

## 2ndCD-Poteat1993FridayTranscript-102123-final

### Friday Evening Transcript 2

*(Continuation of Friday 11/19/93 evening session)*

Many years ago, and I think Dale would remember this, and probably Taylor, and Ed St. Clair, and who else do I see around ????? it was the mid-sixties mafiosi...and for reasons that are now obscure, I suggested that the seminar read the piece that I had contributed to the Polanyi *Intellect and Hope* volume and Bruce Haddox, who I believe is not here tonight (others say he's here ... Bill spots him and says "Oh. Hey" and Bruce says "Late as usual")

Poteat: Well, that's right...I am delighted to see that you have been separated from your cigar... But Bruce Haddox came to class and with characteristic restraint and gentility said "I just had no idea what in the hell was going on in this piece and then suddenly I started imagining listening to you read it and all of a sudden it began to make sense."

Now that is exactly what you should expect. Robert Penn Warren made the observation that poetry requires a mouth...that in other words it is not to be **read** in your cubicle...it needs to be **said**. Well, if what I am claiming here has any legitimacy then it absolutely must be the case that you can understand what is going on here better when you see me **doing that** (his emphasis... a gesture?) than you can by reading the books even though I make a strenuous effort to reproduce that state of affairs subject to the limitations of print.

So it seems to me that the academic world is imprisoned in an essentially discarnate world of teachers' notes and students' notes usually with a barrier, physical barrier, separating the one from the other...which both students and teachers are glad to have, lest they should fall upon one another. (laughter)

Now this is all by way of saying, and I don't mean to sound facetious about this that ..... Plato understood perfectly well, the role that Eros plays in intellection; and if Eros plays a role there, then a Platonic dialogue with living participants is better than a Platonic dialogue read in translation from the Greek. And that's because the reality that is brought into being by our exchanges of our words and gestures and movements and visual expressions, and all of the rest of it, literally produce a world, so that – you may say well it is a very unstable one – but when you walk out of this room tonight, you will be carrying with you, for a certain length of time, a world that we together conjured up; and it is necessarily more real to each of us, than could have been the case if I had simply gotten out a copy of a book of mine, and read it aloud to you.

So, if I might just add one self-serving observation about my own teaching experience which, to put it mildly, met with extraordinarily equivocal responses from students, what I did was to limit the class to 25 and had I my choice I would have limited it to twelve, simply because it is easier to do that. And we read a single book, in this case Hannah Arendt's *The Human Condition*...this was an upper-level undergraduate course I think it was titled "Religion in Modern Problems."

And when I said we read a book, we didn't read this book...we never got ...in all of the twenty years or so that I used this ...we never got to the end...we never even got beyond the middle. And the reason was that what was going on was a colloquy between Arendt's text and my interventions and the students' responses.

Now the strangest and most inexplicable outcome of all of this to me was ...literally the last class I ever taught at Duke was a special session designed for rising senior high school students - half of the students were in this class and half were regular Duke undergraduates - and the course was a summer school course and these high school kids got college credit – this was obviously a recruiting tactic..... contributed absolutely nothing to the Duke Blue Devils but got some good students this way.

The last class I taught was on the subject of interpretations of religion in the Western world – or something like that -and what I did, this was about a five or six week course, we met for an hour and forty-five minutes a day and I gave them short things like "Existentialism is a Humanism" by Jean Paul Sartre or the first chapter of *Language Truth and Logic* by A. J. Ayer or Freud's *The Future of an Illusion*, and so on, things that a reasonable student could be expected to read and appear in the seminar room and I would say "What is this all about?" "What's going on here?"

And I don't exaggerate when I say it almost brought me to a state of collapse because I could not get a **rise** out of these students...neither the Duke undergraduates nor the high school students whom I expected to do something interesting. They all sat there and I could look them in the eye and say "What do you think is going on when Jean Paul Sartre says "**so on and so on**".....(Poteat seems to pound the table to accentuate each word)

And it was as if what I had said had had the effect upon their brains of radio waves or something. I was, to say the least, grateful that this was my last class at Duke.

After the course was over and the students had gotten their final papers and their grades and we were all going down the stairs together from the third floor and the stairs were wide enough to walk two or three abreast...and one of the students who was in a bunch around me said "You know this is absolutely the greatest course I have ever had!"

And I was so floored ... so left in such a state of catatonia by this observation that I didn't have the presence of mind to say "**WHY?**" (laughter)

And I have thought about that many times and I really believe that, in part, what they found interesting about this course was that for good or ill they saw *intellect at work*....even if they didn't feel that they were ready to enter into it...and that is what they thought great ....it was more entertaining even than ??? (laughter)

Is that responsive to your query? I have a feeling you have got something really good to say on that score and I really wish you would do it...

?????: I think it's intriguing(inaudible) I'm really glad you're here, really glad, I think we needed your presence...(inaudible)... And I guess I wonder if there's something about the structure...???...Yahweh...Ishmael?...?Inaudible. But whatever, I'm really glad you're here.

Poteat: Well thank you..... and may I say that I'm glad you are here.

Jere Moorman: Bill, I have another question. There was a part of me when I was reading about your retro-tensions and your pro-tension and I enjoyed your tennis example. And you talk about the equipment that we have and how hazardous it is and when the memory and I hope go, sort of, that's the end of it, and I felt a moment of despair there, in my really wanting to believe in Yahweh who can raise the dead, and some sort of eternal life and so I wondered if you could tell me how far you can get me with your work with my task of believing in a God that raised the dead.

Moderator says: "should I turn this off?" (Laughter)

Jere Moorman continues: ...Secondly you talk about conjuring up a world and I know... it's my belief that you're not a constructivist you're not an objectivist, so I'm saying "Wait a minute, what the heck does he mean by this conjuring up a world? It sounds very subjective and relative" .....

Poteat interrupts: But look, look at what you and I are doing right now. Have we not between us in the course of this conversation conjured up a world and was there anything subjective in the bad sense about that?

Jere Moorman: I'm ready to hear the one about the raising the dead. (Long laughter)

Poteat: That's a tougher one. (More laughter)

Moorman: I am not looking for the (inaudible) but you seem to be able to get me somewhere where I could do better with this???? I'm not asking for the final ??????

Poteat: You don't know what a relief that is to hear....

Poteat: Am I to understand that what you want some response from me on is how my stated embrace of Yahwism translates into some of the familiar theological doctrines of Christianity? Is that what you're after?

12:50

Moorman: Not exactly, and in fact I should confess that I should know the meaning of this term "transubstantiation" ....and I forgot what that means..

Poteat: It means that the wine and the bread that are blessed by the priest in the celebration of the Eucharist really becomes the blood and the body of Christ.

Moorman: OK, thank you. What I am asking for is maybe I can answer my own question. It seems like one of your endpoints, possibly the supreme endpoint in *Polanyian Meditations*, is the reliance on the faithfulness of God. So where I can take myself with that is I'm saying "OK I can try the best as I can to respond to my calling, and go through the protensions and the retrotensions, and the hope and the memory and then eventually I have to depend on the faithfulness of God"...

Poteat: ....You don't have to. . .

Moorman: Well, not have to, but if I'm...that's true...(inaudible)

Poteat: It is nowhere written that you have to...

Moorman: That's true, but I can get... but that makes sense to me... But like ???Kierkegaard??? said "I am hopeful, but God has the final word." (Bill says "Right") So if that's your theology in that book, as far as my question goes I'm saying "Ok that's as far as I've gotten"...

Poteat: That's it ...that's it ...you've got it...you and ??????

Ed St Claire: Bill, come at it another way -your comment about how does your thought translate into commentary on traditional Christian theological points, you could really come at it from the other way around, that is how has your long inquiry, informed by certain Christian theological points, informed your position that you now have and what has guided you in your search for a sense of bedrock.

And the two things that immediately come to mind for me are a sense of incarnation and a sense of logos. It would seem to me that your notion of mindbody that, well, I'll overstate it, that only from a Christian point of view with a radical sense of incarnation could you ever have arrived at such a radical notion of mindbody in the first place. (Bill: Absolutely).

So as that turns back to... it's not looking disinterestedly at incarnation very much the same thing could be said of logos, not in the Greek sense of static logos but the sense of speech and convivial order and so on, but to come back to his point when I think of Christianity, in terms of beliefs, the three points that always come up with are incarnation, logos and resurrection. So then we can come back and puzzle over the same thing, not with his question of how does your thought apply to the notion of resurrection, but really the other way around. Is there any sense of Resurrection at play in the long project that you have been on in the same sense in which incarnation and logos, and I am asking it only because rightly or wrongly, those are the three things I always come up with on Christianity...?

Poteat: Yes, and I think they are a good three things to come up with, and I like very much everything you have said, including the suggestion, that had I not been an incarnationist deep down in my bones, and if I had not believed in the logos deep down in my bones, I never could've come to the kind of appreciation of my own mindbodily existence that I have tried to articulate.

17:20

The notion of resurrection is... has not surfaced in what I have had to say, I suppose simply because, in a sense, it is presupposed in what I have said. Now let me explain: Do I believe in the resurrection of the body and the answer is "yes." If you ask me to elaborate on what that means, that's a theological question that has had a long and complicated history into which I am not only not competent to enter but am uneasy of entering into it at just this point in connection with your question.

But I take the belief in the resurrection of the body to be an affirmation about the nature of our being in the world, that we are not discarnate spirits, and we will not once again be discarnate spirits, when, at our death, that spirit leaves the body. In other words to put it much too crudely, I would say that belief in the resurrection of the body is an affirmation about the nature of what it is to be a son of God, and that is to be mind and body son of God, so that this scar on my wrist surreptitiously inflicted when I was messing with a Chinese Carpenter's sharp chisel and walked several miles with blood running down on the ground. I make that all very vivid for you, because that is right there on my body and that's involved in the groaning and travailing of creation so far as it concerns me in my relationship vis a vis the Almighty.

Anything less than that is in my view a denial of the first two points that you have used to characterize the nature of what Christianity is to you.

20:00

St. Clair: And just to come back with one last thing...to come back to the point you made about your earlier work in the essays...I guess they are out...

Poteat: Yes, they are out ...the bad news is out...

Yeah, I mean one of the things that Nickel and Stines did was to hand me all of this stuff and make me to read it to be sure I was really saying what they thought I was saying and they discovered many places that I was talking utter nonsense...I mean even I recognized it...but I said.... *By golly*, this was a portent of what was to come for me.

Poteat: Araminta:

Araminta Johnston: (much is inaudible but you will get her line of questions) I want to go back to what we were talking about conjuring up the world that may be even....More difficult for us than what we have just been talking about ....When you talk about conjuring up a world we start getting nervous...and your example shows we are not talking about something mysterious..

Poteat: It's commonplace

Araminta Johnston: There are two examples.... Ordinary examples that I think of. If you read in the newspaper, a record of a conversation and interview ...a reporter and interviewee And you read and you say...There must be more to it than that...whereas if you had been there...there was more to it. The same thing can happen. If you've heard someone speak, or give a lecture, and then go back and transcribe a tape you find something different in the transcription from what you heard. So those are just ordinary, everyday kinds of things that confirm what you were saying..

Poteat: Yes, they do indeed.

Araminta: Not something mysterious at all mysterious at all..

Poteat: Not anything mysterious in the least and if two of you were to fall into conversation as you were heading to your hotel room for the night and were in a sense recapitulating what went on in there tonight you might diverge very sharply from one another as to what has gone on in there. But this is not problematic. This is just another conversation taking place. And if there is the need to adjudicate among the alternative interpretations of what happened, then we will set about doing that. The probability is there will be no need to adjudicate among them.

But I want to say that **reality** is the sum of all of these these realities that come into being among us this way and if you say, oh dear, that's idealism. This is one of the swords that hangs over my head all the time or used to. I cut the damn thing down and stashed it in the corner.

But this is a natural reaction and Ron Hall was always jumping on me every time I would send him something and threatening me, because I was being an idealist, and I always retorted that idealism is a danger only to people for whom a distinction between the ideal and the real is real.

And to me, in the context of what I am arguing, **they cut no ice**, just as you know, one of the favorite debates among some of the people that read or half-read,... that Wittgenstein was a linguistic behaviorist or not. And if one thing is obvious about Wittgenstein, he would probably not be able to contain himself since he was not an easy person, shall we say. He would say that the distinction between behaviorism and something else doesn't exist because it supposes that there is a distinction between the mental and the physical.

Now, all of this is in our bones, and so I am not at all, suggesting that it is possible for me to come, you know, swaggering in here about a Copernican revolution and have everyone go home a Copernican. On the contrary, I hope only to make your consciences slightly uneasy so that you will sit down and say now wait just a minute ...am I back sliding and if so, how.

Taylor Scott: All of what Araminta said is true, (inaudible) that the ordinary and the commonplace happen and there is wonderment in it. One of the problems is what do we do when we start thinking about the ordinary and the commonplace.

Some weekends ago, I was over at Ron's house and we were talking about fixing a couple of martinis and he didn't have any olives and his neighbor said I've got a bottle of olives in my refrigerator but they are cut up for salad (laughter)..would they be all right?

And Ron said, and I'm sure you will appreciate, this, Ron said: "yeah they'll be fine." (much laughter) Yeah. OK now. There's a stripping of gears in the world that has been conjured up there...there is a contradiction in the world that has been conjured up. And isn't one of the things that your work is calling upon your readers to do is to attend, not simply to the wonderment of the ordinary, but also to the contradictions that we live, in not being able to **think well** about the ordinary?

Poteat: Yes, **that** but there's also the further thing .... I like the story about Ron and the olives and we read body language with great skill and we would immediately recognize anyone saying "Yes, they would be just fine" as being in a state of conflict of some sort. But what I would want to add to all of this is, that the model is that, without taking thought, we render coherent in, how should I put it, ...actual living, **what for thought could only be construed as radical incoherence**. Just as there would be radical incoherence between what Ron is doing with his head and what he was doing with his mouth. You see what I mean? In other words, let's take do you If you like these theological things (Taylor? says I don't ...Poteat says I know you don't.... laughter) I used to think that I was a lapsed Episcopalian, until I couldn't figure out what it would mean to be a lapsed Episcopalian. (Long laughter multiple jokes exchanged..."redundant" -Poteat loses his train of thought..)

Poteat: Now you've made me forget (several suggestions until several say "coherence") yes "coherence" now, if I only knew what I was going to say about "coherence" .... wait just a minute it will come to me. Someone asks it is it about what Ron meant when he said "It will be just fine"?

Poteat: No, the theological point

30:20

We in the course of celebrating the holy communion or morning prayer or whatnot...we recite the Nicene creed or the Apostles creed

(Long? lapse as tape is exchanged)

....potency when they are participated in.

So, you don't have to, and indeed, you can't render logically coherent the Apostles Creed by taking it apart and examining the logic of each of its several claims. The Apostles Creed is a complex entity that bears within it the Christian faith to the worshipping confessor.

Poteat: (Calls on Dale Cannon whose preliminary comments are inaudible)

Bill interrupts: This is the kind of preface that would cause a man to tremble to have to answer the question.... (laughter)

Dale Cannon: ...Apostle's Creed does not make sense when contemplated in the abstract. (Poteat says yes)

I'd like to ask whether from your Copernican Revolution standpoint...looking back and re-reading Plato he makes more sense than ?the tradition ????

Poteat: Yes. Absolutely yes. In other words, the Plato that weighs heavily upon us is the Plato that we have chosen to let weigh heavily upon us...just as we were saying is true in the case of Descartes. Yes, Absolutely, and you know, I...believe or not... I go back and I read ..not often... but I read away in *The Republic* and I say, You know.,.Plato was really a smart guy.,.he really had it.... and as John Berkman would tell you...Thomas Aquinas was too ...isn't that right John?...(John says "I think so") ....are you ready to declare on that question?

Jim Wiser: I'm Joe Kroger and I'm embarrassed to ask this question because I can't recall exactly how you put it in the book or in one of the books but you were talking about worlds being called into being, not just conceptually, not just by language, but music...(Poteat affirms Yes) that there is a different world called into being by Bach's Preludes (Poteat: yes) and Chopin's peeking over the abyss

Poteat: Yes, Yes. Fluttering over the abyss like a bird of bright plumage (laughter)

Kroger: My question is whether or not, there's not around that issue a whole different vision than I have ever seen of aesthetics (Poteat: Yes) because you work very cleanly and clearly in ontology and in epistemology and pulling together or in making those terms irrelevant (Poteat: "that's right") and in a way aesthetics becomes irrelevant too...but there is a perspective for it.... would you comment on that a little bit...

34:34

Poteat: Well, I believe that ...first of all let me endorse what you have imputed to me as in fact what I have said and that I am dwelling in the world which at the moment may include the sound of the washing machine chugging away in the laundry, the sound of passing cars, the sound of my mastiff pup snoring...all of these are elements of the world that I am then in, and when Glen Gould is playing the Goldberg Variations that is a world that I dwell in.

Now if you wonder where I got all that, here I have to do honor to Ron Hall's mentor...Kierkegaard...in this sense, the most important single thing that I ever read in my life and I must tell you that when I (laughs) proudly presented my copy of *Either/Or* vol 1 to a graduate student at Yale who was very senior

and very conscious of his seniority and he was sort of the resident Kierkegaard scholar amongst graduate students... I proudly showed him my copy of *Either/Or* on the steps of the Sterling Library at Yale - having just acquired it for \$2 – the hardbacked copy from the Princeton Press edition - and he said “Oh there is nothing in that that is of any importance whatsoever.”

And what I found in there was “the immediate stages of the musical erotic” and I read and puzzled over that thing for perhaps thirty years and there is a sense in which I learned more about how to talk about these things from author A who is the pseudonymous author of this disposition on music, and architecture and painting and sculpture and opera and epic and so on...that’s where I got all of that... And so, for me to be listening to the music of Mozart while observing the *Guernica* mural of Picasso puts me in a different world from that in which I find myself when listening to the St. Matthew Passion in the cathedral of Chartres. **And I feel these things palpably. I feel that this music is a palpable limit to my being, not only a limit but a ground for it.**

I’m **very charmed** by what you just said about the possible...at least the necessity to revise if not to abandon aesthetics as we have understood it before simply because I never thought of that and **I think you are right!**

Aesthetics then becomes a Kierkegaardian category to be laid down alongside of ethical and ethical/religious. So, you see you have spotted something that I had not spotted as such myself before that is that this Copernican revolution will do that to your Bach and your Massacio.

39:14

Poteat calls on Bob Osborn

Osborn: (several inaudible words here) If anybody can focus?? on the underside of the Copernican revolution ???is fine??? with me. I've been listening to and thinking about the theological illustration and the Nicene and the Apostles Creed (inaudible) I understand you to say that when you read this as embodied members of the body of Christ (more inaudible) it’s what otherwise observed from a second hand standpoint from a (inaudible) My problem is (inaudible) It helps me as a reader but I swear I don’t get in what sense it helps me as a writer.

How could a theologian who is on the other side of this write any differently from one who is pre-revolutionary? And let me comment here, we had a conversation at your house I remember when we talked about writing with a pencil vs. with a word processor. And it occurred to me that is about the only answer that for the moment I can give (laughter) What does it mean to write theology in this revolutionary way?

Poteat: In a perfectly real sense, Bob, it need entail no changes whatsoever in what you do. What it entails is a change in your sense of how this is authorized and vindicated. Do you understand what I am saying?

Osborn: Yeah and I guess I do I do and I think do anyway and I should but I guess I am not sure how revolutionary that is.... You might say simply that you do it carefully....

Poteat: Well, that's certainly true.... but ...does it not make any difference to you as a theologian, for example, that the mind/body dualism simply has no cash value anymore?



Osborn: Yes conceptually and in other ways but I still don't know quite I make that realization work when I sit down with a pen in my hand.

Poteat: Well, I don't know because. . .

Osborn: Other than...Other than that I would not write in such a way as to or I would not advocate it or interpret when writing my doctrine of man ...mankind...humankind ...the person....(inaudible) I would want to make it clear ??? not in a dualistic way anymore???

But it is much more than this...that we are talking about and I that am having a hard time...

Poteat: Yeah, Well, let me ask you this. Let's get it away from what you are doing which I don't have before me, and which if you like, you can present to us, but absent that we are talking rather abstractly but let me just ask you this: How would the history of 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Century theology have been different if the problems, or if what was problematic, for theologians in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century resulting from dualism didn't exist...hadn't existed?

Osborn: I can understand that...that point I can get.

Poteat: So for example let's take Schleiermacher and Ritschl. Now how would they have written differently if they had not been faced with the problematic of dualisms ...dualisms that to be sure were foisted upon them by Immanuel Kant.

Bob: I guess I understand (Inaudible) and I would say some 20<sup>th</sup> Century theologians have attempted to do that... but I was thinking more you are requesting more on the what they have written than how they write...that is, they are writing as non-dualistic persons and you have them reflect primarily on what the non dualist person would write rather than on how they do it and it is the former dimension of it and maybe I am wrong in even asking about that and looking for or expecting that there would be some way in which being embodied would actually change the way as opposed to the what...

Poteat: It won't change, in other words, this is a better account, I would argue, of how you actually have written theology all your life than the account that you would give if I were to ask you to give it in terms of the tradition of philosophy that you and I both grew up in.

See I am not showing you something that you haven't been practicing all of your life. I am trying to discover that what you have been practicing all your life is different from the way in which a second order reflection upon it interprets it.

45:24

Ron interrupts and says there are some people who want to jump in on this

Doug Adams: Over 25 years ago when Harvey Oswald? and I would walk into your class we would look forward to wonderfully long responses to questions and the only question we would have among ourselves (???) is whether there would be one sentence in there or there might be two... in the course of the hour. (laughter) Now to me that's changed quite a bit

Poteat: You mean that I'm...

Adams? Well, you've gotten a lot of sentences

Poteat: You mean I am using more sentences or fewer?

Adams: Well, they are shorter, There are more periods...(others affirm) More periods and shorter sentences...

Poteat: Now that is interesting. Somebody said to me the other day that I had never seen a semi-colon that I didn't like (long laughter)

Adams: But I wondered whether that change....if there is a change in the way you write in that sense, if there are, from 25 years ago to now, if there are?? a kind of form you use to convey your writing if that invites, by more sentences and shorter sentences, a different kind of response in the reader... or if indeed that in fact that hasn't changed...

Poteat: Look... my writing is something over which I do not exert very much sovereignty...I simply am the creature of this thing. Now I know that this sounds weird, but it isn't weird. It's true of you no less than it is of me. That, in other words, the text of what you write, evokes from you an assent. But the reason that I go for extended dependent clauses within dependent clauses is that I am overwhelmed by the sense of the inadequacy of the medium of the printed word to convey what it is I am trying to convey. And so, what I try to do is to grab hold of the reader and hold on to him or her. And the way I do that is to keep them suffering (laughter) from one dependent clause to the next. (laughter and inaudible comments)

Poteat: Bruce?

Bruce Haddox: I am going to ramble for just a minute and the reason I was thinking when the first the question about the resurrection until Bob's question about the methodology...or the how (inaudible several sentences) are related. ????? If we were to say that modern theology in so far as say from Schleiermacher up through contemporary theologians are actually creating or constructing some world in which?? know well ...And certainly it doesn't affect them? It seems to me that what is interesting about modern theology is that theologians do not simply do that. They also – either fore or aft – tell you the meaning of what they have done. The 128 pages of *The Christian Faith* by Schleiermacher tells you what he is going to do in terms of how or in other words defines the world...

He says here is the world that I am speaking in and that world is not a world that in fact is created within a community of speakers and hearers...it is the world that Kant ??? and on and on (Poteat: Right) and that is true of Tillich, and in some sense in Barth. So in one sense it seems to me that what you are talking about does bear on how a theologian writes, not in so far as it actually would change what he does but it actually would change, it seems to me, the requirement that modern theology feels to tell the world that the world that I am actually writing for is the modern world and it seems to me that is almost an obligation for modern theology.

That's the first thing and the second thing is that it seems to me that if you take seriously the notion of the world as it is constructed in community of face to face speakers and hearers then all of these sorts of things we are talking about like resurrection really have a function of the meaning of life within that world and not something like the resurrection within the context of a kind of lifeless world....???even if you embodied it wouldn't mean much???(ed. Not entirely sure that is what he said)

(Poteat agrees)

Haddox: It seems to me that that notion of world ??? is an absolutely crucial (inaudible) And I wanted to pick up on one other thing I would say is when was writing a piece that I was giving to ??? and after I got it done...

The problem I was having was that this reads like I was giving a speech and then, of course, I realized that that is the only way that I can write (Poteat: right, exactly) and far from being a limitation it seems to me, the more that voice is there, the more real it is ...and Plato actually addresses that (inaudible)

Poteat: Yeah) (inaudible)

51:36

Ron Hall interrupts and exercises his role as chair and recognizes it is time to end for the evening so that Bill and others can get enough rest to begin again in the morning recognizing that he is ending abruptly with many remaining questions

Meeting ends with all thanking one another and Bill saying "And I thank you for exerting the privilege of the chair to end for the night") Enthusiastic loud applause!!!