

Correspondence

The Purpose of the Network

George Blaker, President of the Network, Lake House, Vann Lake Road, Ockley, Surrey RH5 5NS, England

I believe that nearly all our members must know that when the Network started its aim was to explore and to offer to the populace as a whole, or to anyone interested, thoughts about spirituality and a spiritual way of life. We wanted to convince scientists and medical doctors and other professionals too that they would do better to look beyond the restrictions imposed upon them by their many years of materialistic training and to take into account the vast areas of human experience that lay beyond those confining boundaries. We felt that this was a very important subject to be studied, with huge implications for what human activity could achieve, and yet knowledge of it was denied to most people because it would have been almost wholly excluded from all their formal education.

In recent years we have been deflected from that path by the fear that exploring it would render the Network liable to be seen as a sect or cult. This deflection has gone so far that some people have been able to describe the Network as nothing more than a comfortable club for the intellectually curious. In many situations any fear is a bad guide to action and in this case I think it is entirely inappropriate and irrelevant. I have listed below a few of the subjects I would like to see being offered for discussion and for those engaged in the discussion to make up their own minds about. The Network itself would not embrace as its own any beliefs that might arise out of such debates because it holds no corporate views, and it will adhere to that position. But individual members will be free to express their own personal preferences or opinions in such matters, as some of them do now.

The list of themes that I would like to see included for discussion in an introduction to a spiritual way of life would look something like this:-

1. The primacy of the spiritual: we are spiritual beings, temporarily inhabiting a physical body.
2. The continuity of life; it does not begin at birth and end with the death of the physical body. It moves on.
3. The value and reality of out of the body experiences and near death experiences. Examples.
4. The spiritual basis of real love between people.
5. The role of friends and guides and guardians in the Spirit world - who are perfectly aware of what we are doing and what we need.
6. The nature of forgiveness: no one can forgive sins except the person who committed them. With increasing knowledge people will come to see and understand the full range of effects their actions have had. That knowledge will stir within them a deep yearning to repair as much of the damage as they can. To the extent that they succeed in doing that they will experience the relief and comfort of feeling sins forgiven.

7. The nature of the spiritual drive occurring now throughout the planet. Everything that is good that is happening in the world today is evidence of, is part of, and is supported by this spiritual drive.
8. The need to recognise spiritual influences. If they are not recognised, there will be many things closely affecting human affairs that will be excluded from our understanding and from our knowledge.
9. The human aura. Its nature and how it is perceived.
10. The reality of telepathy.
11. The interconnectedness of mind: are our minds interconnected so that they are all semi-autonomous devolved units of the universal mind?
12. The concept of karma. It is not a punishment from God, but is the automatic result of what we have done in the past. What we do now will have future effects, some good, some bad, some short-lived, some more serious.
13. Reincarnation for some. Examples from the Orient and America.
14. Purpose in life. The purpose of human life.
15. "All life is one". - What does that mean?

I would expect this list to be greatly extended by the addition of more themes, and members may wish to propose some. We could set up a series of courses or meetings open to all. Each gathering would be attended by a member from our list of school speakers or by some other person with knowledge and experience of the subject who would be a participant in the discussion. Repeat sessions could be held on the same themes in the presence of a different elder, so that as many aspects as necessary could be studied.

As I have said, I would like the Network to set up an educational programme of this kind. But the basic question is; "Should we go forward in this way towards the fulfilment of the Network's original aim?" It is for the members to decide and to help us to know what the opinion of members is I would be grateful if each member would send me a personal letter giving me their views on this. The letter needs to say no more than "Yes" or "No", but any views would be welcome. Some, I expect, will not wish to reply at all, leaving the decision to others; and to avoid a "no reply" being mistaken for a negative vote it would be helpful if those preferring to say "no" would reply as readily as I hope the "yes" voters will.

In giving our replies may we all be guided by our own innermost selves, our true intuition, as well as by our reasoning.

Lake House, Vann Lake Road, Ockley. Dorking, Surrey RH5 5NS, England.
George.blaker@btinternet.com.

From: Diana Clift, 93 Peperharow Road, Godalming, Surrey GU7 2PN

I am all for the Network remaining true to the intentions of its founders, but - as I understand it - the main motivation was to free scientists and others from the constrictions of orthodox materialist thinking. That does not require us to embrace any particular beliefs about a hypothetical spiritual reality. It does require us to examine the evidence, to explore our own experiences and to assess it all freely with Open mindedness, rigour, humility.

....and of course, good humour! Let's encourage all points of view and beware of exchanging one set of limiting assumptions for another.

An Exoneration of Adolph Hitler

*From: Prof. Dr. Eli E. Lasch, Av.Nestle 9/16, 1820 Montreux, Suisse
E-mail: lasch.healer@bluewin.ch*

A little late, but never too... In Network 68 you published a very positive book review about *The Divine Dichotomy -Conversations with God*, by Neale Donald Walsch. It was one of the most enthusiastic reviews I have ever read, the (unknown) reviewer finishing with the statement: I regard it as one of the most important books I have ever read. The result was clear - I bought it. Book one was interesting, despite some rather erroneous and misleading quotations from the Bible, which put a question mark on the authorship. The whole tone of the book was rather typical for what we call "New Age", i.e. that evil is nothing but an illusion.

I was however horrified when I read in Book 2 something which I can only describe as an exoneration of Adolph Hitler. I am sorry that I have in front of me only the German translation, so that the page numbers and my re-translation may not be 100% exact It starts out with the statement that Hitler was accepted into heaven. That he really did nothing wrong (!) as there is nothing essentially right or wrong in the universe. Things are as they are. Death is anyhow the most wonderful experience in existence, since life in heaven is certainly better than life on earth. (reminds me very much of the Shi'ite suicide bombers) Page 95 (in the German translation): Hitler did not do anything wrong, as millions of people believed over many years that what he did was right (What a wonderful justification for the most horrifying genocide ever. Vox populi -vox dei). Page 96: He did not really harm anybody. He did not cause suffering but ended it, and here comes a quotation from Buddha: Life is suffering, followed by a remark by "GOD": and Buddha was right. (He first made them suffer in the concentration camps and then "finished" their suffering by cremation...) Page 97 He did not believe that what he did was evil. (Of exterminating the Jews I will fulfil the will of God.. Shadows of the Inquisition)

If we follow the ideas expressed in this book then the recently instituted international court for war criminals is superfluous and the Nurnberg trials were nothing but a sham: every criminal act, including mass murder, genocide and torture is permitted and "GOD" concludes: You may not agree, but that is of no importance. Why do I respond now to a review published a year and a half ago? The reason is, that a few weeks ago a fundamentalist Rabbi in Israel declared that the victims of the holocausts were reincarnated sinners and had only themselves to blame. Another exoneration of the Nazis. Though we have something called freedom of speech, I believe that there are certain things which are taboo, one of them is an exoneration of the Nazis. There are still too many victims around. I, for one, would not like to have anything to do with a God like the one who talked with Mr. Walsch, and I am somewhat astonished at the approach of the Network. I have enough problems with the fact that HE did not interfere. That HE justifies such deeds is too much for me. The most important book published! Really!!

Response from David Lorimer

Thanks so much for your letter. The review is my responsibility and in it I did not discuss the ever-vexed issue of moral evil and theodicy raised by your letter, which I perhaps should have - mea culpa.

I have written about this in my book 'Whole in One'. As I see it, from the viewpoint of traditional concepts of God and atheism, there are three lines one might pursue:

- 1) Given the beneficent and all-powerful nature of God, evil is a mystery and the ways of God are unknowable not to say unfathomable
- 2) Life is an accident. There is no God and nothing to explain
- 3) There is some form of reincarnation and karma, but we only have the vaguest idea about how it might work - this view shares some of the unfathomability in 1), especially, as you point out, when applied to an event of the scale of the holocaust.

Walsch's view is different. His concept of God is not so radically transcendent - we are each expressions of God and have free will. Thus human beings are responsible, both individually and collectively, for their actions and their consequences. God can therefore only 'intervene' through the actions of other humans (which did occur in this case, but not until vast suffering and death had happened). Human beings are constantly making choices, which define them and indicate the level of consciousness from which they are operating. Walsch urges people to act from the highest in themselves, but this is necessarily limited by their understanding of what this is.

In the chapter prior to the one from which you quote, he says that Hitler's actions were what we would call mistakes, adding that they represented the actions of an unevolved being. In saying that there is no hell to which Hitler went, I would part company with Walsch but perhaps substitute 'purgatory'. I believe that Hitler would have had to undergo a life review, as we all do, and would then experience the suffering that he brought about, directly and indirectly, on such a massive scale.

This would amount to the greatest amount of suffering one can imagine and might take eons to work through. I think that Walsch blurs the distinction between death as the end of physical suffering and the torture that might have led up to it. He DID inflict physical suffering, which ended in death. The point he was trying to make was badly overstated since death may be a release, as he says, but the manner of death may involve unnecessary and unspeakable suffering. In saying later on that Hitler did nothing wrong, he puts wrong in inverted commas, making it clear that he is using the term relative to Hitler's own limited and distorted understanding. In Chapter 4 he explains, rightly in my view that 'the inability to experience the suffering of another as one's own allows such suffering to continue.

Separation breeds indifference, false superiority. Unity produces compassion, genuine equality'. He then goes on to argue that the Hitler experience was made possible as a result of group consciousness (as Jung also points out, but relating it to the unconscious). Much of this group consciousness was held in place by fear and terror. Add to this the sense of separation and superiority and you have a massive loss of conscience and compassion. This seems to me self-evident and the results predictably disastrous.

He then points out that these genocide episodes 'show humanity to itself' (the shadow), remarking that 'Group consciousness is powerful and produces outcomes of unspeakable beauty and ugliness'. We are still seeing this today, as in the former Yugoslavia or Rwanda. In 'The Undiscovered Self' Jung makes the point that individual consciousness is the only bulwark against the insanity of the collective, a point that I still regard as crucial. It seems to me that one of humanity's greatest challenges is how to deal with the violence of the masculine collective consciousness. Individual men can be quite civilised, but put them together into a gang and their level sinks to the subhuman with the lowest common

denominator urging them on. We have not yet evolved the humane structures and consciousness to resolve this kind of situation. Indeed many people still think that war is the best way to resolve differences.

One more point - It seems that good and evil do not exist in the same way when people are in a state of non-duality, beyond the normal polarities of manifest existence. This makes no sense at all from the level of the rational mind, whose job it is to deal with polarities and their resolution.

You will perhaps not regard this as an adequate response to your letter, but the issues you raise have defeated the rational philosophical mind since it evolved in India and Greece! Incidentally, I regard Book 2 as the least good of the three and Book 3 as the most important, which is why many of the quotations about the Divine Dichotomy came from there.

With all good wishes

David

Dear David,

Thank you for your very detailed answer. As I suppose that you have your letter in front of you, I will not have to quote those parts to which I shall refer.

First I want to make one thing very clear: I believe in the existence of God, or to make it clear: I KNOW it from personal experience, and this knowledge is similar to that of Pascal. I am also coming nearer and nearer to the conclusion, that something in our way of thinking is wrong and that we are on the best way to the (or an) apocalypse.

But to your letter. To the three lines of the concept of God which you pursue I want to add a 4th, which comes out of Judaism and of my personal experience: God is certainly unfathomable, but to design HIM as benevolent is, what we would call wishful thinking and a very late one as such. The whole basis of Christianity is after all based on the view of God as the stern Judge and on the benevolent intervention of Christ. Why should otherwise every Mass start out with the words Kyrie Eleison -

God have mercy upon us? If He were really beneficent there would be no need for that expression.

Judaism, on the other hand, claims that every concept we have of God is by necessity wrong, as it is based on and limited by human understanding. As already said by Maimonides: God is beyond any understanding. This fits in rather well with my personal experience. After my "light experience" or meeting with GOD in the light, I was shown that the Hebrew word for God, Elohim, if read backwards, becomes a short sentence meaning: "who he is not", and when God met Moses at the burning bush he was told that God has no name, since "Eheye" is a process, "I shall be" and not a name. God's "name" in Christianity, Jahve, is not a name either, but again the description of a process "He or It shall be", and you cannot name something which is in constant creation, something which is not yet but shall be. Therefore also the translation of EHEYE as I AM is a mis- or rather partial translation. It should be: I am and shall be, for all eternity, as there is neither time nor space for God the creator. (This I received directly from the Source).

This enables every Generation or rather every age or era to redefine its concept of God.

According to this view there is (or was) a constant interaction between God and mankind and befits the biblical sentence describing the creation of man: In HIS image. This must be a very unusual concept for you and for most people: a god who «is» not but defines Himself as "I shall be who I shall be". And he continued telling me: I am everything and nothing at the same time.

Up till recently my belief system was very similar to that of Walsch and in my first book on the Bible I said that God was depicted in the story of the Paradise as a kind of "Greek Chorus", an entity which does not interfere directly, but, exactly as Walsch said, only through the acts of other human beings. But, to quote an Israeli writer: why do we need such a God at all? A God who does not intervene is a God who basically does not exist. But....your line No.2, which is also defined as God is dead can be seen as 'our existing concept of God is dead' and that could open the gateway for a new view or concept. These are the subjects I am working on at this moment. I am also working on a 'Dialogue with God' but in German. My 'GOD' however is the one who has revealed himself in the so called Old Testament and is very 'interested' in creating a new image for himself. HE also claims that the Hebrew Bible is much closer to reality (or truth) than our 'modern' western science. As I am talking about channelling I cannot but agree, especially as my own experiences in healing certainly do not fit this type of science. So I just listen.

But back to Walsch. My main problem with his writing is that I agree too much with what he says, and this is exactly its danger, since that has always been exactly the way the Adversary operates, and believe me, he does exist. It is our modern denial of him that opens the gates and allows him to enter. This was also the way Hitler chose and that was the reason nobody recognised him until it was too late. As I said in my first letter: He, Hitler, knew exactly what he was doing. Until 1939 he preached peace while preparing for war. What he did was misusing the power of love-and he was very conscious about what he was doing. He was not 'unevolved' but became willingly the servant of the adversary. This, by the way, is the only way to understand the holocaust.

There are, however, some Jewish mystics who bring up the possibility that the Holocaust represent the 'birthpains' of the Messias. Who knows? As I said before, the way of the adversary is to propagate ideas that sound good. Once the listener (or reader) is convinced (trapped or caught), he slides in something which furthers his aims, and that is exactly the danger he represents. But Walsch's God states very clearly that there is no such thing as the Devil. Neither is there good or evil, and that brings up the question of whom Walsch is talking to, whom is he serving?