LECTURE BY DR. ANDERSON ON I-CHING GIVEN AT ST. PAUL'S EPISCOPAL CHURCH

Tuesday Evening group: May 18, 1971 Lecture 1 of 5 lectures

following Rogation Sunday

Father Sanferd, members of the seminar and friends, it is a great delight for me to be here. I haven't know Father Sanferd anywhere near as long as so many of you must have, but he did us the favor of coming out to the religious studies colloquiam at the college, and that was the first time that I had made his aquaintence, and since then I have had the delightful opportunity to talk with him a little; so I feel much more at home then I might have had we not met under those agreeable circumstances. When he asked me to bring to you certain thoughts on the topic of how a Christian looks at the I-Ching, I was needless to say, somewhat taken aback. Not in any sense that there is something inappropriate about the topic, because thats not the case, but the word "Christian" is first in the order of the sintax of the title, and that immediately makes one ask himself whether he has the right to talk as a christian about such a thing. I make personally a Christian confession and profession, but confession and profession are not in them selves always sufficient to bring one to shaping up to what it is he confesses and professes. On that account, I though for some time about the relation between one's self and being a Christian, as well as one's relation as a christian to a scripture which belongs to a tradition which is non christian.

So perhaps it wouldn't be amiss if I said a few words about the Christians relation to the question of a non christian scripture, because that is what the I-Ching is, it is a scripture, and as such commands in the serious reader a profound and unique respect. Scripture is catagorically different from any other form of literature. That is to say, it properly bares an authroity that is not embodied in other forms of literature. One must cope with that. Either he submits to that as the case, or he begins to study a scripture whether his own, as in our case, the holy Bible made of two testaments, the old and the new, or whether he addresses himself to a scripture that is not in his own tradition. That is not easy to come to terms with in our time, since we have habituated ourselves to regard ourselves as the last word before any object that faces us. Which is to say we have absolutized consciousness. And we do not respect the being of the other in its own right. That is particularly disasterous to the activity that we shall call religious when we approach scripture that way. So with those opening remarks, I do want to come very much to one of the issues that will remain for the christian in his attitude towards non-Christian scriptures.

There are some texts that perhaps some ...well, there are more then some, many of you have note books and paper...you might want to copy these down, texts from our own scripture, and after I've read them to you I will try to tell you the relationship they have to the question of the Christian's looking at non-christian scriptures. They are as follows:

John 1:9, John 10:16 and Romans 1:19-21 and following.

John 1:9 tells us that the light that is the Word, with a capital "W" is the light that lighteth every man. It is well as a christian to take that universal statement precisely as it seems to me intended, namely, universal. Then in John 10, Jesus remarks that there are other sheep that are not of this fold, and in Romans, St. Paul is at pains to point out that the pagan romans had all in their tradition that was sufficient for coming into an adequate relationship with God, where salvation is concerned, but because of their own perversity, they wouldn't do it. A very remarkable statement, he says that in the things that are made,

that is in the things that are standing around us, that make up our circumstances, there the image of God can be met, provided one is determined on meeting it. One is not coerced to meeting it, but it non-the less abides, and it is available to be meet. It seems to me that perhaps we haven't always borne down as hard on the significance of St. Paul's view of the accessability of revelation as we might have. I suggest that between now and the end of our serries you will undertake, if you will be good enough, to reflect on those texts that I have just read. I brought them forward to you because it does seem to me that in our own scripture, there is a much more benign attitude towards the capacity of God to make himself available then sometimes we have been taught. And on that account, it seems to me that one as a christian need suffer no embarassment if he undertook to study the wisdom of a revelation that is not directly embodied in his own heritage. On that account, then, I felt rather embolden to begin to discuss with myself what it is as a christian to look at the I-Ching.

Now it would be rather strange, given the suggestion, that one ought seriously relate to another scripture as an authority, if one in so saying didn't embody that counsel himself. And since the I-Ching is an oracle, it seemed to me, were I in good faith with it, I should have to put the question to the oracle itself. So I did that, and there are faces here that I've seen before that are aquainted with the oracle and it might be just as well on that account if I gave you the answer. And those of you who are not yet able to consult the great text, will I trust, have some introduction to how to do that as we go along. But in the mean time, those of you who are familiar with it could begin to study the answer between now and next time we come.

The question that I asked was as follows: What is the most fruitful approach a Christian can make to the I-Ching. If possible one should always keep his questions as simple as he can, not because the oracle is deficient in intelligence, but simply because to formulate a question simply is already being on the way to some clarity oneself. Now, the answer that I recieved is as follows: Hexagram number 42, the hexagram called Increase, with the following moving lines: lines 1, 2, 4, and 5. All of that I trust will become intelligible to those of you who don't know the text not too long from now. Moving lines, as those of you who are aware of the text and know its uses, can plainly discern, simply mean that there is another hexagram that is derived from the first, and that is where it stops. One doesn't go on indeffinitely deriving hexagrams. But, the derived hexagram is number 64, called Before Completion. Well, I trust that between now and next tuesday, and God willing we will be here again, or perhaps we should say, Tao willing in the Chinese context, you will have been able to study those.

I do commend your getting hold of the Wilhelm/Banes translation put out by Princton for the main body of your text. If you could get hold of that for those of you who are really serious about becomming acquainted with the text, there would be much to be gained from it.

Now, the next question that I wish to raise is fundamental, namely, "What is the I-Ching?" What is it; that's a rather different question from "How is it?" or "To what end is it used?" What is it, means simply that we must try to grasp its lineaments that will lead us to distinguish it from what it is not. So we will need to pause a moment and go rather slowly. Perhaps the first thing we should do is to remind ourselve what it is, with respect to other things with which we can compare it.

So that requires us to repeat one thing, namely: that it is a scripture. I do repeat that because one will never meet the I-Ching if he does not first believe that. He will always stand outside of an encounter with it that will be productive for the person in terms of the uses of the book. That imposes something on the reader, doesn't it? Something rather frightening, but I mean precisely what I'm saying. If one is to take this document seriously, he must listen to what it says and listen to it not by absolutizing his own consciousness over against it. But in humility, in the conviction that if indeed it is scripture, then he will be taught something, he will not merely learn something. It takes no talent to learn anything, we are learning all the time in spite of ourselves. It takes, however, a particular and conscious ordering of one's self to submit to be taught. That's not always easy for any student to settle for. That distinction is always implicit when we come before scripture. We study scripture as we ought, then we shall be taught, not something more then we already know, but something different. There is a vast deal of difference between merely adding to one's store of acquaintance knowledge and submitting to be taught so that he can learn, not more, but that which is different from which he already grasps. That is what scripture claims to teach us, and scripture assumes that a person coming to it, for the first time in that spirit makes a radical point of departure in his own personal existence, which if he follows through must bring about in him self change. That it will never coerce him to undertake such an arduous activity. So there is something either orish about confronting such a text, If one is to confront it religiously. Now of course many persons here might have not such interest, and far be it from me to suggest that in order to participate in our seminar you must apply yourself to the word of the I-Ching in such a fashion. No, not at all. One can learn an awful lot about the I-Ching without ever approaching it that way. But one will not learn it, anymore then one as a christian can learn his own embodiment of the word in holy scripture by simply running around learning about it. He must confront it in such a way as to make himself available to the truth that it embodies and he must try to inviserate that truth in his own daily life.

That means that from that point forward he lives stratigically, where as before, he was merely going along as we say in English, for the ride. Having been thrown into the world, been carried along with it, until he makes his exit. It seems to me that there are only two ways to live. One either lives that way or one sets about a very dangerous enterprise, namely becoming a person, who is human. It is quite a different thing from being a man, or being a woman. To set about becoming a human person who happens also to be a woman, who happens also to be a man is the distinction that I'm trying to bring forward. If one will relate to scripture adequately, then he has the possibility of begining such a work But of course, he need not, and most don't. So that leaves us then with two approaches to our seminar.

Some among us will want to learn about it, and others might undertake the risk of learning it. That's an introduction to what the I-Ching is. Now I will try to say in very few words what it is.

The I-Ching is a practical manual, you might want to in your notes underline the word "practical",...the I-Ching is a practical manual for one who wishes to make adequate passage from brith to and through death. I want to repeat that, because it is one thing to copy it down, and it is another thing to hear it. The I-Ching is a practical manual for one who

wishes to make adequate passage from birth to and through death. Passage is made willy-nilly anyway; as to whether the passage is adequate...Ah, at that point we are checkmated every time. That is always the question, in the last analysis for every person who thinks himself human. Out side of that particular question, and the distinction that it brings for us, we have no distinction as beings, none. It is not easy to grasp that, I know. And I don't mean to denigrate humanity, or to give myself airs that somehow or other I have found a way to be above it all. Nonsense, utter balderdash No, I simply want to stress the distinction between being on the one hand a biological mechanism, a cultural datum, a sexed animal, and getting distance on one's existence,sufficient distance to ask the question of himself, "Is my passage adequate?" That's all.

Our own scriptures are sufficient That is to say the Holy Bible is quite sufficient to point out to us what adequate passage means. The I-Ching is quite sufficient to do the same. The Gita, the Upanishads, Rig Veda, there are sufficient to tell us what adequate passage is. And they all make one statement about it. Now we come to the crux of the matter. They say,"look, do it and while doing it you will be coming to understand it, but not unless you do it " And we don't like that. We want a map of the journey to begin with, we want built in securities and safeguards, we want the whole thing to be intelligible in advance, or we won't move, and we call that commone sense. And that doesn't distinguish us one whit from the amiba. We don't expect of the amiba that it would entertain the concept of passage anyway, but it is not so clear that because one has heard the word, that it is spelled "passage" that he has grasped the concept, it doesn't follow at all. When it is applied to the movement from death...no...from birth to and through death. But I didn't make a slip of the tongue, because there is a death from which we move when we are born, and all depends on whether we remain dead until we die. Dead to an existence we might have lived. And worse, which we can never live again, having not lived it in the first place. That existence we might have lived, is now in the kingdom of what might have been, which can never be lived out. That's very sobbering, and it rather inverst the usual notion of where and how we are in the world. But that's allways the way with scripture, it tends to stand our cherished notions of security on their heads. That's why it is so dangerous to give one's self airs that he is reading scripture correctly. If then, the I-Ching is concerned to introduce us to a possibility which requires to be one in the first place, then we must try to make a distinction quickly, between on the one hand, destiny and on the other fate.

The I-Ching implicitly makes that distinction for us. So does our Bible. St. Paul says we are all destined for glory. Some theologians have made a lot hash (?) of that and got themselves all caught up in Divine determinism, and some how given themselves airs that grace will coerce them into heaven. Nonsense. There is nothing whatsoever in Biblical thought to support such a curious idea. There is much to warn us against playing syllogistical games with religious language since we can sometimes land ourselves in the most fatuous notions. What then does St. Paul mean to say as he does we are fore ordained, we are destined for glory. Are we on that account forced to live in a state of grace. Well, any body who has devoted himself to Pauline thought must know that that is a rank contridiction of the apostles' position. No, it means this: that each of us comes into the world with an ideal promise, which awaits our achieving and living out. Which is to say that destiny is fate raised to a higher

power. Fate is simply what will be will be. It has no moral value whatsoever. Coping with one's fate is instinct (?) with moral value and spiritual promise To cope with one's fate adequately is precisely what the I-Ching is all about. It will teach one how to face his circumstances, those things that are standing around, how to face them resolutely, as a warrior. There is not a sentimental passage init. For that matter, there is no sentimental passage in our own Bible. I don't mean that neither scripture is without expressions of correct sentiment. But correct sentiment and sentimentality we distinguish in english, don't we? It is that distinction that is hard to learn in the flesh. It takes no particular talent to distinguish the two words lexically. To live that distinction requires heroism A difficult word in our time of the anti-hero. Not a welcome notion at all. St. Paul is in no doubt about that when he tells us in Eph. to put on the whole armor of God...all of it; lets not give ourselves airs that we can leave a little of it off. All of it. And then he names the various elements of armor that we require bedause he knows that the only way that one can achieve his destiny is to face his circumstances like a warrior. Another unfortunate word in our time. But nontheless an archetypal word, and on that account, one that we must never foolishly abandon.

What is it to be a warrior? It is simply never to forget one's death. Never to forget one's death. Death walks with us every minute, every second. It is unintelligible, but nearer then hands and feet. It is not a matter of duration, but of the instant. Dying is a matter of duration, not death. There is no hope for it but to face it. But we are not coerced to face it. We can fool around and behave as though we are not indeed ringed about by death. But there is the little matter that remains. It is the case that we are; a small matter that will not go away.

Now I want to make a distinction that is parimount for our study of the great book. It is one thing to be restored from sickness to what we call health. And rightly we have praise for that, when the therapist accomplishes his work. It is another thing for a normal person to grasp his existence. A very different thing altogether. One who grasps his existence, knows in his bones...that's a wonderful english expression... to know it in your BONES...he knows it in his bones that whether he likes it or not, he always lives in crisis. Why? because he must always decide, that's why. And the answer is never given to him in advance. I remember when I was a small child, and I would go to some social gathering that I was invited to, and I was brought up in a rather more static socity then ours, growing up as a child in england, and somebody in the house, it never failed would begin to put a wet blanket on the whole thing by saying to me as I went out the door, "Now look son, remember who you are." Just the very thing I wanted to forget. And in an English society, that means simply that one has to shape up to what has been given to him in advance, whether he likes it or not. Stiff upper lip old man and all that. Or as the young people say today, "get it on." Now, I don't mean that when they use that expression they are talking about what I'm talking about. That is a very happy expression, because it points to a decision. You either get it on or you don't. We find that out every day when we dress, don't we. Its either on or its off. To be told to remember who you are is to be told you must undertake your journey in a certain way. And it is just not cricket to do it in any other way. And people who indulge in un-cricket like behavior are persons who are understood to fail in the most important

of their duties. Namely to comport themselves, to comport themselves in such a manner as to make it possible for them to embody continually who they are. That is to say, it is an achievement to become who you are. Something worked upon, and if not, insofar, one's existence dribbles away, leaks out. The I-Ching is a practical that will teach us how not simply to conserve what ever personal existence we may have funded, if indeed we have any, but it will continually remind us that we must never become slack in our effort to fill up our essence with ever more rich existence. And for that, one must live as a warrior. That doesn't mean that one undertakes to make excursions into foreign territory. No, no nono, nothing so dramatic as that. That rather titilates our fancy, promises of some reward for giving ourselves airs. Nothing like that. No, one isn't going anywhere on his own steam at all. On the contrary he has all he can do to stand and face those forces that ring us about, that invite us to make a compromise with them so that they and not ourselves flurish, wax ever bolder and stronger what ever little existence we might have indeed funded for ourselves. That's the heart of the matter. Whether one will or will not undertake such a disciple of self change. And thats a question that I devoutly hope that some of you will ask your selves with the gravity it deserves, and the sobriety, then without which one won't even grasp the words of the question itself.

Our fancy is titillated a great deal by talk of life as an adventure. It is very silly talk. Even Nietzsche got a little ahead of himself when he said that we must live dangerously, as though somehow or other our life is not instinct with danger anyway. You don't have to try to live dangerously, life is dangerous. Period. The problem is not to give ourselves airs that we can plunge into life and bound around like great noble beasts. No. There is something far less titillating then that: simply remaining at our posts, where in the hierarchy of creation we were put, and put there in advance. Every great scripture of every religious tradition asserts that; about that there is no choice. There is only one choice: will we remain there? And that's irronical, because if we dicide that we've fed up with it, somehow we are not going to remain there at all, in fact we are going to try something else; it won't change the fact that that is where we are. You just don't have any say in the matter. The only thing you have a say in is this: I think perhaps I will try to imagine myself in someother case. And then I will try to act out that its the case that it is something else. That's all. How much better then to try to discover where and how one is already in the world, and begin to shape up to it. That is the task, and we don't have very long to work it out. We really don't. Every time I think I'm in my 49th year, I swallow hard. Why? I have to ask myself how much personal existence have I funded in the meantime. How much has leaked away. And if it has leaked away, whose falt is it. Every great scripture tells us it is our falt. It is not the falt of the environment; it is not because when we were carried by our mother, she was somehow startled by a bat. Its our falt.

Now, in your introduction to your large text, the one that was graciously held up to your view a little while ago, there is a very remarkable analogue presented for your consideration. It is about living life as one sails a boat. Sometimes one requires to sail it as we say, against the wind. And even when one sails it with the wind, he does not on that account give over attending to the task. He still requires to steer. Now, thats all we have to say about ourselves. Steering. That's all. We don't self move in the radical sense of that word. We are

born along, and we wern't asked if we wanted it that way. Young people sometimes in desparation, furstration, a fit a peak, will turn around to their elder and say, "I didn't ask to be born." Well, what is the answer to that, "Would you rather be dead?" And if you decide on that do you want to do yourself in, make as small a mess as possible, because somebody else will have to clean it up. That's what I mean about scripture offering no sentimentality. The young far more often then not react to such a response with deep gratitude. Why? Simply because such a response tends to bring them back to an awareness of their point of departure in the world. Which point was given to them in advance. They didn't manufacture it.

Now, I want to notice a few things in the I-Ching rather quickly because we need some time for you to discuss some things as well. If you will look at your notes carefully you will see that I have made the following statements which I hope you will try to commit to memory, not necessarily word for word, but the significance of them. The first is that the I-Ching is a practical manual for such persons who wish to make adequate passage from birth to and through death. Now, I will wait a second to see if you have that down, because we are going to return to that in the next three meetings. Then the I-Ching presents to us the contrast between destiny and simple fate. Destiny is an achievement. Fate is just a happening. We must be very careful about lusting after happenings. Nothing could be more mindless of such a betrayal of our ideal promise then to lose a grasp on the very next thing I want to bring home with all the vigor and rigor I can, namely to lose our grasp on whatever personal history we have. And if we have none, then it is not so easy to acquire, then to set about perhaps trying to achieve one. A person who is concerned to achieve personal history is one who begins to grasp the relation between the past and the present; and the past and present and future. Not as happenings, but as stratigically ordered by his own sellection from among those things that are standing around, as those things which he must cope with upon this instant, and cope with decisively. And having made his dicision, get on with it. And dont' spent time worrying about it, mumbbling about it Having decided, be done with it and do it, and carry it through. One of the great statements in the I-Ching is simply this: ...one of the marvels of the text is the language is all amazingly simple..":the superior man carries things through."

Now, that is a distinction that comes up all the time in the text, the rather undemocratic distinction between the superior man and the inferior man. The superior man is the man who lives strategically. He knows what he wants, and he knows how to get it. But he lives very differently from what we call the life style of the go-getter. He knows how to wait for what he wants, and that's how he gets it, but knowing how to wait. Never for one moment forgetting that he is waiting. In that respect, he behaves much like the cat. But he does better then the cat. Sometimes a cat can be so upset that its deginity is threatened that it will defend that dignity ill timed. There is a very fine book by a naturalist called The World of the Tiger, which some of you might have come upon. It is quite a remarkable book. It is a compilation of experiences of naturalists with tigers and observations done by naturalists of stories that they have authenticated with respect to the behavior of the tiger Now the tiger is sometimes, believe it or not, hunted by wild dogs in India, when there are enough dogs. It takes quite a few dogs. The dogs only do this at extreme risk, of course, when they are totally

famished. And the tiger finds himself soon out of breath, because cats don't run as well as dogs for long periods of time. One of the finite limits that tigers suffer. But the dog suffers a finite limit by not being so big. And there isn't anything either can do about those limits. We have a few too as human persons. The tiger then backs up against a tree, because he does know it is far better to face his enemy head on then to continually have to worry about what is behind. And then the dogs begin to inch up closer and closer, until finally one dog will rush the tiger, and of course promptly die for it. And after twenty or thirty dogs have died this way, the rest of the pack has moved up, more and more. Finally the tiger...sometimes, not always...there are wise tigers, once in a while a tiger who hasn't learned to wait efficiently finds it too much for his injured dignity, and he charges the dogs, and they sworm on him, and with enough dogs and with enough loss of blood he dies. When all he required to do was remain at the tree. Scripture tells us: stay by the tree, and face circumstances patiently. The new testiment word for patience is very beautiful. It is made up of two elements in greek: hypo and the verb meno, meaning to remain. To be patient means to remain under or to remain behind, when one wishes to rush forward. That's heroism raised to a higher power. To know how to remain behind. That is why for instance in hexagram 15 called Modesty the I-Ching says that the modest man is even modest in his modesty. The heroism requires one never to give himself airs while at the same time never to lose one's individuality. Both. is one of the great stresses of the scripture. Both. Those are the marks of the superior man by which one means man generically, means the superior woman does the same. The superior person, the superior human person is capable of that. All others who are not are inferior men who give themselves little fancies from time to time that they are different. An amiable dream, but with disasterous consequences for funding personal existence. One is different only in so far as he fills up his essence with that difference. And he doesn't do that unless he DECIDES on it, and having decided carries it through perseveringly, never forgetting his death.

Now, I haven't said anything about the I-Ching as a christian that is not also stressed in our own scripture. Therefore a christian can look at the I-Ching without any qualms,unless the quam happens to be how badly he has already failed his own scripture. And for me that's qualm enough. I don't need to go to the I-Ching to try something else on for size when I haven't yet even tried on our own. But our scripture is generous enough to suggest to us that we can, if we will, study revelation in other moods, in other times, but implicit in its generousity is of course the admonition, don't give yourselve airs, because the discipline of making personal passage is no different in the other scripture from what it is in yours. All scriptures are the same in their teaching about the structure of destiny. They differ in other respects, but not in that respect. The structure of destiny is testified to in essentially the same terms: what it is to make adequate passage from birth to and through death.

There are some texts that I want to have you record for study concerning the christian warrior, since I have made so much of warrior hood; you might care to copy them down. Eph 6:11-18 3:17 19 and John 3:21. John 3:21 is amazing. It says literally in the greek "The one who is doing the truth is coming to the light." Amazing. Is it not the case that most of the time we would rather think that in order to do the truth we

must get all the information on it in advance as we possibly can. And then after we have funded all this information on how to do the truth, then perhaps we will consider risking doing it. No. The apostle doesn't say that at all. He says you will never find out what the turth is until you first do it, and then you won't find out what it is after having done it, because that's not the way the greek reads, but you will find out what the truth is while you are doing it. It is not an if/then proposition. The one who is doing the truth is coming to the light. There is a non-temporal relationship between doing and coming to understand. On that account then, one doesn't do the truth opportunistically. Because the reward is never after the fact, but is intrinsic to the activity. And the activity is costly. It is literally a matter of life and death. Life and death of whom? Oneself as existing person. Not oneself as a human animal, not oneself as a vital statistic. Not oneself as a member of a group enjoying group soup. Oneself as an individual person suffering the claim of ones vocation, The formal cause of his identity is his vocation That's why in scripture there is so much fuss made about discovering what one ought to be doing. N

Now, there is a hexagram in the I-Ching that I trust those of you who have the text will study, and it is one of the most beautiful in the book. It is hexagram number 53, and you will find that on page 204. It is called Development, or Gradual Progress. And it is a wonderful discription of how one goes about filling up his essence with existence. On page 205 the commentary reads as follows, and the reading is based on two images that come together in the six lines that make up the hexagram, and the two images are the first three lines, Mountain, and the next three lines above,Tree, wood, wind. Now I am going to read to you some very profound words, and one of the things that will perhaps shock you is how marvelously simply they are: The tree on the mountain is visable from afar, and its development influences the landscape of the entire region. It doesnt shoot up like a swamp plant." You must see the relation between that and the statement eariler about patience, about waiting, the tree that developes upon the mountain does not shoot up like a swamp plant, its growth proceeds gradually "Thus also the work of influencing people can be only gradual. No sudden influence or awakening is of lasting effect. Progress must be quite gradual. And in order to obtain such progress in public opinion and the mores of the people it is necessary for the personality to acquire influence and weight. It would be well to underline that word weight. It has something to do with funding personal existence.

This acquisition of influence and weight comes about through carefull and constant work on ones own moral developement. we haven't time to discuss at length what the word moral means here but it has a very particular meaning. It has nothing to do with being goody-goody; nothing frivolous about this book. I trust those of you who have the book will read this hexagram clear through because the hexagram discribes a progress in the filling up of ones own essence with personal existence in six steps. And the last step is a consumation of ones passage as having been made authentically. Which is to say adaquately.

Now I want to add to your assignment as follows: I believe it's possible for you to get this little book isn't it? Have you seen this? It's called Change - Eight lectures on the I Ching by the son of the translator of your major text. It's a Harper Torch book publication and please read if you have the time chapter three very carefully. And also spend as much time as you possibly can on chapter four. Those two chapters are not only helpfull but rather essential in such a short time as we shall spend together. Those of you who have the major text, you'll find a section in the text called the material - called the material. You'll find that in the table of contents. And within this section called the material you will

find on pages 266 and 269 two charts. One of the charts I'veplaced on the board though in no complete fashion as it is in your book. Begin reading then on page 265 where you see the words chapter 2 and read through page 272. Now that's not alot of reading as far as pages go, but it is a great deal of reading as far as content goes. It will go far towards helping us grasping what it is to understand the nature of the world in which we live and move. And at our next session we'll be able to turn our attention to some of the basic structure of the text in terms of how to go about cunsulting it, and what must be memorized in order to do that effeciently. So next time what I shall undertake to do is to introduce the text to you hoping that my introductory words this evening have helped you grasp the nature of the text in terms of its concern so that one can turn his attention to the book with the sobriety that it deserves. If one would do that it's quite amazing how much one can learn in a very short time, but if one takes a diletante attitude towards it he can pretty well make up his mind that only will he not learn anything but even that which he thought he learned he'll promptly forget. One could hardly have taught college students as long as I have without having come to such a conclusion. Now perhaps some of you have some questions about some of the awful things I've announced. Yes.

Student: I feel rather sacreligous cunsulting the I Ching as a woman and I wondered if that would be your attitude toward it.

Anderson: No.

Student: You feel that it would be alright to consult it.

Student: Could you repeat the question.

Anderson: I'm sorry you didn't hear her? Right well then I'll repeat it. If I don't do it well please stop me. The concern is whether she might not in consulting tne I Ching as a woman undertake to do something sacreligous. And my answer to that was simply no.

Student: It is acceptable as far as your understanding of it to ask it in relation to me.

Anderson: Oh certainly. That'a what it is for. That's why I called it a practical manual.

Student: I wonder if you felt that the book with Jung's foreward in it is as an acceptable a text as this one.

Anderson: Oh that's the one I've been using in refering to the large book. It has Jung's foreward in it. Please read that foreward it'a very valuable. And it might be that there will be questions you'll wan't to raise about it.

Student: You spoke of your youth and being advised to remember who you were as most of us have been. And also keeping your post, now I know that we mean quite different things but somehow they sound a little bit the same.

Anderson: Did you all hear that? Maybe I could summarize the question, and I'll wait upon your approval. What is the difference between being at one's post and practticing who one is. Is that alright?

Student: Correct.

Anderson: Well let us for the moment recall our own scripture. In the third chapter of Genesis the very first question that God puts to man is an extraordinary one. He doesn't say Adam who do youthink you are. No, He says, "Adam where art thou." It's altogether premature to find out who one is unless he has first discovered where he is. In our century we've virtually mesmerized ourselves into stupifaction with lusting after identity. In doing so we've gone beyond where we haven't yet begun. We're stupid enough without adding to it. We possess as finite beings an irreducible stupidity an invincible stupidity. Though the world presents an intelligible face to us, we can never exhaust it conceptually therefore we are irreducibly stupid before it. On the other hand something of it

can be intelligibly discerned and among those things that it presents to us for intelligible discovery is simply what I called our post. And the post that is given to us in advance is a sacrificial one as human. We stand at the nexus between the divine order and the natural. And our task is to mediate in so far as it is given us as a priestly vocation so to do to mediate the natural into the order of grace, and to mediate sacrificially the ministry of grace to the natural order. Because grace does not destroy nature but completes her, but she does not become complete without our ministry. It is hard then to remain at one's post because to do so is to be expendable. Unless we become in good faith with that post we shall never discover who we are. And that is why I said earlier that the formal cause of our identity is our vocation because we are called to that sacrificial activity. And that's why the Lord says to Adam, " You've lost your bearings man, you're out of it. Now you tell me where are you, where. And the fool says I hid myself because I was scared . Notice he can't say anymore where he is, it's really remarkable. Before one becomes too enamored with those theologans who insist on the fall as a fall up rather than a fall down one ought to take some of this into serious consideration. Orthadox theology has profound reasons for saying that the fall was a real fall, not a bogus movement but a real fall. And we must shape up to that and aquit ourselves like men before it. That also has to do with facing our death. So then there's no sense in talking about who we are. It's premature until we've first undertaken seriously to learn where we are. And that's why it always struck me as a child most frustrating to be reminded who I was while it was never quite so clear how to go about thinking about that. One of the reasons for that is simply because I still had to wait to find out where I was. And my father rather helped me with that. When I was a very small child he'd be sitting in the library reading a book and if he knew that I was walking in to ask him something he'd make sure that the book went up here you know or a newspaper. And I would walk up to him and then I was much closer to the ground than I am now. Way down here, little chap. And I'd say-um um dad I'd think I'd like to go outside. It might have been raining you see and I'd been kept in and I thought that perhaps I'd been kept in enough. I wanted to go out, squish around a little bit. And he would go hm,hm. Than I would say again- dad I really want to go out. And he'd say hm. Than I'd say- but,but dad mayn't I go out. And then no not really? And then he'd say this frightfull thing. Hed always say this terrible thing, he'd say,"Hm , is that the wind I hear or someones ears flapping." And well you know the blood started to rise from my toes. But he was teaching me something. He was teaching me to learn hoe to wait. Don't for one moment think that he was a cruel man. He wasn't, not at all. He was teaching me a very great lesson. Of course it was many, many years later that it all dawned on me. And sometimes in my office at school to this day I ask myself, when the occassion seems to require it, have I the courage the old man had to say ~~he couldn't do~~ the equivalent of that to a brash young fool. At least my father had it going for him that that wasn't to bad behavior for his generation. Whereas for mine it's just absolutely unthinkable. So I try to think it. And I also try to do it when I think it ought to be done. It's on that account then that we make the distinction between where and who. And to say that who is already too soon asked.

Student: Thank you.

Anderson: You're welcome.

Student: .... are you saying that the life is a battle?

Anderson: Yes I'm saying that life is a battle. I'm also saying that life is a journey. And I'm also saying that life lived adequately is a transfiguration. I'm saying those three. And I'm saying that we don't journey unless we battle, we get dragged along. Therefore the power of

our movement lies in our capacity to stand at our post. It's our office so to do regardless of how many roles we play while so standing. Roles have nothing to do with it. It is our office so to stand. Today the distinction between office and role is rarely made. We listen to all sorts of nonsense today because we have somehow or other preferred mindlessness so we collapse distinctions whih at least our forebearers had the wit to preserve . Though whther they lived them out or not well that's something else. But they did attempt to preserve them. We haven't even a start for that. That's what I mean about being a warrior , accepting that life is a battle, and then executing what he must decisively which means make a clean cut when it must be made. That's what a decision means, to make a cut. If you look up the etymology of the word you'll see that it simply means to cut off. The people who claim to be the most humane are usually very dirty with a knife. That's also what I mean. Goodness me it's getting very quiet.

Student: Your last remark had to do with one's self?

Anderson: It has to do with the problem of self change. There's a great deal of surgery that requires to be done upon oneself if he means to undertake making adequate passage.

Student: Would you say it's more of a adding to process or a shucking off process?

Anderson: Shucking off. Getting rid of the fat around ones soul.

Student: What is the prize to be won in this battle, this victory, what are we fighting for?

Anderson: Well let's go back to what I said earlier. You've asked that question because you didn't grasp what I said earlier. Now with that in mind let's examine your question. The question is what is the prize, what is the reward for all this fighting. Now I'm going to speak very slowly, and some of you with pad and pencil might with some ~~prophet~~ Poet take it down. Not because I say it but rather because it's profitable I'm saying it. The activity of fighting to fill up ones essence with existence is an activity whose goal lies within the activity itself. It does not lie outside it. And there's no way to find it out until one first makes the decision for self change. If he makes the decision for it than he requires to act in a very specific way and tokeep on acting in that way and never fail. No vacation from self change. Most people when they hear that get tired before they begin, they just won't begin. Well they have their reward , they never began. Therefore the question can only be answered interms of the way the answer to the question was formulated about who. It's a premature question until one has begun, though it can be answered academically the way I answered it which is to say the activity of warrior-hood has for it's goal what is intrinsic to the activity itself. The Christian warrior does not move into spiritual warfare because he wishes to win heaven, how vulgar can one get. What did Jesus say about the kingdom of heaven? St. Lukes Gospel makes that very clear in the seventeenth chapter, about the twenty first verse. He says, " the kingdom of heaven doesn't come with a sign, it's not here, it's not there, it's among you, it's within you, it's in your midst. " So where would you be going to find it? Over there plain enough. Now of course some theologans are not much on for the exigesis that I've just begun. They rather say that the kingdom of heaven after all refers to our Lord. Now does it? Seems to me they can't read. He didn't say simply it's not there He also said it's not here. He was here the time He said it. Nothing is so difficult to grasp than the activity whose goal lies within the activity itself, not outside it. There is no intellectual concept so difficult for the person capable of grasping it with his head and such persons are very few . Since all persons are not gifted with metaphysical powers. But everyone can grasp it if he will, if he undertakes to obey scripture. That's another bad word in our time, obey One doesn't get to heaven by getting brighter. I'm very glad for that. Oh

I'm so sorry, yes.

Student: If the meaning is in the activity or the doing than I don't understand your use of the idea of looking back on your life and acknowledgeing a personal history or realizing the funding of your existence. I don't understand how you can do that if the meaning is in the doing than how do you accumulate this thing. Idon't understand funding your existence.

Anderson: Well let's read from our text. Hexagram number 20 says something remarkable about that. On page 84 and this is the hexagram called contemplation. Incidentally if ther are others of you have appointments you'd like to meet or your just plain tired, please feel free to go before I read this. I don't wish in any way to impose on you, but your questions are so very good that I'm indulging myself. So won't you please if you care to feel free to do as you will. Hexagram #20 begins on page 82 but I want to read the third line which is in the bottom of the page on page 84. It says in the text itself; " Contemplation of my life decides the choice between advance and retreat. " Now let's look at the commentary. The commentary says; " This is the place of transition. We no longer look outward to receive pictures that are more or less limited and confused, but direct our contemplation upon ourselves in order to find a guideline for our decisions. This self-contemplation means the overcoming of naive egotism in the person who sees everything soley from his own standpoint. He begins to reflect and in this way acquires objectivity. " Now the next is worth underlining since the counsel is so profoundly cotrary to the sort of thing that we're encouraged to do in our time. " self knowledge does not mean preoccupation with one's own thoughts; rather, it means concern about the effects one creates. It is only the effects our lives produce that give us the right to judge whther what we have done means progress or regression." How much easier it is to chase the tails of our own thoughts; running around continually seducing ourselves with possibility, rather than looking at at the actual record. Now one must learn how to look at that record and while looking at itfind his looking at it a functional looking. And while he is looking functionally at that record sometimes not too pretty, he none the less despite the uninviting patina that it sometimes bears, his still is still because he is a man of good will enjoying the activity whose goal lies within itself.

Student: Does he ever the activity.

Anderson: Never, never. In fact if he prefered not to look at the effects that he has heretofore created he would show himself altogether in bad faith with his own existence.

Student: There's one thing here that makes me a little uneasy because I think sometimes that if you have reacted to a situation that comes to you in a very simple way that seems sometimes it's better not to worry about looking for the effect. You may not be able to see it for years and years. Am I talking about something different from what you are or not?

Anderson: Yes you are. You're talking about being worried. The superior man is bent on cutting that out.

Student: Ok now I feel fine about that

Anderson: Fine. You did hear that wonderfull question I hope? I'll try to summarize it if I may. The question was; Is it not the case that one can become preoccupied with worrying about the effects that he has produced? And futhermore is it not the case that one doesn't observe the effects for many many years, and then if he was concerned about the thing that he hasn't yet seen all this time then what's going on that's profitable? Nothing, nothing profitable is going on. Obviously one can not concern himself with any effect that isn't present as an object to his analysis. And futhermore he isn't a warrior. Even if the effect is bad he can not possibly divide himself by getting over anxious about it. That's also bad news for our time. You know so many theologans in our time and philosophers indulge themselves with the thought that finitude and anxiety are the same. Utterly unscriptural. Also I might add psychologically perverse. No

possibility of making self change if you believe that. Why does our Lord say, and I'm speaking as a Christian, who is still trying to become one and is not necessarily one because it's recorded as such in his baptismal record. Why does our Lord say in the twelfth chapter of St. Luke's Gospel; Don't be anxious, cut it out. Does he mean by that be frivolous instead? Certainly not. No he doesn't mean that. He means make a massive affirmation of existence and make your decisions clean and sure and having made them wait. Because it takes a long time to grow a will let alone a good one. The person, the child we call willfull is the child who hasn't got a will at all. It's no small achievment to acquire a will, will is a power a force. And if one reads the new testament correctly there are instructions in it as to how to get on with developing a will. That isn't going to come over night. It's the discipline of a lifetime. And you don't have to wear a placard saying I have a will if you have one. People just know, especially children and animals. They get it straight the first time. Takes a little longer for persons without one, but not to much longer. It all comes back then to learning how to stand. And I don't mean standing willfully, but rather standing willingly. If one hasn't a will he can't perform anything willingly. Goodness me. Father Sanford are we outraging limit?

Sanford: If there more questions I'm sure you'd like to entertain them, but if there aren't why maybe this is a good time to confer.