

Rough CopyREMARKS TO PRIORS ON A Aug. '72
HISTORICAL ORDER

History moves on discontinuity. Now if you put that into religious language, you are saying God is sovereign. Or that it is God's economy that determines the economy of time, temporality. But in our day particularly, I suppose however, that this is true in any day, if you cannot get this in utterly secular language you don't know what that poetry about the divine will or divine providence means. Maybe fool there for just a second. The only way we have of directly grasping what it was like in another time of course is to look through the solidification of that time. And it's only by an indirect exercise we call empathy you get out of your time, get into another time where you feel after the states of being that produced the solidified articulation of those ~~kinds of~~ states of being which we call doctrine, or philosophies. And I'm quite sure that if you got inside of the forging, the forming that which comes to us as sort of solidified abstract doctrine, or conceptual relations, that--I mean I believe this with a passion--that if you could get inside of that you would be feeling the way you feel today that you were trying to get said in what for you is secular language the traditional poetry that determined your interior montage. And if this be true, and I think I've only seen this part with clarity recently, then of course we are pointing in a fresh way to the new essentialism that man is stumbling into and you notice is grounded in state of being as overagainst intellectual conception. And then of course you have to add knowing the relativities of your own posture, that this is the way in the beginning, is now, and shall ever be. That's what you've got to say. At the bottom.

Now history moves on discontinuity which means that change never takes place except in the presence of awe. That awe is discontinuity. And if you ever noticed as you in recent months to say nothing of earlier moments in your life, have you not grasped that when you experience awe, you become AWARE of the fact that some way or another things are not the same and will never be the same. Of course that is a part of the lecture. In the earth area, I guess that is Trek III maybe. That all

things become new. Here is an illustration inside yourself of the point that history moves on discontinuity and on discontinuity alone. ^{This} ~~xxx~~ means that the religious establishment and the so-called secular civil establishment moves finally only in and through the activity of God and said in a secular way so that you're not theologizing here, you're just saying the way it is. That save discontinuity breaks in, it's rather obvious that you do not have the coming to be of a not-yet.

Now this discontinuity is not some formless thing in history, though it is ever without form. When discontinuity strikes, it becomes form and if that were not true, then you have no way of saying the statement that history moves on discontinuity. Now that's rather poorly said, and it's hard for me to get it said, if discontinuity did not take form, you wouldn't even know there was such a thing as discontinuity. Or, another way of saying it, you would have no way of being conscious of discontinuity, and what you are not conscious of, obviously is not, unless you go to an abstract universe and posit some kind of an eternal gaze which is fine, but you've got to remember that's where they got mixed up in rationalism--that gaze is not your gaze; it's a posit of your imagination, and therefore has not the quality of what we mean by reality. That's where we said "no" to your abstract rational systems.

Now discontinuity, this form of it has a billion levels--I don't know how to illustrate it, but first of all its form ~~is~~ is far smaller than the point of a pin. As a matter of fact, you've got to say almost ~~that~~ ^{like} the form is like that whistle for a dog--you almost have to work back where there isn't any noise. And then noise, and then expanding, expanding, expanding, expanding, so that it becomes extremely discernable. This is an illustration of this is in your own experience of awe. The form ~~that~~ ^{begins} in the recognition that you are not simply have awe in you, but you are in awe. That is the beginning of the form and there isn't much

form there. By the time you get to the point where you get where--I don't know how, but by God, I'm different. The form has begun to whirl into larger whirls, and then when you get so far down to where you are ready for the great indicative resolve in your existence, then I mean biteable form is there. And then you can go on to the practical manifestations in which form seems to be superimposed upon form itself. Now when you talk about history, this kind of description I've made relative to myself and you as persons, when you come form there, you know what I'm going to say, is that's your religious order. That is the WAY BACK. and from the religious order, to use our jargon, it's like the serving order, the extended order, the movemental order, the movement, the new church, the new world. Or, pretty obviously, to use other language, it's movement. Move-ments Move-ments. Movements. which change society. And I suppose that's so obvious that you don't even need to dramatize it. Here is fixed society. Movements within the dynamic is what alters the fixedness of the society and creates another fixedness of society. You say society is always moving, well bullshit. That's not true. My lord, the civil rights people know that--it just won't budge. And the irony of it is that the civil rights movm-nt is a manifestation of the fudging dynamic of society. I don't ask you to agree with me; you can get your mind around that. And so it ever was; and so it ever will be. This is true in every culture. History has been moving. And you work backwards from that and therefore there have been movements in history; therefore there have been religious orders from the very beginning of time. And obviously they had many faces and many forms. I say obviously because the movement that makes history move or that makes history movement, must itself be moving or it is movement that is movement itself is the closest thing you have to pure change which is awe--the primordial beginnings of form; that is movement. Therefore in no time and no place could you ever have the same movement. But not only that, but the moment that a movement stops moving itself

or becomes open, becomes unopen, itself passes over into the stasis and is therefore no more movement. What I am trying to say, like the Women's Temperance Movement, ~~WTCU~~ WTCU, is that it? Well, at one time that was a movement, but I tell you, it's been wooden for a hell of a long time in a very wooden city its headquarters lie. I feel that is the main reason we got out of Evanston, for fear that that would rub off on us. You could never call that a movement. You cannot talk about labor movement anymore--there isn't such a thing. I've written down several pages in and I don't want to make a case for this, but to show you that a movement moves in the broad itself and then each one of these is filled with openness or movements as it goes along, and of course, this is an abstraction. There is a formation stage or a natal stage; then a formation stage; then a conscious stage; then an order^{ing} stage; then a serving stage; then a blending stage,^{and} then there's an ending stage. And at the ending stage you become WTCU. But inside of each one of these there is movement. I'm trying to get back to get back to as long as movement is movement, inside itself, it is going someplace and in inside of those going some places, there is movement. This is its openness. Movement is only movement as long as it is openness. Or, the moment that movement is not to itself and to the world discontinuity, it is not movement. Now maybe I've taken too long to belabor that point.

The religious order, or call it what you will, is the heart of the spark of any movement. Now, I think it's pretty clear that the^{dynamic of a} movement in terms of changing history, the dynamic of a movement which is the communication of discontinuity to continuity, ... be pretty clear then that the way it does this is being the presence. Now I'm trying to say what a religious order is that carries history on its back relative to that carrying history on its back.

Now this presence that I'm talking about, it just is. It's like

there's no intentionality in it whatsoever first of all. It is unintentionality, and this is what you mean by presence. If I am only a presence when I am conscious of being a presence, or decide to be a present, then I'm kidding myself and am not a presence to the world. This is begin to get another way with that indicative, or the other~~e~~ side of that, of course, radical intentionality is within this presence, but it is almost like you'd want to call it unintentional intentionality. Now before I get through I want to reverse it and make it ~~intentionality~~ intentional unintentionality and ~~unintentionality~~ intentionality, both of them, and that has to be there. It is I think clear that a movement is not its knowing. It is not its verbal articulation. It is not its reflective capacity, so a movement obviously and lives upon radical intentionality, or the intentionality of knowing itself, and I don't need to spell this out in detail, but it is any movement, any radical core of movement in history has seen through, or it is seen through. That's the intensification of knowing. And because it is seen through, it has the capacity to articulate having seen through. If it does not, it has finally not seen through. That is to say, it is fine to have states of being, but until you are able, no matter how poorly this is done, to do this, then you have not seen through, so it has this capacity certainly, and it's like relative to that particular fixed moment in history, it has beheld the absolute by which judgement ~~has~~ is executed upon the unmovement dimension that is there present in that moment in society.

Another way of saying this, the intensification of knowing here, is just to come right out and say that a movement not only prays, it is prayer. I mean it is prayer. And the power of a movement is rest--not simply here and not primarily here as I want to emphasize in a moment, but rests on that ~~same~~ seeing through. It's like we've talked many times about what charisma is, what spiritual power is, well, one way of describing that--like spiritual power has nothing to do with my intentions or my willpower, nothing whatsoever. It is the unavoidable consequence of having seen through. If I wanted to press at us a little bit, I'd want to say

to any degree that one of us is not comprehensive in this operation, when we are not comprehensive, that means we have lost our seeing through, and I mean your power goes out. Have you ever noticed one of your colleagues who is a big mighty guy up there lecturing or in another situation, ~~and~~ he comes in to the assignment and he's got his own God damn little petty ax to grind? Have you ever noticed how a great giant like Mathews just before your very eyes crumbles into a God damn shitass mouse? I don't want to mention any names, but you know that any recent experience, but it's like my sister ~~xxxx~~ used the figure of speech, fall into a heap of shaking palsy--and you've seen them just wither down? The POWER of the movement is having seen through. But this is not its function. But it has that

The second thing is that it is not its doing. No, its doing is intensified I need not mention in any length the power of cruciformity. Now I'm sneaking up on this religious business. The religious order by definition is those who have seen through. You've got to wipe out of your mind everything you meant by a religious order ~~because~~ for we have seen the solidification; we have seen non-religious orders. A religious order is that body which has seen through, and secondly, a religious order is that body who for whom cruciformity is no longer something out there; they are cruciformity. This is why sacrifice is there. This is the POWER, unbelievable power of casting in the great monastic ^{movements} ~~order~~ in our cultures as well as others. Not --and if you think of that on the moral level, and I know I mean something deeper by morality than most people do--if you think of that on the moral level, you will never see it. You get it to the ontological level. And this is a sign, and a sign isn't something external. A sign is always down inside your guts. It was a sign to them, and therefore and only therefore ~~is~~ it became a sign to the world, to those about them. I'm not making a case for chastity, because chastity in itself is a bunch of bullshit, but what was behind that in terms of the absolutely sacrificed life. Oh, I'd like to get up on a housetop these days and sort of scream that God's people

are the people who see that their chance to live a glorious life is glorious beyond all articulation and lay down that great, glorious gift ~~for~~ going to their death so that other people might be their glorious gift. This is the great, holy suicide. And not all by any means are capable at this time of radicalized doing. I tell you the deeds that change history are not the deeds of shoveling this pile of coal or being in that demonstration --the deed that changed history takes place down in here, but it's the most objective deed that man can find words for. That's a religious order and you or you or you or you might belong to an outfit like this and be no more a religious order or part of it than the moon is, and so well, say the Roman catholic order--how many folk have they got in them? who are on the roles but who are not religious? And of course they know it, and ~~people~~ weep over it, and like the rest of us don't know exactly what to do about such things. This is the power of agape. And I mean it's power. You show me one man who in this great deed inside his gut has committed holy suicide, and I'll show you a man who cares for this world, and you can't have one without the other, without that great act down in your guts, you're going to love your family or your nation or your race or your something else, your church. You want to know what spiritual power is, and its not something somebody flexes muscles he can get; it is the by-product of a sacrificiãl life. No moralism here, no sentimentalism. When this happens, you don't give one good God damn whether anyone else thinks you've laid down your life or not--no moralism here. That doesn't even ~~xxx~~ enter your mind. You are consumed to see that you be the indicative that you are. What could anybody else's opinion even have to do with such a thing? This is the power of agape. This is the power which turns justice gone to ashes into mercy out of which new justices are built. No other power. This is not what we have been conditioned to believe. We have been conditioned to believe the Abraham Lincolns and Napoleons and the Wellingtons and the Caesars and Gregory the Great, and Gingus Kong are the ones that change history. NO.

Agape has changed history The manifestation of agape is a religious order. Now then this leaves only being, and since there isn't such a thing as being, you can't very well talk about it, but you've already talked about it in doing and knowing which are unimportant because being is the intensification of those; that is to say it is actually the presence which is contentless, but is filled with that which does not exist, intensified knowing and intensified doing--it's that presence I used to scream when you came out on those silly French theologians who in our time took that concept of presence and brought it to the attention of the world. You had alot of idiots, including the Tazay boys who thought that presence was getting out in the middle of a ghetto and going around doing this and no, no, no. The presence is the intensification of the seeing through ~~add~~ the agape. It's like for me in the other world that the last two areas come together and represent the sheer mystery that shines through in the presence which is the intensification of the river ~~of~~ and of the mountain, or presence is finally not being there, a religious order doesn't change history; discontinuity changes history--which is to say the intrusion of the mystery transposed history. The religious order in the intensification of knowing and doing becomes transparent so that thy mystery flows from out there through me into impact the world. No magic here. No magic whatsoever. Only the mystery changes the world; only when society is once again shoved up against the mystery does change occur. And the mediator of that mystery to the masses of man is your religious order, and that's their presence. This is why a religious order is either the beloved parasite of civilization or the hated outcast. In either case they are the outcasts, and either one of those can ~~be~~ be perverted, or either one of those responses can be a genuine and authentic response to the religious, but when either one of them, if they are authentic, they are not responding to the religious order but they are responding to the disclosure of the mystery to that religious order. This is why even though I don't know a great deal

about what I'm saying, I say again to that 80 year old nun, you take off your habit, and I'll wear it. Now that is but an external sign of the awareness that you are set aside to be the transparent mediator of the mystery whereby men and society and finally history itself -- lives are changed. I'm not making a case for a habit at the moment. I'm trying to point beyond that and if there is not, I call them the beloved parasites, this is present in the Eastern church; I saw people rush to kiss the bishop's ring, and in my protestant's ~~ring~~ background, I always thought that was a pile. Well, of course it can be a pile ~~if~~; it be perverted. But also that is a communication of the mystery.

JWM p. 10

and if there is not, I call them the beloved parasites. This is present
 in the Eastern Church. I saw people rush to kiss the ~~papa's~~ ^{bishop's} ring. And in
 my Protestant background I always/~~that~~ ^{thought} was a pile. Well, of course that
 can be a pile, it can be perverted. But also that is a communication of
 the mystery, when there is health within that. That is the beloved parasite.
 I tell you some of the Roman Catholic priests may not like to wear their
 collar, but when I wear mine traveling, I get attention, kindness, and
 curtesy ~~from~~ and consideration from policeman, from airplane operators.
 Maybe they have had so much of it that they are sick of it. Maybe
 that is what their trouble is.

* If you pull the sickness out of that and get down to the ontology,
 that is what I mean by the beloved parasite. I, too, as long as that religious
 didn't insist that I kiss his ring or take off my hat before him, I tell,
 you, I would be willing to take off my hat before that body more than any
 other ~~temporal~~ temporal ~~phenomenon~~ phenomenon that I know anything about. I
 like to say, the bishops of the Church are my bishop. And I could bow
 my knee before them all, because finally integrity in that hasn't anything
 to do with the man sitting on the throne but ~~with~~ ⁱⁿ me. But I'm putting ~~my~~
 myself in a different position at the ~~same~~ moment. *

And then on the other side of that, you are the hated outcasts.
 This again is the fear and the fascination that you can expect whenever the
 mystery shines through. And the religious can always expect to be persecuted.
 We sometimes wonder why the establishment ~~isn't~~ isn't more friendly to us.
 Well, the one who thinks that the establishment is ever going to be friendly
 to us at all is out of his mind. That doesn't mean that from time to time
 God will not bring us showers of blessings, and bring this bishop, that bishop,
 or another moderator ~~in~~ into sympathy with us as God opens his eyes, not
 to us--I'll come to that in a moment--but to the mystery that we represent.
 I want to say one a other thing. We Protestants are ~~just~~ finally just

JWM P.11

beginning to catch up on things that you have known for a long time. You have sensed even among the greats in the Church in recent years as it begins to dawn on them who we are, that even if it is for only a moment, that there is respect, not respect for you, but a respect for something that is shining through you. I'd like to say that Tracey Jones' speech the other day, with all of ~~xxx~~ his bumbling and fumbling was an acknowledgement that no matter what we were, something was shining through. Then he goes on and doesn't give us money, to hell with that. He saw, he beheld, he experienced. What I am trying to say, ~~xxx~~ is not to extol our virtues. That makes no difference. But that is what a religious order has been from the beginning in history and shall always be. And call it by any other term that you want. It is the presence that . . . It is an incarnation, that in this body the mystery shines through and awes men, trembles them, excites them, envisions them, motivates them--which is to say that the religious order never changes history. It is the catalyzing factor. IT is the motivity agent-- to use sociological terms--~~that~~ that arouses men --if I wasn't afraid of 19th century moralism I'd say--to ~~xxxx~~ be their best. And I mean that ontologically and not morally. ~~xxxx~~ --which means to be God's men.

And then one sees that our presence--and I mean the presence of all religious orders in history--itself is discontinuity. That is why you and I should be worried whenever we in slobbism begin to move toward looking like the establishment. We must never be discontinuity. To put this in "trans" language, we are the "trans" and we have to be the "dis." But here is a secret noone can see. It is the religious dynamic in history that loves the establishment like the establishment couldn't even dream of. The one who says NO with his life, with his being, is the one who has said an ~~xx~~ eternal yes.to creation, and that means the establishment. We must never forget that.

JNM p.13

Now then finally a religious order has to be nothing. I tried to say to myself last ~~at~~ night if you can point to me--and I am going to take the Roman Catholic orders--the grand things the Jesuits have done, and they have, or the Dominicans or the Christian Brothers, they have--to the degree you can say the glorious things they have done, to that degree they were running out of being a religious order. Does that communicate to you? Now mark you, they had to do glorious things. That is ~~was~~ what they were in ~~the~~ history for, but to the degree that you can point to it, they were running out of being a religious order. That ought to worry us, because either we are going to fail or some glorious things are going to happen. There is no in between. But this is our danger. A religious order is not, fellows and girls, --has nothing to do with wanting to be humble. To hell with that. I think in one way a religious order is the most prideful thing that ever hit history. Yes. I am trying to say that without a religious order there isn't any history. I don't know how more pretentious you can get. And here's the paradox. It is nothing of the order; it is their presence, which is not their presence but the presence of the mystery. Therefore, to the degree they become something, you know, flesh, that transparency goes, and therefore their moment has passed in history, and other movements, which can be nothing, which can be transparent, come to ~~be~~ be. We have talked about that so much that I don't think I'll go on. I think I'll stop. I'm not so sure that I have said this very clearly, but what I have intended to say is that there is nothing religious about a religious order, and nothing religious when you say, "A religious order carries history on its back." I've tried* to say, that's just the way it is. It's just the way it is, and it always has been and always will be.