

Copy 2 94

Of the Religious Houses for the ~~next~~ year. And this ~~was~~ gleaned, during the past quarter, from

the kind of encounter that we had with colleagues all over the globe. And the projection there is that with the

88

88 houses that we now have, you realize that Calcutta, Canaberra, W Ombulburt and Centrum Chicago would be

included in that 88, that we will be having, in all probability, the way it looks ~~at~~ and this is for

us to decide, 12 additional houses, so that by the quarter of the fall, we would have 100. I understand that

there is interest in others, and it might be that we have 101. That wouldn't be a bad figure to work, with

~~through~~ you know for about a year, we are doing 101 things anyway, with 101 houses. One of the critical things

that was dealt with in the course of the past quarter was the whole question of whether we as an order can move

to create ~~the~~ the Centrum dynamics across the globe in a slightly different manifestation than it has been

in the past. That is, that you know there has been some thought given to/whether we move in the direction of

having four ~~&~~ manifestations of Centrum. And as we went from one house to another, we used the talk on polity

to ~~get~~ get that question raised ~~in~~ before the whole order. This is a question of whether we move ~~from~~, say

having a centrum here in Chicago, to having one oh, say in London, or it might very well be necessary to have

it ~~a~~ in Brussels, or to have one in Bombay or possibly in ~~xxx~~ Delhi. And to have one in Hong Kong, or on an

outside chance ~~even~~ in Manila will give us a whole different feel of what it means to be who we are, and will

change us, change the whole course of our history. It's the kind of decision that the whole order need s to

participate in. And, so, as we ~~traveled~~, over the ~~q~~ past quarter, we had one primary task. That was to deal ~~w~~

with the practicalizations of our globality. You can see how the whole question of how we have a centrum

in Chicago and another in London/ <sup>and one in Hong Kong</sup> and another in Bombay would fall into that kind of a context, or that ~~kind~~

of a category. And, when we had that rare privilege of visiting our colleagues in houses, our usual routine

was ~~a~~ first Joe was up, then Neil was up, then I ~~was~~ up, or we had what we call the "Joe, Neil, Joe" song

and dance routine. I mean, it got to be that way. It was like teaching RSI back to back for about 90 days in

a row, about 32 or 33 times, I guess, we dealt with this. And in the course of it, ~~we~~ you would expect that it

would change considerably, but that was to follow a pattern that we have the Economic, Cultural and Political

dynamics that we dealt with ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ The finances of the order, that is, how is it that we build a commonality

across the globe so that we, if we have inequity, we have it according to mission, and not according to anything

else. How is it that we build the models that will give the possibility of someone in Cebu, or someone in Bombay

the participation in ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ in the same way that you and I participate in the finances of the Order, and that

we have a kind of release from Economic worries to be left with only the worries of the mission. And then to

deal with the whole question of order polity, or how it is that you make decisions, was the next aspect of our

work. And then with the practical issues, that ~~xxxx~~, how it is that you stand present to our own decision to

~~xxxx~~ create our own consciousness, that is by the creation of the screen that we choose to look through ~~xxxx~~

create our own consciousness. How do we stand present to that and use it intentionally, relative to battleplanning

and of course that began the whole business, the whole question of battleplanning and deals, we will be dealing

with that tomorrow morning, and then I think that Joseph will be working with order finance tomorrow Noon. But

to raise the whole question of order polity, I worked off of a 4x4 that had this kind of a rationale to it. And that is, how does this question get ~~xxxx~~ raised in the first place, or what's the origin of it, or even the nature of it. Why is it we would be dealing with the whole question of polity and then the issue of the relationship that we take do it or the very basis of the polity that we have. And then the third point had to do with our style and then the fourth had to do with the form of our polity and it was here that we dealt with the area dynamic, the centrum the panchayat and the commissions. And of course this got orchestrated many different ways and usually, it started off ~~xxxx~~ some way with the insight that got reaffirmed in that ~~xxxx~~ legal commission back in the winter quarter, that you and I ~~xx~~ live off the 20th Century insight that ~~xx~~ creativity does not come out of relaxation, but creativity comes out of intensification of tension. That is that we recognize what for creativity of an individual, or the creativity of a group or a movement in history to be released, that there be a self-conscious decision to embrace the tension, or the complexity that is the givenness of our time. And it's that very ~~the~~ tension that births the creativity, that births the future. But the birth only occurs, ~~xxx~~ you might

want to say, with the complexity or the intensification of the tension itself, not with the relaxation. And I guess that's something that we just operate on an unconsciously and until we get it stated to ourselves that that is sort of the style by which we operate, and it ~~is/comes out of~~ comes out of our common life. Or, ~~is/comes out of~~ our polity is not created in abstraction, as some kind of experiment. I mean it is an experiment, it comes out of our life together, and it comes out of our engagement in a missional task. And we would want to suggest that the only reason that we ~~had~~ raise the issue of Polity now ~~is/has~~ and you know that ~~there~~ there have been times that we have just bracketed it, and just said we will deal with that later. The reason we deal with it now has to do with the whole issue of how it is that we go about the task of maintaining one thrust, in this whole globe. That we don't get fragmented, or so split up or diversified that we lose chastity of our mission. And that we hold to a global commonness. and that is the real question, as I am sure all of you at one time or another have encountered it, and particularly as we turn to the world.

to carry out a whole new dimension of our task. And then he indicates that our whole polity

got built on the basis of consensus, that is that we set out quite intentionally <sup>set out</sup> to cut over against

any architectonic structure that was characteristic of the society that we've got and I think which

is well integrated in many, many different ways and that tend to be dehumanized. We have said a

NO to that, now on the other side of saying no to that, what happens is what kind of a model do we bring

in, what kind of basis do we operate on. You know, we've operated on consensus and that's been perhaps

the gift of our whole polity. And then that's gone in to usually a discussion of the various relation-  
about

ships of the various parts of the form or the structure that our polity has led us to and you might

remember that this has been laid out to us before, that we had an image of the houses, say the areas

representing one aspect of the tensional dynamic that we build into polity and that the areas were

constructed out of our existential engagement in the mission, that is to say that we've decided to work

on the basis after we'd tried continents and/regions and just found that in terms of the task that we'd tried

had to be done that this gave us a far more effective way of approaching our task and/

created a whole new network of global machinery, if you will in order to get the task done, to get

RS-1 presented to every last fat lady and to get the methods to people so that they could determine

their own destiny. You're familiar with that, well that is to say that the area is that which holds

a particular function in creating a tension that is global-local and local-global or the tension itself

between centrum and the area, and I want to say that maybe we characterize the area this way: That it

is first of all a dynamic. And there are about 54 areas and it is determined primarily on the basis of

geography, though certainly we approach it in terms of the geo-social dynamic, with the emphasis would

be on the Geo of that tension, that is we say there are 54. By contrast there is one Centrum. And its

emphasis would be on the Socio side of that Geo-social dynamic. The area is that which enables engagement



for the sake of enabling that engagement. You think of For the sake of serving the local, and in order to do that, the emphasis is on the global. I don't know whether that comes to across very clearly or not.

Out of that kind of struggle with that kind of dynamic. Although we have got to find a way of being

clear that there is a particular function of that is built in to the kind of polity dynamic that we are creating. And we want to say that which holds all of this together, now, I will

put this out in terms of say, we have had Chicago, and London, and maybe Hong Kong and Bombay, and

within that centrum there would be four dynamics, that is \_\_\_\_\_ research and development and operations

and management. And we could envision that as of this fall, we would have that for such as

manifestation of the one global dynamic that is the centrum and they'd have to set foot somewhere

and they'd set foot ~~anywhere~~ ~~anywhere~~ ~~anywhere~~ on the basis not of some abstract geographical approach to the

world but rather on the basis of missional necessity. The only reason that you'd want to put a centrum into

is to enable that continent to take off, the only reason you'd ever want to put a centrum into

Hong Kong is to sustain the task that's being carried off there. And it might be, you see, that a centrum

would show up maybe sometimes on a continental basis, sometimes on a  $\mu$  sphere, sometimes on an area,

I mean, that's just a possibility. And so it's \_\_\_\_\_ a sphere in terms of its

sociological dynamic and not its geographical location. To move fairly quickly here, we have had a  
commission

that are most closely related to the centrum dynamic. And those commissions are part of

our polity structure and you can envision that wherever you have a centrum with the manifestation of

these four internal dynamics that you would have the commission. And right now they show up in the form

of the assignment commission, a fiscal commission, a legal commission, and maybe what we call a personnel commission. And there might be others that would be necessitated at some time in the future. The commission is a temporary structure that's brought into being in order to get a specific task done.

But it might be that some of those tasks are ongoing and those commissions go on forever and ever.

OR it might be that we would bring a commission into being to get a particular task done and then it not meet for five years. But it has an advisory capacity and its whole purpose is to build practical

models that give guidelines to the mission to the movement and to the order. Or it's out to defend the existence of the order or they guard the practical they guide engagement. and they focus expertise and all of that for the sake of unblocking that which prevents mission engagement

and then we've imagined here what we call the Panchayat worked a little bit on another model that

we'll put into your hands as soon as we get it printed up. that would indicate to me the kind of stew that needs to go on the kind of thinking that we have of getting a hold of it and maybe this is

not going to be adequate to hold the imagery of the dynamic of the area the commission and the Panchayat

and the Centrum but the Panchayat is so much a part of the decision making process of the order. Now the

other side of that you have to say that its function has to do with sort of eschatological symbolic role

or its hold the eschatological it has a very particular task ~~of~~ that is it's out to build <sup>the</sup> ~~to~~ practically/

vision for the whole order and it would be out to guard the comprehensive to care for the symbolic and

defend the deeps and to be a presence of the mission. and it has a very practical function which is

part

of I suppose a priorship ~~function~~ dynamic and that is it is to make temporary decisions to

consensus on temporary decisions ~~in~~ that if its necessary for the whole body to move on than they

become consensed or temporary decisions that unblock the missional engagement and you know that's <sup>what</sup> ~~the~~

picked out of self we ~~are~~ quite ~~un~~consciously I think from Tiazé where they have reached back into some of

the dynamics of order life and kind of hold that the prior the abbot is ~~the~~ <sup>or what ever</sup> ~~the~~ appointed to make

decisions on behalf of the whole body when the whole body can't make it s decisions so that it can be about

it task. and I suppose the Panchayat would have that function and I'm sure that as we move we are going

to ~~W&W/14~~ cover a greater clarity as to what the Panchayat is and how it functions in the light of

th

the decision-making process. But it has to do with symbolic power it has to do with carrying off the

function which is not unlike the Queen of England. that is she doesn't go out and rip up all the programs

she doesn't doesn't pres sent bills she might suggest certain things and then the work is hammered out in

the various committees in the parliament and when the bill is finally voted upon it's presented for her

stamp of approval and that's a symbolic act and when that act is carried out it be-comes the law of the land

It has something to do with that symbolic function, without which society is not going to be held together.

and in fact you could take the kind of ~~W&W/14~~ analysis that comes from Plato about the dynamic of society

that he saw in terms of the monarchy and oligarchy and the democracy and you might take that kind of

use it

dynamic ~~W&W/14~~ ~~W&W/14~~ ~~W&W/14~~ as a tool to analyze what in the world is going on today. and surely you

might discern that the symbolic in a way is radically collapsed. How is it that we hold the symbolic?

within our own day? or is it that we hold the tension between those dynamics? I suppose that one of t

the ways that we deal with this whole question of oligarchy or those within our midst ~~that~~ <sup>which</sup> serve the

function of holding a common wisdom and it's only as we get the corporate body together that we have the

power ~~of~~ of the corporate wisdom. Well the way in which we avoid the danger of some kind of aristocracy

is that we constantly the task of building common memory or that is to day that the way you avoid an

aristocracy is to build everybody in the order into that aristocracy or you blow the bottom out of

any possibility of ~~elitism~~ democracy and that is you build your common memory and that perhaps

is one thing that will counteract the danger. And then of course the voice of the people ~~is~~ or everybody's

wisdom is built into the decision-making process. that it's not on the basis of any voting procedure or

on the basis of one man or one vote or it's not even done representationally and might want to comment

about that in a moment But it's this particular form that we have decided to create or to come up out of

our missional engagement <sup>but</sup> o You can talk about it out of the rationality of the Platonistic approach to society

It has an effect on our existential encounter with life itself and the whole task that we have before us

and you have built in four structures that is to say we have come up with the area, the Panchayat,

the Centrum and then the commission. and it's when the work in kind of a tensional of ~~dynamic~~ dynamic that

you have the possibility of creating ~~the~~ new polity structure in history. and the way that that kind of

dynamic works is that we have certain common global operating principles that there isn't anyone in the

world that can come in from ~~the~~ an area outside that area and tell it what it's mission is or that

those that are engaged in that missional task ~~the~~ have defined what that task is and how they are

going to go about it if you just stop there, why we'd be dead ~~the~~ but what you find is that there are more

of them these areas would be going off doing there own thing the tension is the Centrum is going to have to

hold that area accountable to operating out of the global consensus it's ~~the~~ design/~~the~~ ~~the~~ ~~the~~

it's task ~~the~~ is to hold accountable also to the task it has laid out to itself the same way that the

accountability goes the other way that the area holds the Centrum accountable for it's being the servant

the enablement the backup to see that that missional task gets completed or is engaged in. well in brief

that's a rough outline that we'd carried and dealt with relative to the structures of polity where we raise

the questions of what is it that acts as the glue for our polity structure and that simply is the

what I called trust or that's where I attempt to recapture that term - trust - and that trust has more

aspects to it that is the trust in yourself that is to say that the polity structure of the order is

dependent upon you trusting yourself I mean who is it that decided that you'd be here? You decided that

you'd be here, nobody else. You'd decided very much where it is you'd be assigned now the only question

you have is whether you're going to decide to trust your own decisions or ~~whether~~ whether you're going

to trust ~~you~~ the decision to be where ~~you/are~~ It is that you are. We had a fellow come to the house a

short time ago, a couple of quarters ago now, and he said he wanted to be a sojourner and he'd been a

sojourner in a couple of other houses, I found out later. well sure he was to be a sojourner, He ~~did~~

said I'd sure like to be an intern but I don't have, can never make a decision like that. So he sojournered.

WE said all right two weeks and then you can reconsider a chance to think it over. Well at the end of two weeks, he said I'd sure like to be an Intern (by the way in the mean time he had tagged everybody in the

house in a private conversation in how I in the world did you ever ~~make a decision~~ decide to be an

Intern? You know. How did you ever make that decision and at the end of the two weeks we had a chance to

talk a bit and he said I sure would like to decide to be an Intern (he's been to Academy by the way)

In other words he knew all that we knew. He said I sure would like to Intern, but I don't see how I could

ever make that kind of a decision. Maybe if I could sojourn for a month longer. Well that were certain other

kind of dynamics going on ~~that~~ there that made it valuable for us at that time to say "Sure". Well, I mean

One day, just about ~~what~~ ~~was~~ ~~you~~ ~~was~~ ~~doing~~ / I don't know how I could ever decide to do that, and I

said well you know what have you been going for the past 6 or 7 weeks "Well I've been in this house, I've

been living here and I said "You've been working here?" and he said "Yes" and you've been under full-time

assignment? "Yes" You've born responsibility for the whole house? Yes. And I mean he had. I said well you've

The Point is that he was there ~~for the whole thing~~ to consider the whole function

of ~~his~~ being an intern, he didn't question those decisions to be where he was. But there is no reason for griping or having any question of where you are ~~if~~ you decided to be there and you can trust that decision.

The other thing you trust is you trust your colleagues. Now I mean that. You trust your colleagues. Not out of some idealistic picture of what you would like for them to be but you trust them for what they are.

Therefore, when you do that you avoid stupidity. You don't make any stupid images, You know who they are and you trust them to be ~~what~~ <sup>who</sup> they are but then in fact you trust your whole life to your colleagues that

is what it means I suppose when

and then once they've got it built sit down and take pot shots at it or somebody will start criticizing it or the next day somebody will say "Well I don't quite think we can do this way, all is a way of avoiding

the implementation of the model, and that's to say a lack of trust in the model. When you ~~will~~ build that model and decide to go with it, you go with it until that model screens to be changed and then you change it.



that the common memory gets built? Or is it ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~mission~~ ~~the~~ ~~kind~~ ~~of~~ thing, well it's the kind of

thing that Rich Jones did up here the other night I mean consensus was being built <sup>when he</sup> ~~as he stood up here~~ and

read that poem by Mao. I mean consensus gets built by the decor around here. Consensus gets built by our

rituals. Consensus gets built by Daily Office, <sup>and by</sup> Collegium, and <sup>by</sup> House Church. It gets built by PSU's and

<sup>by</sup> workshops and by model-building sessions. It gets built <sup>in</sup> by virtually everything that we do. You wonder

why we have been sort of insistant upon ourselves about being up there for Daily Office - it's not simply a

to puff us up, my God that gives us the whole foundational <sup>any</sup> dimension of decision we make to be missional

Or why is <sup>it</sup> so necessary for us to be in Collegium every morning when we'd rather be sleeping? It's because

it's therethat common memory that gets built out of which we make the missional decisions. I mean polity

and consensus goes on in <sup>the</sup> ~~the~~ midst of a scripture conversation in the morning, in the midst of our news

conversation, or you could say in the midst of the conversations that go on around the edges that is going on

all the time and the consensus is being built over a long process of time it isn't just being build when

somebody stands up and announces that the common wind is, well, I guess that is part of

would ~~we~~ need to move in the further articulation of it.. As I have reflected ~~with~~ a bit on what this

work of polity has done the method ~~of~~ <sup>by</sup> which we've gone about it, that is , going across the globe and being

~~we~~ in contact with our colleagues in every area, ~~and~~ there are a few things that have come to my mind that

I ~~just~~ want to put out before you, ~~one~~ <sup>NOT</sup> is some ~~final~~ kind of final mandatory ~~with~~ thing, requirement, but

just somethings that I've been stewing on. and I want to use this as the time to have all of us just participate

selfconsciously in the kind of creation of the articulation of a new ~~polity~~ <sup>common</sup> polity structure because the whole basis

of our moving in this ~~with~~ direction is not simply that we will ~~not~~ <sup>be</sup> certainly ~~not~~ <sup>NOT</sup> efficient, or even, ~~not~~ <sup>not</sup> effective,

<sup>I mean</sup> ~~but~~ in the first instance we are not out to do this for ourselves, we do this as an on-behalf-of action

that we use ourselves to do it on. That is we do it on behalf of local communities that are being raised

across this continent across the globe. We do it on behalf of corporations, <sup>on behalf of</sup> nations, on behalf of the church

and we are out to engage in that creation of polity out of that self-understanding, but first just a few

reflections that as I've tried to put a hair as

as something that would enable something that we can bounce off of in order to get some things of our polity

stated. <sup>One</sup> All of the things that happened in the course of that trip was the building of the practical vision

and Neal has a great presentation that will fill us in on <sup>that</sup> what we're out to hold a global commonality.

I suppose there was the task of even prioritizing among problems, or that is to say, to guard the comprehensive,

to defend the deeps, and to defend the symbolic. <sup>For at we were just</sup> ~~the~~ times <sup>as</sup> lending objectivity, acting <sup>as</sup> a sounding board

to others and yes the whole question of accountability was there. But that ~~kind of~~ accountability was usually

symbolic, sometimes it has to be ruthless in terms of the external task and in terms of the internal care of

~~kind of~~ of the spirit. and the internal care of the practical <sup>life of</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>work</sup> the house, like finances. Well, I hope

we get very clear for whatever the implications <sup>it has</sup> are for the future that we be very clear that that team you

sent out was no inspection team. I mean we were not about the job of inspection, we were not about the task

<sup>Trying to go out use some kind of</sup> of ~~setting some~~ super vision for checking up on anybody. My God, whenever I have heard any intimation of that

thing I see red. That's architectonic thinking that's bureaucratic thinking and I mean we stand over against

at every point. In no way ~~will~~ we ~~ask~~/~~you~~/~~to~~/~~carry~~ out to ever carry off any kind of inspection My God, we're

hopefully beyond using that kind of thinking. ~~We~~/~~do~~/~~you~~/~~discern~~ where the edge is? and to share we might have

seen or heard the edge articulated elsewhere. ~~set~~ out to build a common memory/ I mean to tell you it's a

tragic thing when you go around and see ~~how~~/~~many~~/~~people~~/~~do~~/~~not~~/~~know~~/~~do~~/~~not~~/~~know~~ what the largest

Cedar bucket factory ~~in~~/~~the~~/~~whole~~/~~world~~ is . Can you imagine, I mean that's a vital link in our

common memory. Is there anyone here who knows? It's a cedar bucket factory. where they make cedar buckets!!

I mean common memory is crucial. So how do you engender ~~the~~/~~global~~/~~consensus~~? My god when you think of

the expansiveness - I don't know how many there are now in this order - I've heard many different estimates

I know by the way that we had the privilege of ~~meeting~~/~~the~~/~~eldest~~/~~person~~/~~in~~/~~the~~/~~order~~, Joseph's mother

in Hyderabad. I think she's either 82 or 83 years old. and I mean she's the first one up for daily office.

Well anyway, also ~~when~~ within that the whole function of it had to do with some practical research, with

personal care. I suppose we carried out not only a Panchayat function but we carried out ~~it~~ I suppose a

commission function and certainly assignments were a critical question that got raised. And that's part of

the function of the symbolic to raise that It's a strange thing the way people respond to assignments

I mean one thing that just became clear to me once anybody is able to go anywhere and doesn't have to be some  
wh

where, or once one is able to do anything, and doesn't have to be somebody, my God he can virtually ~~WGN~~

write his own ticket in t ks outfit. But anytime you have to be someplace or have to be somebody well then

you can expect the wisdom of your colleagues to be brought to bear. I mean that's the way we care. But

it's a strange thing to view the responses to assignments and ~~WGN~~ we did deal with the whole question of

<sup>I</sup> ~~YOU'LL~~ see tomorrow some of the break ~~WGN~~ loses that globalization and communization  
fiscal policy. and ~~WGN~~

of those policies. We were carrying out I suppose a Panchayat function, a commission function, and I

suppose a little bit of development and research went on and had to do with operations as well, and then

had to do with the practical visioning of the areas. I suppose that in all of this the one thing I want

to be clear with you, is a reflection on this business of the area Centrum. Now this is just to spin a

little. I To move Areally and to move in terms of creating Centrums is not to move in the direction of decentralization. I heard <sup>that several times</sup> that that's what in fact we were doing

I want to say that what we are doing when we move globally, and we cut across any kind of archtectonics or beauracratc thinking when we move areally and when we move to creastecentrums around the globe

we're centralizing or that is we are enabling local man to get focus and to get <sup>that</sup> expended in terms of the one globe he has on his hands. It's only when we get trapped in some kind of archtecture or

beauracratc thinking that we can ever begin to use <sup>any</sup> other kind of language. I have a few reflections

also about terminology and I don't know maybe it's to far down the line to even think killing the old

area prior, I mean killing the term of the area prior. *WJ* we need to clean up our language or clean up

our terminology so that we can get cleaned out of our almost unconscious archtecture thinking. I

don't know when we began <sup>just</sup> to talk about global priors and the global priors are assigned to the

centrums and to the houses but we don't even have, maybe we just do away with the whole term, area priors