

RETURN TO  
ED IT.  
FILES

SOCIAL METHODS SCHOOL: RICK LOUDERMILK: MODEL BUILDING 3/13/74

It was

As mentioned at lunch, there is a shift that takes place at this point,  
*(and certainly intensification)*  
it's one of ~~the~~ *restification*, it's not something else.

As you can see, we've arrived at the session <sup>there</sup> in the <sup>middle</sup> ~~middle~~; which is a watershed between ~~the~~ analysis and battleplanning or the laboratory has been divided into initial steps and now into head on battleplanning steps. It's not that you have'nt been doing practical analysis up to now, it's been very practical and on the basis on which the actual battleplanning will be built.

But perhaps what we are about now is to take a few steps back, look at what we've done and thereby <sup>gain degree</sup> ~~a degree~~ of self-consciousness ~~with-~~ regarding the

methods that we will be using throughout the school and also thereby giving ~~to~~ each of us a kind of skill in ~~passing~~ <sup>That is</sup> the methods on. The degree to which we can sit back and observe in some sort of systematic way <sup>How</sup> ~~what~~ we are doing

~~and how~~ we are doing ~~what we are doing~~ and thereby we can realize the content <sup>what we are doing</sup>

and also the methods <sup>for arriving at the content</sup> .... There fore the intention here of the model building <sup>probably</sup> section

dynamic / in which up to now you've been building models <sup>of how and where</sup> ..... ~~so we~~

~~But~~ ~~going~~ <sup>to putting</sup> a model building section is not to say you haven't been exactly what we are doing

and thereby have some kind of clear road map as we go ahead to the nitty-gritty and <sup>get out</sup> give some practical considerations <sup>to</sup> your community and work on the

problems. .... To do that it is helpful <sup>almost</sup> ~~at least~~ it is necessary for me to

back that into history just a little bit and get a perspective, that is a running start on what we have been doing.

To start I would like to use the analogy that what we've been about so far is very much akin to the kind of revolutionary activity that build ancient China. The Confucian revolution <sup>as it's often referred to</sup> was a foundation kind in that civilization's history <sup>was brought</sup> ~~to~~ in which a structural change or a structural revolution <sup>caught on</sup>

~~(one of the primary things is that it looked like things were always changing)~~ but the most important thing - it seems like when we look back in history that

Laudermilk

page 2

I don't think that that is the case. There were static civilizations always, there were ~~also~~ always an establishment, always a disestablishment, It just looks like they were longer standing because ~~they were longer standing because~~ you haven't got enough room in the history books to write all the steps down.

The empire that was China was very well established. ~~and~~ when Confucius came along and given the kind of feudal system that was there in order to make some changes he attached himself to the Emperor ~~as~~ as an advisor for some ~~time~~ 20 years tried ~~some~~ to make some changes in the court. After just about that long he realized that no changes were being made. That the establishment kept on being the establishment. And realized that that is exactly what the establishment's function is. Is to maintain the establishment. He had another job to do and that was <sup>to</sup> bring about change and therefore used a different strategy. <sup>But it</sup> There was a quiet, <sup>structural</sup> simple strategy. It was a quiet revolution. By that I mean it was from within but the strategy he used was <sup>as you know</sup> to gather around him a group of men who were disciplined, who were trained, and who worked with him for about as long as that 20 years, and then he dispersed them into the outlying communities of the provinces. Now their task as they had been trained, as they had been working with Confucius, was to do three things. The first thing they were to do <sup>was</sup> to make available to the masses, a new way of making decision. It was a <sup>decisional</sup> decisional philosophy of decision making that is known as Confucian philosophy built on the ying yang principle.

You know, in which opposites can be considered in one whole and ~~that~~ dealt with at the same time. This may seem like kind of a simple thing now, with the tools that civilization has today, but people ~~beginning~~ for to be able to think about two opposites at the same time and make a decision about both <sup>a breakthrough</sup> was ~~very~~ in civilization at one time.

The second thing that he had them do was to deliver or talk about a new image of what it meant to be a Chinese <sup>human</sup>. Now <sup>there was</sup> ~~the~~ images of humanness and of being Chinese, but he began to talk to, to deliver to these guys the word that they call

the "literati " . Now that is not an elite name, it just meant that they were all the people who could read and write, in those days, and their job was to

teach people <sup>how</sup> to read and write in those provinces. ~~That's what they wanted to do~~  
~~about~~

If they were about anything , they were about that: .....

<sup>inside</sup>  
you've got to get back ~~in~~ there and if you have a set of \_\_\_\_\_ that is illiterate,  
If you go into a backward province and you don't teach anyone but the illiterate,

and you go into those backwood provinces and you teach people how to read and write,

that's social methods school., very basic social methods training. If you havent

learned how to read and write, that's very difficult. YOU know, some would rather

go out and farm or <sup>hunt</sup> ~~house~~ or do something else, but to sit down at the table and take

they had short  
little, guess ~~you need like~~ chopsticks, and pour over a desk ~~some day~~ all day was

a

a revolution, in ~~fact~~ some peoples ~~mind~~ ~~assigned~~ ~~to~~ ~~that~~ patterns. During the day,

writing first came into society , as a n injection of soical methods that changed a

whole ~~civilization~~ civilization. They were the only ones who knew how to make out a will,

so that property could be transferred, They were the only people who knew how to

audit accounts and add up the tax records so they were very valuable to the <sup>establish</sup> ~~xxxxxxx~~-  
ment

~~in~~ in that area. These were so cial method they took a very, very

from within in a  
quite way  
~~the~~

that they

basic social methods ~~and~~ injected it into the ~~xxxxxxx~~ civilization.

permeating over a period of time, and thereby, brought about literally the bureau-  
cratic system / <sup>I mean that</sup> ~~which~~ in a very positive sense, that ~~any~~ ~~xxxx~~ built the very ancient

civilization of China. The bureaucratic structures , the civil service system,

which the Empire was able to maintain and and finally has operated on for a very long

time. If that ~~thing~~ seems distant to you or far away, I think it still <sup>helpful</sup> ~~holds~~ ~~though~~

because this is <sup>still</sup> ~~just~~ what we are doing. We are dealing with social methods, which ,  
according to transition we are in, are basic to the future of civilization as writing

was a thousand or two thousand years ago. In fact, we are starting all over again to

teach ourselves <sup>how</sup> to be civilized people. We are starting all over again with the basics.

with "What is a Problem?  
WE started, ~~one with a problem~~. We are starting all over again .What is a society?

It's become a fundamental question, what are the three parts of a society? It's like

That's what we're doing

we've not yet hit first base. We're starting all over to put this thing back together.

And then for the recreation of this society, one of the goals will be the recreation  
of the type of human being that lives in that society. We are, at the same time,

making a social construction and projection whereby you and I will participate and

probably our children will participate . <sup>and</sup> Therefore we are creating ~~the~~ ~~xxxx~~ what it

meant to be a human ~~mixing~~ being for the next <sup>50</sup> few years, and because of certain vested interests that us human beings have in <sup>that</sup> ~~us~~, we have to make some decisions.

That is, the important thing about the decisions that we are making is that this

revolution, or this rebuilding of civilization that we're talking about is ~~what's~~ <sup>not</sup>

happening ~~just~~ in Chicago, its ~~not~~ <sup>not</sup> happening ~~just~~ in USA, not happening in

just one civilization. It's ~~what's~~ <sup>not</sup> happening in just one part of the ~~world~~ <sup>globe</sup>. This

is probably the radical ~~issue~~ <sup>nature</sup> of the times, in which we live, this reconstruction of

civilization is happening across the globe. And thereby the possibility, ~~and the~~ <sup>as well as</sup>

(that's what the Chinese word "crisis" means), both possibility and danger) the danger, <sup>✓</sup> is before us ~~once~~ <sup>once</sup> again, of building, of recreating a society. This is

both a revolution of such a profound ~~nature~~ <sup>no</sup> that it is hard for us to grasp and

I think our images of revolution, you see, is determined by 1776, and that it has to

be done that way. Actually if you ~~want to~~ look at history, violent revolutions occur and probably ~~have~~ <sup>have</sup> to occur, but I would submit to you that the changes brought

about by violent revolution do not last long. That the changes that are foundational

to civilization are ~~brought~~ <sup>they're</sup> about by quiet revolution, brought about by structural

revolutions, they're brought about by laying foundational premises, within society,

within the structures so <sup>as</sup> to mutate them, <sup>so that the new may</sup> ~~or that which is needed to~~ emerge. It's

not clear all the time which way to go . It is not clear exactly what the ~~manifestation~~

of that new social vehicle is going to be, therefore you and I have to have twice the

courage, one to venture out and two to be patient, within and begin to work for, the

emerging manifestations of that society, and of that new human being. Therefore, you

and I ~~have~~ <sup>therefore</sup> some decisions to make, you and I have some plans to make. Therefore you

and I have some jobs to do. And the considerations here are not easy, xx

When you and I <sup>sit down to</sup> decide what to do, we are trapped, we have been driven,

western civilization <sup>then are</sup> in ~~reconsideration~~, in only two ways to make decisions. If you look at your training,

<sup>and</sup> if you look at your education, if you look at what society has given us here, we really

have only two ways to choose. We can make a decision on ,you know, ~~what~~ society

has said is good, what is right, what ought to be, what is ideal for this situation,

and what kind of ethical system; or we can use another type in which we can ~~ask~~ see

has been most what/~~would be more~~ useful, what has been most ~~customary~~, what has been most

traditional in the past and build on that, and really those are the only two avenues<sup>1</sup>

until the 20th century, were even offered to man~~in~~ kind--offered to us in the West

really--upon which to construct and ferret out the milieu and the new civilization.

Now in the 20th century another, ~~another type of~~ the kind of decisional approach

has been given us, ~~and~~ and it goes by several names, but the most ~~well known~~ familiar is, you know,

contextual ethics or biological ethics in which there is ~~humanism~~ given ~~to~~ or  
~~bracket~~ brought to it a kind of consideration and systematic approach beyond simply what is

good and what is wrong and what ~~isn~~ has been customary and what has not been

customary. It throws you over against the entire context in which you operate--both

outside the Western world and ~~inside~~ within the Western world--beyond the white middle-class

values and within the white middleclass values --and yet what is becoming strangely

apparent when that showed up is that there is not just 2 systems of ethics or 3

systems of ethics, but probably there are many, many, many rational systems of ethics

which are yet to be invented. Now that's a kick in the head, isn't it! Thought we

had it narrowed down. ~~No!~~ <sup>all</sup> Probably there ~~are~~ many that we'll have to invent before

this revolution in over. In other words, ethical as a way to decide is a rational

system ~~is~~ superimposed upon ~~everyday~~ everyday life, upon the decision you make, upon

the activities you participate in; but ~~that~~ to call it an ethical system is to

give it a little bit more credence than it is a drawing together <sup>in</sup> the rational unity

the impact that it made. <sup>of an age</sup> So that when you talk about a system of decisions, you are

talking about a way to act, you're talking about something that has a foundation

under it. And today ethics are both an indicative mode -- an indicitive ethic

is present today which in one sense includes contextual ethics because what do you

mean by indicitive ethics. Well, ~~its based on what we've said and what~~ we've known for a long time:

that you and I have to decide on the basis of what actually is before us. We have

to deal with what <sup>and simply</sup> really is, not with what ought to be. Or that ~~is~~ it is

time to get behind the moral manifestations of you/ought to ~~do this~~ or you do this

because its been authoritatively passed down ~~xxxx~~ and finally give a person

a way to recreate for himself his own standards and ~~his~~ own criteria of action

. By indicitive you mean it comes out of the consciousness of the individual and

he ~~is~~ <sup>a</sup> invents it. Now this tis ~~the~~ dangerous approach, this is a wide open approach.

This is happening in our times, <sup>is such a</sup> ~~because of the~~ way, <sup>that</sup> --its like everything that has

gone before us is so inadequate ~~that~~ to deal with the crises that we are in--whether

look at the economic life, the cultural life

you look at the economic life, the political life, or the cultural life-- that any

pattern that you hold up has <sup>so</sup> many problems ~~insist~~ already analysed in it, that

you wouldn't want to use it anyway, and <sup>that</sup> when you do that 1000 year~~t~~-conversation, you

know, and ask people 'now, what would you like civilizaition to be like in a thousand

years?' ~~ooooo~~ a strange silence settles in the room. That is, the future is so

frightening in its possibilities, dangers, etc. that we are being driven back into

<sup>the</sup> present to invent human consciousness and an analysis of human society as it ~~really~~ is

to once again reconsider and say for ourselves what ~~the~~ foundational building blocks are

which ~~xxxxxxx~~ constitute human sociality. What are the Foundational building blocks that constitute a society at all.

And thereby with the minds and the insights and the

people of today try to say what is the mode of decision-making that allows a person to

even stand in the 20th century and ~~make~~ responsible decisions, make ~~a~~ a decision that

is befitting of the times and the cruciality that he stands within. Let me come at it

something like this: when you approach ~~such problems~~--the depth of human consciousness--

(and this has been mentioned before) that is, that those past models are inadequate and

there aren't any future models that are waiting out around the bend to be found that

that we have to create them right now, what you run up against in human existence is

simply the fact of mystery...~~that first is~~ that this 20th century is like coming upon

the planet totally barren and starting all over again. ~~That's~~ It's as if we've come

upon <sup>it's</sup> ~~and~~ unknown world, /as if we've come upon raw human consciousness from the word 'go'

and now have to recreate every fiber, every structure, every plank of human existence

again and in so doing you're over against simply the mystery of human existence itself

which has always been <sup>perhaps</sup> there but ~~which~~ <sup>which</sup> was covered up/by standards or by criteria

or structures of the past and *then we try to begin* again over against that unknown.

~~now~~ all over again. Until a person starts there he's already fogged up, he's already

out of focus, he has ~~no~~ no possibility of seeing ~~what~~ what's really needed,

How do you get back to that phase zero in the history books to start over again is

what ~~y~~ we're doing with this model building. Let me illustrate what I mean.

It's clear today that the nature of humanness itself has to do with ~~being~~ freedom.

It has to do with the free release to create. It has to do with the fact that a human

being is ~~not~~ not legislated freedom, he's not given freedom, he's not sold freedom,

He is freed~~om~~ creativity. He is freedom and thereby has the possibility of going

about deciding for himself, <sup>of</sup> /going about the possibility/ of creating his own standards.

*and*  
This is an insight of our age. Before you had to earn your freedom, /you had to

purchase your freedom. This is a new insight in one sense that comes into the con-

sciousness of the 20th century. And then the way Charles talked today at lunch.

Whatever else decision-making arises out of, it comes ~~g~~because a person is put into a

situation~~m~~ in which he has to care. Or as Charles talked this noon, in which concern

<sup>wife?</sup>  
for your life and for the person by you and for yourself in that situation ~~and yourself~~

with that person is not superimposed; that is, what you ought ~~to~~ do in that situation

is not clear, that the concern ~~thought~~, the drive to do something in that situation

that in this <sup>(to take him?)</sup>  
is present and /~~in that~~ freedom a person has to decide whether ~~they can~~ <sup>(go to the</sup>

~~bat-~~

bathroom?) or not. To pick up on that illustration.

IN other words, the difficulty here--and Charles made this extremely clear--

because <sup>were</sup>  
that ~~because~~ you and I/~~are~~ born into a white race does not mean that we are not con-

cerned about black people. In other words, to be concerned does not mean that you

have to say ~~no~~ "no" to being a white man in order to be concerned about Black people.

That the concern is there. Let me put it another way. Because you were born into a particular family with particular brothers and sisters and particular relations

does not mean that you have to negate <sup>your</sup> ~~the~~ family in order to care for the world.

Those ~~these~~ are but two sides of the same coin. That human concern is there from the beginning

ning. Or the way Chrles put it: primal human sympathy is an indicative. It's

simply there. And the frustration <sup>and</sup> ~~and~~ the difficulty that we have ~~is~~ in most cases

is because of ~~the~~ frustration in expressing that care. Or somebody said <sup>the</sup> ~~the~~ other day

that apathy comes not from a lack of care, but because ~~is~~ people have been hurt so

much in try<sup>ing</sup>ing to express ~~xxx their~~ their care they're just tired <sup>of trying</sup> tired. It comes

from caring too much. Human concern has got to be the initial motivation, or is

the initial motivation for any decision finally, whether it goes against what you

think you ought to do or not ought to do in the situation on <sup>that</sup> ~~the~~ airplane encounter.

Come at it something like this: the raw consciousness <sup>has</sup> ~~is~~ presented

to us the fact that life is problem, to put it in another metaphor, that life is

pure problem, period. Is that right? Pure problem, period. Life is suffering and

the  
 life is tragic and that the only/only context in which you can act is that context  
 in what it means to be a human being is to take utter delight in dealing with the  
 pure problems, period. You know? When a person refuses to deal with the indicative  
 of his existence, when he refuses to deal with the real problem he has on his hand,  
 (Like the man who had<sup>poor</sup> a prostate operation--you can pretend that isn't the case, you can  
 pretend that that's not going to get wet all over the seat in a few minutes, you can  
 pretend...but the real problem is there and the only thing you've got to do is  
 deal with it one way or another. What I'm trying to say is that when you refuse that  
 consciousness, when you refuse that indicative situation, that's immorality, that's  
 the wrong relative to that situation. Therefore, people who negate the indicative  
 possibility of their own mystery, their own freedom, their own concern <sup>call</sup> ~~we~~ those  
 people today...we say that causes mental illness. You know? We say people have a  
 nervous breakdown, we ~~say~~ say people get sick because they don't have the possibility  
 of affirming their own creativity, <sup>or</sup> /their own possibility. But that's not exactly  
 right. Those people aren't sick, they're immoral. To negate-- x in this kind of a

How can you say that? Well, if you go to a psychiatrist, he can't allow you to make

some ~~decision~~ decision about your existence. All he can do is show/<sup>how</sup>it is you've

been <sup>negating</sup>~~negating~~ the indicative of your existence. You've got to decide whether you're

going to be that free creative person or not ~~xxx~~ All he can do is point out your

immorality for you upon which you can decide to live in society as a responsible

person, that is, out of the situation ~~xxx~~ and the consciousness that you ~~g~~ bring to

it. Now, all I'm trying to say ~~ix~~ that these states of being <sup>which</sup> ~~xxxx~~ have been so

clearly articulated for us, of mystery, of freedom, of concern, of serenity in the

midst of tragedy and suffering is the nature of every human <sup>being's ~~ixix~~ life today</sup> ~~beingxxxxxxxtoday~~

And therefore you have to start there. But let me put it this way. Everybody ~~ix~~

observes, judges, weighs up, decides and acts. Its not/<sup>just</sup>that there are ~~justx~~some

people who are dealing with decision<sup>s</sup> and some people who aren't dealing with

decision<sup>s</sup> Everybody is involved in observing and deciding and acting. It has to

<sup>that</sup> do with the rational road map that you build for yourself in which to act, in which

to decide and which criteria you use in so doing. What you've been doing is building

~~your~~ your road map in the first few sessions. Do you see that? You've been

delineating the parameters of your action, you have been in most cases attempting

to build a bigger picture ~~is~~--that is all of society, economic, political <sup>and</sup> cul-

~~ture~~ tural --and to deal with the pressure points--that is, where the concerns ~~are~~ ~~focus~~ ~~is~~ ~~is~~ are ~~is~~ ~~is~~ ~~is~~

focused in <sup>are ready?</sup> <sup>actual? (tactical?) steps</sup> <sup>(actual map?)</sup> society-- and now you ~~want~~ to lay the ~~(tactical plan)~~ to deal with what you have

actually created to ~~this~~ point. In other words, these states of being that I've

mentioned: of creativeness, of concern, etc. \* do not come about outside of con-  
~~crete~~

crete situations; utterly mundane situations, everyday happenings. And without

~~these~~ those external happenings, these states of being would not be conscious for

it you and me, /would not be possible ~~for~~ for consciousness if they were not there

In other words, as you well know, any decision that you make has to deal with the

context in which you're living. Let me put it like this, I want to spell out at

least four characteristics of responsible decision-making under this rubric of

indicative ethics. In other words, your ~~actions~~ and your decision is always

contextual. Now by contextual, I simply mean you have to relate it to what has

gone before and what is coming after ~~it~~wards. And in dealing with the ~~problems~~ of

society and in dealing with the ~~problems~~ of your community ~~you're~~ <sup>you've begun</sup> ~~you're~~ <sup>you're</sup> going

to do this ~~at-least-initially~~ by looking , at least initially , at the 60s'

looking *at least initially* at the ~~70's~~ , to build some overarching context, in

which you can act. ~~Turning~~-Turning more to the particular, your decisions take

place in the midst of your great big ~~overarching~~ <sup>responsibility</sup> decisions that come to you

when you're washing the dishes. These great big old responsible decisions

happen when you're having a fight with your wife or making love to your'

wife; that's ~~whn-y~~-when you make decisions about history and ~~that's~~ you notice

~~that~~ that this is not removed from real life situations. Come at ~~it~~ something

like this, We say that one of the major problems in the world today is War;

you know it ~~always~~ comes up when you're brainstorming, The war ~~intz~~ the

Middle East, it used to be the War in South East Asia it's still going on to some

degree. War ~~is~~ is a major problem, how did you come upon that insight. Well

I'd like to submit to you that the most violent situation in the United States

today is the American family. There where violence is <sup>going on</sup> ~~being-born~~, most brutally

and most diabolically is in the husband-wife relationship.

...I'm concerned about human life..That's right, that's right.but the realization of that doesn't happen while you're reading a book of Vietameese history it happens ~~when-~~ in the midst of your life. Now violence is a problem its not some abstraction in Viet Nam. That is it happens in a concrete situation, ~~i~~like Charles was saying today, ~~that~~ your care for the world doesn't happen by making a big trip around the world; it happens on the airplane coming home. to Chicago. That kind of indicat~~i~~ve existence is where the context ~~for~~ your ~~life~~action evolves. It becomes clear that the kind of decision, that what you know you need to do. ~~It~~ That's what you mean by indicative existence.

The second thing is that this ~~thing~~ is always created. It may seem a bit redundant but let me say ~~a-ward~~it another way.. IN this kind of an understanding inthis kind of an ethical system, you decide the Right. You decide the good; you decide, so to speak, the morality. necessary. And and the moral deed, and

I don't mean anything pious, I don't mean anything righteous by moral deed.

A moral deed is a unique deed. And a moral deed is <sup>today is entirely</sup> ~~a-let~~ different from what

it was yesterday. A moral deed is like an artform. It's the unique of the

unique of the unique artistic expression. No two moral acts are ever alike.

Totally unique, ~~bea~~because of each indicative situation is unique and therefore

your response required, the response elicited, the response created is always

unique. This is the freedom, this is the open-endedness is talking in this

kind of a way. In other words, the significance and the meaning of any act

of any problem, of any situation, has to be injected <sup>to</sup> in it. And the nature of

indicative ethics is that responsibility is upon you. I don't know whether

the Black man realized *he* was going to make a great business,

on that encounter, I don't know if he realized ~~that~~-who Charles was. It doesn't

matter. Charles decided about the significance of that event in light of the

whole world and that changed ~~eve~~-that situation and every situation ~~in~~ in

Charles' life thereafter~~x~~ . That's what we mean by created--it's open. You

have to decide <sup>that is</sup> is not a good statement. That is a wrenching, struggling process which is the nature of indicative ethics. You say something like this: Indicative ethics or authentication~~g~~--that's a bit awkward--authenticating ethics. What do you mean by authenticating ethics? It means that in a relative universe and a <sup>in</sup> relative world which we are conscious of, that every model you put forth is no better or no worse than any other model you put forth. There are no absolute models. And you and I are clear that every form and every structure and every pattern that we offer up is tinsel, it's dated, and it will be out-dated very quickly. But what it means to be a responsible person is that in any given situation <sup>that</sup> you invest yourself completely in dealing with that situation; that you're not holding back, letting your entire efforts go into dealing with what you've decided to deal with. Now, here are \_\_\_\_\_, here is the radicalization of authenticity. You have a temporal model and you have your total being, <sup>and</sup> at any given time and you're asked to put your total being in a temporal model. Realizing that 10 seconds later, someone's going to come in with a better model. And <sup>in</sup> 2 minutes later you will agree that your total being needs to be

injected in that 10 seconds later. Now it's not quite 10 seconds, but it's almost that way sometimes--at least it seems lkike it. That this ~~here~~ is the dynamics of model-building. This is the dynamics of responsible decsision-making. This is required that is your authenticity depends upon not some authority saying this is what you ought to do, but upon your deciding-this is what you ought to do and you got to have 3 good reasons for doing it. And the 3 good reasons are a model, they are a plan, they are a road-map, they are a rational picture to the best of your ability...You are held to account, I guess George was saying the other day, to answer for that; not in some kind of "well, I decided so!" What are the 3 good reasons you've decided so.? This is the nature of authenticating indicative ethics. And then 4th ly, I call this--indicatives ethics have a methodological feel to them--that is, not only am I <sup>interested in your</sup> mentioning 3 good reasons, I'm also <sup>interested in</sup> mentioning how you arrived at those 3 good reasons. That is what is means to be a responsible person in a case of dealing with your community, you say that this is what we ought to do this quarter, you know, in the next 3 months you gotta do this program and this program and this

Not especially to allow somebody else to come along and say that if I do these 3

steps I'll arrive at the ~~same 3 good~~ programs but this is what it simply means to

be responsible. <sup>that</sup> ~~so~~ other people can participate along with you in that decision-

making process and standing in the same spot that you're standing, going in the same

direction you're going, they can see what you see even if they call it by some

other set of 3 good reasons. That this kind of methodological clarity, or if

you're going to deal with masses of people, there's got to be some way to communicate

the "how" you arrived at that decision. Your methods these past few days have been

extremely important and now as we go forward into a different kind of model-building,

it becomes even more important. That is, as you begin to work and as you ~~being~~ begin

to decide to take responsibility for that hunk of geography and ~~that~~ the lives of

people in there, you're taking on a huge responsibility. You're deciding to create

the future. [You're deciding ~~tes~~ in creating their future ~~the~~ in fact the whole

historical process] and therefore model-building self-consciousness here ~~comes~~

becomes all the more important. The dynamics of model-building. Where do you start,

how do you begin on something lklike this? Once you've decided to go ahead and thrust your existence into the fulcrum point in history, where do you begin?

Well, what we've learned in the 20th century is that you begin with social analysis.

Now, that's a good scientific approach. What do we mean by social analysis? That is,

first of all, you simply delineate emperically the processes that social activity

that you're going to operate on. You do an anatomy of your community. Does that

communicate? That's what we've been doing up til now, really, isn't it? You've

been dissecting to the best of your ability, that community, peice by part by peiece adn

and lookeing at it in some kind of an objective way. Now the function of <sup>this</sup> ~~the~~, though,

is to see it in its component parts and because <sup>we know</sup> today that society is dynamical, <sup>the</sup>

relationships between the parts, <sup>+</sup> this is important. You delineate those components

economic, political and cultural, but you have to also deal with the ~~want~~ relationship

of how they interact one with another. Society is ~~dyna~~ dynamics; **society** is a moving

organism; **society** is a fabric that has these relationships and when you can see

the model of the whole; that model , then, tells you what you're working towards.

That is, it gives you both the picture of the current situation and whether its a square or triangle or a hexagon, the balanced relationships between those parts then determines the direction that you're going to move. Do you see that? Nobody else tells you what the goals of society are. The goals of the community come from your picture of the community. The component parts--economic, political, and cultural--are the ones we're working with, the ones we've worked ~~out~~ out; the ones that's taken from the wisdom of the ages. Therefore, we keep saying, a balanced society never exists; there's always problems in society. That's right. But ~~now~~ the capability of the human mind is to conceive of a normal society from which all these problems become <sup>so</sup> ~~more~~ clear. A normal society is one that's balanced between the economic, political and cultural. It sounds abstract, that's right, because the human mind has to abstract if its going to think. Now it doesn't think only an abstraction. It deals with real situations. It deals with the indicative. But by dealing with that abstract normative model, you got into peices out there and you've got the relationship between the peices and lets say for the moment that balances

is too idealistic a term. What you want are tensional relationships between those component parts however you define their indicative relationship, their actual relationships, their indicative relationships; you want to define the creative tensional relationships between the parts. And therefore what you're working towards is enabling those parts to tensionally enable one another. No ~~creat~~ creative effort comes out of anything but tension in the 20th century. Now, I'm using tension now in the positive sense, <sup>as</sup> I believe that it's indicatively conceived. But only in tension is there some creative move forward; is there some kind of direct delineation of the dynamic processes that arouse human beings to be human beings. Let me give you this picture, when we teach the LENS seminar to business people, we had management by objectives, you know, we know how to set goals, and work toward them and they're right; they have, but what you know is, what you want to ask is; "how did you arrive at those goals?" Well, "the president gave us the quotas",,or "we decided that this should be the quota for this quarter." "How did you decide?" <sup>they've been hused,</sup> and then there is a hush. That is the way you arrive at these

f

goals is got to be indicatively. It's got to come from the bottom up. Not a superimposed vision or a superimposed objective. "How did you arrive at these objectives?" Well, you arrive at them by building an inclusive problem-mat.

Now let's go a little bit further here. An inclusive problem-mat has to do with

delineating the ~~so~~ spots of ~~human suffering~~ innocent suffering. It has to do with

putting your finger on the pressure points, <sup>where there is inequity, where there is malfunctions</sup> ~~where~~ there are blocks; where there

are some kind of imbalance in your model. And those then become, as you know, a great

~~very~~ big long list of problems, And yet the objective,--let me go back and state this

as clearly as possible--your objective therefore that you begin to work towards, or

so to speak, <sup>is</sup> within those problems--that's not exactly right. If the problem in

the society is a lack of pre-school training programs in the community then your

objective becomes the establishment of pre-school training facilities in the community.

Now, that's a little bit simplified. It's not quite that simple when you start

stating your objectives because society is the complex network it is. Let me use

an

an historical example: Thomas Jefferson said that the problem, boys, with this government that we rose up --its a nice model--(they had been working with it for a few years)--Thomas Jeffesrson came along and said that only a few of us are making decisions; there is inadequate partic ipation in the government by the people and for the people and whatever other way. We've got a problem here. Now, what's your objective. The objective is to have more people participate in the government, right! What's the objective in that situation. Thomas Jefferson said that it was free public education. He said that you cannot have a responsible gobernment without educated voters. That is the obhjective is not simply a particular event, but it's within the problem that you've already delineated. Do you see that? The problem--mat, the crucial issue of that problem, does focus for you where the blocks, where the imabalances , where the malfunction is going on ~~sh~~ in the process. That is wherre the components in these processes as they work together are not working. Wherre the bugs are in that process and therefore you may have in <sup>a</sup> ~~this~~ society much suffering and many, many problems--like cancer causes suffering in society--and <sup>SH</sup> ~~that~~'s a problem.

But the question is now, 'do you drop everything that you're doing and put all our efforts behind the Cancer Society in order to deal with it?' How do you decide that don't, you know, all go ~~out~~ and join the Cancer society, rather stay home a few days <sup>more</sup> of figure/so ~~thing else~~ <sup>out</sup> that that is a major problem rather than simply another problem-mat. Well, the

*How do you decide*  
inclusiveness of the problem-mat depends upon where the breakdown in those dynamics

has occurred. In other words, where is the weak link in the chain. You vision

society as a linked chain; if problems occur or coagulate around certain weak

points and it's only reactivated if the processes are re-energized to then create

the tension between the ~~links~~ links once again and society as a whole are strong

*chains*  
again, to use that part of the example. Or its like a ~~teeter-totter~~ teeter-totter. If

all of your problems are on one end of the teeter-totter, it's simply a matter of

dealing with the problems in such a way that the processes which are being blocked

are re-activated and you've got some sort of equilibrium. Now, I'm using broad

examples here, or bread images.--The teeter-totter is pretty elementary, I guess,--

~~to try to~~

to try to get a feel after the total approach to problem-matting. It's more

that a matter of listing; and writing those objectives, its a more sophisticated

task than just taking because the third thing is that you've

got to plan social action. But I want to qualigfy that and point out that what

we're talking about in most ninstances is Indirect Action. That the forms of

~~Sec~~ Social demonstration and the forms of social process and the ~~kn~~ kinds of efforts

that ~~we~~ ~~shve~~ been make in the past with social action have not workded. Therefore

a new understanding of social action is based on <sup>TACTICAL</sup> practical action. What it <sup>TACTICAL</sup> practical

action? Well, <sup>TACTICAL</sup> practical action is just indirect asction; but it's indirect action

in the sense that what you're out to do is to solve a problem and not start a program.

That's the basic definition. Now, what do you mean by solving problems and not

statrting a program? A program is like the Boy Scouts--thats a fine program.

The Little League is a program, it's a fine ~~prgrm~~ ~~prgrm~~ program. That's not what we're

talking about. We're talking about ~~prebiesssibis~~ problem-solving actions. Now at one

time the Little League might have solved a hell of a problem, I can't even remember

what it was that it was solving now, but that's beside the point--the action that

you are <sup>planned</sup> playing is hit and run; in the sense that you want to hit a problem and then

drop it, you know, you don't want to perpetuate a Lettle League with 14 teams in each League and have a playoff that'll involve three citites--that's not what I want to be talking about. I'm talking about tactical action that moves in, builds up the bridge and moves back--that's not the ~~ks~~ kind of action either--I'm not talking about insurrgent action, I'm talking about resurgent action so therefore I have to change my images, it's like a timed-released Contact capsule. yYou run in ~~ad~~ and drop you Contact capsule and <sup>then</sup> for a period of time you plan that its going to keep going off periodically so that the brigde keeps open and people can move across it. Now, that's an image of <sup>tactical</sup> practical action that's helpful because its indirect.

And you don't want to, don't ever want to be caught being president of some organization you want to build a team idea, a corporate approach that allows people to come together to solve a problem and <sup>then</sup> dissolve, if necessary, right after the provelm, or you ~~want~~ <sup>got</sup> to be concerned with motivation people to lead the Lettle League, you ~~don't want~~ <sup>got</sup> to be concerned with motivate <sup>ing</sup> people to ahave Boy Scoutt Leaders, <sup>not because Boy Scouts Leader is necessary</sup> although Boy Scouts are fine--it sounds like I'm criticizing the Boy Scouts here. You are concerned

with the human element in the society. You are concerned with motivation of the community to deal with their problems thereby performing indirect caction on the problem. Do you see what I'm trying to say. Your job is catalytic, your job is indirect; your job is always <sup>therefore the</sup> crucial ~~and the~~ inclusive problem-mat; ~~its~~ <sup>is</sup> built on a comprehensive social ananalysis, but it is indirect action--or to put it forthly--the only consideration here is that the g son of a gun has to be practical. The practical dimension fo dynamics of model building has to do with <sup>assigning</sup> ~~being able~~ to find people <sup>to do</sup> ~~for~~ these jobs. It has to do with building a realistic time-line. Is it going to take you 4 years to find Boy Scout leaders or can you do that in 4 days. It has to do with deciding what it means to be a Boy Scout Leader anyways. these days and the Cub Scout manual does not help. You're in an urban society, you're in a new world yuo have to have a new kind of Boy Scout leader so we've got to lay that down. What does A Boy Scout leader d0--spell ~~all~~ those function out, you see, that's your responsibility, so that all the Boy Scout leaders can take the handbook and go off and lead Boy Scouts. That's ~~the~~ practical moedel-building, that

ought to keep you busy, I know, but that comes, --now don't everyone go back and write a Boy Scout handbook--what I'm talking about is indirect action, you see that? That's based on inclusive problemmatting that comes from a total social analysis, that tells you what to do. That tells you how to go about it. I comes from looking at the total picture and working on methods for doing that. Basically, therefore, we're talking about revolutionary integrity. We're talking about the kind of posture, the kind of attitude that can be implanted in every local community. We're talking about the kind of posture that allows people, what we used to call is, was, leadership training, but that sounds so eweak now--we're talking about people who are concerned for their own community in the light of the total needs of the world and have the capabiliyt of--every community is going to keep having problems, we're not going to wind up over here one day and have 3 cities that don't have any problems and therefore everybody cna come and look at it. No! what you're going to have is youre going to have a group of pepople who are trained in problem-solving methods, who are trained in corporate methods, who are trainded in motivational methods and

and therefore can meet any problem when it comes up. That's what it means to be a revolutionary (urban?) man. That's what it means to be a man of integrity. That's what it means to be a reformulated community. And what we call that (term is) model-building, a technique of <sup>passing</sup> ~~tacking~~ on methods; of the ability to design and build your whole practical vision for the community's future. You see, the community is going to go in the direction of the hopes; its going to go in the *direction of the dreams, its going to go in the* direction of the vision for the people. But the key there is to give them ways to construct that vision, to rationally ( I say rationally, not in some brittle sense,) but in some way to objectify those hopes, in some way to elicit that concern into a plan of action ~~the~~ rather than "city hall is saying what it ought to be" although you've gotta work with city hall and look at what they've planned; rather than ~~that~~ than than having some outside group say "this is what ought to happen in this community"; you give people the possibility, that's what motivates a person, when he has invested in that decision and in that future his own sweat, his own insights and his own family's future built into it-but don't lose the context now, in terms of the overall realization

that he is over against the Mystery of the Universe when he decideds that; he is over against his won ~~esse~~ free creative spirit; he's over against always dealing with responsibility for others; he's always dealing with and taking into cnsideratifont the methods whereby other people can participate. Come at it something like this.

The revolutionary's integrity depends upon the designing of a scientific system., rather that some kind of band-aid or protest. Haven't we learned by now that stop-gap action won't do the job. <sup>that</sup> Protest isn'tthe way. The way that you got a man to the moon is that you build a system of total support that will allow life to go on from this place to this place. It's the same thing with community reformulation--you're not goijng to the moon, you're ~~not~~ going 10 years down the road here in the community. You take all this and what it well need to support it; you take the economic processes, the political processes, cultural processes and for those to inter-act together and that's going to push us down here ten years. What's going to be needed to keep those processes going in that community, economiclly, politically and culturally in 10 years? Once you've got that stated ~~no matter~~ haowver accurate, you build a system that will allow that community to move. In total support. in toatal

scientific models. You say we're not scientists; we're not trained in this area.

You're going to walk through it new in the next <sup>3 sessions</sup> ~~couple of seconds~~ how do you do it

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10,. You say "there is such a system?" "yaeah" "How do you

know"? "Well, we've tried it out. We experimented with it." that's the way

scientists do you know. They try it out." "How do you know it worked?" "Well, what we

said was going to happen; happened." "How do you know"" ""Come look at fifth City!...

Come

Come look at Uptown, Come look at the aboriginal community in Olmnbulgarri, come look

at the shum-io community in Hong Kong." "How do you know it works?" Well, I think

finally some of us are from missouri and can't go to hong Kong so you've got to

sell them one way or another, so you've got to demonstrate it. You've got to put it

into some kind of local, observable physical demonstration. No abstract research, I mean

mean, we've got more abstract research around here than you can shake a stick at and

we've been over most of it 3 times as I've been able to tell. We've filled up this

place with more file cabinets than Kemper Insurance ever thought of filling up. We've

that the research you've got the data and it

are busy

ed.

a matter now of getting those together. That's what we're going to be about. What we're talking about, is what motivates, finally I believe, what is behind every human being, and that's his hope, that's his dreams, and the question now is not whether people have hopes and dreams, I believe they have courage to go ahead and hope and dream; the question is 'how', HOW you bring that off. How ~~did~~<sup>do</sup> you do it in your life time. Now the results may come in later; but if you're not interested in it now, ~~then~~ you're not interested. In other words, <sup>genuine</sup> human fulfillment and genuine happiness is the decision and we've said that before, or maybe you've talked about that but when you say that happiness is a decision, what you've got to realize is that happiness is never immediate. Fulfillment is never superficial, Oh, this does not mean there isn't spontaneous joy, this doesn't mean there's not spontaneous happiness. No, what I'm saying is that happiness <sup>what</sup> ~~that~~ really amakes a person genuinely happy, is always different from what he thought was going to make him happy. Or that happiness is always unexpected. Happiness therefore is an adventure. Happiness is always a venture into the future. It's a venture into the

future. It's a venture into the real future. It's a venture, therefore, in real problems of the world. You build your happiness. Isn't that clear by now. You Build your hopes. You build your own future. And therefore you get tired fo sitting there filling out those worksheets and drawing those models but that's what you're doing. You're building your own happiness. You're building your own future. And that's either fulfillment or it's not fulfillment. That happiness has got to be happiness now or it ain't happiness period. Right? We're not going to wait for happiness ~~now~~ to come around the corner. ~~and you~~ But until you build a picture of the future, happiness might come around the corner and you'd never know it. Just think, it might already be here. And we've been missing it all this time. Only until you've got the model, only till you — as inclusively, as intentionally. *futurically and intentionally*  
*as ~~empirically~~ as you know how*  
~~The truth is that you don't have, that~~ <sup>as</sup> your're consciousness will allow, do you build that model. And then you see, my goodness, the moment is not empty; the moment is filled so ~~full~~ full that you get tired around here. You've noticed that? Its's not that folks ~~are so~~ <sup>aren't</sup> happy, it's that they have so much happiness that they don't know what to

do with it. And the fact of the matter is that the future is not coming around the corner, the future is already here, and its being put together in those laboratories. It's being put together in those decsiion areound those tables. The future ~~is~~ is alive and well, I's like to report to you from our laboratory and I'm sure from yours-- the future is doing fine and now is the time to realize it. Now is the time to build ~~the~~ new social vechicles. Now is the time to realize the fuuture hopes of all mankind.....the end