

Coming of age in the Ivy League: on the social construction of a myth of genius

Author: Terence Rajivan Edward

Abstract. By referring to notable analytic philosophers, this paper raises a question of to what extent a certain myth of genius of universal: that of the neglected genius who later finds recognition.

Draft version: Version 1 (May 16th 2022).

Brown University and friends have uploaded a number of modernist magazines and journals, so that they are accessible for anyone.¹ I read issues during the pandemic lockdown and afterwards. I was reading *The Egoist*, one of my favourites, and I came across the following material about the life of an Eskimo artist:

In American collections of Alaskan Eskimo art are a few carvings which, instead of following the conventional routine of those tribes, show a marvellous lifelikeness and power of characterisation: If the carving shows a long team of dogs, every dog has his own individuality, his own psychology. Inquiry into the origin of these unique works of genius shows that some years ago there lived in Alaska an old fellow who was universally recognized as weak-minded; for he insisted on spending his time in carving, to the neglect of the practical duties of hunting and fishing ; and he did not even do his carving properly in the style that centuries of tradition have fixed as proper for carving, but persisted in making his carved dogs look like *real* dogs ! What could be more ridiculous? So he lived and

¹ Strangely there is no *The Calendar of Modern Letters*, however, or *The Criterion*.

died despised. Much good it does him that now, when he is dead, his works are being greatly admired by men of a foreign race in a foreign climate. (1914: 15)

It is a familiar story: that of a creative figure in a field who breaks significantly with tradition and finds recognition later, either in their own culture once it has changed somewhat or in another culture. But such familiar stories also give rise to questions.

One question is whether this happens in all cultures, or all societies, or whether it is a myth of genius, in a derogatory sense of the word “myth.” Removing the derogatory ingredient, we are left with a thesis:

(Neglect Thesis) Anyone whose contributions to a field reach the level of genius will experience neglect by their contemporary society or exclusion or else extremely suppressive actions, such as being killed.

It is difficult to resist combining the thesis with the following thesis:

(Natural Neglect Thesis) This kind of unpleasant treatment is human nature.

The question, which poses a challenge to both, is: are there cultures which have geniuses without the pains of genius? I notice that in analytic philosophy, we have outstanding contributors who were embraced by their native institutions from quite an early stage, such as John Rawls and David Lewis, and they continue to flourish in these elite institutions, or else their writings are treasured there, and in the provinces of academia within the English-speaking world. Why are they not just neglected or thrown out, and left to be admired by “men of a foreign race and foreign climate”² or worse?

Various people have conceived of “Anthropology in Reverse.” The expression can be used to mean different things (Kirsch 2006: 3), but the most obvious way of using it, from my standpoint, is for the following situation:

² In the case of David Lewis, one could argue that the climate condition is met.

(Reverse anthropology: travel sense) A member of the kind of society traditionally studied by anthropologists travels to the West, to a part that is exotic or unfamiliar from their perspective; they produce a report for their own society.

Below is another sense:

(Reverse anthropology: textual sense) There is a canonical text within the tradition of Western anthropology, the result of a Western anthropologist studying another society, and someone produces a reversal of that text, in which a member of another society studies the West in a comparable way.

Probably “the West” is not the ideal term here. And what exactly does comparability mean? The clarification I have in mind is that the original text was focused on a certain problem and it is a similar problem that the anthropologist in reverse works on. I believe one can develop a system for measuring comparability. In relation to this second sense, I conceive of a very loose reversal of an infamous text (Mead 1928): a tribesman visits Ivy League universities and writes a text about how the pains of genius are absent there.

An explanation for why John Rawls and David Lewis were embraced by their native institutions is that a culture is like a set of rules which anyone can in theory meet and some people meet the rules of their own culture, and so are embraced, such as Rawls and Lewis, and some meet the rules of another culture, like the Eskimo artist referred to, and so are embraced by that culture, or at least their productions are. But there are less pleasant explanations.

One less pleasant explanation has to do with the qualities of a multicultural society. “I might have treated a Rawls or a Lewis differently in another society, according them a low status and shunning them as well, but in this one it is too risky. My group would suffer and a rival ethnic group would flourish.” Whatever the explanation, I wonder whether cultures which do not

exclude their geniuses, leaving them to be admired by men of a foreign race in a foreign climate, will not be taking yours: “You are not better than our local wizard.”

References

Byington, S.T. 1914. On the Interference with the Environment. VI. The Question of Obscenity. *The Egoist* 1 (1): 15-16.

Kirsch, S. 2006. *Reverse Anthropology. Indigenous Analysis of Social and Environmental Relations in New Guinea*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Mead, M. 1928. *Coming of Age in Samoa. A Psychological Study of Primitive Youth for Western Civilisation*. New York: William Morrow and Company.