

Social framework that makes possible for people to be just or unjust to one another. When you stand before that dynamic self-awareness comes and you work mythologically <sup>or</sup> ~~an~~ anthropomorphically down inside in order to grasp a state of being. Another way to say this is, these states of consciousness are what \_\_\_\_\_. Another interesting thing you look to history, I suppose in the next six or eight month as we are studying various cultures of the world we'll have more data on this. A myth behind the very practical myth of the cultures behind the male and female problem disclose states of being, they are articulations of states of being in the male or the female. One of things in the ones I'm familiar with and this is pretty obviously is that the mythology \_\_\_\_\_ unbearably indicates that you can't have one without the other and we are way beyond biology and we are way beyond psychology with this doved into the ontic level, or to the state of being. It would be fun with a group like this to have a conversation on the Adam's Rib bit, and what, and you always have to begin with these articulating authentic states of being.

\_\_\_\_\_ that deal with it on a psychological level, that man is invented that myth in order to ground the fact he is was prior to the female. That kind of stuff you just want to pull the chain and let it run down out of history, the Adam's Rib bit myth that we were ~~going~~ <sup>going</sup> to ~~play~~ try and take it apart could only possibly been invented by both the male and the female. And that it does justice to the state of being that produced that articulation in the first place. You can see that in that myth they were beginning to see that you can't have one without the other, the platonic one where, oh this is ancient long before Plato, where the first being of consciousness was neither male or female. Hey that is pretty nice in the evolutionary process when you get back to the cells that

just divide themselves, fertilize themselves. I never thought about that. Anyway then they divided into male and female trying to hold that same kind of thing. I suppose that everyone of us has an mythology, every single one of us we operate with it, it maybe way down in the twilight zone of our being but we all have our mythology. I would guess that the one that in the western world is the most powerful is the one Freud gave to us, and he admits dependence upon Plato and this is the idea that there is no such thing as an unambiguous male and no such thing as an unambiguous female. Both principles are in each and each one is dominant over the other. I would judge that that is the basic myth, or that has to do with the basic mythology which everyone around this table actually operates.

I want to fool with that a little bit more, although you could pull all of this out by ~~QUESTION~~ questioning in an conversation every bit of this. I'm not so sure that the conversation that we use is especially, since we only have one on this subject you would anywhere near have time, you have so much else to do before you get up to this point, I don't know whether you would have time to pull this out, it would take a little bit of time.

I suppose that, and I have to admit a kind of ignorance here that any of us could cure very simply. That is the mythology behind the Chinese Ying Yang relative to the male and female. I'm not particularly interested in that in the Ying Yang as a graphic and dramatic articulation of the myth that we operate with that in our day I believe came from Freud. And if you grasp what you have in the circle with the S in the middle and it's different colors but usually red and black the one is the Ying and that's the feminine and the other is the Yang and that's the masculine. But the fascinating thing is that there is a little round circle of black in the red

sort of like chemistry splashed in the base of the red half of the circle. And then there is a little red circle in the black base part of the circle. Now that black within the red represents the opposing principle. That is to say that the red is in part of or that the ying is in the Yang and the Yang is in the Ying. How this thing operates, to put it in contemporary Western thinking is just simply an illustration that I have no way of knowing that I'm a male save I am confronted by a female or to put it another way. The only reason that I'm white is because there are some people other than white. Otherwise I wouldn't even know it. So in every aspects of living the opposing principle has to be present to have any principle. Now when you spell this out in terms of details of male and female you have the rudimentary insight at this moment in history relative to the male and female. This is to say that homosexuality and or lesbianism is never to be approached as morally wrong which is what our society has done, and we have been deeply ingrained ~~that~~ with the concept that that is morally ~~wrong~~ wrong. And I'm sorry to say that in the first immediacy my thing in this area is on the moral basis. Though rationally I know better that you have to have a principle beyond what you are judging in order to judge anything. And therefore I actually operate, but in this case ~~irrationality~~, that is I'm not aware of the third term that allows me to say that homosexuality is morally wrong against heterosexuality. But you see that that third term is there, that third term is moving into the ontological \_\_\_\_\_ which I'm able to tell you with my mind where the tragedy in homosexuality is is that there \_\_\_\_\_ deficiency that this person is not a full human being whether it be male or female, is not a full human being. Therefore you say no to it not just mentally but you say no to it in terms of ontology.

And then if you care for another human being you would try to do something about it not on a moral ground, but in order that that human being might participate in the whole of consciousness ~~of~~ about consciousness or in the fullness of manhood or the fullness of womanhood. Here's the tragedy as I grasp it in that area, being that this particular person has cut themselves off from the ob-  
~~jectiv~~ jectifying opposite principle that enables them to experience the principle that is within themselves to the fullness or be a full human being. Now it seems to me that our time is very clear about that. That is sort of the center principle and whether you have a man or a woman grasp in that principle. And if that is the only aspect of your mythology, what I have described up to now, you have destroyed both the masculine and the feminine. For what you have done is reduce them into this principle which leaves out the awareness of the other uniquenesses. In the Ying Yang principle what it means you intend to erase the content of the red and the content of the black. If you say what I said now you acknowledge those principles but you have lost the content that which eternally separates a woman from a male or in abstraction, that dimension of her femininity that encountering a male brings into activated consciousness itself. And when that happens, and I'm ~~xxxx~~ going to use the male a moment then it makes his biological sexuality all he's got with which to interpret himself with and this one form of deep \_\_\_\_\_ that is constitutionally say for the male, always there. And this is what made me jump on that Charlie Chaplin joke. A man with this has happen when he is reduced to this one pole and only over against a woman does he know himself when he begins to grasp himself as a sex animal then begins to worry about his potency which is always manifest in trying to prove to himself that he is sexually

potent you women, I don't suppose I need to spell this out in great ~~xxx~~ detail, the joke that Charlie Chaplin used when he was 87 or something like that, he said, "Oh Boy, to be 69 again".

male malase to the very bottom, for when a man begins to worry about the bedroom scene and the more he worries about it the more he becomes a lamb at the slaughter is the female contends to cheapen

about that bed I mean she fighting he's got nothing period. Can you imagine you women having conversation at bars flow out of this deep malase of today. One of the tragic things about the Ghetto is precisely this, your male, I just was reading down there in one of the bathrooms which has an Ebony in it, this morning and it back on this white people think of the black man

as a stud. Well you see that whoever wrote that article, and I'll bet he was a black man or he was emasculated <sup>white</sup> ~~type~~ ~~ixxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ who was in the same situation he was communicating this malaise I am discribing now, that he finds it necessary to even get it communicated. You can go on and fill that in by the hour. Now that happens when the other masculine principle gets lost we've sorted that out I think very well it's the adventuresomeness and here no ~~no~~ female can share with the male. I remember the day Aimee ~~xxx~~ said she was disappointed because she always thought she was the adventurer and need to be that's manifesting you female sicknesss which of course would not be possible if the Ying Yang was not there . Every woman ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ who has an ounce of male, it was something about going down to watch the ships, have you ever seen women on boats, I'll pass that.

Now we have not get this articulated yet, what is this in the women? And everytime you talk about this women get sick and they get sick partly because of what Aimee said, but you can

If the adventuresomeness is that second pole that this ~~is enough~~  
ought to illuminate ~~this~~ What is that going to be.

Very quickly put some flesh and blood on this pole. What does  
that mean. David what does it mean? What is this principle that  
makes a man a man? That makes him weep. It makes him what?

240