BC: I’m in agreement with Chelsea (?) on a fatal flaw in… not fatal, his fatal flaw in obviously the racial (?) sense and Sagan’s work. And that is his absolution of Judaism and Christianity from participation in our lost (unclear) as being a heritage from the Greeks. But I think the thing that makes it so awesome and overpowering in our time is that there is a merger of those two traditions, that they reinforce each other. The Greeks providing even in the latter day, a secular version of Judaism. For example, a reason that we have trouble meeting with any kind of idea that will not fall into a logical context. This thing I’ve been talking about before, this lack of a calculus or indicating that the whole is more than the sum of its parts, rose out of the merger of this historical idea of time and the fixed causal relationships in time. And rather than omitting an alternative form in time the Chelsea was talking about, that merges perfectly with the secular component of the Judaic tradition, I mean of the Grecian tradition with its respect for logic and linearity. And it’s the merger of the two of those that leave us with no alternative. We have no alternative time system (unclear), not even a mythical vision that we can rely upon to break that tradition, to amend it, to (unclear) it in any way. And that’s the awful world that we are caught in. I think that’s the reason that we can (unclear) his thesis on the Greeks and see us as living that out. You know it seems to me that we are in our Peloponnesian War. And if we are not going to extract ourselves from that Peloponnesian War. The depressing thing for me this week is up to this I’ve been worried about the (unclear) of this culture to build in an Apocalyptic vision and that’s still gets us in trouble. You know it still may be that Racan (?) is willing to fulfill that Apocalyptic prophesy. But it seems after reading Racan (laughter) reading Sagan and trying to utilize that in view of the present that it becomes absolutely focused because if we don’t go up in a cloud of smoke that T.S. Eliot would be right. It will be not with a bang but with a (unclear). It’s the way the world ends, not with a bang but with a whipper (?). And by a whipper I mean going the same way as that Greek civilization, just beating ourselves to death on this Peloponnesian War. You know we are locked just like the Greeks. I don’t care who you call Sparta and who you call Athens. But it seems to me that the Soviet Union and the United States are behaving and acting in the end of the world in the same way that Greece did, that that civilization didn’t even fall because of the final direct confrontation between Sparta and Athens. What happened is that they simply expended themselves on their Imperialism with the rest of the Greek city states in the same way that it now appears to be equal lightly (?). The Soviet Union and the United States will simply run out of energy, out of creativity, out of resources, out of everything, piddling around for the city states, carrying out that metaphor in Latin America and in Africa and in Asia. You know that a society can fall just as much from being drained in that kind of way, pursuing irrational kinds of things in Afghanistan (?) you know the way we react to that. All of these little domino theories. The Peloponnesian War was ruled by the same kind of domino theory. They didn’t play the game so they didn’t use that metaphor, but the same thing no matter where it happened. And Sagan I think makes that point very well when he talks about Sicily for example. Why in the hell, how in the hell could any rational supposedly rational thinker in Athens ever come to see the necessity of an absolute victory over Sicily being critical to the survival of that culture? The Barbarians out on the frontier. But we do the same damn thing. Both us and the Soviet Union somehow believe that Afghanistan is critical to the survival of one of the systems or both of the systems or whoever gets it in terms of Sicily. You know that kind of breaking out, another kind of contradiction that grows out of that kind of Peloponnesian image is Latin America and the way that you know we fall into thinking that somehow if we don’t win the battles of the minds of men in El Salvador in this particular instance that the Republicans in danger, that all the other city states are going to follow to Sparta and we will be lost and contravene facts. Athens and Sparta as well have looked at the adjoining city states and discovered that there was a Spartan city state within 90 miles of Athens and Athens survived that existence in the same way that we have now for 30 years had a Spartan state 90 miles from us and we’ve managed to survive without for a long time even drawing them on the map. Now that’s the kind of repressions that we go through. I remember this was in the early 60s where someone the way we do from time to time, you’ve seen these maps where they divide up the world between red, pink and white. The democracies are all in white. The bad guys are all colored in in red. Now this too fantastic things occurred on this map. It just indicates that it has nothing to do with the map or with the geography or anything else. They drew this map and this is gearing up for Vietnam, that whole domino thing and coloring more of the map red and so forth and so on. Cuba was left off the map. It wasn’t even drawn in. Cuba had simply ceased to exist. This was three or four years after the revolution. And China for God’s sakes was unidentified. It didn’t even have the name of the nation, just a big red blob there. China and North Korea didn’t even have a name. You know it was just the Netherlands, just (unclear). You know if you were making geopolitical arguments, how in the hell can you leave out Cuba and China you know if you’re trying to make an argument about geopolitical endangerment, just that kind of irrationality. The thing that Josie did alert me to that I really hadn’t seen today before our lecture is just how long this schizophrenic existence has been. Now in previous lectures I’ve tried to make a great deal out of the position of indeterminacy that the reformation put the Western mindset in. Now remember my argument that man could live with his life being predestined as long as he knew about it but the horror that the reformation posed on the mindset of Western man is that he was eternally predestined but wouldn’t know about it until it was too late to do anything about it. Well you know the Josie’s comments on the Old Testament this morning just brought up and reinforced that again, that it wasn’t positive (?) man in the history of Western civilization. It was the first one to live in that frightening, indeterminate, unknown, capricious kind of a work. But so was Issac and so indeed was Abraham, so indeed was Jobe, so are most of those Old Testament characters. When you stop and think about a man having to, in a place where theoretically at least, as far as a mythic structure is composed, God has never before asked a man to sacrifice this only begotten. And all of a sudden he demands it of Abraham. My God you know, if you just imagine it at the psychological level, getting oneself together to obey and do what no man has ever done before, to sacrifice your only begotten and finally get up, bring yourself to do it, get the boy there, tie him down on the altar, pull out the dagger, raise it, and then some character, “Hey, just kidding baby!” (laughter) “Turn the boy loose.” You can see how resident then that schizophrenia has been since the very beginning. And Josie just brought out how reoccurring that is, that kind of capriciousness in a way that I never realized before. I now see that there is not a discontinuity between the Old Testament and the Protestant (?) experience. Now I still haven’t been able to handle, I just haven’t thought about it that much, the interim period between the birth of Christ and the reformation, which was again an attempt to (unclear) that. But it was beyond unsuccessful. And in the history of the civilization only lasted 400 years. Well, no that isn’t true. Somehow as time had it (unclear). But anyway it is partly relevant because it was Roman (?) the Gnostic tradition that was attempting to introduce to them a principle back into Christianity was finally put down. You know obviously it marks the final defeat of Gnosticism as a viable addendum of mainstream Catholicism that is essential to the Pope, not to the Pope, but to the Bishop. What was the name of the Bishop, to the Bishop (unclear of name) and having the city of God become one of the committed texts of mainstream Catholicism, represented the final defeat of Gnosticism as an alternative or even as a branch. You know one of the ways that Catholicism has historically dealt with those kinds of deviants and those kinds of little hyraces is putting them out a little monster, creating an order. But Gnosticism represented such a direct attack on Christianity from Christianity’s perspective that it was one that they couldn’t accept monsters. They simply had to be ripped out of the church in a very vivid and even too obviously very vicious kind of way. But Augustine was uniquely fitted to do that because he started as a Gnostic Christian himself and then became converted. Which brings us, there are two or three things that I want to kind of tie that into on this whole problem. One of them is the continued prevalence of Gnosticism and its perversion into an individualistic form in modern involved packets (?). One author has presented to me what is a very persuasive argument that what Riech (?) calls the new narcissism is an old and consistently emerging and reemerging Gnostic tradition in Western Christian thought that at least post-Christian Gnostic thought starts out with the New Testament arguments that there’s a little piece of God in all of us, a little piece of the Holy Spirit that resides in all of us. And arguments from that to the individual becoming the God head and then the thing that scared Catholics to death became the God head then, not just the Catholics but formal Christianity today. The thing was coming the God head. You could do anything you want, that everything was allowed and nothing was forbidden once you had converted yourself into the God head. Now this author goes on to argue that the modern mathesecian (?) of that in modern secular American thought is cocktailed Zen Buddhism (laughter), that Americans because of individualism and because that the Zyche (?) guys those hidden assumptions are connected most closely to the Gnostic tradition. Read only half of the Zen story. That if you read you know the Zen stories successfully it is indeed about the inward journey. But if you read the full texture of that spiritual path that’s recommended in the Zen and the Buddhist tradition, that’s only the first easy part is that inward trip. But that’s where it stops in the Western tradition, that you arrive at your individuality and that is sufficient. You arrive at the secular version of the validity of your own conscience before God, and that’s where the journey stops. And he says the great tragedy in the translation of Zen thought into American behavior is that the trip stops there and it never returns to what the Zen master sees as the hardest part of the journey is the return back out into the world and the execution of those insights in the world at large. Now I think he’s getting a Zen Buddhism or Zen and Buddhism generally the benefit of the doubt because I do not see, certainly not as becoming (unclear) in the world at large, them willing and ready to act in the world, that it is still a kind of public teaching posture. But it’s not acting into the world. That it is many of the things that look so brutal and inhuman in the Orient had occurred precisely because it accepts what Hanheric (?) calls world lists. And she says that that our Satan revolving me is something that is imminently worldly, that is ready to act into the world rather than seeing a compromise in individual salvation by remaining of the world. That was the Greek tragedy that Greek, that was the Jewish tragedy that that world was quite indeed led to the Holocaust, their refusal to become contaminated by that secular mundane world and that laid the groundwork for the Holocaust. Those are some of the themes that I pick up from Josie and from Sagan. The other one that I wanted to dwell a little more on… Oh and the other thing that Josie was very attentive about is the degree to which the Christian vision and Christ Himself is the acting out of an unsuccessful resolution. My gut’s startled that He’s a human. He is carefully and intentionally made asexual by everyone except perhaps (unclear). He had been very involved with Mary of Magdalene which is one of the subterranean images in the whole Christ story but it’s characteristically desexualized. It has to do with moral principles instead of a sexy woman (?). So in a sense Christ is a Son castrated by God. He has no offspring. He doesn’t take part in that critical human event that perpetuates the species. He’s intentionally exempt from that and in the end even the castration isn’t sufficient. He has to go up on the cross to satisfy (unclear). He makes that fantastic Freudian slip, you know, “Why have you forsaken me?” At the height of his pain he says, “This is a very unfatherly like event from my father, and you’ve got me up here with a spear in my side and a couple of spikes through my hands and a couple of spikes through my feet. That’s fatherly behavior?” All to no avail if you read Dostoyevsky. It is nice after reading the Christian myth to read Dostoyevsky’s *Grand Inquisitor* because in that Christ simply decides that He has been cheated. And the grand inquisitor says, “You’ve been cheated.” You he said that if you’d go up on the cross you’d make man happy. Look around. Did you make man happy? No. We grand inquisitors come in and try to make them happy because you make demands on them that they can’t live up to. So they are unhappy. You put their eternity in jeopardy. They can’t be happy with that. We have given them mystery and magic and that makes them happy. In all absolution, taken care of eternity and that makes them happy. Then Christ listens to the argument and at least my favorite interpretation of the story is that He says that the grand inquisitor is right, kisses the grand inquisitor on the forehead, leaves the prison with the clear implication that there’s going to be no second coming, that the father isn’t going to cheat the Son a second time. He might be dead the first time. You know that he’d listened to Father the first time and look what happened. He went up on the cross just for the pure pleasure of this sadistic father. And he didn’t fulfill his promises. So why come again? Why would he leave the old man a second time around? No, he says he falls out of the cell and the grand inquisitor out of his concern for men and his willingness to sell his soul to save him is seen. He says you know, if there’s anything to all of that stuff at all then I’ve sold my soul. But the payment he allows on this earth is so much that I’m willing to do this. But we’ve taken off throughout history this burden of selling our souls in order to get man some souls. It’s a very painful life. And he just loathes at the recognition that when JC kissed him on the forehead, JC was saying yeah you’re right, you know, that you are the one that loves mankind and not my father, certainly not my father. That’s kind of one of the follow-ups on Josie. I think it does in kind of a weird way now look to go into a little bit. It does tie in and that’s to something I only mentioned before, the Sophie Principle and the Sophie Alternative from the Carbolic tradition within the Judaic tradition. Carbolic (?) is a heretical, mystical element of the Jewish religious tradition almost as long. And Josie might even want to argue longer that the formalized written Biblical version of the Judaic tradition. The Carbolic tradition, and there are strong hints and slips of the tongue throughout the Bible. At the very moment of creation that Yaba (?) had a wife and the Greek translation of her name is Sophie which means wizard. And I think that becomes important a little later. In Josie’s, that’s another kind of inversion because in Josie’s original myth it’s the matrons wisdom and the female principle is taught. Is Satan listed? Was he? No. In this Carbolic tradition it’s the opposite, that God is the male image, is the power, the creed. You know, he’s a personification of power, zapped and something happens. But then you’ve got wisdom and she’s described in attribution (?) as being the backside of God, not in the Freudian sense but (laughter), an older image you know that Janice image that you see one face or the other but never both. You either have wisdom or power, never both. Because and they are at a profound behavioral level and I think that’s what a lot of this stuff is getting at. They are reconcilable. They either act or you think, but you don’t think and act at the same time. You may act then consider your action or fight or flightism (?). Or you may think but if you think very far you don’t act and even (unclear). And Sophie was a backseat driver. You know he (unclear) to create man, he said well we all need to link man (unclear) and Sophie said you know, show the wisdom. Think about this. Now if you make man the thing you propose to do, the first thing that’s going to happen is that they’re going to eat from the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge. You know they even have to throw them out of this Eden you’ve built for them. You know if you just get through that and one of them is going to kill another. Then the next thing that happens we have to flood all of it except for two out and start all over again. Don’t bother. Think about it before you just create this flawed animal in your image. You know he keeps saying this every instant of creation. Finally I don’t need this classic wife (?) so he divorces her in the Carbolic tradition. And he goes ahead and creates on his own without wisdom all of the contradictions that are built into this universe. But he does it without wisdom as an exercise of unlawful power which you know I think the whole metaphor is about thinking without acting because you can’t do both. That’s almost the biological place at which this myth is cast. And then all of them are trying to reconcile with those kinds of contradictions, not being able to do three things at once, not having two tongues so that they carry on three or four stories to tell the whole story. That’s another order of contradiction. Then you have to call for them one at a time and that throws us back into a later work. When they know at some level that the world is not linear and that you can’t talk about simple cause and effect trains, that there are always multiple inputs and outputs, that it’s some kind of complex circular system that is impossible to deal with as you talk about it one word at a time and mention one thing at a time or maybe half a dozen times. So it’s those kinds of contradictions. And Jung in one of his less zany moments wrote a little book called *Answer to Job* that all of you can read at some cocktail hour. He’s another one with kind of a wishy washy Christian (unclear). He hangs on doing a lot of Christianity without being very serious about it. Anyway he does run through this where he says that, but he still puts it in the Christian image rather than in a sometimes existential image. But he argues that that’s a recurring problem in the Bible is that feminine principle, that it keeps emerging in different kinds of ways. There are slips of tongue in the Genesis story where God is talked about as though He were two people in certain ways. But then he divorces Sophia and marries Isreal because Isreal agrees to be a compliant wife who won’t backseat drive and indeed isn’t even allowed to go in the Saint’s church (?) with a man. She isn’t even allowed to sit on the same side of the church. She was in the (unclear) section of the church, in the most… supposed to behind the, in the back of the room, the back of the bus. Anyway he argues that the first time that occurs is a contradiction. Someone is trying to face this impossible image. You know the image of this in fate of Yawa (?) is that he is both omnipotent and omniscient, that he knows everything and can do anything and has done everything, and that that is an inherently contradicting position, that in our imagining of God and since he is in our image or we are in His image that that is an impossible thing, that you can’t both know everything and bother to act. That action becomes pointless if you know it. If you know the outcome, you know all of the possibilities then why bother to act. And I’d just sit around imagining the creation of the world and all of the history of people’s boats running around down there. You don’t have to act upon it. Why he argues that the first time that comes out is with Job. You know even in even the absolute image of this uncaring, unthinking father. Now here you have the most loyal of sons, Job, the one most loyal man on the face of the earth. Well God’s sitting on there twiddling his thumbs wondering who he can annihilate today. And the devil comes traipsing along and says, “Hey, you sure created a disloyal, disrespectful species down there.” God said, “Oh no, I didn’t.” And the devil says, “Oh yes you did. There isn’t one of them that can’t be tempted.” And God says, “Fate just won’t end.” He says, “Oh yes. There’s one down there (unclear), good ol’ Job.” And the devil says, “Oh no. Because you’ve given him everything, everything that that man could possibly want. Why not be loyal? But why would you treat him like you treat the second and the third sons? Take everything away from him? And then you’ll see how loyal he is.” And God takes the bait and says, “Alright, the bet’s on. I bet you that Job with persevere.” Well the devil then proceeds to do everything to him that can possibly be done. He kills all of his children. Interesting. You know, this kind of job that we have sitting up there is very concerning. He kills all of his flocks, causes all of these plants to wither away. He even kills all of his servants, when he gets around to killing all of his servants because all of the servants too. And Job still perseveres except that now he’s even catching flack from his fellow man he leaves in this omniscient as well as omnipotent God. So they’re saying, “Jesus, Job, why aren’t you going to do anything that’s possible? If God’s treating you this way you’ve been doing something in the closet that someone doesn’t know about. You know this is a reasoning God. This is (unclear) and he’s treating you like that? It’s all your fault.” And Job keeps saying, “No, no.” And finally comes (unclear) he goes to see God and says, “God, do you really think you’re being just with me?” And God says, “Son how dare you ask that question. Didn’t I create the world? Didn’t I destroy it by fire? Didn’t I destroy it by flood? And you have the guts to ask me that question?” You are beginning to sound like Sophia (laughter). I divorced her. What am I going to do to you? And so Job kind of tries to start it up again saying, “No I need to know. What did I do wrong? What did I do wrong? Father I asked you a question.” “How dare you! I am your creator. How dare you ask me that question.” I think lots of fathers have trouble dealing with those questions that they’re to be asked. And so Job you know tries to get him to convey the wisdom and the wisdom isn’t there. And finally Job realizes that My God, you know, this is just a stupid, mean bastard (laughter). You know, there is no justice in him. If there is justice he says it would be discovered among men and not with this character sitting up there. And as soon as he realizes that (mumbles), he puts his hand over his mouth to shut up. And then he’s restored. And his children are restored to him. As soon as he shuts up, as soon as he puts his hand over his mouth and doesn’t ask questions that have anything to do with God’s wisdom, everything comes back. His fields start blooming again. His orchards are just abundant. All these children are back. I mean he was even given now a bunch of grandchildren and great grandchildren to dobble over. And the next night it sneaks out in the song, Sophia returns in the very present form. It just slips out in terms of the Bible, in terms of the continuity of the Bible. In the songs of Soloman, you’ve got this extricated version of creation that left her out except for two little Freudian slips up there. And all of a sudden you have this character in the songs of Soloman that says, you know, I was with you at the very beginning. From the first instant, I’ve been with you. And he was always unjust a man. I’m the one that’s interested in justice. So here you have wisdom speaking. He’s only disinterested in justice and he’s only uninterested in power. I mean he’s only interested in power. Now that’s all he’s done. He hasn’t got any wisdom. And he quit listening to me long ago. And then it’s repressed and nothing happens again until the next time that comes up it’s kind of a crisis, is with the dispersion of the people, the whiting out of Judaism.