A Sociological Appreciation of an Ancient Egyptian Text

Carlos Allones Pérez, USC.

Firstly, I offer, an English translation of an antique Egyptian text for the benefit of the reader. It was taken from the original hieratic text which is kept in Berlin and is from the Middle Empire and was authenticated by Maspero in 1874. I chose this translation out of several possible English versions. This one appeared in "The Literature of the Ancient Egyptians" and was collected and commented on by Adolf Erman in London in 1927.

Secondly, and of much less importance, I also offer my dear reader, some comments made from a sociological point of view, which came to me while I was reading this marvellous find.

"THE DISPUTE WITH HIS SOUL OF ONE WHO IS TIRED OF LIFE[1]

[This strange work is based upon the conception that the soul is an independent being apart from the man; it can leave him at death, but it can also stand by him faithfully.
In the lost beginning of the book it must have been related how a man was impoverished, deserted, and calumniated, and how in his distress he wished to bring his life to an end, and that by burning. His soul itself had urged him to take that step, but it declined to remain by him when death was actually at hand; for in the case of so poor a person it feared that it would fare badly. No tomb would protect him, and no survivor would bring him victuals, and thus it was threatened with hunger, cold and heat. So the unfortunate man endeavours to persuade his soul not to desert him in death. Where the treatise at present begins, both are arguing before certain judges, whose tongue is not biased; the soul has turned to them, instead of answering its master].

[1] English translation from the original Middle Kingdom papyrus, and footnotes, by E. ERMAN (1927): *The literature of the ancient Egyptians*. pp 86-92. London: Methuen

"Then I opened my mouth unto my soul, that I might answer what it had said: This is too much for me at present, that my soul speaketh not with me - - - - My soul goeth forth; it shall stand there for me - - - - It fleeth on the day of misfortune.
Behold, my soul thwarteth me, and I hearken not unto it,[2] and drag me to death ere I be come to it, and cast me upon the fire in order to burn me - - - - May it draw nigh to me on the day of misfortune and stand upon yon side, as a mourner doth[3] - - - - My soul, it is foolish, to hold back (?) one that is sorrowful on account of life; lead (?) me to death, ere I be come to it, and make the West [4] pleasant for me. Is that then something grievous? - - - - Tread thou upon wrongdoing.[5] The unhappy one will endure:[6] Thōth will judge me, he that contenteth the gods: Khons will defend me, he, the scribe of Right; Rē will hearken unto my words, he that guideth (?) the sun's ship; Isdes will maintain my cause - - - - My distress is heavy upon me and he beareth it for me… The gods avert the secret of my body.[7]

This is what the soul said unto me in answer: Thou art not a man (of high degree) - - - - (and yet) thou carest for good things like one that possesseth treasures.[8]

I said: I go not away so long as that one[9] remaineth on the earth - - - - I will carry thee away. Thy lot (?) is to die, while thy name liveth on, and yonder[10] is the place where one alighteth - - - - If my soul will hearken unto me - - - - and its heart agreeth (?) with me, it will be happy. I will cause it to reach the West, like the soul of one that is buried in his pyramid, and at whose burial there stood a survivor.
The expedient, whereby the luckless one proposes to attain this, is unfortunately unintelligible to us; one can only see that he will do

[2] I.e. before the time appointed for me.

[3] The meaning probably is: since I have no survivor to trouble about me, let it at least remain beside corpse. The same wish more exactly expressed below.

[4] The usual name for the abode of the dead and the necropolis.

[5] Give up thy purpose in wishing to forsake me.

[6] The following passage declares that he relies on the good and righteous gods, who will espouse his cause.

[7] My unspoken troubles? The body is to the Egyptian the seat of thought.

[8] Meaning probably: the gods will not trouble themselves about a miserable person like you.

[9] The soul.

[10] The other world.

something which will safeguard his soul against the distresses feared. He assures it that it will despise another soul as a weary one, *and* it shall not freeze; *it will despise* another soul that is too hot, *for he* will drink water at the place of drawing,[11] *and it will also look down* on another soul that hungereth. In this wise *it is to* lead him to death – *otherwise hast thou no possibility of* alighting in the West. Be so kind, my soul and my brother, and become mine heir (?),[12] who shall make offering and stand upon my tomb on the day of burial, that he may prepare (?) the funeral bed.

Then my soul opened its mouth to me, to answer what I had said: If thou callest burial[13] to mind, it is sadness, it is the bringing of tears, it is making a man sorrowful, it is haling a man from his house and casting him upon the hill.[14] Never wilt thou go forth again to behold the sun.[15]
They that builded in granite and fashioned a hall (?) in the pyramid, that achieved what is goodly in this goodly work – when the builders are become gods,[16] then their offering-tables are empty (and they are) even as the weary ones which die upon the dyke without a survivor; the flood hath taken its end (of them) and likewise the heat of the sun, and the fish of the river-bank hold converse with them.[17]
Hearken thou unto me, lo, it is good for a man when he hearkeneth. Follow the glad day and forget care.[18]
Thus the advice of the soul now is that he had better give life a further trial, and then, probably in support of the theory that this is still to be endured by even the most unfortunate, he recounts to him two tales, of which we frankly understand but little:
A man of humble birth tilleth his field and loadeth his harvest on to a ship, that he may tow (it)…, when his festival approacheth. He seeth that the

[11] I.e. "the part of the river where water is drawn," where it was the wish of all the dead to drink.

[12] I.e. the survivor, who recited the prescribed formulæ over the corpse and performed the rites necessary for the welfare of the dead. Since the luckless one has no one to render him this service, the soul is to take on the duty.

[13] To be able to appreciate all the malice of the following sentences, it must be borne in mind that to the genuine Egyptian of that day there was no higher duty than the care of the dead and of their tombs. This is represented here with bitter scorn as useless folly (arrant heresy).

[14] The tombs are situated on the high ground at the desert edge.

[15] It is the constant prayer of the dead, that they might leave their tombs by day and behold the sun.

[16] I.e. directly the kings are dead.

[17] Meaning: they dragged themselves down to the water's edge and there they died; they lie half on the land and half in the water, their corpses shrivel up and rot simultaneously, and the fishes nibble at them.

[18] That is the usual cry at banquets.

night of the flood (?) cometh on, keepeth watch on the ship until dusk, and goeth forth with his wife and his children; they perish upon the lake, endangered (?) in the night amid the crocodiles. *Then he sitteth him down and when he* hath a share in the voice *(i.e. can speak again ?), he saith:* I am not weeping for that maid, who cannot come forth from the West to another woman upon earth; I am troubled for her children that are broken in the egg, that behold the face of the crocodile before they are yet alive. *We understand still less of the second tale*[19] *of* the man of humble birth, *who begs his supper of his wife.*

Then opened I my mouth to my soul, that I might answer what it had said:

[FIRST POEM]

Lo, my name is abhorred
Lo, more than the odour of carrion[20]
On days in summer, when the sky is hot.

Lo, my name is abhorred
Lo, more than catching fish
On the day of the catch, when the sky is hot.

Lo, my name is abhorred
Lo, more than the odour of birds,
More than the hill of willows with the geese.

Lo, my name is abhorred
Lo, more than the odour of fishermen,
More than the shores of the swamps, when they have fished.

Lo, my name is abhorred
Lo, more than the odour of crocodiles
More than sitting on…, where are the crocodiles.

Lo, my name is abhorred

[19] Perhaps it is only the conclusion of the first.

[20] In Egyptian a name is said to “stink”, meaning to “be execrated”; the following verses express this by means of comparisons, which come readily to an Egyptian, especially those associated with fishing and fowling in the swamps.

Lo, more than that of a wife
When lies are told against her to the husband.

Lo, my name is abhorred
Lo, more than that of a stalwart child
Against whom it is said, he… to him that hateth him.[21]

Lo, my name is abhorred
Lo, more than that of a… city,
(Than) that of a rebel, whose back is seen.[22]

[SECOND POEM]

To whom do I speak to-day?
Brothers are evil,
Friends of to-day, they are not lovable.

To whom do I speak to-day?
Men are covetous,
Every one seizeth his neighbour's goods.

To whom do I speak to-day?
Gentleness hath perished,
Insolence hath come to all men.

To whom do I speak to-day?
He that hath a contented countenance is bad,
Good is disregarded in every place.

To whom do I speak to-day?
He that maketh wrathful a (good) man by his evil deeds,
The same man moveth all men[23] to laughter, when his inequity is grievous.

To whom do I speak to-day?

[21] No doubt a stepchild is meant.

[22] Who has fled.

[23] The masses make mock of the righteous for becoming enraged against the evil-doer.

Men rob,
Every man seizeth his neighbour's (goods).

To whom do I speak to-day?
The sick man is the trusty friend,
The brother that is with him, hath become the enemy.[24]

To whom do I speak to-day?
None remembereth the past,
None at this moment doeth good to him that hath done it.

To whom do I speak to-day?
Brothers are evil,
A man is treated as an enemy (?) in spite of (?) a right disposition.

To whom do I speak to-day?
Faces are invisible,
Every man hath his face downcast against his brethren.[25]

To whom do I speak to-day?
Hearts are covetous,
The man on whom men rely, hath no heart.

To whom do I speak to-day?
There are none that are righteous,
The earth is given over to the workers of iniquity.

To whom do I speak to-day?
A trusty friend is lacking,
A man is treated as one that is unknown, albeit (?) he have made (himself) known.

To whom do I speak to-day?
There is none that are peaceable;
The one that went (?) with him, he is not existent (?).

To whom do I speak to-day?
I am laden with misery,
And lack a trusty friend.

[24] The meaning may be: since his own relatives have deserted the poor man, he now has no friend save him who is in a worse plight.

[25] No one now looks openly at the other.

To whom do I speak to-day?
The sin that smiteth the land,
It hath no end.

[THIRD POEM]

Death is before me to-day
As when a sick man becometh whole,
As when one walketh abroad after sickness.

Death is before me to-day
As the odour of myrrh,
As when one sitteth under the sail on a windy day.[26]

Death is before me to-day
As the odour of lotus flowers,
As when one sitteth on the shore of drunkeness.[27]

Death is before me to-day
As a well-trodden (?) path,
As when a man returneth from the war unto his house.

Death is before me to-day
As a clearing of the sky,
As a man… to that which he knew not.

Death is before me to-day
As when a man longeth to see his house again,
After he hath spent many years in captivity.

[FOURTH POEM]

Why he that is yonder[28] will be

[26] Meaning probably that one is released from rowing.

[27] The poet means a feast on the cool river-bank.

Only that …a living god,
And will inflict punishment for sin on him that doeth it.

Why he that is yonder will be
One that standeth in the sun's ship,
And will therein assign the choicest things unto the temples.

Why he that is yonder will be
A man of knowledge, and he is not hindered,[29]
And he petitioneth Rē when he speaketh.

That is what my soul said unto me: Cast aside (?) lamentations, my comrade, my brother - - - - I will abide here, if thou rejectest the West. But when thou reachest the West, and thy body is united with the earth, then I will alight after that thou restest. Let us have an abode together." [30]

II

The first time I heard of this Egyptian text – 4,000 years old – was during the session in which Professor Javier Roiz dedicated his lecture on Political Science at the University Complutence to Eric Voegelin. This was in the spring of 1999, and we studied his Conference at Harvard: "Immortality: Experience and Symbol."[31]
The author, a German immigrant to The Unites States, valiantly defended that the social extension of the consciousness of immortality, was a condition *sine qua non* good social order – essentially, peace, justice and freedom – of a society, of *whatever* society, cannot be achieved.
Voegelin did not, however, suggest a return to the religious languages of the faithful, but instead, he proposed putting them into cold storage, until

[28] "He that is yonder" is a regular euphemism for the dead. The three concluding verses are in praise of the lot of the blessed dead, who, as the sun-god's companions, promote what is good.

[29] The man who is tired of life doubtless alludes to his own fate.

[30] Up to here the Dispute and its commentary as appears in A. ERMAN (1927)

[31] Published in ERIC VOEGELIN (1966-1985): *The collected Works of Eric Voegelin, Published Essays*, Volume 12, pp 52-94. Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge and London.

such time that science could one day justify a return to a re-symbolisation of these languages, more or less as our Antonio Machado expressed it:

It's best not to forget
The old words…
Which will come back again
To be heard.

In order to be able to give such a ticking off to the American society in which he lived, Voegelin, must have seen something in this Egyptian text to support his ideas.
I have to declare at this point I have more sympathy with the sentiments expressed by Voegelin's interpretation of the title: *"The dispute of a man, who contemplates suicide, with his soul"* than Erman's interpretation of the title: *"The dispute with his soul of one who is tired of life"*. The reader will know why after reading this.
All this has to do with an ancient text -earlier than *all* the monotheist traditions and 2,000 years before Christianity- which comes from that fascinating Egyptian civilisation which lasted *forty* centuries. For no better reason than for the reader's solitary confrontation with its rich powerful poetry, with no intermediary of any kind (Oh, to be able to *directly* read the hieratic manuscript!), I have decided to set its text above any other.
However, it will do no harm to our secularized societies if we were to use the text to make some sociological comments, which seems to me would provide a fitting endorsement of the ideas earlier published by Voegelin. But naturally, anyone is entitled to question my interpretation, or my ideas of Voegelin's interpretation.
So, I am ready to make some suggestions which were inspired while I was reading this marvellous *Dispute*, which has come down to us from the beginning of civilized times.

1. For some reason, this man wants to put an end to his life. He has his own beliefs and wants his soul to guide him through the process of dying, because "otherwise hast thou no possibility of alighting in the West".
Given the man's deteriorating social position, it appears perfectly in order to the soul that this man wants to kill himself, however the soul doesn't see it as its task to accompany the man at the moment of death.
To convince the soul, the man says he has the support of the gods "who avert the secret of my body", and he assures the soul that it is therefore in his power to guarantee the soul won't suffer cold, heat or hunger in the great beyond.

In its reply, the soul shows us how truly cynical and malicious it can be. This without doubt must have caused a scandal within the society of the time, going against, as it does, the religious and political order of the Empire. Not only that, but it is also completely against all that is most venerated within our own Christian society, which came much later.
Even the pharaohs, the soul points out, laid to rest in their pyramids after their deaths, were no better than the corpses of the weary ones left on the River banks to be nibbled by the fish… "Follow the glad day and forget care!"
And to illustrate the point, the soul then tells the unhappy man two stories, of which only fragments survive, although the efficacy, simplicity and clarity of these stories remind us of the amazing parables of the Rabbi of Nazareth. (But then, did not Jesus spend his infancy in Egypt?)
But confronted with this advice, the man who wants to die reacts angrily. He feels insulted and starts reciting verses with such violent emotions, that they overwhelm and move the soul to be left without words.

Lo, my name is abhorred
Lo, more than the odour of 'carrion'
On days in summer, when the sky is hot.

The manner in which an individual's name is pronounced, and the tone that is used, is profoundly linked with the respect or disdain with which the individual is treated and the good or bad political reputation the person merits.[32]
And in this, our unhappy friend, is not mistaken. He knows that his acquaintances fly from him, as they would a plague, as they would the most repugnant smells like carrion or rotting fish on a midsummer's day "when the sky is hot." He knows his name is like that of a wife "When lies are told against her to the husband".
The same potency of verbal images with which he expresses the above (which was no doubt very popular and common among the Egyptians of the time), leads us to understand that in truth this man now has no hope in the society of his contemporaries, of his equals, of his family or his neighbours.
They don't even try to understand him, or the reasons for his behaviour and for his fall from grace. They would never act in his way, and this is the general assertion of them all, and for this they despise him.

[32] For the concept of 'Person' see the Spanish edition of T. HOBBES (1979): *Leviatán*. Madrid: Ed. Nacional. – In particular the introduction by Carlos Moya.

2. But how has he come to this? How has he been converted into a social failure? Is he perhaps a thief, a murderer, or a coward who has dishonoured his country?
From the verses that follow, it appears he doesn't believe so:

To whom do I speak to-day?
Brothers are evil,
Friends of to-day, they are not lovable.

To whom do I speak to-day?
Men are covetous,
Every one seizeth his neighbour's goods.

Moreover, he puts himself, on a high moral plane and above the society of the time, which he describes harshly and in dark tones.
His own soul now reproaches him for his pretensions of superiority: "Thou art not a man (of high degree) … (and yet) thou carest for good things like one that possesseth treasures."

To be more effective in his criticism, the author uses the third person (apart from in the rhetorical questions), as if the whole thing has nothing to do with him. He doesn't feel part of the human race to which he belongs. If he's lost his social position in life, perhaps it's because he tried to change things, to better them, without caring of his own person or his properties. Thus, by not taking advantage of his opportunities, he has systematically been converted into a social outcast.
It is clear that this moral criticism could pertain to whatever human group, if one can consider it with sufficient sentimental disengagement, but this text, with its contents, its form, appears much more like the here and now. Perhaps this is more contemporary for us, the westerners, than it ever was to those who read it at the time it was written. For capitalism, due to its intrinsic constitution[33], seems to morally degrade societies in which it is established… *or so I believe*.

This text then can fundamentally be considered as classic, because it is antique, yet to us it is contemporary, and once more we can give some justification to the Egyptologists, when they tell us that those 40 centuries of civilization in Ancient Egypt formed the classical epoch of our culture.[34]

[33] KARL MARX: *Capital* (1849)

[34] K. LANGE and M. HIRMER (1968): *Egypt: Architecture, sculpture, painting, in three thousand years*. London: Phaidon

To whom do I speak to-day?
There are none that are righteous,
The earth is given over to the workers of iniquity.

To whom do I speak to-day?
The sin that smiteth the land,
It hath no end.

3. In the first poem, the author recognises that he can only expect unpleasantness in his personal life; in the second poem, that it is impossible to reform the society in which he lives, and that he now sees his death as a liberation from all this:

Death is before me to-day
As when a sick man becometh whole,
As when one walketh abroad after sickness.

Death is before me to-day
As the odour of myrrh,
As when one sitteth under the sail on a windy day.

Is our *social soldier* tired of life then? It's strange because he is never concerned about his own welfare. It's not because he hasn't known and enjoyed the good things of life (this same poem devoted to death is a good example of the opposite); curiously, he loves life, but for him the most important thing overall is his fight to improve the lives of everyone else. So in this sense, why should he talk of being weary?

Perhaps it's because he is disillusioned with humanity who our *reforming fighter* puts aside as impossible, he appears to have a sort of mystical experience like that of San Juan de la Cruz:

I live without living in myself,
And so high contentment I wait,
That I die because I do not die.

But this is also strange, because he is evidently a man not only given to reflecting much on things. He rather is a fighting man, a man of action. His is not the way of the mystic, but that of the heroic. His religious faith, that which he has, ("the gods avert the secret of my body"), doesn't take

him away from human affairs, but instead leads him to immerse himself in them.
It is for this reason, he looks to his faith, to his beliefs and to the tenets of those beliefs for a way out of his feelings of desperation, for a way to continue with his fight…and there he finds the answer! He finds a way to continue with his life's work, but for that he first has to lose it; he has to die in order to reach "the other side", because only *from there* he will be able to continue his fight!

Why surely, he who is yonder
Will be a living god,
Punishing the sin of him who commits it.

Why surely, he who is yonder
Will stand in the barque of the sun,
Causing the choicest therein to be given to the temples.

Why surely, he who is yonder
Will be a man of wisdom,
Not hindered from appealing to RE when he speaks.[35]

He wants to kill himself, not because he is tired of life or of his fellow men, but because of his faith which leads him to believe that only after his death, has he any chance of influencing the God RE, that only after his death, will he be able to use the immense power of this God to reform Egypt!
Yes, he is thinking of committing suicide, but not because he is tired of life, but because it's part of a process, an instrument or a means of bettering the social order of his beloved nation.

Just as well his soul has more common sense than he does! Although it promises it will be loyal to him, it advises him to hold on, to think twice and wait for a bit.[36]

---

[35] The Fourth Poem –last sequence- as appears translated in VOEGELIN (op. cit). p 63

[36] We shall look at Voegelin's interpretation:

"The precise degree of differentiation which the author of the "Dispute" has achieved will become clear only if we confront the assurances of the last sequence with the Egyptian experience of cosmos and empire. In the primary experience of the cosmos all the things it comprehends –the gods, heaven and earth, men and society – are consubstantial. Since the realm of Egypt is a partner in the cosmos, its order is supposed to manifest the *ma'at*, the divine-cosmic order, while the Pharaoh is supposed to be the mediator of this order to society. At the time of the author's writing, however, Egypt was in disorder because of the Pharaoh's malfunctioning; and according to the traditional conception of empire, this unfortunate situation could be repaired only by the epiphany of a new Pharaoh who again would

III

And now to finish, some quick words on the theme of the scientific re-symbolisation of religious languages, so beloved by Voegelin and us, and others as well:

> "In order to simplify the issue, I will say that mankind of old faced absurdity, and escaped it through religion. And today again, man faces absurdity; but how can he escape this time? It is pointless to entertain hopes of communicating with people in a language other than the one they use; and we have acquired a new language, which is science. This is the only language in which we can articulate greater and lesser truths. For they are the old truths after all, once contained in the language of religion; and they must now be re-presented in the new language of man." [37]

The advance of capitalism has made it impossible to return to the collective models of discrimination against women and any regression

---

effectively channel the flow of *ma'at* from the gods to society. Set against this traditional conception, the "Dispute" must be considered an extraordinary, if not a revolutionary, event in the history of empire, inasmuch as it offers a substitute for the mediating function of the Pharaoh. For the author of the "Dispute" is neither interested in life at all cost nor in immortality in the sense of conventional imaginings – such topics belong to the mode of unreality from which he is disengaging himself – but in quite a different kind of immortality that is meant to become instrumental in restoring order to Egypt. The living god Man shall shoulder the burden of the living god Pharaoh who has failed. There can be no doubt, we are witnessing a spiritual outbreak, bursting the primary experience of the cosmos and moving in the direction of a personal experience of transcendence. The author is on the verge of the insight that Man's order, both personal and social, will have to depend on Man's existence in immediacy under God. In view of the very articulate symbolization, it would even be tempting to press the interpretation one step further and to consider the insight into Man's nature as *imago Dei*, without the benefit of Pharaonic mediation, as achieved. But that would be going too far. For the unknown author does not radically break with the primary experience but, the phenomena of social disorder notwithstanding, preserves his faith in the cosmos. His Man is not everyman, and therefore, he cannot translate his personal breakthrough into a revolution against sacred kingship. The acceptance of status a counsellor to the sun god remains the only method conceivable to make the newly discovered reality of Man effective in the economy of cosmos and society – and in order to achieve that status, Man must commit suicide. The time had not yet come for the transfer of authority from the cosmological ruler to the prophet, sage, or philosopher as the nucleus of a new communal order". (Op.cit: pp 63-64)

[37] NAGUIB MAHFOUZ (1994): *Adrift on the Nile*. p. 93. New York: Anchor Books

whatsoever to various religious languages which publicly supported such discrimination.
This discrimination, if we were to follow the teachings of Anthropology, consisted of the political domination *collectively* exercised by all adult males over *each and all* mothers during the bringing up of children. So, young males then as small boys learnt to respect adult males. In this way the consciousness of social mortality (*ergo* of physical mortality itself) were extended down through successive generations.
This parenting mechanism (for example, the patriarchal variety in our western cultures), was perfected generation after generation, and it is specifically *this* that capitalism is doing away with.

Welcome to "Women's Lib". But the problem is that the egalitarian axioms capitalism propagates as part of its production processes are revealed to be ineffective, not to say counterproductive, when it comes to the organisation of people's private sexual relations and the bringing up of children.
Let us admit, here and now (and only for the sake of argument) that formal organisations function well enough, for instance in North America societies, but social relationships between the sexes and the ages are a spectacular failure in those societies, and we know such relationships should play the most important part in revitalising any community.
They tell us that a new solidarity is emerging, a new and rich sentimentalism between men and women. Perhaps there is, but we have to then *ask* what happens to all those children of divorced parents, whose numbers are growing all the time.
No, nobody wants to go back to the old times, although we can not get satisfaction within the new ones.[38]

Let us hope the social sciences will provide us in the future with a rationale *(and some proof)* that discrimination against women is not an essential condition for peaceful human society, but we must also wait in the future, for an explanation *(and some proof)* of why equality dogmas are of no benefit in organising how we bring our children up.
Perhaps, I say, in the future, the sciences, human and natural, will be able to prove something of this (or perhaps they will prove something *to the contrary*), and *in this way* will achieve a powerful re-presentation of the

[38] "Because we are mammals, and male and female mammals at that, we have limitations, and we must know them, provide for them, keep them safely in our habits, if not continuingly and boringly in our minds." Margaret Mead, *Male and female*, 1949

See also C. ALLONES PÉREZ (2019): *Family and Capitalism*. Universidad de Santiago de Compostela.

contents of religious languages. However, *this is not really the point*. The point *is* that only when we've collectively managed to leave capitalism behind, will we manage to get out from under the contradictions in our upbringing we suffer today.
I.e. Only in a post-capitalist era, where men and women will *be able* to create industries of any aim but that end-less of making money, will the consciousness of our own mortality *return* and spread throughout society again.

And this, as Voegelin tells us, is the only thing that will ensure *a certain* reconciliation of the social order.

Translation by Fran Clark