

Table 5.1. The differences between White Male Society and an Emerging Female System (Schaefer, 1981)

	Ego/systemising Analytical and defining	Eco/empathising Synthesizing and emerging
SCHAEF'S APPELATIONS	<b>White Male System</b> <b>Reactive Female System</b>	<b>An emerging female system</b> <b>later renamed as</b> <b>Living Process System</b>
<b>Content Issues</b>		
TIME	Clock time	Process time
RELATIONSHIP	One-up or one-down Defined by the self	Peer Defined by relationship
SEXUALITY	Preoccupation with sex	Sex as a part of something bigger
INTIMACY	Approached physically	Approached verbally
LOVE	Series of rituals	Flow of energy
FRIENDSHIP	Support of the 'team effort'	Verbal intimacy
PARENTING	Teaching children the rules	Facilitating development
COMMITMENT	Incarceration	Covenant
POWER	Zero-sum	Limitless when shared
MONEY	Intrinsic value	No meaning in and of itself
LEADERSHIP	To lead	To facilitate
RULES	Regulatory serving the system	Freeing serving individual needs
THOUGHT	Linear	Multivariate and multidimensional
PROCESSING DATA	Rational	Intuitive
LOGIC	A tool used to win	Balanced progression
COMMUNICATION	A tool to win, confuse and stay one-up	To understand and be understood
NEGOTIATION	To manipulate and to win	To clarify needs and wants
RESPONSIBILITY	Assignment of accountability and blame	The ability to respond
DECISION-MAKING	Roberts Rules of Order	Consensual
ORIENTATION	Product	Process
GOALS	Exploitation	Conservation
MORALITY	Legislated and public	Private
HEALING	All-knowing and certified	Working with
<b>Process Issues</b>		
	Linear	Paradox
	Either-Or	Both-And

Table 5.2. Rolheiser's (2004) three "factors militating against contemplation" (p. 27)

<p>Narcissism: excessive self-preoccupation; the postmodern obsession with the Self as a Project in which Self-development is pursued with "a sense of duty and asceticism that were formerly reserved for religion ... because self-development is salvation" (p. 30-31); and the lack of sense of the communal.</p>	<p>Rolheiser (2004) identifies four features by which narcissism has become a special problem in our age:</p> <p>(1) the incapacity to recognize the reality of others. Rolhesier states: We see this narcissism, first of all, in our propensity for individualism and our corresponding inability to be healthily aware of and concerned about the reality beyond our private lives. To offer a simple but clear illustration: For the past some years, I have been involved in a marriage preparation course. This course is a requirement for marriage in various churches. Many who attend are not there out of their own choice. In our sessions, we do battle with their many objections, which rarely deal with the substance of what is being discussed—the nature of marriage. Rather, the primary (often hostile) objection is to the idea of the course itself: "Why do we have to take this course? Why are the church and society concerned about my marriage? My marriage is nobody's business. This is my life, my love, my sex, my honeymoon, my future, my concern!" ... One expects to hear objections like this from the children of René Descartes, not from the children of Jesus Christ. ... The objections of the young people I just quoted echo the lonely voice of Descartes doubting the reality of everything beyond the private world of his own self. What they are really saying is, My heartaches, my headaches, my wounds, my problems, my chronic shortage of money, my mortgage, my tasks, and my worries are real. Other people's lives and the larger community, and its concerns are not real. (pp. 28-29)</p> <p>(2) the Yuppie instinct for the quality of life (which in turn he breaks down into (a) quality of life, (b) upward mobility, (c) the pursuit of excellence, and (d) material comfort);</p> <p>(3) the movement towards excessive privacy (e.g. 'that the law should maintain enough public order so that everyone can do their own thing'(p. 33); and</p> <p>(4) the inability to act out of a purpose beyond the idiosyncratic preference; that is, the inability to find a motivation that isn't self-centred. In terms of Maxwell's (1984) idea of "value reality", what this means is that we "do not connect our values and priorities to a structure of value beyond personal preference and the comfort of our own inner worlds. In the end, our own reality is the only one that is real and important" (p. 35).</p>
<p>Pragmatism: the "philosophy and a way of life that asserts that the truth of an idea lies in its practical efficacy":</p> <p>Worth lies in achievement. ... The ideals of pragmatism lie at the very heart of the Western mind, undergird our technological society, are deeply enshrined in our educational systems, and are evident in our impatience with anything (or anybody) that is not practical, useful, and efficient (p. 36).</p>	<p>What this means says Rolheiser (2004) is that we end up taking our sense of worth from "What We Do Rather Than from Who We Are" (p. 371). It's hard to see how the Christian status of "being made in the image of God" can find resonance in an age underlain by a technological society. Certainly, one suspects the Stage 4 technological society needs the remnant capital of a Stage 3 Christian connectedness to maintain the Empathising dimension to at least the levels that it currently has. Indeed, Hamilton (2008) makes just this point; that we are currently running on the pro-social cultural capital built up in pre-modern religious times.</p> <p>Trusting only the scientific method – the technological solution - as the way to truth is the final sign of the pervasiveness of pragmatism: Thomas Merton was once asked by a journalist what he considered to be the leading spiritual disease of our time. His answer surprised his interviewer. Of all the things he might have suggested (lack of prayer, lack of community, poor morals, lack of concern for justice and the poor) he answered instead with one word: efficiency. Why? Because, "from the monastery to the Pentagon, the plant has to run ... and there is little time or energy left over after that to do anything else." Merton is pointing out that, when it comes to God and religion, our problem is not so much badness as it is busyness. We are not very contemplative, he's saying, because the demands of our lives absorb all of our energies and time. ... There is a more subtle manner in which pragmatism works against contemplation. When self-worth depends on achievement, then very few persons are going to spend much time in prayer or contemplation since these are by definition not utilitarian efforts. (pp. 39-40)</p>
<p>Finally, unbridled restlessness precludes "a way of being in life ... when ordinary life is enough" (p. 41).</p>	<p>There are three subsets that Rolheiser identifies feeding into this problem:</p> <p>(1) the greed for experience (e.g. through the constant compulsive travel which is a symptom of an exclusive focus on our own heartaches and supposed tragedies)</p> <p>(2) the impatience and lack of chastity (defined as an inability to wait2). Finally,</p> <p>(3) the lack of interiority results in the "great paradox of our time [which] is that many of us are busy and bored at the same time" (p. 49): Being filled yet unfulfilled comes from being without deep interiority. When there is never time or space to stand behind our own lives and look reflectively at them, then the pressures and distractions of life simply consume us, until we lose control over our lives ... We overwork, but are bored; socialize excessively, but are lonely; work to the point of exhaustion, but feel like our lives are a waste. (p. 50)</p>

<sup>1</sup> The effects of this attitude make themselves felt everywhere: achievement of professional goals takes precedence over family life, personal virtue, and leisure; persons who are retired, unemployed, or at home with children feel unfulfilled and useless; we have no place for handicapped persons, for the aged, for the sick; we end up as part of the rat race-with no time and no leisure, high blood pressure, and a diminished sense of enjoyment—and do not know how we got there or how to get away from it; and, finally, when doing is everything and being is nothing, we end up with nothing to help us prepare for death (Rolheiser, 2004, pp. 37-38).

<sup>2</sup> "Travel, reading, achievement, sex, exposure to novelty, the breaking of taboos, all can be good, if experienced reverently and at their proper time. Conversely, they can tear the soul apart (even when they are not wrong in themselves) when they are not experienced chastely, that is, when they are experienced in a way that does not fully respect the other person or object that is the subject of the experience, or that does not respect our own integration (p. 46).

Table 7.1. Beren's (2006) four temperament descriptors

<b>Theorist™</b> Strategic Skills set  The core needs for the Theorist™ are for mastery of concepts, knowledge, and competence. They want to understand the operating principles of the universe and to learn or even develop theories for everything. They value expertise, logical consistency, concepts and ideas, and seek progress. They abstractly analyze a situation and consider previously unthought-of possibilities. Research, analysis, searching for patterns, and developing hypotheses are quite likely to be their natural modus operandi.	<b>Catalyst™</b> Diplomatic Skills set  The core needs for the Catalyst™ are for the meaning and significance that come from having a sense of purpose and working toward some greater good. They need to have a sense of unique identity. They value unity, self-actualization, and authenticity. They prefer cooperative interactions with a focus on ethics and morality. They tend to be gifted at unifying diverse peoples and helping individuals realize their potential. They build bridges between people through empathy and clarification of deeper issues.
<b>Improvise™</b>	<b>Stabilizer™</b>

Table 8.1. An example of how intuitions come first and strategic reasoning second (from Haidt, 2012)

Event	How intuitions come first, strategic reasoning second.
<p>“On February 3, 2007, shortly before lunch, I discovered that I was a chronic liar. I was at home, writing a review article on moral psychology, when my wife, Jayne, walked by my desk. In passing, she asked me not to leave dirty dishes on the counter where she prepared our baby's food. Her request was polite but its tone added a postscript: ‘As I have asked you a hundred times before.’</p> <p>“My mouth started moving before hers had stopped. Words came out. Those words linked themselves up to say something about the baby having woken up at the same time that our elderly dog barked to ask for a walk and I'm sorry but I just put my breakfast dishes down wherever I could. In my family, caring for a hungry baby and an incontinent dog is a surefire excuse, so I was acquitted” (p. 52).</p>	<p>“So there I was at my desk, writing about how people automatically fabricate justifications of their gut feelings, when suddenly I realized that I had just done the same thing with my wife. I disliked being criticized, and I had felt a flash of negativity by the time Jayne had gotten to her third word (‘Can you not...’). Even before I knew why she was criticizing me, I knew I disagreed with her (because intuitions come first). The instant I knew the content of the criticism (‘... leave dirty dishes on the ...’), my inner lawyer went to work searching for an excuse (strategic reasoning second). It's true that I had eaten breakfast, given Max his first bottle, and let Andy out for his first walk, but these events had all happened at separate times. Only when my wife criticized me did I merge them into a composite image of a harried father with too few hands, and I created this fabrication by the time she had completed her one-sentence criticism (‘... counter where I make baby food?’). I then lied so quickly and convincingly that my wife and I both believed me” (p. 54).</p>

Table 8.2. Some of the differences in the brain hemispheres' versions of the world and the values consequent on that. As McGilchrist (2009) observes, "the brain is not just a tool for grappling with the world. It's what brings the world about." (p. 19)

The brain has to attend to the world in two completely different ways, and in so doing to bring two different worlds into being.

<b>The attention delivered by the left hemisphere e.g.</b>		<b>The attention delivered by the right hemisphere e.g.</b>
FOCUS AND GRASP	VS.	BREADTH AND FLEXIBILITY
THE KNOWN	VS.	THE NEW
PREDICTABILITY	VS.	POSSIBILITY
DIVISION	VS.	INTEGRATION
THE PART	VS.	THE WHOLE
ABSTRACTION	VS.	CONTEXT
CATEGORIES	VS.	INDIVIDUALS
THE IMPERSONAL	VS.	THE PERSONAL
THE NON-LIVING	VS.	THE LIVING
RATIONALITY	VS.	REASON
<p>"By contrast, the left hemisphere pays attention to the virtual world that it has created, which is self-consistent, but self-contained, ultimately disconnected from the Other, making it powerful, but ultimately only able to operate on, and to know, itself. . . .</p> <p>"The contributions made by the left hemisphere, to language and systematic thought in particular, are invaluable.</p> <p>"Our talent for division, for seeing the parts, is of staggering importance - second only to our capacity to transcend it, in order to see the whole. These gifts of the left hemisphere have helped us achieve nothing less than civilisation itself, with all that that means" (p. 93).</p>		<p>"... the right hemisphere pays attention to the Other, whatever it is that exists apart from ourselves, with which it sees itself in profound relation. It is deeply attracted to, and given life by, the relationship, the betweenness, that exists with this Other" (p. 93).</p>

Table 9.1. The relationship of our moral evolutionary inheritance with Christian practice and patriarchal leadership

<b>Haidt's (2012) moral matrices</b>	<b><i>So What?: Who (needs to) Benefit?:</i></b>	<b><i>So What?: Who (needs to) Lose?</i></b>
<b>Care/harm</b>	All who are harmed especially the least of our brethren.	
<b>Liberty/oppression</b>	All who are oppressed especially the least of our brethren.	
<b>Fairness/cheating</b>	All who are cheated especially the least of our brethren.	
<b>Loyalty/betrayal</b>	All who are betrayed especially the least of our brethren (unless in the context of power relationships they need to be – see right column).	Disrespectful authority
<b>Authority/subversion</b>	All whose power is subverted especially the least of our brethren (unless in the context of power relationships they need to be – see right column).	Disrespectful power
<b>Sanctity/degradation</b>	Every one whose humanity is degraded, especially the least of our brethren.	

Table 11.1. The left-hand/right-hand case method (from Argyris, 2006, p.133)

Thoughts and feelings not communicated	Actual conversation
He's not going to like this topic, but we had to discuss it. I doubt that he will take a company perspective, but I should be positive.	<p>Hi Bill, I appreciate the opportunity to talk with you about this problem of customer service versus product. I am sure that both of us want to resolve it in the best interests of the company.</p> <p>Bill: I'm always glad to talk about it, as you well know.</p>
I'd better go slow. Let me ease in.	<p>There are an increasing number of situations where our clients are asking for customer service and rejecting the off-the-shelf products. My fear is that your salespeople will play an increasingly peripheral role in the future.</p> <p>Bill: I don't understand. Tell me more.</p>
Like hell you don't understand. I wish there was a way I could be more gentle.	<p>Bill, I am sure you are aware of the changes [and explains].</p> <p>Bill: No, I do not see it that way. It's my salespeople that are the key to the future.</p>
There he goes, thinking as a salesman and not as a corporate officer	Well, let's explore that a bit . . .

Table 13.1. *The false self in action* (from Keating, 2001, p. 139)

WAYS OF REACTING TO FRUSTRATIONS OF EMOTIONAL CENTERS	WAYS OF REACTING ACCORDING TO TEMPERAMENT	WAYS OF EXPRESSING ONE'S EMOTIONAL PROGRAMMING
<p><b>Grief (refusal to let go of loved possession)</b> Self-pity Discouragement</p> <p><b>Apathy (withdrawal from life)</b> Boredom Bitterness Aversion for others Sloth Despair</p> <p><b>Lust (greed)</b> Overweening desire for bodily, mental, or spiritual satisfactions Compulsive acting out</p> <p><b>Pride</b> Overweening desire for fame, wealth, or power Desire for vindictive triumph Vanity Self-hatred in face of failure</p> <p><b>Anger</b> Hostility Desire for revenge</p> <p><b>Envy/Jealousy (sadness at another's good)</b> Competitiveness Loneliness</p>	<p><b>Withdrawal</b> Tendency to passivity and to swallow the hurt</p> <p><b>Aggression</b> Tendency to fight back</p> <p><b>Dependency</b> Tendency to rely on strong figure in environment</p>	<p><b>Materialistic</b> Workaholism Possessiveness Wealth, money, property Luxurious food and drink Sports</p> <p><b>Emotional</b> People pleasing Satisfying relationships Emotional exchange Sexual misconduct Certain kinds of music</p> <p><b>Intellectual</b> Academic excellence Need to be always right</p> <p><b>Social</b> Status Prestige Racism Nationalism Forms of domination Authoritarianism</p> <p><b>Religious</b> Legalism Pharisaism Hypocrisy Prejudice/bigotry Cults</p> <p><b>Spirituality</b> Attachment to psychic powers Attachment to spiritual consolation</p>



Table 13.2. The human condition in distal and proximate terms (partly derived from Keating, 2001, pp. 140-141)

FOWLER'S STAGES OF FAITH	LEVELS OF CONSCIOUSNESS	CULTURAL EVOLUTION	INDIVIDUAL EVOLUTION	SOCIETAL CHARACTERISTICS	PRIMARY DEVELOPMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS
Stage 6	7. Unity (wisdom)	The realm that post-Protestant Catholicism must now explore (and through descent rather than triumphal rise.)			
Stage 5	6. Unitive (holiness)				
Stage 4	5. Intuitive				
Stage 4	4. Mental Egoic (full reflective self-consciousness)	3000 B.C.E. to present	8 years to adulthood	Industrial/technological society Participational government	Full reflective self- consciousness Emergence of reason Personal responsibility
Stage 3	3. Mythic Membership (group overidentification)	12,000 B.C.E	4 to 8 years old	Stratification of society Verbalization Socialization	Overidentification with group affiliation Conformity to group values Fear of death
	2. Typhonic	200,000 B.C.E	2 to 4 years old	Farming society Authoritarian government Wars	Full formation of false self
	1. Reptilian	5 million years B.C.E.	0 to 2 years old	Magical Hunting society Living from day to day	Formation of body- self Formation of power/ control center Formation of affection/esteem center
				Immersed in nature	No consciousness of a self Dependence on mother Prompt fulfillment of instinctual needs Formation of security/survival center

Table 14.1. Template of Lacan's discourses: Factors = S2, S1, \$, a (derived from Bracher, 1994).

	<b>Left-hand factors</b>			<b>Right-hand factors</b>	
	<b>Factors active in the subject speaking or sending a message</b>			<b>Factors that the subject receiving the message is summoned to assume.</b>	
<b>The top position</b>	The place of agency or dominance: the most active and overt or manifest factor	Agent	→	Other	The factor called into action by the dominant factor in the message: The activation of this factor is a prerequisite for receiving and understanding a given message or discourse. Receivers, in order really to receive (i.e., understand) this discourse, must (for a moment, at least) be receptive to a preconstituted knowledge, which means emptying themselves of any knowledge that might interfere with the knowledge in the discourse and becoming an amorphous, nonarticulated substance, a, to be articulated by the discourse.
<b>The bottom position</b>	The covert, latent, implicit, or repressed factor—the factor that acts or occurs beneath the surface. It is the place of (hidden) truth, the factor that underlies, supports, and gives rise to the dominant factor, or constitutes the condition of its possibility, but is repressed by it.	Truth		Production	What is produced as a result of the receivers allowing themselves to be thus interpellated by the dominant factor of a discourse is represented by the position of production.

Table 14.2. The disposition of the four psychological functions in the *University* Discourse

Agent: S2	→	Other: a
Truth: S1		Production: \$

Table 14.3. The disposition of the four psychological functions in the *Master* Discourse

Agent: S1	→	Other: S2
Truth: \$		Production: a

Table 14.4. the disposition of the four psychological functions in the *Hysteric* Discourse

Agent: \$	→	Other: S1
Truth: a		Production: S2

Table 14.5. The disposition of the four psychological functions in the *Analyst Discourse*

Agent: a	→	Other: \$
Truth: S2		Production: S1