

SPHERES AND RIGHTS

A Study Of *The Urantia Book* On Gender Differences

Byron Belitsos

A Paper Prepared for the Wrightwood Series on Gender

Copyright 1994, Byron Belitsos

"Forever each sex will remain supreme in its own domain, domains determined by *biologic* differentiation and by *mental* dissimilarity..."

"Each sex has its own distinctive sphere of existence, together with its own rights within that sphere...."

"Women's rights are by no means men's rights. Woman cannot thrive on man's rights any more than man can prosper on woman's rights...."

From The Urantia Book (p. 938)

What an abyss divides the sexes! Let us abandon the pretense of sexual sameness and admit the terrible duality of gender.

Camille Paglia, Sexual Personae

As we strive to find common ground with women, let us never forget that our two systems are fundamentally dissimilar. Their system is based on estrogen, ovaries, fallopian tubes. They give birth; we give advice.

Humorist Charles Varon, "State of the Gender",
from Wingspan: Inside the Men's Movement

SPHERES AND RIGHTS
 A STUDY OF *THE URANTIA BOOK* ON GENDER

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface

Part I: Gender Differences And Gender-Spheres

Deity And Gender Differentiation	3
Biological Determinism And Gender Justice.....	5
Maternal Instinct As Holy Grail.....	5
Industry And Instinct	6
The "Apollonian Swerve" From Nature.....	6
Revenge And Paradox	7
Sexual Suicide And The Economy Of Eros	9
The Vicious Circle Of Gender Revenge	10
George Gilder's Solution	11
Jesus' Solution	12
Gender Appearances And Realities	13
Ambiguous Findings Of Social Science	13
Brain Science And Mental Dissimilarities	14
"Spheres And Rights": The Master Concept of Gender.....	17
"The Hand That Rocks The Cradle"	17
Are Mothers Morally Superior?	18
The Wages Of Patriarchy	19
"Puerarchy"	20
Elusive Spheres Of Charm And Grace	20
Respecting Gender Boundaries	22
The Invasion Of Spheres	22
The Timely Emergence Of The Men's Movement.....	23

Part II: In Search of the Male Gender-Sphere

Jesus And The Men's Movement	25
Robert Bly On The Masculine Soul	25
The Victim Hood Of The "Soft Males"	25
Recovering The Male Sphere	26
Iron John And Jesus The Man.....	26
Was Jesus Androgynous?.....	27
The "Charm And Force" Of Jesus.....	28
Jesus And The Male Psyche.....	28
Methodology For This Study	29

Jesus As "King"	31
"The King" In The Urantia Book	31
The Kingly Side Of Jesus	32
The Inner And Outer Kings	33
The Primacy Of The Inner King	33
Jesus, Warrior For Truth	35
Jesus The Fearless Hero	36
Maintaining Warriorship	36
The Fierceness Of The Spirit-Warrior	37
Dangers Of Misguided Warriorship	38
Jesus' Skillful Warriorship	38
Jesus As Healer And "Magician"	41
"Rarefied Realms Of Secret Power"	41
Jesus The Scientist	42
The Healing Mission Of Jesus	43
Delving Deep	43
The Lover Jesus	45
"...They Beheld Him Weeping"	45
The Lover Of Beauty	46
Jesus And Play	46
"Jesus Loved The Children...."	47
"The Best Friend They Had In All The World"	48
Appendix A	
The Key Urantia Book Passage On Gender	49
Appendix B	
A Feminist On "Charm And Grace"	51
Source Bibliography	54
Background Sources	54

PREFACE

The Urantia Book reveals that gender differences are an essential feature of human life, even the afterlife. Gender-based biological and mental differences are also the basis of the complementarity of the sexes. Further, we are told that gender differentiation and complementarity reveal a Creator design, and in that design inheres a divine vision of spheres of existence assigned to men and women -- spheres in which they "reign supreme".

Our planet Urantia stands on the brink of the discovery of these "gender-spheres", plus "gender rights" that accompany them. Feminism was the first modern statement in this evolving debate; the "men's movement" is the next step and will, I believe, reveal an entirely new dimension.

Though staunchly affirming the political, social, intellectual and spiritual equality of women, the UB's chief contributions to the debate about gender is a disclosure of sex *differences*. This includes assertions about maternal instinct, the indication that women "appear" to be more intuitive and less logical, and an allusion to unexplored realms of feminine "charm and grace". Like the Book's theory of race differences, these revelations are jarring. They seem arbitrary to many readers. But recent developments in science and social evolution seem to lend some outside support. It is also remarkable to witness the emergence in recent years of "difference feminism", a movement which is quite compatible with the Book's teachings on sex differences and even celebrates them.

Part I of this essay explores the wide-ranging implications of the Book's teachings on gender differences. I also make some preliminary attempts to define gender spheres and rights, especially the female sphere. Part II goes in search for more clues on the qualities of the less easily definable male sphere. My method is to take a close look at passages that appear to describe the masculine qualities of Jesus.

Much of what follows is experimental and speculative. I had to range far and wide to find authors who corroborate the Book's pronouncements on sex difference. I deployed these authors in creating a preliminary meditation on the key passages. But so much is at stake, and so much more research needs to be done. My hope is that this and future studies will some day point the way to a new epoch in which gender harmony will finally reign supreme.

NOTE TO READERS NEW TO THE URANTIA BOOK

The Book's key passage on gender is reproduced in Appendix A for your perusal.

NOTE ON PUNCTUATION

Unless otherwise noted, bold and italics in quoted passages has been inserted by the author for the sake of emphasis.

PART I:
GENDER DIFFERENCES AND
GENDER-SPHERES

DEITY AND GENDER DIFFERENTIATION

*As love is comprehended on a sex planet, the love of God is more comparable to the love of a father, while the love of the Eternal Son more like the affection of a mother...there is a **difference**, not in divine content but in quality and technique of expression, between the love of the Father and the love of the Son. [UB: 76]*

The great gift of The Urantia Book to gender studies is the revelation that sexual differentiation has a cosmic basis. Sex differences are meaningful even in understanding Trinity relationships -- indeed, can be found throughout the Book's discussion of deity personalities.

While the author calls the above illustration "crude, indeed", it is suprising that this Divine Counselor draws any gender distinctions at all in his (or her?) presentation of the nature of Paradise Deity.

At the level of local universe deity, gender differences are explicit, but gender harmony is perfect. Indeed, the divine couple on Salvington are a model for mortal couples; they provide the "transcendent pattern for family organization...of the worlds of space". In addition, we are invited to know Christ Michael as a father and the Creative Spirit as a mother, for this aids our devotional practice and theological understanding.

The Son functions as a father in his local universe. The Spirit, as mortal creatures would understand, enacts the role of a mother...

Though he was the sovereign of this local universe, the Son published to the worlds the fact of the Spirit's equality with him in all endowments of personality and attributes of divine character. And this becomes the *transcendent pattern* for the family organizationof the worlds of space. This is, in deed and in truth, the high ideal of the family...[see 366]

What is the "transcendent pattern for family organization" that our beloved Sovereign and his co-equal divine consort provide? In my reading, their cosmic endowments of gender difference and role complementarity should be at the heart of our understanding. For though they are equal in divinity, Michael and the Mother occupy vastly different cosmic roles. (I'm sure they have a lot of fun together even so.)

For example, cosmic roles are revealed in the most severe test a Creator Son can undergo: insurrection by a subordinate. Role differentiation comes to the fore as we read that only Sons can contest rebellion. However, role complementarity is **also** essential, for the Mother's cooperation is necessary for success.

In the face of insurrection only the Son and his associated Sons can function as deliverers. Never can the Spirit undertake to contest rebellion or defend authority....but no Son could hope for final success without the incessant co-operation of the Divine Minister and her vast assemblage of spirit helpers, the daughters of God....[368]

Revealed to us are many other indicators of distinctive roles and spheres of activity at the local universe deity level:

- Only the Michael Sons go forth into the worlds of space to incarnate, while only the Creative Mother Spirit can provide the "vital spirit spark" of life through the Life Carriers....
- The Creator Son pours out his Spirit of Truth which is the basis of "spiritual philosophy, the wisdom of spirit realities", while the Creative Spirit originates the spirit circuit of the Holy Spirit, the basis of spiritual reason, or "soul intelligence". [See UB: 1108]
- She is "equally and diffusely present throughout her entire local universe", while he "...cannot personally be in two places at the same time..."
- He acts "timelessly within his own universe" while she is "...wholly and entirely independent of space..."
- She "...never leaves the local universe headquarters world....", while the Creator son "...may come and go..." [See 366 - 369]

BIOLOGICAL DETERMINISM AND GENDER JUSTICE

Forever each sex will remain supreme in its own domain, domains determined by biologic differentiation and by mental dissimilarity.
[UB: 938]

Forever supreme? Only revelation can get away with such brave statements. This stunning description of immutable gender differences points to a pre-existing, purposive Creator design. Apparently, the deity patterns of functional differentiation that we just examined are mirrored on the worlds of space. Not all of today's notions of human gender differentiation are hopelessly culture-bound; The Urantia Book tells us they have cosmic and divine roots.

In this section, we consider biological differentiation alone as a factor in determining the sex "domains". A discussion of mental dissimilarity follows.

For today's scholars of gender, theories of sex difference based on biology are held in low repute -- especially anything as drastic as an "instinct". Ten years ago, at the zenith of liberal feminism, any belief in biological determinism was deemed an intellectual crime, punishable by exile. Even in today's more flexible climate, most scholars mistrust or ignore even the striking discoveries of recent brain research into sex differences. In a review of the most recent scientific research on biology and gender, R.C. Lewontin of Harvard University complains in the New York Review of Books that "...nearly all the biology of gender is bad science".

Surely here is a case where the authority of revelation would come as a welcome gift -- for those few audacious enough to embrace an epochal revelation. And though sometimes cryptic, various passages in the Book do speak to the issue with great clarity. The UB gives us a firm basis to announce that biology can be the starting point for a close look at sex differences and resulting sex roles.

MATERNAL INSTINCT AS HOLY GRAIL

In this connection, it may come as a surprise to many that the Book bases much of its discussion of gender on the notion of "mother instinct".

The notion of "instinct" is to gender studies what the holy grail is to myth. Instinct is a show-stopper; it is by definition immutable. We are told that "from age to age the mores change, but instinct never" [938]. Instinct is there by purposive Creator design, and one can't tinker with it like a Democrat trying to reform the health care system. If an instinct were to be defined in revelation, it must become the premise -- the "first word" -- of the discussion. For with revelation as a support, the biologic is the cosmic.

I don't mean to exaggerate this point. But if one spends weeks reading popular and scholarly books on gender with titles like Why Men Hate Women Who Distrust Men Who Fear Women, it is amazing to see how the decks get cleared upon turning to the UB's passages on gender.

To begin with, the Book tells us that civilization can *never* "obliterate the behavioral gulf between the sexes" [938]. And what is the basis of this difference? Woman has an innate maternal instinct, which man lacks.

...women naturally love babies more than males do. [774]

Mother love is instinctive; it did not originate in the mores as did marriage. All mammalian mother-love is the inherent endowment of the adjutant mind-spirits of the local universe and is in strength and devotion always directly proportional to the length of the helpless infancy of the species. [932]

Here, then, is the holy grail of gender: a Creator design for biological motherhood, a pre-programmed endowment of the adjutant mind-spirit circuits of the Local Universe Mother Spirit.

INDUSTRY AND INSTINCT

Of course, for some of us, the existence of a maternal instinct is intuitively demonstrated by experience and observation. But the following assertion may not be so obvious:

Innate maternal affection will never permit emancipated woman to become man's serious rival in industry. [938]

This one is not especially favored by today's mores. When I first became acquainted with this passage, I was living with a feminist scholar, now a professor of women's studies. It didn't sit too well with either of us. But it does help explain changes in the women's movement since then. Liberal feminists have had a difficult time reviving interest among women in an Equal Rights Amendment, while "difference feminism" has been on the rise ever since its defeat in the mid-1980's.

Nothing is said in the text of the UB to prove this claim that emancipated woman cannot be man's serious rival in industry. It is however amplified with a similar bold assertion:

In self-perpetuation woman is man's equal, but *in the partnership of self-maintenance she labors at a decided disadvantage*, and this *handicap of enforced maternity* can only be compensated by the enlightened mores of advancing civilization and by man's increasing sense of acquired fairness. [936]

You won't find much evidence or explanation for these provocative statements in the UB about women's prospects in industry. Apparently, the revelators won't rob us of the pleasure of discovering the logical and experiential basis of these propositions. But if we begin with this premise about mother-love and the central importance of woman's procreative power, it is possible to go out and create a reasonable discourse on gender differences.

THE "APOLLONIAN SWERVE" FROM NATURE

Several modern authors, two men and one woman, each very much against the grain of trendy thought on the subject of gender, come to mind as corroborators of the UB's

teachings on gender and biology. Each arrives at this uncomfortable place by way of logic and by reflection on history of the sexes.

In *Sexual Personae*, Camille Paglia, a towering and influential post-feminist scholar, does not concern herself directly with women's prospects in industry. But she does convincingly demonstrate that in Western history, the realm of industry and culture was invented by men as a defensive reaction -- an "Apollonian swerve" -- from woman's natural procreative power. In one typical passage she contrasts "male" theories of history with women's "cyclical nature":

The western idea of history as a propulsive movement into the future...is a male formulation. No woman, I submit, could have coined such an idea, since it is a strategy of evasion of woman's own cyclic nature, in which man dreads being caught...Woman does not dream of transcendental or historical escape from natural cycle, since she *is* that cycle...Whether she desires motherhood or not, nature yokes her into the brute inflexible rhythm of procreative law. [Paglia: 10]

For Paglia, Western culture arose from men's struggle for a separate identity in the face of the primeval power of nature, which he confronts especially in the engulfing sexual and procreative power of women. Behind the veil of her beauty and nurturance is her "confederacy with chthonian nature" -- the life-giving but chaotic and "emotional" forces of nature. These forces may threaten masculine security; but women find given in nature their *biological purpose*.

Men react by carving out a separate domain, one marked by reason and logic; like golden Apollo who stands astride the dark and wild Dionysius in Greek myth, he erects through force of will a separate realm of male activity whose chief preoccupation is *mastery of nature*. By striving for mathematical and conceptual purity, he escapes from nature and from his overwhelming debt to his mother. The UB's claim that women "appear to be somewhat less logical" than men [938] makes more sense in light of man's defensive Apollonian swerve from woman and nature.

REVENGE AND PARADOX

As further revenge, man objectifies woman's beauty, turns her into a sex fetish and imprisons her in spheres of his exclusive definition. This process goes further than it might, because women are emotionally handicapped in this millennial struggle for power:

The mother and child relation is natural, strong, and instinctive, and one which, therefore, constrained primitive women to submit to many strange conditions and to endure untold hardships. This compelling mother love is the handicapping emotion which has always placed woman at such a tremendous disadvantage in all her struggles with man. [UB: 932]

Men are insecure in the face of woman's sex charms and natural procreative powers, yet woman's mother love paradoxically makes her *less powerful* in the power struggle with these defensive males. *Her* revenge then sets off another paradox.

Woman's status has always been a social paradox; she has always been a shrewd manager of men; she has always capitalized man's stronger sex urge for her own interests and to her own advancement.

By trading subtly upon her sex charms, she has often been able to exercise dominant power over man, even when held by him in abject slavery. [UB: 935]

But the struggle escalates! As further revenge, men even conspire to monopolize the realm of spirit. According to Paglia, their technique is, again, Apollonian: the intellectual mastery of man-made religious doctrine, or "revealed texts"; the demonizing of the body and of feminine nature; and domination of religious ritual and symbolism. But this is yet another paradox, for the revelators tell us that "Woman...has always been the moral standard-bearer and spiritual leader of mankind". [UB: 938] One wonders how we got into this confused mess!

It required an incarnation by a Creator Son to initiate Urantia's break from male-domination of religious institutions. But this project is far from completion.

And this liberation of women, giving them due recognition, was practiced by the apostles immediately after the Master's departure, albeit they fell back to the olden customs in subsequent generations...Paul, despite the fact that he conceded all this in theory, never really incorporated it into his own attitude and personally found it difficult to carry out in practice. [UB: 1679]

Woman's status in Palestine was much improved by Jesus' teaching; and so it would have been throughout the world if his followers had not departed so far from that which he painstakingly taught them. [UB: 1840]

Why would sincere men undo the teachings of their Master and return to a dark past of oppression? Paglia pins her explanation on overwhelming male insecurity: men must find themselves through unsteady performances and arduous achievements in the realm of mind, but woman's usefulness to evolution is given in her body and in her instinctive bond with her children. She does not have to wander the earth in a quest for her identity. She is already central to life. Woman's womb is man's point of origin, of birth. Her sexual organs are sufficient for the mission of nurturing infants. As mother, she stamps an indelible mark on the child, which the child carries into eternity. "A human being's entire afterlife is enormously influenced by what happens during the first few years of existence." [UB: 1922] In this sense, she is in control of destiny as well. All men are aware of the enormous influence of their mothers, and many never escape from its bonds.

In this section, we are in search here of a biological basis for understanding sex differences. How does man, in flight from biological mother-domination and woman's inherent sexual power, compensate for his lack of natural power? According to Paglia, his natural genital constitution lends some hint.

The male genital metaphor is concentration and projection. Nature gives concentration to man to help him overcome his fear. Man approaches woman in bursts of spasmodic concentration. This gives him the delusion of temporary control of the archetypal mysteries that brought him forth. It gives him courage to return. Sex is metaphysical for men, as it is not for women. Women have no problem to solve by sex. Physically and psychologically, they are serenely self-contained. They may choose to achieve, but they do not need it. [Paglia: 19-20]

She continues the genital metaphor into the mental realm:

The male projection of erection and ejaculation is the paradigm for all cultural projection and conceptualization -- from art and philosophy to fantasy, hallucination and obsession. Women have conceptualized less in history not because they were kept from doing so but because women do not need to conceptualize in order to exist....Without [the power of conceptualization], he would be helpless before woman's power. Without them, woman would long ago have absorbed all creation into herself. There would be no culture, no system, no pyramiding of one hierarchy upon another....Political equality for women, desirable and necessary as it is, is not going to remedy the radical disjunction between the sexes that begins and ends in the body. [Paglia: 20-21]

None of Paglia's arguments deny woman's ability to function equally well in any of the realms of conceptualization that are identified with men; they are simply less motivated to enter therein. Paglia herself is one of the most brilliant conceptual thinkers I have read. The issue is one of motivation: for man, these Apollonian realms of activity provide a much needed sexual affirmation. For many, it provides the very basis of psychological survival in the face of female power.

SEXUAL SUICIDE AND THE ECONOMY OF EROS

This theme is also taken up by George Gilder in his 1973 book Sexual Suicide, one of the most articulate conservative responses to the first wave of feminism.

"Sex is the life force -- and cohesive impulse -- of a people, and their very character will be deeply affected by how sexuality is managed," writes Gilder in his introduction. After a cogent summary of the biological and sociological differences between the sexes, he concludes that "...[women] control not the economy of the marketplace but the economy of eros: the life force in our society and in our lives. "

Woman's ability -- and consequent right -- to control sexuality is based on two essential and natural qualities of her sex, according to Gilder: her innately secure sexual identity, and the long-term horizons of female procreative biology.

Woman's sexual identity is inherent in her physical being and confers on her certain powers and prerogatives not available to men. Indeed, women's sexual constitution has an inexorable cosmic power which lends to her sexual and erotic advantages over men. Many studies of sexual intercourse, beginning with Masters and Johnson, have shown that women enjoy sexual relations more profoundly and yet can forgo sex more easily than men. In addition, her success in the sex act does not depend on a contingent physical performance, as does the man's. Nor does her identity as a woman depend on engaging in intercourse; she has other specifically female experiences that affirm her sexuality. She is reminded of her sexual nature monthly by her menstruation, and her breasts and womb are further omnipresent reminders of her potential to enact her biological function.

In discussing the erotic aspects of our lives, we must concern ourselves chiefly with women. Males are the sexual outsiders and inferiors. A far smaller portion of their bodies is directly erogenous. A far smaller portion of their lives is devoted to sexual activity. Their own distinctively sexual experience is limited to erection and ejaculation. Their rudimentary sexual drive leads only toward

copulation. The male body offers no sexual fulfillment comparable to a woman's passage through months of pregnancy, the tumult of childbirth, and on to the suckling of her baby. All are powerful and fulfilling sexual experiences completely foreclosed to men. [Gilder: 14]

Her sexual power is also obvious in courtship and sexual selection. Although men are almost everywhere found to be the initiators of relations between the sexes, Gilder reminds us that *this responsibility for initiative derives from male sexual disadvantage*. She has less to prove sexually, and more to lose by entering into indiscriminate sexual relations.

From her position of greater natural restraint and selectivity, she is the sexual judge and executive, finally appraising the offering soft males, favoring one and rejecting another, *managing the sexual nature of society*. [Gilder: 23]

Men's deficit in the economy of sexuality gives rise to the uniquely male condition -- puzzling to many women -- of a restless, often undefinable sexual insecurity and mistrust. Here we can turn to The Urantia Book for support.

...man's distrust and suspicion were not helped by the fact that women were all along compelled to resort to shrewdness in the effort to alleviate their bondage.

The sexes have had great difficulty in understanding each other. Man found it hard to understand woman, regarding her with a strange mixture of ignorant mistrust and fearful fascination, if not with suspicion and contempt. Many tribal and racial traditions relegate trouble to Eve, Pandora, or some other representative of womankind. These narratives were always distorted so as to make it appear that the woman brought evil upon man; and all this indicates the onetime universal distrust of woman. [See UB: 935]

THE VICIOUS CIRCLE OF GENDER REVENGE

Women's sexual identity and security is a natural endowment, while men must validate and express their manhood through continuous action in the external world.

Unfortunately, this male drive may become an *unstoppable force*. Insecure men will seek sexual affirmation through control of women lives or anything else in their environment that will submit to harsh logic if not brute force. In primitive societies, insecure men seek to subjugate women socially and subdue her cosmic sexual power, to control her body and mind and the prerogatives of her gender-domain, even turning her in a piece of property. This is even witnessed in modern society:

Woman has always been treated more or less as property, right up to and in the twentieth century after Christ. She has not yet gained world-wide freedom from seclusion under man's control. Even among advanced peoples, man's attempt to protect woman has always been a tacit assertion of superiority. [UB: 936]

As the revelators tell us, "We do not regard a planet as having emerged from barbarism so long as one sex seeks to tyrannize over the other." [UB: 564] But a given reaction to this tyranny by women is not necessarily righteous. As Sam Keen pointed out in Fire In the Belly, there is a crucial difference between a *prophetic feminism*, which cries out against the unjust domination by men of women's lives, and an *ideological feminism*, which seeks to blame and attack men, creating even greater male insecurity.

A feminism that attacks men only plays into the "social paradox" we have been dissecting: the vicious circle of man's reaction to natural female sexuality, leading to shrewdness and covert manipulation by women, leading to Paglia's "Apollonian swerve" of icy male intellectualism, leading to covert female sex manipulation to regain some power, leading men to become increasingly abusive and mistrustful to maintain their control. As we will see in Part II of this essay, no one gets to *grow up* under this arrangement -- certainly not men.

GEORGE GILDER'S SOLUTION: WOMEN MUST CIVILIZE MALE NATURE

Gilder suggests that woman's unacknowledged sexual power points the way to a solution. Like Paglia, he offers a sociological argument derived from a biological/cosmological thesis. These methodologies of Gilder and Paglia are strikingly similar to that of the UB's own theory of gender.

Like Paglia, Gilder argues that the horizons of female sexuality are relatively long-term; her procreative powers tie her into natural rhythms quite unlike the short-term, repetitive build up and release of sexual tension so characteristic of male sexuality. Ultimately, her identification with nature's extended cycles of gestation, birth, and nurturance -- supported by an innate mother-love implanted in her by the Universe Mother Spirit -- have profound cosmic implications. This connection is rightly celebrated in contemporary feminist spirituality and eco-feminism -- but ignored by ideological feminism.

The "feminine principle", if you will, is more in tune with the demands of advanced cultural evolution. Cosmic cycles -- even the demands of producing cosmic citizens and sons of the Father -- are implied in her very biology. Here then is Gilder's solution:

The crucial process of civilization is the subordination of male sexual impulses and psychology to long-term horizons of female biology. If one compares female overall sexual behavior today with women's life in primitive societies, the difference is relatively small. It is male behavior that must be changed to create a civilized order. *Modern society relies increasingly on predictable, regular, long-term human activities, corresponding to the female sexual patterns.* It has little latitude for the pattern of impulsiveness, aggressiveness, and immediacy, arising from male insecurity without women -- and further enhanced by hormonal activity. This is the ultimate and growing source of female power in the modern world. **Women domesticate and civilize male nature. They can destroy civilized male identity merely by giving up the role.** (p. 23) [Italics added]

JESUS' SOLUTION: SPECIAL PROTECTION AND MALE MATURITY

The Urantia Book largely supports Gilder's assertion that "it is male behavior that must be changed". This is well exemplified in Jesus' instructions to the man who was mistreating his wife. This remarkable lecture explains how a loving, mature male must treat his wife (and children). As we have seen with Paglia and Gilder, Jesus' teaching turns on the issue of woman's natural procreative powers and specialized sexual and nurturing role. Note how Jesus supports his case by an appeal to gender differentiation and complementarity at deity levels, which we examined earlier.

Jesus said: "My brother, always remember that man has no rightful authority over woman unless the woman has willingly and voluntarily given him such authority. **Your wife has engaged to go through life with you, to help you fight its battles, and to assume the far greater share of the burden of bearing and rearing your children; and in return for this special service it is only fair that she receive from you that special protection which man can give to woman as the partner who must carry, bear, and nurture the children. The loving care and consideration which a man is willing to bestow upon his wife and their children are the measure of that man's attainment of the higher levels of creative and spiritual self-consciousness.** Do you not know that men and women are partners with God in that they co-operate to create beings who grow up to possess themselves of the potential of immortal souls? The Father in heaven treats the Spirit Mother of the children of the universe as one equal to himself. It is Godlike to share your life and all that relates thereto on equal terms with the mother partner who so fully shares with you that divine experience of reproducing yourselves in the lives of your children. If you can only love your children as God loves you, you will love and cherish your wife as the Father in heaven honors and exalts the Infinite Spirit, the mother of all the spirit children of a vast universe." [UB: 1471]

Here's how I would summarize Jesus' teaching in relation to the Book's own history of the relations of the sexes. Through attaining "higher levels of creative and spiritual self-consciousness" (see above quote), a man can harmonize the tension between woman's desire for equality and her need for special protection. He must do this much as the Father honors the divine motherhood of the Infinite Mother Spirit, yet remains equal to her in Trinitarian relationship.

In Part II, we will return to this theme by looking closely at how Jesus' life provides a new model for masculine maturity (i.e., "higher levels of creative and spiritual self-consciousness"), and for the male gender-domain in its fullness. We will also see in the coming sections how women must play their part in civilizing men -- as Gilder believes they must -- by exalting high moral and spiritual standards.

GENDER APPEARANCES AND REALITIES

Male and female are, practically regarded, two distinct varieties of the same species living in close and intimate association. Their viewpoints and entire life reactions are essentially different.... [UB: 938]

This echoes the earlier theme of "...domains determined by biological differentiation and mental dissimilarity". In which ways are men and women "essentially different" in viewpoint and reaction to life? The Book gives us a few precious hints:

Women seem to have more intuition than men, but they also appear to be somewhat less logical. [UB: 938]

We all know this as one of the most carefully crafted statements in the Book. Note the qualifiers: "**seem** to have more intuition"....."**appear** to be less logical". This passage is a profound moment in a revelatory text, so we must unpack its possibilities.

The first question is: Why not authoritatively sort out for us the difference in mental attributes between the sexes? Couldn't uncountable marriages be salvaged by agreement on this point alone?

Seeming appearance is one thing, reality another. Why not just state the essential differences in unambiguous form? How, for example, does a transcendent being like Michael of Nebadon see mortal sex differences at the level of mind? Does the author of this paper know the answer, yet labors under a mandate to withhold the truth?

Consider the possibility that the mental dissimilarities of the genders is an unsolvable mystery for all sex creatures. The author of our passage is chief of Urantia seraphim, and seraphim are a sort of rarefied sex creature. Elsewhere about seraphim we read the following:

Though not male and female as are the Material Sons and the mortal races, seraphim are negative and positive. In the majority of assignments it requires two angels to accomplish the task....Such associations are primarily necessitated by function....[UB: 420]

Seraphic pairs are complementary in function like Materials Sons and mortals. Material Sons and daughters have distinct sex differences -- this is evident when you read the narration of the default of Adam and Eve -- and they always operate in pairs.

In my view, such sexual or complementary associations of beings are *closed epistemological systems*. Beings operating in such dyads cannot get outside the system far enough to see the absolute essence of the other sex (or the other "complement of being"). This handicap in perception would even include our author of the key paper on gender differences, the chief of Urantia seraphim. Perhaps this explains his/her use of terms such as "seem" and "appear".

AMBIGUOUS FINDINGS OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

If we downstep ourselves for a moment and look at evolutionary thought on the subject, we find the same muddle. A defining moment in gender studies of the past twenty years

was the publication in 1982 of In a Different Voice, by Carol Gilligan. Much of previous male-dominated psychology had concluded that women were somehow morally deficient, because they lack moral reasoning skills displayed by boys and men. Gilligan convincingly showed that women live by different -- but equally moral -- ethical norms. According to Gilligan, women tend to base moral decisions on principles of compassion and care, whereas men base theirs on abstract principles of justice. Women ask "who will be hurt least?", while men think "what is the fairest thing to do?" Women reason that they must *care* for others, based on intuitions of relationship, while men concern themselves with the logic of determining the *rights* of others.

One is tempted to see in this a tidy theory a gender difference along rigid lines of emotion-intuition versus logic. But in a thorough review of the research findings since Gilligan's book, Carol Travis showed, in her 1992 book The Mismeasure of Woman, that the wide popularity of the theory "does not rest on its scientific merit." Subsequent studies showed that *men* were more care based. One overview of the studies of the last decade showed that women were actually more justice-based than men! So much for the findings of social science. It's likely that mental differences between the sexes will always be a matter of appearance, always subject to a debate about semantics.

Issue settled? Not so easy with our beloved Urantia Book. The Book leaves us some other hints about mental dissimilarity. Remember this puzzling passage?

It was farthest from Eve's intention ever to do anything which would militate against Adam's plans or jeopardize their planetary trust. **Knowing the tendency of woman to look upon immediate results rather than to plan farsightedly for more remote effects**, the Melchizedeks, before departing, had especially enjoined Eve as to the peculiar dangers besetting their isolated position on the planet and had in particular warned her never to stray from the side of her mate, that is, to attempt no personal or secret methods of furthering their mutual undertakings. [UB: 840]

BRAIN SCIENCE AND MENTAL DISSIMILARITIES

Perhaps the physical sciences can offer fresh insight. For this we turn to a remarkable book, entitled Brain Sex, which summarizes world-wide brain research into sex differences. The findings are startling. I'm not qualified to judge this data as good or bad science, so I simply offer these excerpts (from the book's opening chapters) for the interpretation of others. Emphasis is mine.

To maintain that [men and women] are the same in aptitude, skill or behavior is to build a society based on a biological and scientific lie.

The brain...is differently constructed in men and women; it processes information in a different way, which results in different perceptions, priorities and behavior.

In the past ten years there has been an explosion of scientific research into what makes the sexes different. [Scientists and others] working apart, have produced a body of finding which, taken together, paints a remarkably consistent picture. And **the picture is one of startling sexual asymmetry.**

The truth is that **virtually every professional scientist and researcher into the subject has concluded that the brains of men and women are different.** There seldom has been a greater divide between what intelligent, enlightened opinion presumes...and what science knows...

...the differences between the brains of males and females...are now clear. There is more to know...but **the nature and cause of brain differences are now known beyond speculation, beyond prejudice, and beyond reasonable doubt.**

The biggest behavioral difference between men and women is the natural, innate aggression of men...Even researchers who are hostile to the acknowledgment of sex differences agree that this is a male feature, and one which cannot be explained by social conditioning.

One measurements of various aptitude tests, the differences between the sexes is average scores on these tests can be as much as 25 percent.

The area where the biggest differences [in aptitude] have been found lies in what scientists call 'spatial ability'. That' being able to picture things, their shape, position, geography and proportion, accurately in the mind's eye...One scientist who has reviewed the extensive literature on the subject concludes, 'The fact of the male's superiority in spatial ability is beyond dispute.' It is confirmed by literally hundreds of different scientific studies.

At the very highest level of mathematical excellence, according to the biggest survey ever conducted, the very best boys totally eclipse the very best girls...for every exceptional girl there were more than thirteen exceptional boys.

The male advantage in seeing patterns and abstract relationships -- what could be called general strategic rather than detailed tactical thinking -- perhaps explains the male dominance of chess, even in a country like the USSR, where the game is a national sport played by both sexes.

While the male brain gives men the edge in dealing with things and theorems, **the female brain is organized to respond more sensitively to all sensory stimuli. Women do better than men on tests of verbal ability.** Females are equipped to receive a wider range of sensory information, to connect and relate that information with greater facility, to place a primacy on personal relationships, and to communicate.

Girls learn to say their first words...earlier than boys, and are generally more fluent in their pre-school years. They read earlier too...**Boys outnumber girls 4:1 in remedial reading classes.** Later women find it easier to master foreign languages, and are more proficient in their own, with a better command of grammar and spelling.

Girls and women hear better than men. When the sexes are compared, women show greater sensitivity to sound...Six times as many girls than boys can sing in tune.

Women see better in the dark...Men see better than women in bright light. Intriguing results also show that **men tend to be literally blinkered**; they see in a narrow field -- mild tunnel vision -- with greater concentration on depth. They have a greater concentration on depth than women. **Women however, quite literally take in the bigger picture.** They have wider peripheral vision....

In childhood and maturity, **women have a tactile sensitivity so superior to men's that in some tests there is no overlap** between the scores of the two sexes; in the these, the least sensitive woman is more sensitive than the most sensitive man.

This superiority in so many of the senses can be clinically measured -- yet it is what accounts for women's almost supernatural 'intuition'. **Women are simply better equipped to notice things to which men are comparatively blind and deaf...** Women are better at picking up social cues, picking up important nuances of meaning from tones of voice or intensity of expression.

"SPHERES AND RIGHTS": THE MASTER CONCEPT OF GENDER

Each sex has its own distinctive sphere of existence, together with its own rights within that sphere....

....women's rights are by no means men's rights. Woman cannot thrive on man's rights any more than man can prosper on woman's rights....[UB: 938]

We have considered "domains determined by biologic differences..." and the more controversial issue of "domains determined by....mental dissimilarity". If we continue to follow the thread of the Book's teachings on gender, we arrive at a concept of gender even more controversial -- the notion of complementary but distinctive "spheres and rights" of each gender. This appears to be the Urantia Book's master concept of gender.

Some may argue that this standpoint represents only the highest point of evolutionary thought in the 1930's; others may regard it as an echo of the Victorian separate-spheres ideology; some will accept it as that last word on the issue. I prefer to treat any sociological statement in the Book as working hypothesis and an indispensable starting point. In this paper, I treat the spheres theory "as if" it is revelation, cautiously deferring to the authority of the text. I believe that the burden of proof for an alternate view should fall to the revisionists.

Let us return to our exegesis. Note the use of a three-dimensional spatial metaphor -- "spheres of existence". Apparently, Creator design has reserved for each of the sexes a substantive "gender-world" -- an expansive realm in which it "reigns supreme". We have already seen that these gender-spheres are not merely *conditioned* by biology and psyche; they are "determined" by inherent physical and mental characteristics.

Bearing this in mind, what guidance do the revelators give us concerning how to recognize woman's distinctive sphere? Literally speaking, it seems there are only two passages: one on moral and spiritual leadership, and one on "spheres of charm and grace."

"THE HAND THAT ROCKS THE CRADLE"

In constructing the first of these, it appears that the revelators ranged far and wide in the written record of planetary thought in search of "a highest existing human concept" that might apply. The result is a fragment from a 1865 poem by William Ross Wallace, a minor poet of the nineteenth century who was a close friend of Edgar Allan Poe. The poem is entitled, "The Hand That Rocks the Cradle Is the Hand That Rules the World", and the original stanza is as follows, with my italics added:

Blessings on the hand of woman!
Angels guard its strength and grace,
In the palace, cottage, hovel,
Oh, no matter where the place;
Would that never storms assailed it,

Rainbow ever gently curled;
For the hand that rocks the cradle
Is the hand that rules the world.

These lines appear to be translated into the following passage, one of the most vivid in the Book:

Women seem to have more intuition than men, but they also appear to be somewhat less logical. Woman, however, has always been the moral standard-bearer and the spiritual leader of mankind. *The hand that rocks the cradle still fraternizes with destiny.* [UB: 938]

She has led in spirituality and in upholding moral standards. This is the domain in which she has reigned supreme. Does she still? The revelator's next move is a leap to the concept of her instinctive mother-love. Yes, the mother of the species gives birth to, and "fraternizes" with, the child's destiny. Of course, *fraternize* is a weaker term than Wallace's sentimental notion of "ruling" the world. Still, this passage presents a strong image of leadership.

Let's not ignore the previous context of this line. We can also see in this cogent passage a connection between what *seems* to be a mental dissimilarity -- "more intuition" and "less logic" -- and the sphere in which she reigns supreme. The use of "however..." strongly implies that moral and spiritual leadership do not require logic so much as intuition; presumably, the activities specific to the male sphere do.

In the final analysis woman's right to leadership in the moral/spiritual domain is derived (at least in part) from her motherhood and the innate mental capacities and aptitudes that accompany it. As the poet Wallace would have it, this supremacy is symbolized by her nurturing hand, whose "strength and grace" is guarded by angels.

ARE MOTHERS MORALLY SUPERIOR?

The distinguished anthropologist Ashley Montague argues this case in his beautiful book, The Natural Superiority of Women, especially in a chapter entitled, "The Genius of Woman as the Genius of Humanity":

The maternalizing influences of being a mother have, from the very beginning of the human species, made the female the more humane of the sexes. The love of a mother for her child is the basic patent and model for all human relationships. Indeed, to the degree to which men approximate in the relationships with their fellow men the love of the mother for her child, to that extent do they move more closely toward the attainment of genuine humanity. [Montague: 182]

For Montague, this mother-love is paradigmatic of the highest form of human love. Men participate in this love as a child, but increasingly depart from it as they leave childhood behind. Because of their "greater competence" in loving and cooperative relationships, women are naturally superior to men in the moral and spiritual realm. Indeed, Montague concludes the argument with an allusion to Wallace's famed poetic line!

It is in this of course, that women can realize their power for good in the world, and make their greatest gains. *It is the function of women to teach men how to be human.* Women must not permit themselves to be deflected from their function by those who tell them that their place is in the home, in subservient relation to man. It is indeed, in the home that the foundations of the kind of world in which we live are laid, and in this sense it will always remain true that they hand that rocks the cradle is the hand that rules the world. [Montague: 183]

Montague takes Gilder's position that women must civilize male nature. But Montague argues throughout the book, somewhat like Paglia, that men's historical response to this natural "rule" of women is reactionary. It drastically exalts the male sphere -- the cold object-world of industry, the brute logic of the market, the violence of the battlefield -- over the spiritual and moral values of the home and of mother-love.

THE WAGES OF PATRIARCHY

As we have seen, Paglia argues that this seizure of power was motivated by man's terror of woman's procreative powers, including male fear of being engulfed by mother-love. Here is another of her vivid accounts:

Male bonding and patriarchy were the recourse to which man was forced by his terrible sense of woman's power....Reason and logic are the anxiety-inspired domain of Apollo, premiere god of the sky-cult. The Apollonian is harsh and phobic, coldly cutting itself off from nature by its superhuman purity...Apollo's great opponent Dionysius is ruler of the chthonian whose law is procreative femaleness. [Paglia: 12]

On its positive side, Apollonian male reason produced the material and cultural achievements of Western civilization; its negative manifestation was an all-pervasive, oppressive patriarchy.

Patriarchy operated not only by devaluing the feminine as a realm of "soggy emotionalism and bristling disorder", in Paglia's terms, but by invading woman's domain in order to control it with Apollonian logic. This violated her basic rights, the rights belonging to her gender-sphere.

Lest resentment build, I would like to lend the Book's much wider perspective to this discussion of the ravages of patriarchy .

But man did not consciously nor intentionally seize woman's rights and then gradually and grudgingly give them back to her; all this was an unconscious and unplanned episode of social evolution. When the time really came for woman to enjoy added rights, she got them, and all quite regardless of man's conscious attitude. Slowly but surely the mores change so as to provide for those social adjustments which are a part of the persistent evolution of civilization. [UB: 937]

While it is true that patriarchy acted out its fear and disdain for female power, the Book tells us these men were *unconscious*. I offer this standpoint to those looking to pin blame for the historic wrongs of men.

"PUERARCHY": THE RULE OF BOYS

This description of patriarchy also rings true with the contemporary men's movement, which often defines patriarchy as puerarchy -- the "rule of unconscious boys":

Patriarchy is the expression of the *immature* masculine. It is the expression of Boy psychology, and, in part, the shadow -- or crazy -- side of masculinity. It expresses the stunted masculine, fixed at immature levels. Patriarchy, in our view, is an attack on *masculinity* in its fullness as well as femininity in its fullness. [Moore: xvii]

Unfortunately, the men's movement did not arise in time to preempt the first great pendulum swing of righteous indignation of feminism. Ideological feminism reacted to patriarchy by adopting the assumptions of Apollonian reason. In its worst edition, it exalted the values of careerism in the marketplace over the values derived from the mother-child bond. Montague sees this as a colossal error.

But if women ever come to believe that...being a mother is somehow inferior to being a career woman, they will have betrayed themselves, and reveal how profoundly they have been brainwashed into accepting the mythology that males have imposed upon them. For the truth is that being a mother is the most important career anyone can be called upon to follow. [Montague: 187]

The Urantia Book's presentation is more subtle, however, than this formulation. The Book recognizes that woman's work at home -- conveniently delegated to her because this is where her children are -- is nothing less than domestic drudgery.

At least this was so before the industrial revolution. In the section on "Women Under the Developing Mores," the author celebrates the fact that science has "emancipated woman". The modern factory set women free from "the confines of the home." Material progress has tended toward "women's liberation from domestic slavery." These passages clearly distinguish the material requirements of home maintenance from the moral and spiritual challenges of child-rearing, which *do belong* to woman's sphere and her sexual constitution.

ELUSIVE SPHERES OF CHARM AND GRACE

In addition, this *material* liberation has opened up another distinctive quality of her sphere, according to the Book:

Once a woman's value consisted in her food-producing ability, but invention and wealth have enabled her to create a new world in which to function— *spheres of grace and charm*. Thus has industry won its unconscious and unintended fight for women's social and economic emancipation.(p. 937) [Italics added]

Here's a puzzling passage for feminists concerned about equal pay for equal work. Woman's "economic and social emancipation", won by industry, does not automatically lead her *into* industry to compete for equal terms with men as an emancipated woman. Rather, it enables her to create a new and quite separate world of, shall we say, enchantment and elegance. *This* is what industry unconsciously aimed at in its

"unintended fight". This, we are told, is the evolutionary gain that "even revelation failed to accomplish."

Spheres of charm and grace....Bilingual beauties spotted in uptown cafes after a long day of translating UN speeches? Future Madonnas enchanting millions with erotic spectacles? Southern belles in lace waiting for their beau? A wife whose simple smile at the door is the only memory her husband has of the previous day? A quivering poetess who holds the world spellbound with transporting images of spiritual beauty? Delighted mothers tossing beach balls with laughing children on a spring afternoon while their men ride jackhammers at work? A superbly dressed docent leading tourists through a Degas exhibit at the Louvre? Grandma's rhubarb pie cooked to perfection just arriving at the Thanksgiving dinner table while the extended family of eighteen people looks on?

I will leave the further definition of "spheres of charm and grace" to others.¹ But the benefits that mother-love confer on civilization are well understood to all who have enjoyed healthy relationships with their own mothers.

¹Please see Appendix B where I have excerpted from a letter from Rebecca Kantor, who describes herself as "a feminist in search of charm and grace", concerning her perceptions of this teaching in the UB.

RESPECTING GENDER BOUNDARIES

If woman aspires literally to enjoy all of man's rights, then, sooner or later, pitiless and emotionless competition will certainly replace that chivalry and special consideration which many women now enjoy, and which they have so recently won from men.

Innate maternal affection will never permit emancipated woman to become man's serious rival in industry. [UB: 938]

Industry -- broadly conceived -- appears to belong to the distinctive sphere of men. This is the domain of becoming, of *history*; the hand that rocks the cradle is in charge of *origins*, and of the child's *destiny*.

As politics and statehood evolve, the Book tells us, men will function co-equally in the common sphere of home, church and school, but will provide for the specialized service of women in industry.

The due recognition of sex equality and the co-ordinated functioning of men and women in the home, school, and church, with specialized service of women in industry and government. [UB: 807]

THE INVASION OF SPHERES

Acting in their own sphere of worldly power, men's inventions liberated women from domestic slavery, allowing women to enjoy...."a degree of personal liberty and sex determination that practically equals man's." Thus, "....evolution increasingly worked toward the realization of women's rights. *But women's rights are by no means men's rights.*"

Note the deep irony here, one cited often in men's movement literature: It was male achievement in industry, motivated in part by his sexual insecurity, that made possible women's social liberation, *which in turn led to women's direct entry into men's distinctive sphere.*

If we accept The Urantia Book's line of argument, woman's emancipation eventually induces her to aspire to enjoy rights that belong to man's sphere, while providing her with the temptation to abandon the obligations of her distinctive sphere altogether. "Among industrialized races she has received almost all rights and enjoys exemption from many obligations..." But we are also told in no uncertain terms that women "cannot thrive" on men's rights. In the same passage, we are also nearly harangued with the further declaration that men cannot "prosper on women's rights."

I believe this passage is a clarion call to clearly define these gender rights, and to outline boundaries within which men and women might be freely cultivate -- without harassment or confusion -- the activities of their gender-domain. Might this be the new occupation for feminists and advocates of male rights in the epoch to come?

This twenty-first (or twenty-second) century project should define the circumstances under which *individuals* of either gender can freely explore and enjoy experiences in the distinctive sphere of the other -- with careful attention to gay rights in this connection. It

should certainly recognize that *nothing* in either domain, with the exception of physical childbirth, can be foreclosed to *individuals* of either sex or to gay men and women. And, a definition of gender rights must also spell out gender obligations as well.

Paglia reminds us that "Woman, at first content to accept man's protections but now inflamed with desire for her own illusory freedom, invades man's systems and suppresses her indebtedness to him as she steals them." [Paglia: 9] As the UB warns, "emancipated" women will in time discover that they cannot seriously rival men in industry. "A contemporary woman clapping on a hard hat," says Paglia, "merely enters a conceptual system invented by men."

This invasion, legitimate as an individual act, is often her *only* answer to patriarchy's encroachment on her rights. But why all this disrespect for gender boundaries?

THE TIMELY EMERGENCE OF THE MEN'S MOVEMENT

It is none too soon for men to develop an independent response to this impasse. Fortunately, men's literature is just now beginning to achieve philosophic depth.

Almost all these men's movement writers join The Urantia Book in celebrating the economic and social emancipation of women, although much of men's writing today is still in thrall to the impact of what we have called here ideological feminism, or liberal, secular feminism.

Some of these authors come directly from the liberal feminist movement. Warren Farrell, a key spokesman, was three times elected to the board of the National Organization for Women in New York City. After this apprenticeship, he underwent a transformation and later set out on a campaign for his version of "men's rights". Unfortunately, his agenda is a mirror-image of that of the feminists who aspire to thrive on men's rights. In Why Men are the Way They Are, and his forthcoming The Disposable Sex, Farrell argues for men to enjoy the rights once reserved to women's traditional sphere, while mocking the hypocrisy of feminists still unable to accept equal responsibility to initiate sex, die in wars, pay the mortgage, and run multinational corporations.

The other and more important wing of the men's movement takes a cue from Paglia and others, and seeks to remove the emotional basis of male sexual insecurity in the face of woman's cosmic power. **The "mythopoetic" wing of the men's movement is essentially a search for the cosmic roots of masculinity, something that Urantia Book readers can only applaud.** It plumbs the mysterious depths in the soul of man for instincts and archetypes that might be commensurate to with woman's mother instinct and the resulting female procreative power. It sets the stage for the world-wide revelation of the life of the greatest male who ever lived, Jesus of Nazareth.

PART II:
**IN SEARCH OF THE MALE
GENDER-SPHERE**

JESUS AND THE MEN'S MOVEMENT

ROBERT BLY ON THE MASCULINE SOUL

Does the soul bear the marks of gender? Is there a cosmic basis for masculinity? Resoundingly yes, says Robert Bly in *Iron John*, his best-selling exploration of the "deep masculine". And with this manifesto by a renowned American poet, the men's movement of the 90's was launched in the effort to create for men a soulful alternative to patriarchy. Bly's book -- and the social change it has initiated -- gives hope that men can reoccupy the male sphere with a new dignity and confidence, leaving women the freedom to realize the essential qualities of the female gender-sphere.

Bly's search for authentic masculinity led him to the old Grimm brothers tale of the mythic natural man of the forest, Iron John. In Bly's brilliant interpretation, John personifies the unconditioned, instinctually *male* qualities of the psyche. When the timing is right, this friendly, hairy, ancient wild man emerges from the deep forest of the unconscious to initiate boys into *true manhood*. Bly's true man has depth and maturity -- and, as Jesus would say -- operates at "...higher levels of creative and spiritual self-consciousness". [UB: 1471]

Bly's message is compelling: Forget the trite images of manhood from advertising and popular culture. Every man has an Iron John that can lead him *downward* from these shallow waters, into the masculine depths.

Using the Iron John narrative, plus poems, myths and old stories, Bly follows in the footsteps of Carl Jung in attempting to decode the archetypes of the male soul. The result has been the introduction of a new vocabulary for American men: Jungian terms such as "Wildman", "Warrior", and "King" are now in the male parlance. Bly's book sold over three million copies and has made its own mark on the soul of American men.

THE VICTIM HOOD OF THE "SOFT MALES"

Like other writings in this early phase of the men's movement, *Iron John's* point of departure is the male response to thirty years of feminism. Bly's most fervent audience contains the male victims of feminist excesses -- the so-called "soft males" of the 1970's.

These men might be called post-patriarchal. They are sensitive and "in touch with their feelings". In actual fact, observes Bly, they are *feminized*. Mother-identified, and raised in families in which the father was physically or emotionally absent, they now live under the tutelage of their liberated girlfriends or wives. Others are laboring at "integrating the feminine." Many have embraced the feminist program for gender justice, which at its extreme entails a program for the female invasion of the male sphere as restitution for patriarchy's domination of the female sphere.

Rather than seek vengeance for this invasion of boundaries, as their patriarchal fathers did, these men are its passive victims. This is how Bly describes them:

In the seventies I began to see all over the country a phenomenon that we might call the "soft male." Sometimes even today when I look out at an audience, perhaps half the young males are what I would call soft. They're lovely, valuable people -- I like them -- they're not interested in harming

the earth or starting wars. There's a gentle attitude toward life in their whole being and style of living. But many of these men are not happy. You quickly notice the lack of energy in them. They are life-preserving but not exactly life-giving. Ironically, you often see these men with strong women who positively radiate energy. [3]

What underlies this unhappiness, this lack of vitality? These men have not succumbed to Paglia's "Apollonian swerve", but have become consciously engulfed in the feminine. Let us turn for insights to depth psychology -- and The Urantia Book.

RECOVERING THE MALE SPHERE

Buried somewhere in the hearts of this generation of men is the secret of the recovery of the male gender-sphere. These men are the negation of patriarchy. They've left this dying world left behind by unconscious men.

What treasures will we find in this kingdom beyond passive victim hood and patriarchal sadism? The answer, I believe, is the male gender-domain spoken of in the Urantia Book. And there is only one place to stand here: in the authentically masculine soul, exemplified in the life of our Master Jesus.

To find this soul, says Bly, the first step for men is a *recovery of nerve*.

In workshops all over the country, Bly helped thousands of men access their wildman energy, showing them the new and soulful way to express the "deep masculine". And it is notable that, in building his image of the wild strength of Iron John, Bly turns to the Biblical image of historical Jesus who, after all, was initiated by another hairy wildman named John the Baptist, and who "goes wild in the temple and starts whipping the money changers." (p. 26)

IRON JOHN AND JESUS THE MAN

Bly's Iron John is not unlike a modern, mythical John the Baptist. Like the historic Wild John of biblical times, I believe that Iron John vigorously points the way to the Jesus of The Urantia Book.

For readers of the Book in search of a new model of manhood, Jesus is the obvious place to begin. In his life and teachings are the clues for positively defining maleness in a post-patriarchal world. We have seen that masculinity entails a precarious balancing of psychic forces as a response to the overwhelming power of the feminine; Jesus' life portrays these forces held in *perfect* balance.

So the question becomes: What kind of man was Jesus, *as man*? How did he express maleness in his bestowal? And in what ways is his masculinity a vehicle of divine revelation? In what ways his feminine side?

Jesus lived his bestowal life for all men and women on all worlds of Nebadon. He lived a life exemplary for all. But does this mean that his incarnation is gender-neutral? Is he the mere expression of a "neutered" spirituality? This is hard to accept in light of passages like the following:

Could you have had but one look at him, you would have known that **Jesus was a real man of great experience in the things of this world**. The teachings of Jesus in this respect have been grossly perverted and much misrepresented all down through the centuries of the Christian era; you have also held perverted ideas about the Master's meekness and humility....**The teachings of Jesus constitute a religion of valor, courage, and heroism. And this is just why he chose as his personal representatives twelve commonplace men, the majority of whom were rugged, virile, and manly fishermen.** [UB: 1582]

The pictures of Jesus have been most unfortunate. These paintings of the Christ have exerted a deleterious influence on youth; **the temple merchants would hardly have fled before Jesus if he had been such a man as your artists usually have depicted. His was a dignified manhood**; he was good, but natural. Jesus did not pose as a mild, sweet, gentle, and kindly mystic. His teaching was thrillingly dynamic. [UB: 1590]

WAS JESUS ANDROGYNOUS?

In the above passage, and in others, the Book goes to some length to establish Jesus as "manly". His mastery of human life extended to a full expression of masculinity. It was in the company of men, among the hardy workmen employed by Zebedee when he worked in Capernaum as a boatbuilder, that he was first called "the Master." [UB: 1421] His mastery was developed in a balanced way, extending also to the full expression of the "feminine" virtues.

Jesus allowed the full flowering of his feminine self, but he did not suppress his masculine qualities in order to accomplish this. He was not an androgyne in the sense of today's feminist rhetoric. Nor was he like the androgynous rendition of Jesus as a some sort of "bearded woman" portrayed in some quarters of the Christian world.

This kind of androgyny seeks to *suppress* the deep masculine, says Jesuit theologian Patrick Arnold, in his marvelous book Wildmen, Warriors, and Kings: Masculine Spirituality and the Bible:

The attempt to repress or obliterate sexual differences and produce the ideal androgynous person or society, moreover, disguises a devastating attack on masculinity and males....In many ways the whole phenomenon of masculinity is founded on its separation from the feminine world and is energized by its continued contrast to femininity; to eliminate sexual distinctiveness amounts to an unconscious attempt to suppress masculinity. **In practice, androgynous rhetoric is heavily invested in bringing about its ideal mainly by mitigating male "excesses" such as aggression and competitiveness in favor of values that in fact are highly "feminine" in nature, such as harmony and relationship.** [Arnold: 20]

Jesus was not this kind of man: not a polite mystic who was nice to those around him; not an androgyne possessing a kind of neutered sexuality; nor was he a feminized, soft male. It appears that Jesus expressed an noble and androgynous spirituality that did not suppress gender differences but fully expressed and exalted both.

THE "CHARM AND FORCE" OF JESUS

Jesus was truly a master of men; he exercised great influence over his fellow men because of the combined charm and force of his personality. [UB: 1589]

Jesus' "charm" quality might be seen as feminine; his "force" quality as masculine. In the above passage, we first come across the Book's definition of the masculine *force* qualities:

There was a subtle commanding influence in his rugged, nomadic, and homeless life. There was intellectual attractiveness and spiritual drawing power in his authoritative manner of teaching, in his lucid logic, his strength of reasoning, his sagacious insight, his alertness of mind, his matchless poise, and his sublime tolerance. He was simple, manly, honest, and fearless.

Next the passage portrays the "charm" qualities -- presumably his feminine side:

With all of this physical and intellectual influence manifest in the Master's presence, there were also all those spiritual charms of being which have become associated with his personality—patience, tenderness, meekness, gentleness, and humility.

Finally, the revelators explain that *the blend of these qualities in one person mightily appealed to both women and men.*

His personality not only appealed to the spiritually minded women among his followers, but also to the educated and intellectual Nicodemus and to the hardy Roman soldier, the captain stationed on guard at the cross, who, when he had finished watching the Master die, said, "Truly, this was a Son of God." And red-blooded, rugged Galilean fishermen called him Master. [UB: 1590]

And this is as it should be. Jesus' appeal is to all humans on all planets in Nebadon. No wonder he represents the best qualities of the masculine and feminine expressed in one life.

JESUS AND THE MALE PSYCHE

What images do we have of Jesus' rich masculinity other than the incident in the temple? Men's movement writers have just begun to explore his distinctly male qualities. As we walk this same path, we must always remember -- of course! -- that the incarnate Creator Son *must be* much more than a mere exemplar of the "mature masculine." But men can be safe in assuming that -- as the Creator incarnate in a *male* body -- *he cannot be anything less than that.*

Jesus' maleness can help us decode masculine spirituality, but we need an interpretive scheme to know how to unlock the code. For this purpose I have turned to the trailblazing work of depth psychologist Robert Moore, professor at Chicago Theological Seminary and noted author and lecturer. Widely regarded as a leading theorist of the contemporary men's movement, Moore's numerous books include his best-selling King, Warrior, Magician, Lover and The King Within, both co-authored with Douglas Gillette.

In my estimation, these books present a cogent theory of the masculine psyche in its fullness. This makes Moore's work a worthy guide for understanding Jesus' masculinity. This understanding will contribute to a general theory of the male gender-sphere.

The mature masculine self, says Moore, results from a dynamic balance of opposing energies arising from deep structures of the psyche, or "Self." These structures, or archetypes of the masculine Self, are four in number: eros and aggression (the archetypes of the Lover and the Warrior), and ruler and sage (the archetypes of the King and the Magician). These correspond to gender-specific "programs" -- or what Moore sometimes calls *biograms* -- that are ultimately derived from instinctual forces.

Following his mentor Gustav Jung, Moore's model of the psyche is *quadrated*: This has been best summarized in The King Within:

Each quadrant represents in a way a distinct biogram encoded with psychological possibilities necessary to a cohesive and fully functioning human self...All of these programs must be adequately accessed, then balanced one against another in a healthy dynamic tension. [264]

To help grasp the concept of the quadrated psyche, Moore has adopted the pyramid structure shown on the next page. Each face of the pyramid model represents one of the four biograms of the Self. The pyramid structure is not just a convenient graphic. The geometry of the pyramid is extremely useful for envisioning how opposing psychic forces may be balanced and ultimately unified.

Notice that at the base of each triangle are polar opposites of the immature form of each archetype. For example, the two base angles of the warrior triangle represent the *immature warrior*. These appear as two complementary "shadow" forms -- on the one hand the *sadist*, and on the other, the *masochist*. The warrior in his fullness has integrated these diverging fragments of the warrior energy by the synthesizing action of a healthy Ego. The Ego's job is to access each of these fragments, blend their psychic energies, and thereby elevate the immature warrior to a place of maturity at the top of the triangle. Here it can move into a balanced relationship with the other archetypes of the Self.

The Ego works by learning how to access the opposing energies of each biogram, while not *identifying* with it. This same pattern of polar opposites dynamically united at the triangle's tip occurs for the King, the Lover and the Magician triangles.

METHODOLOGY FOR THIS STUDY

If we can accept Moore's theory of the quadrated psyche, we will find in it an uncanny affinity with the Book's description of the balanced and unified personality of Jesus.

"...it is altogether possible for every mortal believer to develop a strong and unified personality along the perfected lines of Jesus' personality.
The unique feature of the Master's personality was not so much its perfection as its symmetry, its exquisite and balanced unification."
[UB: 1101]

In my view, the above description of Jesus' symmetrical personality easily relates to the exquisite symmetry of a pyramid, Moore's master metaphor for the integrated Self. Since few geometric forms represent the notion of symmetry and balance better than a pyramid, I

have chosen this model as a heuristic device to help us track down the mature masculinity of Jesus.

But does evidence exist that Jesus exemplified Moore's archetypes of the masculine? The rest of this study considers this possibility. Perhaps this quest for the cosmic roots of masculinity -- through a study of the incarnate life of the Creator of masculinity -- will provide more clues as to how to understand the differentiation and complementarity of the gender-spheres. It is my hope that future studies might investigate the personalities of the apostles, and other male (and female) figures in the Book for further clues.

METHODOLOGY FOR THIS STUDY

If we can accept Moore's theory of the quadrated psyche, we will find in it an analogy fitting with the Book's description of the balanced and unified personality of Jesus.

"...it is altogether possible for every mortal being to develop a strong and unified personality along the perfect line of Jesus' personality. The unique feature of the human personality was not so much its perfection as its symmetry, its equability and balanced individuality." [J.B. 1:101]

In my view, the above description of Jesus' symmetrical personality easily relates to the opposite symmetry of a quadrated Moore's model suitable for the integrated Self. Since few geometric forms represent the union of symmetry and balance better than a quadrated

JESUS AS "KING"

...The King archetype comes close to being God in his masculine form within every man. It is the primordial man, the Adam...

The first [function of the king] is order; the second is the providing of fertility and blessing.

What can we say are the characteristics of the good King? Based on ancient myths and legends, what are the qualities of this mature masculine energy? The King archetype in its fullness possesses qualities of order, of reasonable and rational patterning, of integration and integrity in the masculine psyche...And in its "fertilizing" and centeredness, it mediates vitality, life-force, and joy...It looks upon the world with a firm but kindly eye...It guides [others] and nurtures them toward their own fullness of being. It is not envious, because it is secure, as the King, in its own worth.

[The King] comes first in importance, and it underlies and includes the rest of the archetypes in perfect balance. The good and generative King is also a good Warrior, a positive Magician, and a great Lover. [Moore: 49 - 62]

The King is primal in relation to the other archetypes of the Self. As we see in the above quotes, Robert Moore portrays the King as the ordering, nurturing and generative principle of the psyche. In comparative mythology, we find that the true King always constitutes a *world-center*. Out of this center, the King (and Queen) generate a blessed world in which others can live and prosper. The King image is central to our understanding of the male gender-sphere.

The King situates a world-center, but each archetypal figure of the quadrated self has a unique and crucial relationship to the kingdom space encircling the world-center. Wherever a genuine King appears, a Warrior arises to defend and maintain the boundaries of this world. A Magician emerges to advise the King and to create a sacred space within his world for healing and life transitions. And the Lover relates to the King's realm in an attitude of joy and celebration, ignoring or even disdaining boundaries.

"THE KING" IN THE URANTIA BOOK

Not unlike the King of myth, The Urantia Book depicts the Universal Father as a Center. He is the First Source and Center, an infinitely creative center from which all possible worlds are generated. On page 118, we read that the all-loving Father is "resident at the very center" of Paradise.

Even the Trinity itself has "King" qualities. The domains of the Eternal Son, the Infinite Spirit, and Paradise, are interdependent with the First Source and Center. On page 1145 we learn that the sovereignty of the Trinity provides for a realm of "universal law", and that the personal relationships of the Deities within the Trinity bring into being a universe of "living love". Similarly, the archetypal King creates a realm of order (universal law) in which he promulgates fertility and blessings (living love).

In the true kingdom, each citizen has the King's unconditional support. The archetypal King has so arranged his affairs that he is able to take a personal interest in the welfare of all of his subjects. His Kingdom is always open to all and inclusive of all; his blessings are upon all. In his most advanced phases, as depicted by Jesus, the King *shepherds* his subjects, and if one is lost or needy, he goes in search until he finds him. (See Jesus' parable of the lost sheep, UB: 1762.)

Other prominent images of the King in the UB include the fallen kingship of Adam; the dignified kingship of Machiventa Melchizedek; the religious king Ikhnoton; the hero-king Moses; and the shadow-kings Lucifer and Caligastia.

THE KINGLY SIDE OF JESUS

Urantia Book readers can readily discover the King quality of Jesus. At age 15, Jesus took on the mantle of acting head of his fatherless earth family. As the oldest son, he became the family's sole provider. He magnanimously carried out his charge for over 10 years, creating an a nurturing home life for the children with "...a well-regulated scheme of management..." [UB: 1394] He was also a foster-father to his siblings, nurturing seven brothers and sisters, until all had achieved adulthood. He took great personal interest in the welfare and happiness of each of them.

After completing this generative work on behalf of his earth family, Jesus then became acting head for a fatherless *planet*. He began this work by ordaining his apostles as "ambassadors of his Father's *kingdom* ." [UB: 1570] He created a center for his ministry in the humble villages and towns of Palestine, a world-center from which he sent his followers out to heal, teach, and bless all the peoples of the planet. All were to be called to enter the "kingdom of God". Later his own followers tried and failed to make him "King" of the Jewish nation.

When this work was completed, Jesus ascended to another kind of kingship: he took on the mantle of *Sovereign of Nebadon*. From his reign on high, Michael calls on each of his children to take on the mantle of a king or a queen in their world. Perhaps we can say that Michael models for men the genuine qualities of kingship in the male gender-sphere, while the Creative Mother Spirit models for women the true queenship of the female gender- sphere.

The King archetype traditionally upholds order and generativity in *all* the realms of his universe: in the family, in the polity, in the brotherhood of humankind, even in the cosmos of all beings. The fact that Jesus declined to be made "King" (see the King-making Episode, UB: 1702-3), did not mean he rejected the need for a generative political order.

Instead, Jesus' mission was to reveal a hidden realm of kingly activity: the inner spiritual life of the individual. We can call this realm, with the depth psychologists, the "inner king". Jesus named it "the kingdom of God within". To the multitude that shouted "Make him King!", he answered by proclaiming the *inner king*. Looking "every inch a...king" himself, he declared to the five thousand:

"If you must have a king, let the Father of lights be enthroned in the heart of each of you as the spirit Ruler of all things."

THE INNER AND OUTER KINGS

In *Iron John*, Robert Bly paints a picture of *interdependent realms* governed by different kinds of kings. In mythology, these levels of King manifestation would traditionally include the "inner king", the civil king, and the "heavenly" or "sky" king. (The Queen manifestation has related imagery). Perhaps these levels of the King reveal the general structure of the male gender-sphere.

I believe the image of interlinked realms of kingly power is helpful for understanding Jesus' gospel of the inner kingdom. Here the Father of lights is "enthroned in the heart", yet we are to be careful to "render unto Caesar what is Caesar's".

The King levels are intimately linked. *This means that when a genuine king appears in one realm, a true king can surface in another.* For example, if an earthly king provides a generative political order in which the subjects feel blessed, they will naturally infer a sacred order in heavens above. The reverse could also be true. A great era of the reign of the inner king in the hearts of the people -- such as the golden age of Buddhism in India -- will produce the reign of a great civil ruler like Asoka. [See UB: 1073] Bly explains this connection of King levels in terms of the spiritual imagination:

When the political king disappears...we find it difficult to "see" or feel the eternal King....we need to notice that our visual imagination becomes confused when we can no longer see the physical king...We need to see our radiant inner King uncontaminated by the images of fallen Herods, or dead Stalins. [Bly: 109]

As a child of the 1960's, I experienced this king confusion. I grew up in a world where the very notion of kingship had become defiled. There was no true king to serve; our political "kings", Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon, were exposed as unrighteous and deposed by the people. Our fathers drafted us to be killers -- rather than noble warriors -- in Vietnam. Later we examine how the Warrior declines quickly when the true king disappears.

In many ways, the movements of the '60's were a rebellion of the sons against the fathers, of oppressed subjects against an unjust king. The 1960's were a time of brothers and brotherhood, but not of the king and the kingdom. By the time of Nixon's resignation in 1974, the sacred image of the archetypal King was in pieces.

THE PRIMACY OF THE INNER KING

By the 1970's, the "patriarchy" came under full-scale attack by emerging feminist critics. Women exposed the cruelty and unfairness of the outward patriarchal order, inadvertently damaging men's ability to perceive the radiant inner King. It has taken over twenty years for men to step forward and redefine the King for the post-patriarchal world. New images of gender differentiation and complementarity are replacing the old stereotypes.

While it is true that a genuine outer king makes it easier for individual subjects to infer an inner king, Jesus taught us to seek the inner kingdom before all else. This teaching marked an unprecedented emphasis on the inner spiritual life of the individual, and my generation has learned this great truth by experience. Jesus proclaimed that the ordering principle of the psyche was truly within, and not dependent on any external political order.

JESUS, WARRIOR FOR TRUTH

...the Warrior is a basic building block of masculine energy, almost certainly rooted in our genes.

The Warrior is always alert. He is always awake. He is never sleeping through life. He knows how to focus his mind and his body...As a function of his clarity of mind he is a strategist and tactician, he can evaluate his circumstances accurately and then adapt himself to the 'situation on the ground'.

The Warrior energy...makes all personal relationships relative, that is, it makes them less central than the transpersonal commitment. Thus the psyche of the man who is adequately accessing the Warrior is organized around his central commitment. [Moore: 77 - 85]

It is difficult to think of the Prince of Peace as an exemplar of the Warrior. Yet if we are to envision a mature masculinity based on Jesus' life, we must find a way to relate to his spirit-warrior qualities. Certainly his warriorship is the most easily misunderstood of his male qualities.

Understanding the Warrior may also help us clarify the concept of gender-spheres. Consider the following premise: As the mother-instinct waxes dominant in young girls, the Warrior biogram, which includes male sexual aggression, is ascendant in young boys.

There are two key areas of evidence for this distinction as regards males. First, in most traditional cultures, warrior initiation was universally practiced on behalf of the boys of the tribe, seldom for girls. And second, the biological roots of male aggression have been revealed in the finding of developmental biology that teen boys are flooded with up to twenty times the testosterone of girls. This aggressive, restless, combative energy can be highly dangerous if these boys are not carefully and skillfully initiated by their elders.

Men are exploring a new concept for modern culture: the ritual initiation of boys into mature warrior qualities in a post-patriarchal setting. We may be unsure of these qualities, but we do know what the reverse looks like. One need only observe the megaviolence of gang warfare in our inner cities -- which includes violence against and devaluation of women and children -- to know the ravages of uninitiated warrior energy. The example of Jesus tells us these boys must be introduced to the warrior's mission of *transcendent service to a genuine King* as a way to harness this instinctual energy.

As we said previously, when young boys are getting overwhelmed with the aggressive instinctual energy of the Warrior, girls begin to experience the instinctual qualities associated with their emerging motherhood. It is believed by some psychologists -- and supported by The Urantia Book's theory of gender-spheres -- that these biograms are complimentary to one another by design. Perhaps some day different initiations will be adopted for each sex that will help young adults fully and responsibly exercise the rights of their gender.

JESUS THE FEARLESS HERO

Jesus is a central model for young men attempting to integrate their innate warrior energy and for older men desiring to assist them. For Jesus was a genuine warrior -- a true Master. He was a protector of truth, a fearless hero, and a paragon of masterful self-control. He tempered the aggressive energies of his boyhood by balancing these with the diverse energies of his psyche. By early manhood, he had become a perfectly unified personality.

In adulthood, he manifested the signs of the mature warrior. Descriptions of Jesus' spirit-warrior qualities abound in the section, "The Acme of Religious Living." [See UB: 1101-3] Here are some examples:

"He was immune to disappointment and impervious to persecution."

"Even his enemies maintained a wholesome respect for him; they even feared his presence."

"He was unquestionably loyal to all truth."

"...he was always true to his convictions and magnificently firm in his devotion to the doing of his Father's will."

In Jesus we see a man whose natural manly aggression is consecrated to the service of a transpersonal commitment. Mythologically, he is a warrior in service to a "True King". Jesus revealed the Father as a King of Love, and he established a new standard of spiritual warriorship in service to His kingdom.

MAINTAINING WARRIORSHIP

Spiritual warriorship, like masculinity itself, is a social construction. It is fragile, and must be maintained with resolve and vigilance.

A spirit-warrior must protect his warrior energies from attack, temptation, or distraction. But why does he fight so fiercely to uphold his warriorship? He does this so that his devotion to a unifying, transcendent cause can be maintained. He would rather face death than falter in his service to his King.

Listen to the ideal spirit-warrior speak of his impending death in service to the kingdom of God:

In answer to Andrew, Jesus said: "...the Son of Man must presently go to Jerusalem, suffer many things, be rejected by the scribes, the elders, and the chief priests, and after all this be killed and raised from the dead. And I speak not a parable to you; I speak the truth to you that you may be prepared for these events when they suddenly come upon us."

And now listen to the true warrior defending his resolve to follow his Father's will, even in the face of an enticement from a loving friend:

And while he was yet speaking, Simon Peter, rushing impetuously toward him, laid his hand upon the Master's shoulder and said: "Master, be it far

from us to contend with you, but I declare that these things shall never happen to you."

Peter spoke thus because he loved Jesus; but the Master's human nature recognized in these words of well-meant affection the subtle suggestion of temptation that he change his policy of pursuing to the end his earth bestowal in accordance with the will of his Paradise Father. **And it was because he detected the danger of permitting the suggestions of even his affectionate and loyal friends to dissuade him, that he turned upon Peter and the other apostles, saying: "Get you behind me. You savor of the spirit of the adversary, the tempter. When you talk in this manner, you are not on my side but rather on the side of our enemy. In this way do you make your love for me a stumbling block to my doing the Father's will. Mind not the ways of men but rather the will of God."**

And now harken to Jesus' call to future spirit-warriors in service of this cause, one which requires even the supreme sacrifice of selfishness:

After they had recovered from the first shock of Jesus' stinging rebuke, and before they resumed their journey, the Master spoke further: "If any man would come after me, let him disregard himself, take up his responsibilities daily, and follow me. For whosoever would save his life selfishly, shall lose it, but whosoever loses his life for my sake and the gospel's, shall save it. What does it profit a man to gain the whole world and lose his own soul? What would a man give in exchange for eternal life?" [Quotes in this section from UB: 1760-1]

THE FIERCENESS OF THE SPIRIT-WARRIOR

It would be difficult to maintain the warrior's resolve to serve his King (i.e., "carrying out his Father's will") when even those who love you do not support you. This is where fierceness must be called upon, even at the price of rebuking and stunning one's associates:

In all the association of the twelve with their Master, **only a few times did they see that flashing eye and hear such swift words of rebuke as were administered to Peter and the rest of them on this occasion.** Jesus had always been patient with their human shortcomings, but not so when faced by an impending threat against the program of implicitly carrying out his Father's will regarding the remainder of his earth career. The apostles were literally stunned; they were amazed and horrified...[UB: 1761]

Jesus treated his blood family in the same fierce way when faced with their enticements to retreat. Recall the episode in which Jesus' family sought to "dissuade him from further work...and to come home with them....[and] to give up the foolishness of trying to preach a new religion." [UB: 1721] He was in the middle of delivering a parting address to the disciples, and when interrupted with the news that his family was just outside, he looked down to his disciplines and spreading out his arms out in a gesture to all his followers, said, "I have no mother; I have no brothers. Behold my mother and my brethren! For whosoever does the will of my Father in heaven, the same is my mother, my brother, and my sister." We read next that "...when Mary heard these words, she collapsed in Jude's arms."

The spiritual warrior has a transcendent mission. He must work diligently at maintaining his heroic stance even if it means emotionally distancing himself from those he loves, while not becoming cruel. Moore summarizes:

"The Warrior energy...makes all personal relationships relative, that is, it makes them less central than the transpersonal commitment. **Thus the psyche of the man who is adequately accessing the Warrior is organized around his central commitment....He is emotionally distant as long as he is in the Warrior.** This does not mean that the man accessing the Warrior in his fullness is cruel, just that he does not make his decisions and implement them out of emotional relatedness to anyone or anything except his ideal." [Moore: 84-5]

DANGERS OF MISGUIDED WARRIORSHIP

What if the king is not worthy of his warriors? What if the king falters, or is found false or corrupt? Then the warrior energy degenerates into a grotesque display of aggression. First the warrior becomes a mere "soldier"; from soldier he degenerates to mercenary, and from mercenary to murderer. In this century, we have witnessed the further degradation of the warrior to that of genocidal murderer. In American culture, males with uncontrolled, uninitiated warrior energy perpetrate domestic violence, rape, child abuse, criminal violence, white collar crime, environmental catastrophes, governmental malfeasance, and other manifestations of infantile warrior energy on a massive scale.

No wonder even to discuss the Warrior archetype raises anxiety! Little wonder some feminists have raised male-bashing to a national past-time! Yet we cannot somehow erase masculine aggression; it is innate and must be guided. Moore believes that "...the Warrior is a basic building block of masculine energy, almost certainly rooted in our genes." [Moore: 77]

The UB supports this view. It teaches that "war is the natural state and heritage of evolving man"...and that warfare exists..."because man is human, evolved from animal, and all animals are bellicose." [UB: 783]

War also had a distinct "social value" during the millennia previous to the industrial era. It selected "innately great men for leadership" -- the great warrior-kings of the past. It could "facilitate the adoption of new ideas such as would not have occurred naturally in ten thousand years..." And it has been "...an indispensable scaffolding in the building of civilization." [See UB: 783-86] The Book seems to teach that harnessing the innate warrior energy was not only essential for survival, but was a socially progressive influence on the development of early civilization.

JESUS' SKILLFUL WARRIORSHIP

Jesus' life shows men how to gain self-mastery in relation to the Warrior. For the true Warrior is always skillful in the expression of his aggressiveness, according to Moore. His warrior energy is not reckless; it is always joined with clear thinking, alertness, and focus. We read that Jesus always tempered his bravery with reason:

His bravery was lofty and his courage often heroic. But his courage was linked with discretion and controlled by reason. It was a courage born of

faith, not the recklessness of blind presumption. He was truly brave but never audacious. [UB: 1101]

The true warrior is also effective, competent and well-organized. "As a function of his clarity of mind he is a strategist and tactician," writes Moore. "He can evaluate his circumstances accurately and then adapt himself to the 'situation on the ground'". [Moore: 80]

In his public ministry, Jesus was a brilliant strategist and tactician. One vivid example is his handling of the King-making Episode (and the Capernaum Crisis immediately thereafter), in which he aggressively and successfully confronted (1) his miracle-minded followers, (2) the false hopes of his apostles, and (3) the caviling of his religious opponents.

First, as a result of "conscious preplanning" [UB: 1702] he deployed a stupendous nature miracle as a vehicle to root out the shallow ones among his followers, while offering yet another sign to the unbelievers. Following this blazing display, the spirit-warrior within Jesus fully unfolded before the eyes of all, going on the attack: **"Jesus comprehended that he faced the immediate declaration of avowed and open warfare by his increasing enemies, and he elected boldly to assume the offensive."**

He began by assailing the idea of the material Messiah and the Jewish deliver. In the presence of the distinguished audience of Jews assembled before him in the Capernaum synagogue, he openly proclaimed that "I am the bread of life" and that "I am the Father are One", forcing his opponents to take a stand. In the tumultuous aftermath of this epochal sermon, "...the apostles were all amazed and somewhat terror-stricken by the sudden change in the Master's teaching tactics. They were wholly unaccustomed to seeing him perform in such a militant manner." [See UB: 1708]

Perhaps he stunned his apostles and opponents, but a true warrior knows when his spiritual warriorship must be invoked -- or held in check. Jesus deployed such wise strategies throughout the public ministry, sometimes engaging in tactical retreats, other times advancing with aggression.

In the final week of his life he unfurls before our eyes an even greater revelation of spiritual warriorship in his handling of his enemies -- especially in cleansing the temple and the last temple discourse. And witnessing these extraordinary feats transformed his band of ordinary fishermen and common believers into spiritual warriors, gladly willing to face death in the name of Christ the King.

These warrior images of Jesus are compelling and inspiring, but even more compelling is the picture Jesus as the perfect image of the Warrior in balance with other energies of the psyche. To get a picture of this exquisite balance, let us conclude by turning again to the "Acme of Religious Living". These are images of mature masculinity in its fullness.

The unfailing kindness of Jesus touched the hearts of men, but his stalwart strength of character amazed his followers.

Always was he saying, "Rejoice and be exceedingly glad." But when duty required, he was willing to walk courageously through the "valley of the shadow of death."

He spoke with undoubted confidence and taught with absolute authority. But his superb originality did not cause him to overlook the gems of truth in the teachings of his predecessors or contemporaries.

He was outspoken in his love for the sinner and in his hatred for sin. But throughout all this amazing frankness he was unerringly *fair*.

He fearlessly faced the realities of existence, yet he was filled with enthusiasm for the gospel of the kingdom.

JESUS AS HEALER AND "MAGICIAN"

The magician is an initiate of secret and hidden knowledge of all kinds...and rarefied realms of secret power.

[The magician is] the archetype of thoughtfulness and reflection. And because of that, it is also the energy of introversion. What we mean by introversion is not shyness or timidity but rather the capacity to detach from the inner and outer storms and to connect with deep inner truths and resources. [Moore: 97 - 110]

Male aggression is all too often responsible for the wounding of others, especially women and children. But profound balancing element exists in the male psyche, and these forces, when activated, help compensate for the ravages of the warrior's excesses. One of the most important is the "healer-magician", though Moore designates it the "magician". Patrick Arnold names it shamanic healer.

The psychic remnants of the shaman still exist in the male soul as the Healer archetype.... **Men need to know that, in addition to such well-known archetypes as the Warrior and the King, they also come psychically equipped with a tremendous capacity to heal wounds and bring about a new wholeness in themselves and others.** [Arnold: 135]

The manifestations of this rich archetype descend down to the modern age in two branches. The ancient healing arts of the shaman and medicine man are in a direct lineage with today's physician, priest, psychotherapist. Another branch leads from the "technicians of the sacred" -- such as magicians, sorcerers, astrologers, and rainmakers -- to modern scientists and engineers.

The UB devotes an entire paper to shamanism, thus showing its key importance in the evolution of the male psyche. [See Paper 90, 986-993] In tribal life, the shamans were often in conflict with the kingly and warrior castes. We read that "In many groups the shaman outranked the war chief..." Further, "the shaman sometimes functioned as a priest-king..." or "very frequently...were able to dominate the chiefs and kings."

The Book's social analysis of shamanism directly supports the view that primal human energies are embodied in the ancient figures of the king, the warrior, and the healer. In the millennia of struggle between these groups, the shamans often went too far. "It was shamanism that took the exclusive direction of tribal affairs out of the hands of the old and the strong..." -- presumably kings and warriors -- "and lodged it in the hands of the shrewd, the clever, and the farsighted."

"RAREFIED REALMS OF SECRET POWER"

Moore emphasizes that mental cleverness, esoteric knowledge, and technical prowess are characteristic of the healer-magician, both in ancient times and in the modern age. "The magician is an initiate of secret and hidden knowledge of all kinds...and rarefied realms of secret power." They can access mental depths and universal forces that others can't. At the same time -- and equally as important -- they have access to "...applied knowledge of how to contain and channel [this] power." [Moore: 97-109]

In discussing the shamanic theory of disease, the UB emphasizes these same qualities. The shamans "...desired to modify and even control the life and energy of the physical domains." They were also deeply concerned about hidden knowledge, differing from today's scientists only in their erroneous beliefs in *supernatural causation*. These grossly mistaken assumptions aside, the UB tells us that the techniques of the shamanic cults were "understandable". "The primitive mind may be handicapped by lack of facts, but it is for all that logical." [UB: 989]

In ancient times, the shaman was the logician and the technician of the laws of the supernatural; in his modern incarnation, he's a *theoretical or applied* scientist concerned with the laws of nature. He is the bio-medical researcher and the heart surgeon; the theoretical physicist and the electrical engineer; the depth psychologist and the therapist. The urge to comprehend and control the forces of nature, mind, and spirit links the shaman and the scientist. *This urge arises from the underlying biogram of the healer-magician.*

Like all archetypes, the healer-magician has a "shadow side". In its puerile manifestation, the healer-magician is a clever, selfish manipulator of men and things. The Book's chapter on shamanism exposes this shadow form of the healer-magician, and praises those religious teachers that arose from time to time to "...challenge the shamans or priests of any age..." [UB: 988]

JESUS THE SCIENTIST

The *Urantia Book* reveals Jesus as the great exemplar of the healer-magician energy in its full maturity. He is the foil of spiritual charlatans and obscurantists, and the inspiration for us all to actualize the healer and the scientist within.

The UB's expanded version of Jesus' life reveals that Jesus was a rigorous scientific thinker. His scientific curiosity blossomed as a young boy. "He persisted in asking many embarrassing questions concerning both science and religion, particularly regarding geography and astronomy. He was especially insistent on finding out why there was a dry season and a rainy season in Palestine. Repeatedly he sought the explanation for the great difference between the temperatures of Nazareth and the Jordan valley. He simply never ceased to ask such intelligent but perplexing questions." [UB: 1365] These kinds of inquiries about nature reached a fever pitch in his *eighth* year of life.

As a grown man, he was able to apply his keen and analytic mind to problems at hand. "He possessed the ability to mobilize all his powers of mind, soul and body on the task immediately in hand. He could concentrate his deep-thinking mind on the one problem he wished to solve." [UB: 1400]

He was a master at applying his knowledge to practical affairs. He studied the habits of the fish on the Sea of Galilee so closely that he could predict catches that others regarded as miraculous. He also was an expert and innovative boatbuilder, and a skillful smith. In addition, he was a great social scientist. Even at a very young age, he carried out a "thorough study of how men make a living." [UB: 1371] We read also that "The real purpose of his trip around the Mediterranean Basin was to *know men.*"

THE HEALING MISSION OF JESUS

Jesus turned his knowledge of men to the applied science of leading men into the realities of the kingdom -- including his sometimes reluctant mission of physical healing. His acts of physical healing were often a distraction from this primary mission of disclosing the Father's love, but the human Jesus truly desired to see his fellows made whole. In addition, Arnold points out that Jesus exemplified a specifically masculine quality in his healing ministry.

Nowhere in the gospels do bystanders ever comment on Jesus' tenderness to the sick. What does astonish them is his *authority*. Jesus heals, not by being nice, but by a show of pure masculine and spiritual force...He *orders* people to get well! [Arnold: 188]

Arnold quotes the many cases in which Jesus does indeed command people to become whole: Mark 1:23 [see UB:1631]; Mk 10:52 [see UB 1652]; and Mk 5:41 [see UB:1699].

But Jesus also exhibited "feminine" traits of tenderness to those who were sick, an attribute that is less obvious in the biblical accounts. Just after ordering the epileptic boy to "Come out of it" [UB: 1631], we find him at the Zebedee home standing over Peter's wife's mother, "...holding her hand, smoothing her brow, and speaking words of comfort..." [UB: 1631], after which her fever left her. Jesus exemplifies Arnold's contention that "Strong, confident, authoritative masculine energy can heal as surely as nurturing feminine care." [UB: 188]

But Jesus' healing ministry at its best went beyond gender qualities and was always by direct and authoritative appeal to the *spirit*. At the pool of Bethesda, he said to the assemblage of the sick and afflicted, "If you could be healed of your physical afflictions, you would indeed marvel, but it is even greater that you should be cleansed of all spiritual disease and find yourselves healed of all moral infirmities. You are all God's children; you are the sons of the heavenly Father. The bonds of time may seem to afflict you, but the God of eternity loves you..." And this direct spiritual appeal inspired many at the poolside not only to become believers in the gospel, but through faith to become instantly healed of their physical ailments. [See UB: 1649]

DELVING DEEP

Like the shamans and magicians of old, Jesus coped with the manifold challenges of his environment by delving deep within for spiritual power. Moore emphasizes that the magician biogram is "...the archetype of thoughtfulness and reflection. And because of that, it is also the energy of introversion. What we mean by introversion is not shyness or timidity but rather the capacity to detach from the inner and outer storms and to connect with deep inner truths and resources. Introverts, in this sense, live much more out of their centers than other people do." Jesus was clearly this kind of healthy introvert.

Even at age eleven "...he was more and more given to peculiar seasons of profound meditation and serious contemplation." [UB: 1400] As an adult, he refined this tendency into a consistent habit of "going off so frequently by himself to commune with the Father in heaven" -- what Rodan has immortalized as his consistent practice of "...the isolation of worshipful meditation." [UB: 1774] And in the midst of his greatest earth crises, Jesus went off by himself to search for the Father's will, sometimes spending entire nights in meditation

and prayer. A mature man is at once a spirit-warrior in his outer life, yet able to dig deeply within for answers to life's great challenges.

Jesus turned his back on the world of the Pharisees - including his own family - to follow his Father's will. He was not a spiritual being who came to this earth to be worshipped, but the human Jesus who came to die for the world. He was not a spirit-warrior who came to die for the world, but the human Jesus who came to die for the world. He was not a spirit-warrior who came to die for the world, but the human Jesus who came to die for the world.

Jesus in the garden of Gethsemane was not a spirit-warrior who came to die for the world, but the human Jesus who came to die for the world. He was not a spirit-warrior who came to die for the world, but the human Jesus who came to die for the world. He was not a spirit-warrior who came to die for the world, but the human Jesus who came to die for the world.

Jesus in the garden of Gethsemane was not a spirit-warrior who came to die for the world, but the human Jesus who came to die for the world. He was not a spirit-warrior who came to die for the world, but the human Jesus who came to die for the world. He was not a spirit-warrior who came to die for the world, but the human Jesus who came to die for the world.

Jesus in the garden of Gethsemane was not a spirit-warrior who came to die for the world, but the human Jesus who came to die for the world. He was not a spirit-warrior who came to die for the world, but the human Jesus who came to die for the world. He was not a spirit-warrior who came to die for the world, but the human Jesus who came to die for the world.

Jesus in the garden of Gethsemane was not a spirit-warrior who came to die for the world, but the human Jesus who came to die for the world. He was not a spirit-warrior who came to die for the world, but the human Jesus who came to die for the world. He was not a spirit-warrior who came to die for the world, but the human Jesus who came to die for the world.

DELIVING DEEP

Like the stunts and suspensions of old, Jesus began with the manifold challenges of his environment by diving deep within his spiritual power. Jesus' environment was the religious program of the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Herodians. And because of that, it is also the energy of Jesus' mission. What we mean by immersion is not simply to be in the water, but to be in the water and to be in the water. It is not simply to be in the water, but to be in the water and to be in the water.

Jesus as a spirit-warrior... he was not a spirit-warrior who came to die for the world, but the human Jesus who came to die for the world. He was not a spirit-warrior who came to die for the world, but the human Jesus who came to die for the world. He was not a spirit-warrior who came to die for the world, but the human Jesus who came to die for the world.

THE LOVER JESUS

The Lover...is the primal energy pattern of what we call vividness, aliveness, and passion....The Lover energy...is also the source of spirituality -- especially of what we call mysticism. [Moore: 120-2]

Rather than analyze Jesus as "lover", I propose instead a celebration, for his love was a perfect revelation of his Father's infinite love. Our main concern here is a bit more narrow (but just as worthy of celebrating): How was Jesus' love expressed through the perfect symmetry of his personality, and how can this revelation help us understand the male psyche and gender-domain?

In other words, how does a man with a love-saturated soul and a mature masculine psyche bestow love on his fellows? What does this look like in action? How can post-patriarchal men look to Jesus as exemplary of the truly *loving* man?

I have listed essential aspects of the Lover (following Moore) in each section below, so as to better organize our celebration of the lover Jesus. The quotes from Moore in each section are followed by supporting quotes from the Jesus Papers.

This picture of the Lover in Jesus completes our portrait of the four-fold pattern of the symmetry of his personality. I will leave it to readers to draw their own conclusions as to whether and how Jesus exemplifies the male gender-sphere.

"...THEY BEHELD HIM WEEPING"

The Lover's connectedness is...through feeling...[But] the Lover is not just the archetype of joy in life. In this capacity to feel at one with others and with the world, he must also feel their pain. Other people may be able to avoid pain, but the man in touch with the Lover must endure it. He feels the painfulness of being alive -- both for himself and for others. [Moore: 121]

If we may use today's parlance, Jesus was a man who was "in touch with his feelings." The Jesus Papers narrate three major episodes in which Jesus wept publicly, for example. [UB: 1102] In the following story, he wept for his people, the Jews, who were about to reject its greatest mission.

Jesus was lighthearted and cheerful as they moved along until he came to the brow of Olivet, where the city and the temple towers came into full view; there the Master stopped the procession, **and a great silence came upon all as they beheld him weeping.** Looking down upon the vast multitude coming forth from the city to greet him, the Master, with much emotion and with tearful voice, said: "O Jerusalem, if you had only known, even you, at least in this your day, the things which belong to your peace, and which you could so freely have had! But now are these glories about to be hid from your eyes. You are about to reject the Son. [UB: 1882]

Many also beheld him weeping openly as he approached the tomb of Lazarus with the grieving sisters of Lazarus, Mary and Martha.

And in this touching episode, he wept over his estrangement from his family just as he and his apostles were about to begin the public work:

Just before leaving, the apostles missed the Master, and Andrew went out to find him. After a brief search he found Jesus sitting in a boat down the beach, and he was weeping. The twelve had often seen their Master when he seemed to grieve, and they had beheld his brief seasons of serious preoccupation of mind, but none of them had ever seen him weep. Andrew was somewhat startled to see the Master thus affected on the eve of their departure for Jerusalem, and he ventured to approach Jesus and ask: "On this great day, Master, when we are to depart for Jerusalem to proclaim the Father's kingdom, why is it that you weep? Which of us has offended you?" And Jesus, going back with Andrew to join the twelve, answered him: "No one of you has grieved me. I am saddened only because none of my father Joseph's family have remembered to come over to bid us Godspeed." [UB: 1587]

I am deeply moved to know that Jesus allowed himself to experience these very human feelings of abandonment by his own family. There is also something profoundly human in its timing, this being the "great day" of beginning the public ministry. A man consumed by the Warrior would never begin a campaign with weeping, but a perfectly balanced personality can find time to weep, to laugh, to play and to appreciate beauty as he pursues his goals and discharges his duties in life.

THE LOVER OF BEAUTY

[The Lover] experiences everything, no matter what it is, aesthetically...All of life is art to him and evokes subtly nuanced feelings. [Moore: 122]

We know that as a boy, Jesus took music lessons, and was "...was very fond of playing the harp." [UB: 1364] At age 14, neighbors would drop by to hear Jesus play the harp and tell stories. [UB: 1389] These are just a few instances of Jesus' love of the beautiful as a child. Perhaps the most notable in his adult life is his visit in the home of Flavius, a wealthy art collector.

Flavius was agreeably surprised when Jesus entered the home that, instead of rebuking him for having these supposedly idolatrous objects scattered about the house, he manifested great interest in the entire collection and asked many appreciative questions about each object as Flavius escorted him from room to room, showing him all of his favorite statues. [UB: 1600]

Jesus' liberal attitudes toward art and beauty were a large part of the reason that Flavius decided to go down to the Jordan the next day to be baptised.

JESUS AND PLAY

The Lover is the archetype of play and "display", of healthy embodiment, of being in the world of sensuous pleasure and in one's body without shame. Thus, the Lover is deeply sensual -- sensually aware and sensitive to the things of the physical world in all their splendor.

Jesus appreciated bodily display in the best sense of Greek athletics. Jesus did not hold to the prudish disdain for the body that was characteristic of contemporary Judaism and the

later asceticism of Christian tradition. At age 12 he shocked his father with his enthusiasm about the Greek games at Scythopolis.

About the middle of May the lad accompanied his father on a business trip to Scythopolis...It so happened that just at this time the annual competitive games and public demonstrations of physical prowess between the Greek cities of the Decapolis were in progress at the Scythopolis amphitheater, and Jesus was insistent that his father take him to see the games...The boy was thrilled with the games and entered most heartily into the spirit of the demonstrations of physical development and athletic skill. Joseph was inexpressibly shocked to observe his son's enthusiasm as he beheld these exhibitions of "heathen" vaingloriousness. After the games were finished, Joseph received the surprise of his life when he heard Jesus express his approval of them and suggest that it would be good for the young men of Nazareth if they could be thus benefited by wholesome outdoor physical activities...Throughout his life he endeavored to introduce the idea of wholesome recreation into his personal plans and, as far as Jewish practice would permit, into the later program of regular activities for his twelve apostles. [UB: 1371]

"JESUS LOVED THE CHILDREN...."

The man under the influence of the Lover...wants to touch everything emotionally and physically. He recognizes no boundaries.

Jesus recognized no boundaries when it came to loving the individual human who happened to be near.

The disciples early learned that the Master had a profound respect and sympathetic regard for *every* human being he met, and they were tremendously impressed by this uniform and unvarying consideration which he so consistently gave to all sorts of men, women, and children. He would pause in the midst of a profound discourse that he might go out in the road to speak good cheer to a passing woman laden with her burden of body and soul. **He would interrupt a serious conference with his apostles to fraternize with an intruding child. Nothing ever seemed so important to Jesus as the individual human who chanced to be in his immediate presence.** He was master and teacher, but he was more—he was also a friend and neighbor, an understanding comrade. [UB: 1546]

Children always felt safe crossing the artificial boundaries of the adult world when Jesus was around.

This year his seasons of deep meditation were often broken into by Ruth and her playmates. **And always was Jesus ready to postpone the contemplation of his future work for the world and the universe that he might share in the childish joy and youthful gladness of these youngsters,** who never tired of listening to Jesus relate the experiences of his various trips to Jerusalem. They also greatly enjoyed his stories about animals and nature.

The children were always welcome at the repair shop. Jesus provided sand, blocks, and stones by the side of the shop, and beavies of youngsters flocked there to amuse themselves. When they tired of their play, the more intrepid ones

would peek into the shop, and if its keeper were not busy, they would make bold to go in and say, "Uncle Joshua, come out and tell us a big story." Then they would lead him out by tugging at his hands until he was seated on the favorite rock by the corner of the shop, with the children on the ground in a semicircle before him. And how the little folks did enjoy their Uncle Joshua. [UB: 1416]

"THE BEST FRIEND THEY HAD IN ALL THE WORLD"

The Lover energy...is also the source of spirituality -- especially of what we call mysticism...the Lover energy, through the mystics, intuits the ultimate Oneness of all that is and actively seeks to experience that Oneness in daily life...

Dwelling in unbroken communion with the spiritual energy of the Lover, Jesus became a lover of all through his love for the One.

[Ganid] asked, "Why do you occupy yourself so continuously with these visits with strangers?" And Jesus answered: "**Ganid, no man is a stranger to one who knows God. In the experience of finding the Father in heaven you discover that all men are your brothers, and does it seem strange that one should enjoy the exhilaration of meeting a newly discovered brother?** To become acquainted with one's brothers and sisters, to know their problems and to learn to love them, is the supreme experience of living " [UB: 1431]

Real men simply could not actually desert a revered teacher who had lived so close to them and had been so devoted to them as had Jesus. Through the dark hours of the Master's death, **in the hearts of these apostles all reason, judgment, and logic were set aside in deference to just one extraordinary human emotion—the supreme sentiment of friendship-loyalty.** These five months of work with Jesus led these apostles, each one of them, to regard him as the best *friend* he had in all the world. And it was this human sentiment, and not his superb teachings or marvelous doings, that held them together until after the resurrection and the renewal of the proclamation of the gospel of the kingdom. [UB: 1546]

He exalted love -- truth, beauty, goodness -- as the divine ideal and eternal reality. [UB: 1583]

APPENDIX A: The Key Urantia Book Passage on Gender

A key passage on gender from pages 937-8 in The Urantia Book is quoted below in its entirety.

Science, not religion, really emancipated woman; it was the modern factory which largely set her free from the confines of the home. Man's physical abilities became no longer a vital essential in the new maintenance mechanism; science so changed the conditions of living that man power was no longer so superior to woman power.

These changes have tended toward woman's liberation from domestic slavery and have brought about such a modification of her status that she now enjoys a degree of personal liberty and sex determination that practically equals man's. Once a woman's value consisted in her food-producing ability, but invention and wealth have enabled her to create a new world in which to function—spheres of grace and charm. Thus has industry won its unconscious and unintended fight for woman's social and economic emancipation. And again has evolution succeeded in doing what even revelation failed to accomplish.

The reaction of enlightened peoples from the inequitable mores governing woman's place in society has indeed been pendulumlike in its extremeness. Among industrialized races she has received almost all rights and enjoys exemption from many obligations, such as military service. Every easement of the struggle for existence has redounded to the liberation of woman, and she has directly benefited from every advance toward monogamy. The weaker always makes disproportionate gains in every adjustment of the mores in the progressive evolution of society.

In the ideals of pair marriage, woman has finally won recognition, dignity, independence, equality, and education; but will she prove worthy of all this new and unprecedented accomplishment? Will modern woman respond to this great achievement of social liberation with idleness, indifference, barrenness, and infidelity? Today, in the twentieth century, woman is undergoing the crucial test of her long world existence!

Woman is man's equal partner in race reproduction, hence just as important in the unfolding of racial evolution; therefore has evolution increasingly worked toward the realization of women's rights. But women's rights are by no means men's rights. Woman cannot thrive on man's rights any more than man can prosper on woman's rights.

Each sex has its own distinctive sphere of existence, together with its own rights within that sphere. If woman aspires literally to enjoy all of man's rights, then, sooner or later, pitiless and emotionless competition will certainly replace that chivalry and special consideration which many women now enjoy, and which they have so recently won from men.

Civilization never can obliterate the behavior gulf between the sexes. From age to age the mores change, but instinct never. Innate maternal affection will never permit emancipated woman to become man's serious rival in industry. Forever each sex will remain supreme in its own domain, domains determined by biologic differentiation and by mental dissimilarity.

Each sex will always have its own special sphere, albeit they will ever and anon overlap. Only socially will men and women compete on equal terms.

The reproductive urge unfailingly brings men and women together for self-perpetuation but, alone, does not insure their remaining together in mutual cooperation—the founding of a home.

Every successful human institution embraces antagonisms of personal interest which have been adjusted to practical working harmony, and homemaking is no exception. Marriage, the basis of home building, is the highest manifestation of that antagonistic co-operation which so often characterizes the contacts of nature and society. The conflict is inevitable. Mating is inherent; it is natural. But marriage is not biologic; it is sociologic. Passion insures that man and woman will come together, but the weaker parental instinct and the social mores hold them together.

Male and female are, practically regarded, two distinct varieties of the same species living in close and intimate association. Their viewpoints and entire life reactions are essentially different; they are wholly incapable of full and real comprehension of each other. Complete understanding between the sexes is not attainable.

Women seem to have more intuition than men, but they also appear to be somewhat less logical. Woman, however, has always been the moral standard-bearer and the spiritual leader of mankind. The hand that rocks the cradle still fraternizes with destiny.

APPENDIX B: A Feminist On "Charm and Grace"

21 June 1993

Dear Byron,

I read your paper titled, "Spheres and Rights" this weekend and found it interesting and provocative. I would love to sit down with you sometime and hear about your experiences growing up amidst "the blossoming of feminism," as well as more of your own thoughts about the gender issue(s) of the day.

There are several thoughts and observations I wish I had time to share in response to your paper. Maybe over the next few weeks I'll have time to post them all. For now, I would like to comment on two ideas presented in the Book, and which you seem to have read as either sexist or at least somewhat demeaning to women.

First, let me tell you where I'm coming from -- that my own views of women (and consequently myself!) have changed considerably over the past few years. Raised in a family setting in which men (and the "masculine") were highly valued and women (and the "feminine") were blatantly ridiculed, I grew up striving to cultivate those qualities I felt were of value (i.e. masculine). By masculine here, I mean generally the *logos* (Greek usage): focused consciousness, rational, abstract thought (including the art of farsightedly planning for more remote effects -- see your Book quote on page 15 of your paper), and by feminine I mean generally an emphasis on *eros*: diffuse, relational consciousness (characterized by feeling values rather than thinking values) which is essential to human and divine relationships and, in particular, love and friendship. Again referring to your Book quote on page 15 [earlier draft -- ed.] of your paper, and in an attempt to suggest one interpretation of this quote, in my opinion this form of consciousness exhibits a tendency to look upon immediate results (social harmony within the family and social groups) rather than remote effects. Ask any mother trying to keep track of three or more kids, put dinner on the table, and juggle the endless chores of family life -- diffuse consciousness has a lot to offer over the one-track-mind syndrome!

(As an aside, I don't get your charge of sexism in this quote. It seems to me the Melchizedeks were trying to warn Eve that her natural feminine tendencies to create social harmony were, in this PARTICULAR situation, dangerous, because a more masculine viewpoint, (i.e., a rational assessment of what was a highly complex and somewhat abstract situation, including the looking ahead toward a remote future), was called for. They weren't making a blanket statement devaluing her natural feminine tendency toward invoking *eros*, nor were they saying that the masculine tendency to think rationally about more remote effects is any "better" -- they're just saying that in this instance it was not the most helpful approach to evaluating the situation and that Eve, being feminine in nature, needed to be on guard not to let *eros/feeling* rule where *logos/reason* was needed. I guess her experience shows the power of *eros* -- a driving force not to be ignored, denied, or

misused, but one which needs careful attention, respect, and cultivation under appropriate conditions.)

Without getting into the boring details, let me say that life itself has offered some rather vivid opportunities to correct my skewed value system and to begin living as I was designed to live - wholly and joyfully as a female of the species with a natural "bent," when push comes to shove, toward valuing relationship processes (feeling) over conceptual processes (thinking). The main lesson I have learned personally is that both the masculine and feminine forms of consciousness are essential to human culture and progress, and that both are of equal value while being very, very different. And while it behooves me to cultivate and utilize both the "masculine" and "feminine" qualities of my own consciousness, I am most naturally at home in the feminine realm, and it is WONDERFUL (!), especially after struggling so long as a gender-identified female trying to cultivate a dominantly masculine consciousness without attention or respect to the feminine. That mis-guided journey led to a thousand dead ends, and I think that many women are having the same experience. Males and females, being naturally oriented in consciousness toward their gender identification, are distinctly different, and vive la difference! But being one gender or the other doesn't excuse us from developing within ourselves the capacity both for reason and feeling. I think that men just have a natural tendency toward reason, and women toward feeling. Two different responses, each essential to a full life.

Unfortunately, what is still lacking among much of the feminist movement is the recognition of the high value of feminine/feeling consciousness in all facets of society. What is needed is a recognition that both forms of consciousness need to be cultivated so that the appropriate (i.e., most helpful) form (either logos or eros) can be utilized in each particular situation as it arises, whether it be between two persons, a family, or in corporate society.

With the previous thoughts in mind, may I offer a possible explication of the words "spheres of grace and charm" (p. 937) -- concepts which seem to provoke a knee-jerk reaction of suspicion and dismay to those of us who camp within feminist territory. At first glance they literally reek of the oppressive roles of women portrayed by Harriet of "Ozzie and Harriet" fame -- at least, that is how I perceived your treatment of them in your paper (and please correct me if I'm wrong). And I must admit to initially having the same kind of knee-jerk reaction. However, after I really looked at the wording of the paragraph, and after doing a bit of sleuthing through the Book (see the quotes below), I realize that these "spheres" of feminine attitude and action are not only affirming of mature feminine consciousness, but essential to the role of effective human relationships, and in particular of motherhood, family, and social life. Here's why:

As you noted, the UB states on p. 76 that there is a difference in the quality and technique of expression of divine love by the Eternal Son as compared to that of the Father. While the content does not differ, the technique of expression does, the Father bestowing Thought Adjusters and the Eternal Mother Son bestowing

Michael Sons throughout the local universes (p.86). The character of God is divine love; the character of the Mother Son is mercy; the character of the Infinite Spirit is combined ministry of love and mercy (see quote below). The Infinite Spirit bestows Creative Mother Spirits, and I would like to make a case that grace and charm are attributes of the Creative Mother Spirit's type of ministry, which, again is love and mercy combined:

"The Spirit is *love applied* to the creature creation, the combined love of the Father and the Son." p. 94.

"God is love, the Son is mercy, the Spirit is ministry - the ministry of divine love and endless mercy to all intelligent creation." p. 94.

The local Mother Spirit ministers to humans by providing the adjutant mind spirits, which in turn provides the females of the species with mother love ("The mother and child relation is natural, strong, and instinctive...."; "All mammalian mother love is the inherent endowment of the adjutant mind-spirits of the local universe...." p. 932). Is it reasonable to suggest that such mother love, formed and "administered" by the adjutant mind-spirits through the human mother, provides the child's first experiences of divine love and mercy ministry -- experiences which will form the basis for that child's future ability to love and be loved in return? If so, what might be those attributes of mother love which characterize human mother love from that of all the other mammals? Given the definitions and quotes below, might we understand grace and charm not as "surface attitudes" of a repressed, oppressed Harriet manipulating her husband to get her way, but as essential feminine qualities which replace or at least soften the more animal (unconscious) qualities of mother love with qualities which are distinctly human and divine, and which create the aroma of friendship which emanates from a love-saturated soul.

There are many quotes [in the Book] which give some pretty good clues that grace and charm are attributes worthy of attention and cultivation vis-a-vis our spiritual lives and the cultivation of a loving family and community. Grace and charm, as used by the Book, are the fruits of eros -- human and divine lovers (and friends) in relationship with one another. If they are not introduced to the child within the home, first through the ministry of instinctual mother love, and then through the loving and merciful ministry of both parents, where does the child experience such values and grow to desire them as personal attributes, thereby becoming more Christlike in nature?

I leave you with these thoughts, and hope they make some sense.

A feminist in search of Grace and Charm,

Rebecca Kantor

SOURCE BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Patrick Arnold, Wildmen, Warriors, and Kings: Masculine Spirituality and the Bible, (New York: Crossroad, 1992)
- Robert Bly, Iron John, (New York: Vintage Books, 1992)
- Warren Farrell, Why Men Are the Way They Are, (New York: Bantam Books, 1986)
- George Gilder, Sexual Suicide, (New York: Quadrangle/New York Times Book Company, 1973)
- Christopher Harding, Ed., Wingspan: Inside the Men's Movement, (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992)
- Sam Keen, Fire In the Belly: On Being a Man, (New York: Bantam Books, 1991)
- R.C. Lewontin, "Women Versus the Biologists", *New York Review of Books*, April 7, 1994.
- Anne Moir, PhD., and David Jessel, Brain Sex, (New York: Delta, 1992).
- Ashley Montague, The Natural Superiority of Woman, New Revised Edition, (New York: Collier Books, 1974)
- Robert Moore and Douglas Gillette, King, Warrior, Magician, Lover, (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1990)
- Camille Paglia, Sexual Personae: Art and Decadence From Nefertiti to Emily Dickenson, (New York: Vintage Books, 1991)
- Marilyn Pearsall, Ed., Women and Values: Readings in Recent Feminist Philosophy, (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing, 1986)
- Carol Travis, The Mismeasure of Woman, (New York: Simon & Shuster, 1992)
- The Urantia Book, (Chicago, IL: Urantia Foundation, 1955)

BACKGROUND SOURCES

- Katha Pollitt, "Are Women Morally Superior To Men? Debunking 'Difference Feminism'", *Utne Report*, September/October 1993.
- Wendy Kaminer, "Feminism's Identity Crisis", *The Atlantic Monthly*, October 1993.
- Aaron Kipnis, Knights Without Armor, (Los Angeles: Tarcher, 1991)
- Robert Moore and Douglas Gillette, The King Within, (New York: Avon, 1990)
- Lance Morrow, "Men: Are They Really All That Bad?", *Time*, February 14 1994.