

We could put an insert that would be one box in which you would squeeze images of human motivity relative to any kind of group action in the factory, in the corporation. You might use those situations as illustrations--it's all in your lecture-- it's just that in this course as it is now, that this is not your primary intent. It might be a fantastic illustration. And yet, if the guild is a human dynamic, it not only works in your local community, but in a family, in a fraternity, in a corporation, in the boy scouts, or whatever else. The guild construct has to work there, or else we are wrong about it. The guild is that which keeps the wheels of any situation flowing even if the guild dynamic is only present in the president of a company.

Anything on that last lecture that you wish to throw in? The crucial thing is that--you need to get more in the transition--you've got to make it clear that liberalism that never really wanted anything to happen, but wanted people to think right, stopped here. That when you are out to accomplish social change, you have to spin through the wall. You have to get to tactics. If you do the whistle-points, you have to vision the five nexus. But if you stop with the vision, it is like liberalism: nothing happens.

I think that this Guild lecture is in good shape. The lecture which needs to be worked at most is number one, and that means that you people who give it have a lot of work. And I'm not so sure but what we've got to have some talks on that before you get away, in the light of listening to the flow and especially coming to this fifth lecture. This morning my mind kept working back on this first one--what was it that needs to be said there that enables the 5th lecture to legitimately say what he says here. And that's why hearing this lecture is crucial to that first one, absolutely crucial.

Now let's look at these three internal lectures somewhat together and then particularly look at rationality, where I think we are now the fuzziest. Those of you who lecture have got to be extremely careful about your transitions, which is, I suppose, quite an unnecessary statement almost to the extent of being obvious. And if you ever lose in your mind as a lecturer, the image that your second point is malaise--you're in trouble. It makes no difference whether you use that term any more, but boy, it is the effect of the social imbalances on the spirit deeps of the individual. If you want to call it the psychological, fine, but it's below that. You transition it this way: the economic dynamic in overextending itself has unintentionally occasioned the vocational malaise. You've got to make it clear that work is not for work's sake, nor can work be for the sake of anything other than the final meaning which the cultural dynamic of your society communicates. If something else is substituted for this final meaning, then you experience vocational malaise.

It's just like the mumps--I don't know how you get the mumps, but there's a way in which something happens and you get the mumps. Well, whenever work is for its own sake, or for the sake of something

other than the final meaning that a given culture communicates to you as the final meaning, then vocational malaise sets in. And so when you get over to disengagement, the same thing, and when you get over to meaninglessness, the same thing. All of this going around "Who am I" that everyone in the room has been going through for 20 or 30 years, is because there was a failure in the social dynamic of society. You and I can say that it's fine that that happened, like it's fine that you have mumps. But that's why it happened. And if that had not happened, you and I would not have experienced the vocational malaise at all. This is the point you are trying to get across. If you get clear on that, that transition is pretty easy. Boy, one of the advantages of having those words up on that board are that they make the transition easy. You can even say, "Now let me spin a little about this business that all of us are familiar with--I want to call it vocational malaise," (or whatever you call it on the board.) With that you have made your transition. Now you back up that transition by spinning a bit on it and you'll have the feel that it's one and not four.

The next level down you move into the ontology. It's at this point of your analysis that has arisen the whole issue of our times about the meaning of the female and the meaning of the male. You take the female, for instance. It's when she no longer had a sense of being authentically engaged in the civilizing process by caring for a home that she began to raise the question of what it meant to be a woman after all. Or you take the man. It's exactly when he got the feeling that he was the cog in someone else's machine; or exactly the moment he felt the nakedness of working for the sake of getting more money to make his kids and wife happy long after it no longer made him happy, or something like this. You've got your transition. You can do it better than I did, but brother, I believe that's exactly the point. Or if you shove this: the male or female in what we are talking about has nothing to do with having a penis or not having a penis--it has to do with the function in the civilizing process of being a male however you define that, and the function of being a female, both of which have to do with your calling, or your vocation. Now, down on the next level, (oh boy, this is great), you're not surprised and I'm not surprised that once my maleness has been called into question by me, it's a crucial problem in my life. That's exactly the way it is for me, ladies and gentlemen. I'm in the throes, with every other awakened person in the world, of raising in a brand new fashion what it means to be a man of integrity. I think that I'd close my lecture by going back. Nobody knows what the sense of resurgence is that all of us feel down inside, but I'm convinced that passion has to do with straightening out the imbalances that have to do with the economic dimension in life. And I believe that is happening, and I believe that every awakened person really wants it to happen. It has to do with forging the great journey of mankind, whether I'm building automobiles or teaching. It has to do with grasping that my work is far more than in all of my life I have called my work. I'm convinced that in this time of resurgence, (and to you women here I say this with enthusiasm), we men, sick as we are, have decided to become men. And I must pay you somewhat of

a tribute. For until I saw some of you women decide to be women, I don't think I could have ever even considered getting off of my bed of effeminacy and little boyhoodism. And finally I am convinced that resurgence has to do with pushing integrity down off the realm of the passing morality into the very deeps of my being, and some way or another, just by reflecting on this gives me a sense of cleanness way down inside. Now what I was trying to do there, in going back over that, was to pull it together into one statement. I don't know whether I did it well, but for me, it was one statement, and you can do what I did for this lecture in the other two lectures.

Illustrations. Well, I don't know--I was going to say that I would try to write out my lecture, and then I wouldn't have it with-in a million miles of me when I was lecturing. If I didn't, I would go back to our lecture form of where you get your points and illustrations. Then I literally believe this is what I would do-- I would put out in the margin: "Is this illustration parochial?" That's the first one. By parochial I mean such that in principle everybody in the audience wouldn't immediately know all about it. Because an illustration has got nothing to do with the speaker and his points. It has to do with helping the person out there suddenly to grasp what you're after. An illustration of that: where sermons went to pot is when they did the readers' digest thing. You know, stringing illustrations together, and most every sermon you ever heard was that kind of sermon, no matter whether it had a text or not, it was the illustrations that gave the speaker his meat, and that's not our idea. I tell you we've got steel ideas. The illustration is not to illuminate this idea, but to help him grasp that hunk of steel. Therefore a parochial illustration you might as well not use. Worse than that, you know what goes on in a guy's mind when he hears it.

The second thing I'd write out there, in the margin, "How much do I need to spell out?" You cannot be sure that everyone has in their head the real story--or even the name, Abraham Lincoln-- as to what you have in your mind. Now sometimes, you know, you can whistle and that universe is there. But you've got to be sure, especially when you use something that appears particularly exciting to you. Those illustrations especially need to be fleshed out. Have you ever noticed that when you get excited over an illustration, that you tend to give only the skeleton of it? It's just so real to you, that where you need six sentences, you find that you only give one. Inside you feel that it's all there. It's not. David used something yesterday that left me thinking through for 15 minutes after he had gone on, trying to get flesh and blood on that last illustration. I was trying to locate it into history, and he should have done that for me. That's just crucial. I'm not saying, "Spin for 15 minutes because you like to hear yourself spin a story."

Also, we have got to avoid being cryptic. Now I was laughing a little bit at these North Shore people who are lecturing--a couple

of years ago they were talking about our jargon. Now I wish they'd stop using jargon! Of course, you are going to have to use jargon. If you are not going to use jargon, you might just as well not go on the trip. A revolution always happens through jargon. What you do is, when you have to use the words, you cut down on the number of them. Then you have got to explain that word. You use this word that you've got to use, then you have this phrase which explains it.

Also on illustrations, you would never mention the name of John F. Kennedy, or any other person in America. Secondly, you never mention any figure in any other country of the world that would cast dispersions on that country. For example, you would never use Hitler's name, never,-- no matter how you use it. I am exaggerating this--but boy, if you did you better build up a case so that they would forget his name by the time you got to your point. Then instead of John F. Kennedy, you use Ghandi. Use a world figure in some other country. You never call attention to our history under any circumstances whatsoever, or any person in it. If you gotta make a point and you think of George Washington, then you ask yourself, who was the founder of Laos? and then you mention him.

(Question: "What about the use of Martin Luther King? Was he a world figure?") I suppose, I suppose, as long as you were not saying something about our country. Or if you are saying something about the terrible way in which we have treated the blacks--and I don't suggest we do that, even. But you could mention his name, as a world hero. You would be wise to say "Doctor Martin Luther King," especially if you are doing it with Ghandi. I made the mistake in a speech in India of calling him "Ghandi." They came up afterwards and said, "In our country we like to have people say, "Mahatma Ghandi." That's something like saying: He's the father of our country. And you see, that's very recent.

I wouldn't sweat that--just have it in your mind. These people who say that those people are incapable of forgiving us are mistaken. They're wrong. I mean, it's just like if someone would come up to me and say, "Mrs. Mathews," some Korean. That wouldn't upset me; I'd take it as fun.

Another thing, it seems to me, that you have got to absolutely avoid, and that is quoting from the Bible. But if you do, you say now, "In the old Hebrew scriptures, the Bible, there is a story about a guy named Job." I mean you come at this as if you were dealing with Shakespeare, but I should think that that would be rare. And I believe I would never use an illustration of the Church under any circumstances whatsoever, (and this has to do with the Bible too) or a theologian, unless a question comes from the floor or in the followup work they introduce it, and then, brother, I would let the dike loose. I'd let them know exactly who I am-- I wouldn't tell them, but they would know that I knew that backward and forwards, but never would I prompt them. It's not because I'm afraid to use the words with the Hindus--that is not what I've got in my mind. It has to do with your course, with what kind of a presence you are out to be.

Keep off of red flags. Cramer used the name "Mao." He wasn't important--he could have used someone else. It's not because you are hurting some one's feelings. You just don't want their minds off on those subjects. A red flag will take five minutes for most of us to get over. If you get on a red flag, --- they've lost the next 5 minutes of the lecture. It's simply unnecessary to do that.

Now I want to push intellectual and non-intellectual. We have done pretty well with RS-1. I only noticed one or two places where we slipped into RS-1-ism. I do not mean ideas--I mean approach that comes off as trying to save somebody's soul. You're not out to do that. Nor are our lectures intellectual discourses. They are edifying discourses, but they have got to unconsciously come across as intellectual. If the intellectual stands out, you don't know what you are doing. One way you work at this, is that you be extremely careful, and someone has already mentioned this about inaccurate statements. For instance, in relation to dates, use the phrase, "Many years ago." To make a gross error there is almost unforgiveable. Naming names: you have to be extremely careful here. If you are going to name one that even a two-year-old in the room wouldn't know, then you better try something like, "There was a guy one time. . ."

The intellectual steel in the course is just there in the three years of work you've got behind this construct, and you don't have to impress anybody intellectually. That's there. You just need to get fresh flesh on it. Pure flesh.

The four points of these interior lectures have improved a million percent, also your fear of that last point is fading. In terms of a secular group, and also in terms of your own facility operating in such a group, I've overcome a lot of the fear I've had about a secular group in this last trip. I mean, if you want to know where the world is interested, the only place in which they are interested is that Other World chart--that's sanctification, obviously. That's where their real interests are, and you can do this with any group very quickly. Now that last point--this is a little difficult, but it is also the grace of God. You've got two sources. One is this chart--I wouldn't think of dealing with integrity if I didn't deal with area B. You've got that plus the sanctification lectures.

In the one in the new morality, which hits the second lecture--it's on agape, plus the sanctification on universal benevolence. In the second lecture, the 4th point, you've got two sources--one is this chart and the other is the sanctification lecture. What you've done is that you have blended them together, and that's what you ought to have done, I believe. Now you don't do either this or the sanctification, but you do your own creation there anew, a new thing. You ought to have indicative ethics along with this.

It has to do with all three of those, and then of course the sea of tranquility and fulfillment in your closing lecture. That one is the hardest one by far to give--the 4th point of the 4th lecture is the hardest one to do with power. We know less about that, I think, and the world knows less about it, but maybe it is the edge right now. How can my life be fulfilled? You would not spend as much time on that point as you would on any of the others. I believe that if I were doing these lectures, in most cases, most of my time would be on point two and three, but point one would be more than the last point. The last one is horrible, but you cannot afford the time; it's got to be briefer, but it cannot be just a couple of licks. You have got to get into it.

Slicker: The first box is the most important. If that doesn't come off, however unconsciously, they don't know exactly where to ground the whole course. And that last one, unless it comes off, it doesn't pull them into focus, it doesn't tie the knot onto the "bam" it punches into them.

I think I would take very, very seriously what Slicker says. That maybe your most time ought to be on that first point; if not, if you went my way, it's because you don't need illustrations there. What you need is hard, brutal board work. That speeds you up. Illustrations take time. In the second point, which is nowhere near as important as the first one, it may take you a little longer, but I don't want to take away from Slicker. You might even consider timewise on that first one. While we are on this, the second thing that needs to be said there is that in that first column, in your first major point, there are only two boxes that have any meaning whatsoever, and one is the one that spells out the dynamics. The other one is the imbalances--the rest of it is just padding. You keep away from the history--that's to be done in two sentences--first of all you are not a history teacher, and secondly, this course has nothing to do with history--that second box in that first column is put there simply to do transition so that you can get to those imbalances. You keep away from that history. In a chart that I was making on it, I just had 60 seconds on box 2.

Wiegel: History is too much of a potential red flag to do whatever value there is in it. Joe: That's where you are going to make your mistakes--and bad ones, and that's where they are going to disagree with your anthropology. That's where they are going to disagree with your interpretation of history, and you aren't interested in whether they agree or disagree. Therefore, don't give them a chance. Just say, like, "Any idiot knows that every culture has got to have someone go out to get something to eat, or they can't live"--that's your history. You go on to the next point.

Now that first point in the first column is the most important point in your whole lecture. That's the third thing I want to say. I'm not talking about time at the moment, but it is the most important--now most of us have gotten over our fear of the triangles and rightly so. When you get over your fear, they are as simple as

hell. And in that we don't have to go down 8 stories, it's a two-year-old who can do it. But what you need is one sheet of paper with your triangles with the EXACT WORDING. If you are like I am, you'd build about 40 of them. With the exact wording and the exact figures, or whatever, so that that's branded in your skull. Then when you go to the board, you can quickly communicate that which is so God-awfully complex to you that it frightens you. And it is. Any more I cannot remember down many levels, and that scares me, for fear that someone will ask a question. I would sure want one of those charts close by.

Now when you put it on the board, I believe you've got to go down to the next level. I want to say that the kind of resources are natural resources, like oil and so on, but in our day technological resources may be a far more important--or any way, if I wanted to get rich in a hurry, and you asked me whether I had a farm or oil, or that I had certain kinds of technical know-how, I'd take the technical know-how.

The crucial thing for me, is where you keep out of each other's hair. If the guy who is reviewing and the guy who gives the first lecture keeps himself to this level, you've got no trouble--the next guy's got to go down one. Number one is processes. The next thing is dynamics--that this delimits this, this defends that, this enlightens this, this illuminates this, and so on. . . And I don't spend much time here, because on this level, any idiot knows that he has known what you're describing all his life.

When anyone uses the word "ally" it is a red flag for me. I explode. I don't like the word, never use it. I like the word "castrate." The economic has rendered the political dynamic impotent, or it is powerless. It's in those documents we wrote in Summer '71. It's there and with force. Or probably the best source are those three gold books in preparation for Summer '72. If you do not draw that picture so that you know exactly what you are going to put up on that board, then your voice fails. And what causes it is that you get to thinking, "my God, I can't push this to the bottom." You get uncertain, but your uncertainty is mislocated; your uncertainty is not what you are putting on that board; it's what they'll never know anything about, and you are letting that get in there and it's because you haven't drawn a circle around what you know and said I'm going to forget what I don't know here. That is crucial. And if your voice crumbles there, the rest of your lecture has worm holes in it.

Now the cultural lecture, our problem there is that we are not clear on rationale and yet I am more convinced that the way we got that going is the way it's got to go. And this little thing here is the best thing I've seen yet on spelling out that part of that lecture on rationality. It's called Rationality Lecture Outline. That's by far the best thing I've seen. If I were going on this trip, I'd have this with me. . . It's a million times more helpful to me than this 4x4x4. I've gone through this, and

I swear, "I quit". Anyway, that is good. 18th of January. Now this Cultural 4x4x4 is not good. Even if I were not insecure, this would not be good. And this is as far as I got, and it's not very far. But it's trying to tie that lecture together into one thing, and therefore I am jumping over many parts of the lecture that you've got to get in there, saying to myself the whole thing at once. I'm going to read it, bad as it is.

1. The cultural dynamic of society which illuminates our common existence and interrelations, i.e., the ground of the great social inventions that comprise histories today is in transitional state of collapse, or in a state of transitional collapse. The powerful economic dynamic has moved into this cultural vacuum, and taken over, and perhaps rightly so. The symbols, styles and images of our common life are defined today by the economic dynamic of society and especially by the overgrown internal dynamic of production. Such a state has placed a chasm between the cultural dynamic and the ultimate, the irrational mystery before which every culture comes into being.

2. Herein is the reason for the deterioration of the cultural institutions, that has to do with education, the family, the local community, religion, and the like, and has thereby thrown the individual, isolated now from social structures, (significant relevant social structures), into a state of radical alienation and final estrangement from the ultimate. In the broad historical sense we have and are experiencing the passingness of all previous cultures, both East and West and this all at once. Inside the individual this has understandably been a moment of darkness, bewilderment, suffocation, of anxiety, as with death itself. He is without a context, without an adequate value system--ours is a profound, therefore human, crisis. It is, however, somehow a boon to grasp the fact that the occasion of the sense of the cut-off-ness that the individual experiences is fundamentally socially occasioned, (at least it's been that way for me).

3. Strange, indeed paradoxical as it may seem, this very axiological failure has enabled man to recover his senses. Man has rediscovered that he is a rational animal, that he must comprehensively relate harmoniously all his experience, (and I mean harmoniously there at that moment), i.e., his whole life. To do this he must have a perspective beyond reason itself. This is his story that relates him to the transrational, to the mystery, to the incomprehensible, to the ground, invisible as it is to all cultures. Out of this story, cultures are built, men live their lives and die their deaths. Without it, all is chaos and personal despair. The story enables comprehensive means that build the necessary structures of commonness and personal fulfillment.

4. Out of this invention of a new story about (this is pretty well Don's lecture) out of this invention of a new story about the meaning of humanness, a new and this time global culture will emerge and a sense of fulfillment within the individuals which comprise it and in principle therefore all men. In the sense of fulfillment there is an awareness of certainty in the midst of the irrationality upon which reason rests--a problemless peace in the midst of all the contradictions to this perspective of certitude, all of which releases a spontaneous joy of life, and occasions a state of endless relation to both the past and the future. Obviously what is needed today then is the story which rebalances culture itself; that in turn then will empower the common relations that define our politics and delimit our material sustenance, or which restores for this moment an operational balance in the social dynamics which will create our future. Herein is the resurgence in this profound moment of history. It is the ground of an emerging new social vehicle. It is the transfiguring force of the family, in a community and the individual in it. It is the reconstruction of all educational systems. It is the renewal of language, art and religion. It is a new grasp upon the political dynamic and the meaning of our commonly sustaining ourselves.

Now this is not the lecture, by a long, long way, but it's something like this that you are fooling with, but I notice here that I did not get much said about the rational. My guess is that we have better ones than this already done. Have we not? Have we not got statements which in two or three paragraphs pull the punch of the lecture together?

Our society is in a state of irrationality. Whenever reason loses its relation to that which itself points to as transcending it, (I'm working with Camus here) then reason itself is irrational. Luther summed this up (the same thing) when he said, "Reason is a whore; it will serve any master." That's a fantastic statement. That's all Camus ever had to say. And when it loses its relationship to that understanding of itself, which is the mystery, or the irrational, then reason itself is irrational. Now you are not going to say this in a lecture, but this is the guts of that lecture--that quote on rationality. That is, reason only operates on a myth, which is irrational. Don had this in his lecture. Reason needs a story. Now reason is not something that goes on in the head. Reason is culture. I would like to start back in Room E again on those triangles. I would never use that "human wisdom"; I'd put images, styles, and symbols. Boy, wouldn't it be fun to do it all over again!

You used to have to move in with a broad sword and carve through to the mystery in our day, but you ought not to have done it even then without deep appreciation, and now it's time to speak of the appreciation. No wonder they located the divine in the rational. It's

like the rational and the irrational are siamese twins; you don't have the one without the other. And so with culture. Culture is not divine, but the divine is not there without culture. There is no way for you and I to be confronted with the mystery, if a culture is not going out of being, or coming into being, I happen to believe, (boy, you would like to be back when we're fooling with history again, which we probably never will). But this is a part of the fact of a country's dynamic--it's either coming or going--it's never there, but of course it's there, when it is irrational. That irrationality was in our very being, our educational system, our families, our -- we didn't even doubt that this was the way it was to be, and my God, here we sit when every Goddamn thing has collapsed. Now what happened? Here you no longer blame the economic in this lecture, and that's why I would like to start out by "Economics just moved in where there was a vacuum, it picked up the situation, and did what it could with it." And it's about right, you know? The story went away. Now you and I, interpreting that theologically, would say, "God took it out of history," but here you don't say that the story went away; it's just no longer relevant. Therefore all the institutions collapsed, and of course the political and the economic are the last to collapse. The first things that collapsed--final meanings went away--none of you ever went to school where they dealt head-on with final meanings. The communities are gone. You and I talk about Ada--shit, Ada was gone before I came along--they didn't know it in Ada. God, all that time I wasted, trying to hold our family together--all seven of us. After Mama and and Poppa could no longer do it, I thought I was called to hold us together. I wasted a great deal of my life, trying to hold together something He had already taken out of existence, but He had forgotten to notify me. I was too thick. . . . You are fooling with this arena in this lecture. Not that you say anything I'm saying, but you fool in this arena. And you can't be this complicated, but down underneath whatever we have in this lecture--boy, I tell you there's complications, and that's why you don't take all your hair down before then, for fear that you walk into your own tiger trap.

One of the most rewarding things you are going to get out of this is a broader rational context for why we have gone through what we have gone through all of our lives, asking what life is all about. And I don't know, I feel like I have just been bathed in wonderful, lukewarm, perfumed water--to have that image flowing through me. You remember that old gospel hymn, "We shall understand it better by and by". And this is true, and we live now in the hope always of understanding. Really in a way, Augustine's thought was on that. . . .

By the way, I think that you just ought to stick in your briefcase a few of these by-and-by songs that you might use in the religious houses that you'll be at on your trip. Well, maybe we can come back to that. Now, let's look at this lecture. Now supposing that somebody at that point and the one you gave just before it said, "Now practically what did you have in mind for us, say, two weeks from now or three?" Suppose that really happened. How would you have handled that? (Gary: Would have gone back to

earlier parts of lecture. . . practically care is that) And then I would have said to you, "Well, yeah, yeah, I get that but you've been talking about that you can't do it for yourself and all this guild stuff you've got up here. Now practically what am I going to do? What have you got in mind? After all this noise you've been making up here. . ." How would you answer a question like that? I can conceive of that happening.

This last lecture I think is in just sort of excellent shape. It's likely a shame to say this but maybe the most important thing he put on that board was the structure of the whole course relative to resurgence. That was his introduction. His review. And that struck me with a certain kind of power and makes me feel now that it's more crucial than ever that every lecturer minus the first one put on the board the outline of their lectures.