

Five lectures, the first deals with the self and sexuality and the ontology of the male, the second deals with the economic dimension of the social process and the crisis in vocation, the third has dealt with the political dimension and the crisis of engagement in society and now we come to the fourth lecture which deals with the cultural dimension and the crisis in the family.

The lecture begins by talking about the cultural revolution in terms of self-consciousness. When was it that you first became self-conscious was it fifty million years ago when consciousness emerged and when was it you became conscious of being conscious, when was it that you were able to transcend yourself so as to create for yourself memories and anticipations. Was that maybe 5 ~~skmxx~~ million years ago. And when was it that the new self consciousness that you and I live in today broke in upon us. Fifty years ago when you became about being conscious about being conscious. When was it that you first discovered that you are freedom itself, that your life is freedom. When was it that you first discovered that you were history. When was it that we discovered that we are no longer in a nevolutionary process but that we are the evolutionary process. That is to say, evolution is in our hands. We decide the future, when was that consciousness poured into upon you. We stand at a time as radical as the time when the rock decided to be plant. A time as radical as the time when the plant decided to be animal, as radical as the time when the animal decided to be man. What is it that you and I are now deciding for the future. This is kairotic time, and by kairotic I mean radical, and by radical I mean, foundational. Things are being altered at the base of human existence, basic fundamental humanness is what is being created, basic fundamental struggle at the deeps. The upheavals that we are in the midst of are upheavals relative to who it is finally that we are, or what does it mean to be a human being. We are in radical times, in that they are universal, there isn't any place that is not being touched by this revolution in consciousness. There isn't any part of life that is not being touched. Every part of life and every place in life is being touched and is being touched and dealt with in the deeps. This is universsal

Lecture 4 - West

revolution and the most frightening part is that this is an irrevocable revolution. It is like the decisions that you and I are making about what it means to be a human being are final, and that is what is frightening the most about it. If you could take back your decisions the day after tomorrow after you have tried them. But there are no take ~~back~~ backsies in this game. It is a final decision that you are making, and the decision you are making is going to then forge the next 1000 or 2000 years. It is almost as exciting as building pyramids when you think of the finality but it is also as frightening, or maybe more frightening. When you decide to shape the total future of humanity, knowing the ~~in~~ finality of it, the pain. Or the pain comes in facing of finality of your decisions about life, knowing that the only way you dare pick up that kind of a task is that you look your own death full in the face. No one dare pick up this kind of task save on the other side of that radical decision to come to terms with his own death. Now, in the midst of that there is a pain which the male faces, and is best symbolized for me in the negation of the ^{youth} ~~man~~. The youth have said, No, poppa. And it is not just saying a no to following in father's footsteps. Youth have said that before and poppa has survived. That wouldn't be so bad. But they are saying no to poppa is a no to his life style to his way of life, no to his understanding of what life is finally all about. That is pain of the negation of the youth. They are saying no to poppas grasp of the universe, they are saying no to the adult males total life. What they are saying is: your whole life has been a joke, and I suppose the pain underneath the pain is having to come to terms with that kind of reality.

What got him was nothing

And then the pain within the pain within the pain of dealing with this consciousness, is that we knew that before the youth said it. But we wish they wouldn't have said it. If they could have just pretended a little while longer.

We are going to look then today at this shift of consciousness by looking at the

Lecture 4 - West

cultural dimensions of the human process and we are going to look at that primarily through the family., as the grounding of the shift in style, but to look at that in the context of the whole: That ended my introduction.

I. The Social Analysis

The process of humanness always has an economic dimension or that dimension which maintains society and it always has a political dimension or that means for ordering the society, whereby you can protect, or defend, the basic existence and whereby you can defend the cultural-existence of that part of society which is the self consciousness about the basic maintaining and defending of society. The cultural dimension is the rationale, or the reason for being. The cultural dimension deals with the self consciousness about both your economic and your political dimension and as such is that which enlightens both the economic dimension and the political. It enlightens the economic dimension by giving significance of maintaining your life. There is not reason to maintain your life unless there is some cultural dimension of your life. It enlightens the political by giving direction, and ennobling that activity of preserving your life. Then, we want to turn today and look at this dimension of the cultural life a little bit closer. It is made up of the symbolic dimension of life, the wisdom dimension of life, and the style dimension of life. Wisdom points to the total body of knowledge that the society operates out of and which the society cannot exist without and which has to be transmitted from age to age. Style points to that web of relationships that embody the self understanding that is held in the wisdom. The style points to how you relate yourself together in a society and the symbols point to that dimension in every society, where you indicate what is significant, where you indicate what is the final meaning out of which you are going to operate in your life. The symbol relates to the style by indicating and by birthing and by creating the style. It is

Lecture 4 - West

something like this. You put a symbol out in front of you and then that symbol returns to create you. You put that grid on the wall and then that symbol returns to create you. You put that grid on the wall and then that grid on the wall returns to create you and the style out of which you live. The style on the other hand, relates to the symbol by investing significance into the symbol. It is the very style which invests the symbols. The symbols relate to the wisdom by grounding the images which the wisdom has, and the wisdom relates to the style by brainwashing the style with the data in categories. You don't need to spend much time here and you can get this out of Document A. The wisdom upholds the destiny which is manifest in the style and the style practically grounds the wisdom, or -ratically embodies the wisdom which you operate with in the society. Now, I want to get directly on to the imbalances. To review for you the balance in the fundamental chart is that the economic has taken over and dwarfed the cultural into an impotent position and has made the political the ally, in that dwarfing. And the way you are going to alter the situation is that the cultural has to get enough power to come down and to impact the political so that it can enlarge itself enough to move the economic, back into some kind of order. Then when you go over, the question is how are you going to get the cultural enough power, how are you going to break the cultural ~~is~~ loose, how are you going to get enough space in that in order to have this influence. You have to go then to look at the cultural itself. The situation you have there is that the wisdom has overtaken the symbolic dimension. right. squeezing it up into nothing, and thereby making style its ally. It goes something like this. The wisdom has, because of the economic tyranny which has dominated our society, everything that you do is subjugated to the economic, and the economic places its emphasis primarily on skills, and on getting things done ~~as~~ so that the wisdom pole out here has collapsed into the skills dynamic and the skills then crushes the final meaning dynamic and makes an ally of accumulated knowledge. The tyranny of the economic dimension of life has demanded then, that kind of warpedness in the wisdom dimension which has been blown up into the tyrant and dwarfed the symbolic dimension, where

you grasp really the significance of life. Now the style has gone something of the other way. The primal community, or as you see on your 2x triangles, the structures, I like to call it the primal community, has been squeezed up to nothing by ~~what~~ what is called on the chart the procreative schemes. I am just going to use here for our purposes the family to symbolize the whole of that because that is where we want to talk, and has made an ally of the roles, in that job. Now, our job then, or if we are going to correct that, somehow, the symbol has got to get enough power to come here to alter the style which will correct the wisdom and when this whirlwind begins to go here, that will get the cultural going, so that it can move on the political in order to alter the economic. That is very brief and very much of an outline, and has to be worked through with a great deal more care, but that is what we have that has been done in that area. We want to center in here in the family, and -in the style, but in order to do that I have to go back here and talk about wisdom a little bit to get an approach on there.

I am now beginning my second point in the outline: II. The Paralysis in the Domestic Situation. The male is required by the economic role which he plays of provider and protector, to get his education here in the skills dimension. That is true and is very evident of course in engineering education, or scientific disciplines, but that is not only true there in science and math skill type education, but that is true even in the liberal arts education. By skill I mean that you are required to get data rather than models. Education is designed so that you acquire a certain amount of facts which control you, rather than acquiring the models which enable you to go and get the facts and put them together and use them. You get, instead of responsible tools, ^{you have} irresponsible data, or you have power, or you know how to build a bridge, but you don't know why to build a bridge. You know how to unlock the atom, but you don't know whether to unlock the atom or not. You remember the Manhattan struggle and the problem they had there. You have the data without the models, you have the information without the means by which to use the information. That kind of an education is the education which the male is trapped in and when he has that situation on his hands, he finds that what he does is retreat. He increasingly isolates himself until he can find a place where the skills or the education that he has on his hands enables him to deal with that situation. First he isolates himself to his box, and then down to a smaller box, and then down finally to the family, because it is in the family that he is still the king. He can do things. He can still operate with the skills that he has and nobody will threaten him. Professor Otwell, a professor at a school in California, Pacific School of Religion, said that he failed 2/3 of every freshman class, his Old Testament class, because they had not learned to think, and that applies not just to ministerial students. Also that one of his great passions is to have conversation, but he can't find anyone that is willing to sit down and converse. He goes to his colleagues in the physics department. They won't talk about anything but physics. He goes to his colleagues over in the English department, they won't get together. The only person he found in his city, and he was caricaturing, of course, was the dry cleaning man. He used to have great conversations. I think probably, it occurred to me last night, that these talk shows that we have on TV may be a try for that kind of dialogue to go on when we have been so trapped in talking about and dealing only with these areas where our skills permit us. Well, back to my lecture.

He is trapped in the family as his last stronghold where he can hold on, where he can be of significance, where his life can be given meaning and hope. But what he knows about that is that the family, or his last stronghold, is not a stronghold but a sinking ship. It has already taken on a lot of water and it might at any moment spill over and go under. All you have to say these days is that the family is in trouble. You used to have to support that by point out that in California now the divorce rate exceeds the marriage rate, and you could list a dozen examples that would hold that up. But you don't have to do that anymore. You just say, the family is in trouble. There is no meaning in the family. It is empty. For the male, it is an alien community. He doesn't belong in the family anymore. He is obsolete, he doesn't fit. He doesn't know how to do advanced math, & but that is not the real problem. The real problem

is that somehow he has himself totally disrelated. His relationship to his wife has turned into something like blackmail. My goals and her goals, he says to himself, are not the same, and therefore I am going to have to manipulate her in such a way that she does more of what I want to do, than let her manipulate me to do more. And so it is a blackmail that goes on in trying to get the other in some kind of parallel line so that you don't go in totally opposite ways, or if that is not the case, then blackmail turns into something like, I won't ask you any hard questions, if you won't ask me any hard question. But the shift from many many men is even further than that. It is a matter of disolve dissolving families. That dissolving sometimes takes the form of you do your thing and I will do my thing. I'll go play golf and I'll get a hobby which will keep me busy and we won't have to bother each other, and you go your way, or that dissolving takes the form of just leaving. Many, as you know many families, the male has just left. Or if it doesn't take that form it takes the form of just stopping. Where the relationship has just stopped, physically, emotionally, intellectually, just stopped. In the midst of that sinking ship, then, as everybody becomes aware that going under all the roles that people play begin to collapse. The family for one reason or another is dispersed and the demands upon the family, or the way that the family organizes itself is no longer the shape or form of the family, is made by pressures from the ~~outside~~ outside. The whole family operates out of somebody else's context, rather than a context which the family itself creates. That makes the adult male an aimless adult. It makes him obsolete. It makes him not fit at home. It makes him restless. It makes him unable in anyway to play his role of being the provider and the protector, and so he becomes aimless, and the child becomes rootless, the child will not live in the adult world. He cannot live in the adult world, and if he cannot find a new world to live in, then he lives between the two worlds, and therefore turns to drugs, or one kind of sensuality or the other, and the elder has become the outcast. He has been placed in premature graves to wait for the icy hand to come and claim him, and in being outcast, the family has lost the continuity, the family has lost the one symbol that will enable them to deal with their situation. They have lost the symbol of death, til they can find that which enables them to stand before their own death, they don't stand a chance. For he has become outcast, and so they have not that possibility through that particular symbol, and the sinking ship, the biggest hold, in this sinking ship, is the meaning of covenant. Covenant has become distorted into some certain conditions, and if you violate those conditions, then we dissolve it. If you do not do exactly what the contract says, then we dissolve it. The covenant is distorted in that it is made between two individuals, rather than a covenant between the two individuals and the total creative process and the society that they are in. Their covenant has a false base, either based in mutuality-- I will love you if you will love me, and pat you on the back--or it is based on social expedience, economic or cultural, or some sort of companionship or romance or sex, or having children. The basic problem there is some sort of false foundation. The basic manifestation is psychologism. It turns in upon itself and begins to operate out of feeling. "I will stay married to you and hold this covenant as long as you don't make me mad. or don't do something I don't like." The heart of the problem has to be the lack of symbols. Sex becomes the most demonic of the symbols, in the absence of sex being a symbol of actually giving yourself in society, and to your family, sex becomes a symbol which, when participated in turns back to destroy you. You create your symbol and then your symbol creates you. If you make sex, which is too powerful not ~~be~~ to be a symbol, a symbol of: life is something you can take or leave, life is something you can engage in without any commitment, -then that symbol turns back to destroy you and to make your family a joke. That is the second point.

I begin the third part of the lecture. How do you deal then with this situation, or particularly, how does the male operate in this situation? First, he has to recognize that he is operating as a king in a kingdomless world. He is operating as one who is supposed to have authority in a world where there are no authorities. He is operating in a world where there are particular things that you ought to do, when there is no static world, but a dynamic world instead. In

that world he is an absentee ruler. When all the demands that are placed on the family, none of which he seems to give these days, used to be the father made the demands. Now it's the school board and the PTA and the basketball team, and the job and the demand for more money and to keep up with the Joneses—they make the demands on the family, not the male any more. He is absent in his rulership in that sense, and his subjects are disinterested, they could care less. The wife and the child are just as happy with him having lost his rulership as not, but the real problem is that the hierarchy that he operates out of is not there anymore. He is like the wolf in the Roadrunner, when something happens and all of a sudden he is out over this total abyss, and all he can do is fall. You remember the look on the wolf's face, where he gets that funny little smile on his face. That is the next point. The male is a hopelessly impotent one out over the abyss. And all he can do is give a little smile on his face, because the world on which he tries to be king does not exist any more. It is not moral failure on his part, but the collapse of the world he is operating in. He is hopeless then impotent, all he can do is fall straight down to the river. He has no clout. He says go and do this, and his wife says, "Yes, dear," and then goes and does what she damn will please. HE says to his children, "You will not drop out of school," and his child says: "Yes, father," and then goes off to school and he learns six months later that his son has dropped out of school. He just isn't in the know about the lives of his children or about the life of his family. He hasn't the foggiest what is going on down in their lives, and he doesn't know how his wife is spending her time or what she is doing, or why she is doing it. He is the incompetent bungler, he is Dagwood. Maybe that cartoon Dagwood and Jiggs, some of you probably don't remember. He is the Jiggs figure, he can't measure up. One of my colleagues defined him as the janitor with bedroom privileges. He cannot measure up to being the male of the family. His only alternative is to embrace the anarchy of the situation, to come to terms with the chaos. If he tries to be the protector of the family, and protect it from the outside forces, he finds that they tear each other's eyes out inside, even when he manages to hold the family together, then the family inside collapses. And so this is the only world, the world of anarchy that he has on his hands, and it is painful ambiguity. It is painful ambiguity, and this is his eternal situation. It is not going to change, and when he comes to terms with the fact that he is going to live in this insecure situation eternally, there in ~~that~~ at that point there is possibility for something new. And the something new is life, a triunverate where he shares power with the rest of the family, and therefore is given back his own basic power, where he can participate in some kind of consensus making that has discipline ~~in it~~ in it, where the terror of listening and having a teenager decide what you are going to do with your family can be participated in with some form of integrity, where he daily ~~has~~ has to recreate temporal models.

Then I go to Point Four, and my time is running out, so I am going to sketch this. The fourth point is Nuclear Wholeness. This is where you describe what is the possibility, or what is the resurrectional style that comes out of deciding to accept the situation that you have on your hands. The first possibility for adventure in this kind of situation is for the male to expand his style, to get himself a global context to live out of. As long as you operate within the family and try to solve it within that context, you can do nothing but continue to destroy yourself. It is when you are able somehow to get outside yourself into a global context, it is then that you are able to see and deal with the situation anew. We discovered this extremely clearly in the Urban Academy. We found the very first courses you had to do to get out of the malaise of being trapped in the one conflict between the black and the white, is to get out into the global context in order to see the struggle that you are in in perspective. The only way that you can break out of continuing microscoping your universe down into smaller and smaller universes is to get out into a global context and let that come back and inform and alter. It gives you a point of objectivity. It gives you a point where you can make objective decisions about your own objectivity. It means expanded style, secondly. It has the possibility here of becoming history long. To recover saints for

the family to live out of, to recover a perspective where families have shifted and changed over history so that you see the family participating in a process that is going into the future and a process that has come out of history from the very first family. Without those two things-----world wide and history long, without some kind of expanded style that gives you the global picture and the total historical process, you will never break out of the malaise of the family. The third expanded style has to do with the community. The male here reenters the community as the model builder, as the one who participates in it out of the ambiguity and out of the necessity to daily create the model that will hold his universe in being. The fourth expanded style is the corporate. Where his style can appropriate the corporate dimension of human existence, then his style begins to be imbued with power. Where his family can once again become some kind of corporate entity, not the corporate entity of the hierarchical schemes, but a corporate entity, and what the male experiences in his own being is power, power to move, and power to act. The first then possibility for adventure is for the male to create, or to constantly expand his style by the global, by the history long, by the community involvement, and the corporate nature.

The second way for him to adventure in life is to create a new marriage. What would it mean for you to recreate the covenant and make it a radical covenant, a covenant which nothing could break, what would it mean to base that covenant on a missional thrust, what would it mean to covenant together to a task, or to a mission, or to a higher value outside your own self so as to create within your selves the glue that will enable creative tension to go on so that you can struggle and so that you can instead of blackmailing one another, you can say a No and not destroy the other person, instead of blackmailing one another, you can say a Yes, where the other person needs it. What would it mean to have a family where the concern is not to preserve yourself by getting the other person to like you, but your concern is to recreate the other, your concern is to see that he gets his gifts into the situation. In that situation, one of the adventures would be a new intimacy, where the knowing of your wife, or your husband would be given back to you in a new way, where the knowing of yourself or the self-consciousness that comes out of the intimate relationship would be intensified and would be given back to you. That would be an adventure. What would it mean to affirm sex in your life again, where sex would be a symbol of you giving your life into the civilizing process, and where sex then became a symbol of the family giving itself into the civilizing process, and where you as a sexual being in relationship to all other women and all other men could be affirmed, and could be given back to you in a new way, your maleness in relation to sexuality. That would be the second venture that the male could take in the midst of this malaise to create the new family.

The third adventure that he could take in this malaise, is to create or recreate the family. What would it mean for the family to have a reason for being other than taking care of itself, for the family to have ~~extenz~~ a task. My favorite story is about the young man who decided to go up in a superman suit, and his family caught him and said, you shouldn't have done that, the Smiths just don't do that sort of thing. The son said, "Hell, they don't. I was just about to do it." ~~Ma~~ Well, you just shouldn't be going around doing that. Why not? You are a chip off the old block. What would it mean for the family to have a reason for holding one another accountable for what they do rather than just being chips off the old block. What would it mean to have an objective reality outside itself whereby you could hold one another accountable. Now That would give back to you your family and it would redefine the roles, it would give the male, an authentic role as that one who brings unity in the troops that are out to do a significant task. It would bring new relationships in being. It would

bring new structures into being to hold those relationships. It would make out of your family one thrust. A chaste family. What would it mean once again to belong to one another as a family because the family belonged to something greater than itself. That's the third adventure which the male can pick up.

The fourth adventure would be to recover his integrity. For a long time now the male has experienced himself as being a man of no integrity. He had integrity in the worldly view of integrity where - probably even that's gone now. What would it mean to have genuine integrity, what would it mean to have a single ? so that your whole body is full of life. What would it mean to have the unifying factor in the bottom of your being which brought significance and pattern to all of your life, that made your whole body full of life? What would it mean to experience the power, the release of the power of the ~~individual~~ individual personality that comes as life finds focus and finds integrity in its activity and in its thinking and in its being? What would it mean? It would mean that you would find it possible once again to honor your spouse and your child. You would find it possible once again to honor all of life because your own life has honor. It would mean that you would have the possibility once again of picking up the task of being the servant of all mankind because your own life has the integrity that permits it to give itself on behalf of its neighbor.

The male then stands at a cross road where he must create the new world. I suppose one of the key places where he creates that new world is in the creation of the family, or the new style, and it is when he gets that style created that he will be able to impact the political and thereby change the tyranny that the economic is operating over his life. He must as the pioneer recreate the community, recreate his marriage, and recreate the family on behalf of all men. He sees that the universe is sort of like an atom, and if you change the situation you are in, you literally change the entire globe. You change the one point where you are existing and that changes not just your life, but the entire globe. The spirit man sees this and he sees that he is always, at every moment, the center of the universe, and whatever he does, that is what God does, and the man's task then is to become the warrior, to become the big big man who takes sides even in the midst of the ambiguity, even in the midst of the horrifying uncertainty, he takes sides and he goes out and fights. And he is to become the seeker, he must recover the mystery, he must recover the final meanings of life. He must recover the symbols. He must become the wise old sage who directs and who mediates, who gurus the situation and he must become the ruler, he must restore order to his community, he must restore order to his family. It won't be the king of a disappeared kingship, but it will be a ruler of a corporate body of people who are out to alter the civilizing process. This is the great adventure that he has on his hands, and he sees that changing his situation not only changes the whole earth, but it changes it for the next 1000 years, and that is the adventure to which you are called.