–Anthropogeny–Phylogeny–Ontogeny–Psychogeny”, taken up later by Jean Piaget for his work on genetic epistemology, classing them in the family of the “structuralists”. Jung's archetypal psychology belongs to this structuralist pattern. There probably exist, on the one hand, universal structural laws, and, on the other hand, an antinomic or binary nature of human thought. These principles enter into resonance with the thought of Carl Gustav Jung, clarifying his notion of archetype and that of psychic opposites and their synthesis. His collaboration with the physicist Wolfgang Pauli, which opens the door to legends, began on an irony of life. Known for his work on the “exclusion principle” in quantum physics, setting out the way in which Nature organises space and time at the atomic level, Pauli found himself excluded from all the physics laboratories on the pretext that, besides his alcoholism, at his mere presence all the instruments went out of order.

84- It is thus that he took the decision to consult Jung. As an analysand, he discovered through this contact the archetypal structure of the worldly collective psyche. Wolfgang Pauli glimpsed an explanation of his own misfortune through a mechanism which he names, in agreement with Carl Gustav Jung, “synchronicity”. The chain of causalities and of the events of life plunges its roots into the dimensions of the infinitely small (a butterfly effect along the axis of the wave of scale of dimensions), just as the roots of our archetypes plunge far into the memory of humanity, into the very zones of oblivion, extending into the deep collective unconscious, stretching well beyond the “Planck wall”. The two patterns being superimposed, if one speaks of synchronicity, it is fitting to define with respect to which worldly structure the synchronicity occurs.