

Summer 72 Prep
Research Assembly

June 19, 1972
Spirit Life

J. W. MATHEWS: OTHER WORLD LECTURE CONTEXT

Well maybe you will be happy to hear me say that I am going to do only one of those and that is the Land of Mystery. I will try to walk through the other three tomorrow. I do not intend to give these other lectures--that is your business. I mean to walk through them and my particular concern will be internal relationships between the lectures and somewhat of the internal flow within a lecture. But, I do not mean in any way what so ever to be building the lecture. And also because I am going to be spinning--you feel free to stop me at any point with questions. What we are out for is clarity--initial clarity for us to get started as a group.

Now hopefully you have before you Area A and some of you can of course be looking at the chart. I now wish that I had had brains enough to have had across here the land - is that one strip up in room 216? Is it on the wall--don't need all of it, just the top strip. Even though it is antiquated, it will be better than nothing. Then the second thing that you ought to have before you right now is these paragraphs, and the third thing are these sentences in which all of the abstract categories of the states of being in "A" are articulated. What they have done is as you well know is that this row here--the reflective, the content, is your key that unlocks the whole thing and holds its together. And the sentences are behind each one of these states of being. They are only --you have only had them passed out through the Land of the Mystery. They were here in your folders passed out when you arrived. They have the famous Amy Hilliard chart on the front of them.

Now then if you will look at these titles and on this follow me for a little bit. George West I think it was, put very clearly if you draw

a line right through the middle of these right after the subjective declaration--you will see that you really have two sides here. And this over here on this side is more dramaturgical and this is more descriptive. And then in the part to the left as you face it ~~xxx~~ there, you have the ~~Subjective~~ Objective Pronouncement and these -- the four of them ~~go~~ up and down in each one of these boxes really intend to be one modern type of a ~~subjective~~ ~~intended~~ the subject. It is like if you were going to come in sentence--where you are not interested in verb structure and sentence structure--but it holds together the thought. And the one over here called Subjective Declaration is the -- and this is said objectively on behalf of the world--this is said on behalf of your own interior experience. It ought to be the same thing. And then with the titles, exactly the same -- one is called you and me (that is for the outsider as well as yourself) and these are the movie titles on the marquee. And then this one is a statement of awareness-- it is sort of a movie title if you made your own movie which as a reflection to yourself and the only one who went to see it was yourself and that is why this is a dangerous category for your songs--do you understand that. When I spot one of those I get a pencil through it in a hurry. Like--I am a moral man. Why, the first thing you have got to say to that is -- horseshit. And by the time you get that said in the song -- the rest of them are way down the road. It's hard to sing. You have to be careful to that one. And then here is the more reflective -- and as you remember the one to the right -- called the concept that is the key. That is just what abstract idea you are pointing to and then the one to the left of that which is entitled the subject. It is like if you were going to come in and give a lecture. You would say, Ladies and gentlemen, the subject

of my lecture is today--and then you would say that (title). Again both of them are objective. And you will see in a moment where both of these came from.

And the affective. And the one moves toward --more towards the analogical--"like being" -- and the other is a more direct attempt to directly articulate a subtle emotion. But both of them deal with the affective. You might call this one like being an affective analogy. And then you move more head on into a pure metaphor. Or an analogy-- and I suppose we ought to change that word analogy there to metaphor though both of them dictionary wise fit what is going on there. Any questions about these? (Question) It is more an attempt to directly articulate a subtle emotion and the other one "like being" is where you are after not a rational but an affective analogy. "Like being mortally stunned." And this means the one on the left as you face the page more subjective and the one on the right more objective as you can see. But don't take those words seriously relative to the Other World ever. (Question) "I had a little tea party this afternoon at three. It was very small-- just three guests in all. Just I, myself and me. Myself ate up the sandwiches while I drank up the tea. 'Twas also I who ate the pie and passed the cake to me." Is that enough?

The one on your left The "you and me" -- you know this is the way it is with all men and the other one is very private like "I am a condemned man". Now that is a motion picture--but it is about me, I make it and I am the only one who pays to get in to see it. It is something like that. It is like one of those very restricted sex films that only certain people can go--you have to over, I don't know. It is about as fearful as that--you don't want to go yelling that column too much. Any other questions on that?

Now let us just look a little bit--all of this is to help us do our thinking today. And obviously--all of us are going to have to do these lectures for ourselves and the people who are going to have to give them this summer--we will have to be thinking together.

Several just little clues. It is extremely difficult this translation job from the intellectual concepts to the being states. These are little clues.

One must always be thinking of the great theological ideas that are in your mind and through these and an ancient ancestor who was the first one down in himself within a huge cloud of awe~~xxx~~ that beheld My, God -- All is Mystery. Can you get back to that? Or, My God, There aren't any LIMITS. And that means to get a hold of one of these states you have to rehearse the whole journey of man because when you get into the theology of where you have a word like Omnipotent, and God be praised that is an abstraction of an abstraction of an abstraction. You have got to work back through it to that state of being that that first ancient ancestor was rocked with and there is no great theological idea where that did not happen. Theology did not come this way (down) it came this way (up). Now that is one of the guidelines--to repeat the journey of man.

Then I used as one of my ~~guidelin~~ guidelines the scripture--The Christian scripture. I want to be able to point to the scriptures--like the Jacov story and be able to say--Do you want to know what I am talking about--that is it! Then secondly, in the scriptures. I decided--Jesus, Jesus, Jesus. If I don't point to something in the scriptures and say there that fits and that fits in Jesus' life, then I am very very suspicious. And then if I can't point to it in my own ~~wx~~ life--which is to say that every one has experienced every one of these states or they are wrong. Even

though a person does not know that he has participated in them--
until someone gives a lecture and articulates that state. And that
is the role of the Church in history--that is declaring the Word in
History as we well know.

And then another key that I just clubbed myself with: INDICATIVE,
INDICATIVE, INDICATIVE. If there is anything that even remotely smells
of imperative, then I know that it is wrong. Which is to say, that
you have to condition yourself to think ontologically and not morally
and that is very hard. But by the effort--by forcing on myself the
indicative mode in each case that was of help to me.

Now remember that you are thinking phenomenologically and this
is an over simplification. This is me and this is the World. I will
not go on into the Kantian epistemology that is behind this but, in
me (make this very simple). I have within me I have what we have called
experiences--states of consciousness. Now metaphysics was very interested
in grounded or relating these states to the world which is forced them
to build their metaphysical system. Now phenomenology intentionally
brackets this question. It deals with states of consciousness--you must
keep that in mind. You are not checking your states of consciousness
against a metaphysical system. When you think phenomenologically--al-
though and don't take this seriously--it is another thing and I get
uneasy and want to qualify this. You and I have gone much further than
we know which up as far as I am aware and mark you I feel like a child
here, we have gone a long way toward another step--maybe in phenomenology.
And that is, to grasp that metaphysics is the dramatic articulation of
the interior play and therefore are working back through metaphysics to
that state of being that is behind. Now you go that when you have a
world-view or a posture in life that is against the metaphysics of the

past that fundamentally said that this world is Rational. And what I said, in my opinion, was extremely important, but not in this moment in what I am doing. And we may have something far beyond what we imagine here. This has to do with mythology as you can readily see. Anyway. (Question) It is the new essentialism. Oh God, help us. It has to do with the philosophy of history in our time. Here is the past in terms of a particular present, the past is transformed into that. And in the light of a particular ~~present~~ present, the past, all of it is transformed into that. Do you see my pictures. And in one of our courses--it is in history--we deal with this historical method. Now in terms of what I am talking about here and I will over-simplify this--up to now and this is an over simplification, man grasped reality to be rational. And I am talking about Western civilization and particularly one strain that conquered Western civilization. Now and this is over-simplification, we think phenomenologically. Which is a form of positivism, which means that we go back to this interpretation of life which is rational and de-rationalize it--into what we perceive here as states of being which gives us this particular pattern. And this then is the new essentialism. Well maybe--you see the direction of my thinking. (Marshall comment) (One way to say that--up until now man did not perceive of consciousness and rationality as different--he used the same word for both of them.. Now we make a distinction between them--as rationality is a form given to consciousness rather than consciousness itself. So we have consciousness pulled out as an entirely separate category.) Exactly -- and this is one of the crucial keys to the Other World in our time--what was said there. (Question) Relate that to the trough you were talking about yesterday. Oh my yes, way back up here--oh you know, a prophet can see across --you understand that, when you are going down on a way--the prophet can see across to

to the up beat. Artists way back up here or the prophets, whatever form you think of them in (And if you don't think of an artist as some assassin painter--but a prophet is an artist, and there are some painters that are not prophets) but most they saw your turning point. Now the turning point is the beginning of a new essentialism or a new rationalism. Only you don't want to call it rationalism--like every one of us have known for a long time that we were dealing with a new metaphysics but we didn't want to call it metaphysics because these bastards back here called it metaphysics, not a metaphysics but metaphysics. That is one reason why you have to invent categories. So your turn, yes, is beginning to see philosophical ground. But these here are your pioneer philosophers -- by the time you get to a Thomas Aquinas or a John Dewey you already on the way back. The guy who pulls it all together rather than Bang, shoots it out that way.

And I am going on with some more of these kinds of checks--but to get all of that crap out of the way which ruins my point--which is in phenomenological thinking--that you bracket any kind of a rational scheme or a metaphysics--you bracket that question. You bracket the problem as to ~~be~~ whether or not you can square a circle. You don't care about that.

Now, and boy this is hard. The next thing you have to say to yourself is straight on what in the hell a state of being is. Now this isn't good--and I haven't had time to refine it--but I think it is right. What I mean by a state of being is: A dramaturgical awareness and a rudimentary feeling grounded in the Mystery on one hand and the ~~picture~~ picture the image of Mystery, and the rudimentary affection of fear and fascination on the other which come as indicative which transcend the indicative, imperative relation and which involves or includes a radical or existential

resolve beyond the process of deciding itself. Period. The rest of it is just in development and which would do you more harm than good. Do me more harm than good.

Now a state of being is a "think", a "feel", and a "resolve" or it is a picture, an emotion, indicative. Maybe I want to say the last picture, the last emotion, or maybe it is the first better even. But on this level obviously first and last means the same thing. Now in your mind for just a second you have got to come to the Mystery thing--and that is hard. Oh I think in the lecture-- I think I make this clear. But if Mystery is nothing--then you can't be present to nothing save you get a think of Nothing. Get a think of Nothing. And like a dictionary won't help you one iota-- your look up Mystery and it will say something like unknown. It won't help you on this. And you are not talking about the Mystery that tomorrow will go away--and in the encounter one thing that happens relative to now trying to articulate states of being is that you have a think--if I can use that word. Suddenly you have a think. It is like you say--My God, there is nothing there but nothing. That is a think. That is what I mean when I say a think. My, God, finally everything is mystery. That is a think. No, that is not a good word. Call it a radical ask think. Or call it the last think. Or call it the first think. Or call it the Alpha and the Omega. Or the beginning and the end. You can see that other people have fooled with this.

Coincidental with this think that you have is a feel. And this is your radical feel--mystery is a foundational feeling--it is a foundational feel. It is the primordial feel. That is the father and the mother of every feel you have ever had. And the name of this great radical feel is AWE. help you on this. And you are not talking about the Mystery that tomorrow will go away--and in the encounter one thing that happens

And whoever invented that word, was great. And the awe is made up of fear and fascination and it is never one without the other.

Now and with that and those of you have been around a long time know that this is simply a deepening of a long ago thing of the image the existential question and the accompanying question--down underneath that syndrome. By which we defined what we called a mode or a mood as a part of a lecture--or the introduction of the the picture of Guernica.

Now then the indicative. This is the decision. This is the thing Palacious that Augustine and ~~Ignatius~~ wrestled with. And mark you, I am a Methodist in the Aramenian tradition which goes back to Palacious and so I am now speaking Calvinistically. I have improved. And the point of it is that for Augustine that there is a resolve behind any decision --no, say there is a reolve, a decision is not possible is what he saw. It is a relational universe to put it in our language. And a decision is --that is underneath the decision is always an appropriation of an indicative which becomes the indicative of your life. Now we are not only saying that this becomes my indicative, we are saying that this is THE Indicative but we are saying it through our experience of life. That the indicative is just one thing--with two heads the think, the mighty think of the Final Mystery and the mighty feel of AWE. Here is the root, the ground of consciousness itself. Which we have been over many times before.

Now that for me is what I mean by a state of being up to this moment in my life without which I ~~cannot~~ cannot describe any one of these states of being. And I want also to say not simply out of insecurity-- but I mean I am sweating full of insecurity, that what I have done is not very good. But I do believe that it is in the right direction.

(Marshall comment) Wesley's paper uses these categories: the natural man, the legal man and the evangelical man. Light, feel and will are his categories.

(Question) Response: This thinking was before the visit constructs.

(Question) Response: I am going to say now what you have to say, and then I am going to answer his question. You know what you have to say, the answer is yes that is all the states of being--there are no other states of being, except what could be subsumed under those categories which means already involved in them. Just period. Now you have to qualify that--out of humility and this a part of our time. We live in a moment of history now you know that--but when you deal on this level--humanness is humanness, but that is not states of being there, that is the articulation of states of being there and therefore it smells of time. And the other humble thing that you have to say, (and that doesn't mean that you take them any less seriously--that doesn't mean that you flipped a nickel to get--That is it for all time) but you are dealing with humanness --but you are standing in the 20th Century dealing with humanness which never heard of the 20th Century. The other humility is that you have to say, My God, how myopic--or you have to be sure that you get sin bait into it. That would be my answer.

Now this has something to do with this very question. And if I were going to give the lecture, I would hit this. This other world has been hidden for 500 hundred years and I think that I maybe symbolically would go back to the 11th century and to say that it began to fade then. And always qualifying this--of course, God's name is always remembered and his Presence is always present but with the coming of Protestantism, it was gone. And again, and in your lecture you don't want to do this but just so we don't go out and make smart asses out of ourselves, why of course, Protestantism--but when you think of the sweeps of history, your terms are strong. We have not know this. It is a rediscovery in our times. And what

And what it is --one way of putting what it is is the recovery of space--spacial images. And I talked with you the other day about all of our lifetime within the church and withing theology --we were concerned with temporal images and that had to be. It is like we said earlier in the lectures that this moment in history wasn't the new time--it was the finishing, the completion of the Protestant Reformation of which my mind, Vatican II signals it is done. The great theological job is done. Which swept aside then what was in glory so that you could move to the new and new is to recover space. Time has to with when you emphasize the poetry of time in terms of the areas we are thinking of -- it is the Protestant principle, of course. And the masculine principle,--well I could get off into male and female ontology here. But I had better not at the moment. And when you emphasize the spacial pole --the spacial poetry, you are dealing with the Catholic substance, or it is the existential and the ontological and the one cannot be without the other. The emphasis of one finally discloses the other. And it seems to me that that is crucial. I recommend for your reading that book of Niehurs, The Other World, it helped me a little bit there. (Toward A New Other Worldliness)

And in my lecture I would be pleased to come to this point-- oh yes, this is a better one, but don't ever copy down this words this is antiquated. In the lecture, in our day, our time has broken loose four unbelievable areas or has had four masterful images about man. And they are, The discovery of Mystery. Though you need to really spin this--I would say that this has been their greatest discovery. But the Mystery has been almost a mysterious discovery. I say science has done the most for it--but man has discovered the --as if he has never

known it before--the mystery. And the second great thing that he has discovered is freedom and here is your whole existential thrust. And the third thing that he has discovered is Agape. And the fourth great thing he has discovered which is the last and it will be ten years before you will see it written all over every thing is happiness. What I am trying to say by this is that what we are doing here is grounded in our times and the last one--it is just beginning to seep through but I have heard more in the last week about its seeping through than I realized was possible.

Now that is crucial. That is one of your check marks. It is the flip side of this and if you don't see that going on in the world it is wrong--and that means every man and not simply the church or what you are doing with the chart is pulling tog ether and pushing to do radically simply the great insights about humanness that have broken loose in our time. And my Lord, you can take the youth culture, you can take th hippies and trace it right through here beginning to end--in all of there ignorance , not knowing what they were doing.

Then this means that we are to the place--and Oh, what a glorious ~~thing~~ thing this is. Somebody comes up to you and says, What is life all about? Why, brother, that is simple and obvious. Life is only and totally all about mystery, and freedom and (boy, I wish I could use this word) love, and happiness. And when you say that, there is nothing left over--that is what life is all about. Or, what is life all about? Life is all about God, and The Self, and This World and Death. And about three more of these that you could go through. The point here is that this is grounded in the totally of humanness--or all of humanmass is encompassed in that or it is wrong. Questions in this category.

Now when you get to there, it is time in your overall context to deal with the loyalty of what you are doing with and to the undergirding, maybe inclusive awareness of our time of change. Or that life is dynamic which is another way of talking about the poetry of time. And I don't want to do this in detail, but if you don't answer that question you are out on cloud nine, rather than in the midst of this world.

Now maybe space and time, if you will think of those two words, if will help you best. I dealt with those problems in this way--in these four areas. The awe of the mystery occurs in the concrete given. Always. Nobody every experienced awe except in the concrete givenness of temporality and this is always towards the future. It deals with the novel, the perpetually new. What I am getting trying to say, that your encounter with temporality is ~~always~~ never backwards, it is always forwards. Or if it were backwards, you would never experience the awe. When you think that you encounter backwards, no, no, that is something going on in your head. That is to say, Julius Ceasear never stuck a sword through me, but if I get a sword stuck through me, I can get a hold of Ceasears' sword going through me--if that makes sense to you. And the awe, is the difference between illusions and the other world. There must be nothing illusory about this whatsoever. That is it only comes when Bang, Bang. And this moment, do you know, that pushed him toward the future. Do you understand that. The present is always turned that way. And that keeps the dynamic as ever against some once and for all static world here in the other world.

Freedom, this is the second one. It is an easy one. Freedom is the propensity towards the future. And consciousness and freedom are two sides of the same coin or the same thing. It is creating the not yet.

Consciousness is always concerned with the future. Even if consciousness is busy thinking about how Moses got over that Red Sea, even though we live in illusions, about that, is dealing with the future.

Now the third one, which is universal responsibility. This is for the actual world. What I am trying to say, is that even though you have to use inclusive terms, the responsibility, the agape is never an abstraction. It is always real and related to the concretions of this world. This agape has to do with concern of the people who were suffering in the war of Nigeria. It is always this kind of concretion. For it is embracing the world as it is, not some abstract image of the world. And the last one.

This is harder for me to say. The peace that is in the Mystery is in the problemlessness. But it is problemlessness in the midst of the real and awful world --the real woes of life. Plus taking upon yourself all of the problems of every body else in the world. This again is towards the future. When you say you don't have any personal problems, you are saying that while the telephone rings and says, Mr. Mathews your son is in jail. That is when you don't have any problems not some other time. And that again is shoving you towards the future. This problemlessness is a perpetual treadmill towards the future. Or it is the call on the phone which says your son is in a hospital and very likely is going to die. Then you know that you have no problems and no place else. I don't know whether I have done this well--but I think that these are the things that have to be stated.

I am going to start quickly to walk through that--but I will stop for any questions. I think there is stuff here for an exciting lecture as well as one that just has to be given. (Question, comments) Oh yes, the relationships--I am going to relate and weave all of these together a little later. Yes, I think so. It is obvious--we your

third term idea of Hienkegaard that the mystery and the self come into being together. So that in the first part you are only dealing with the great think of the Mystery. Actually with the great think of the Mystery is the first great think of EB. And then, as Gene put it, though that is harder to get said, it is exactly the same flip. The moment that you grasp yourself as grasped by agape, the flip side of that is seizure of bliss of happiness or a sense of fulfillment. Now this our fathers saw from the very beginning that only when you love, but I don't mean love, I mean agape, only when you are seized by divine love, for this world, then you are immediately seized to happiness. Or to put it in the other language, and incidental to the great think of divine love is the great think of what a moment to die. All is fulfilled. That one think is that that you ever wanted in life. And that is another great think.

(Question) Light and dark side of God. I have grave problems here-- you know if I pull off and say that the dark side of God's face is turned and it has been there for 500 ~~million~~ or more years when you lost the awareness of the other world and the light side is when we are regaining it, that is pretty easy. It is become a little more difficult when I have to deal with what I have to call kyrotic moment in which the awe is over flowing and the great think is ~~xxxx~~ vivid and the indicative is all about as over against the times when (I tend here to be disloyal to my own thinking) but lets say the times when the kyrotic is fading thin. And you and I know those times and we know that the awe never really goes away--in some ways we go away from the awe. But that is there. It is hard for me to say that.

(Comments, on science--deChardin) The time we get through this summer we will have a deeper appreciation for Chardin--and most of us

(Other comments--Schliermacher) have appreciated him a great deal. Sure, you are going to appreciate him, you can see it in his basic category of dispenience. (Comment--Hocra, Father, Son and Holy Ghost) The think, feel, resolve is the outline of RSI and I feel like I can reach now with my feet stuck in ontology in a way that I never even dreamed. Yes, many others are going to open to us.

This summer in that book, I wanted that book to have whatever you had about the social, I wanted the book to give a ground for what we are doing and you would need Chardin, and Schliermacher, Otto's Holy, and we would get some others.

We are not intellectuals--that doesn't mean that we are not bright. But our uniqueness is that we finally draw together great intellectual insights for the sake of building of gimmicks, if you please, that will enable what these great ideas point to to be participated in by the last fat lady. This is why we are practical revolutionaries, this is why we are concerned with the local parish rather than theological seminaries first of all. We are practical. And when you flatter us a bit--that takes just as much brainpower as the guy who gets the abstract thing thought through and to the degree that Chardin was an authentic man, he would be pleased like hell that somebody would feed it to the masses. That is why we are evangelists. Oh, I had a fine time this morning. And I am talking out of the Protestant memory a moment. You and I are beholding new births, salvations, saving events all around us. But you see the last image of Protestantism was going to the altar and praying through and going out to be a changed man--ours is different. I was thinking only this morning about my beloved friend Happy Thomas--why if she is a re-born

JMM-OTHER WORLD LECTURE CONTENT
June 19, 1972

page 17
Rough copy

woman like you couldn't imagine. And I could bring names. Our new births--they take place in a different way but they are more powerful and far more significant than the other forces. And finally to get to the point--I tell you you are not looking at the same man up here that was your colleague two years ago. I could tell you, I could stand up in an old-fashioned Methodist testimony meeting and bear testimony that I am a new man. And nothing more about that, I don't know whether it is good or bad but it is true.

Now how can this like say Happy, or say Joe, how can he do something that would enable this happen to every man.

---Joseph Mathews