CHAPTER 6.

SYSTEMS OF THOUGHT.

In seeking to win over the hearts and minds of men and women, the one advantage Christianity has, over other religions, is to proclaim the incarnation was planned from the beginning of time, and includes us, because God seeks man's friendship. In contrast Muslims believe, I understand, that Allah would demean himself if he sought man's friendship. Atheists presumably think that it is all self-deception anyway. Yet the Protestant Churches continue in the present dire situation to advocate the worship of the Risen Christ to the exclusion of all else, although in 2000 years this has not improved the way the world is governed. This is not surprising as he wisely washed his hands of the problem. So in practice, the Protestant Churches' interest in the need to maintain Law and Order is satisfied by making a few unctuous prayers about it. They concern themselves only with the individual. That is not good enough, as most people recognise. How can one pray to the Jesus that the Church venerates, "O God of battles, steel your soldier's heart"? This high-lights the inability of the Church to offer any response to force or aggression, except submission and suffering, compatible with their Gospel. Neither clergy nor laity recognise that an era of 2000 years has ended, and that a new leadership and camaraderie are required.

Church-goers, and in particular their leaders the clergy, do not understand that it is a perfectly rational view that they have betrayed society, by washing their hands of its welfare. You would have thought that the last War, which we so nearly lost at Dunkirk, in the North African desert, and in the Atlantic, and in which Germany finished off her destruction of Europe, would have reminded the Churches of the need for Order in society. But today that all seems long ago.

To neglect the truth that the incarnation includes us, and with it a duty to administer the world properly, is surely folly, with so much at stake?

The world may not be in a happy state in 2017; but I would have thought it is fairly obvious that religious rivalries ought to be a thing of the past. We are all in danger of being blown to smithereens by an atomic war. In this situation, I do not believe that bigots of any religion have the remotest chance of building a decent, just society. We all have limited knowledge and understanding of any situation we find ourselves in, and are therefore fallible. So I would suggest that it safest to regard anyone who claims to have all the answers with the gravest suspicion, including all those who profess one-precept creeds. And safest to feel our way forward as best we can, recognising the need always to use one's own judgement; and best of all to have a judgement unfettered by preconceptions. The Almighty is unfettered by preconceptions; and one advantage of an indwelling with Him is that one shares His lack of preconceptions. There is no licence to pursue one's own ambitions, and a bitter pill to be told they are irrelevant; instead one has the inspiration an indwelling with Him provides.

A man must have some certainties in his life. And I began my book, Man's Relationship with God, by claiming that reality is spirit, and that the greatest reality in this created world is a communion between two persons, or two souls, adding that any soldier would agree that comradeship is everything. If Heathcliff's relationship with Catherine was an indwelling, it was one in which Heathcliff destroyed everyone round about himself. But then neither of them acknowledged the reality of God. And this is the danger of trying to find permanence without God; each demands too much of the other. So my attempt to seek an indwelling with another, but within the parameters of the divine indwelling, was surely an honourable aspiration of the human spirit? And Man's Relationship with God was equally obviously the creation of a system of thought that described, and tried to validate, what I had attempted.

Francis Bacon, an incredibly intelligent if immoral man, described most of our cherished beliefs as idols of the tribe and idols of the market place. In modern language, our most cherished beliefs are part of the prevailing system of

thought that our particular society has chosen to adopt. Every society has to adopt some system of thought and belief, to retain any coherence; and there is very little thought in a society outside its prevailing system. If a society tries to be multicultural, and tries to please everyone, it loses its coherence.

One conceives systems of thought best in mathematics and science. Euclid's geometry, based on its axioms, is the most perfect system, and cannot be improved upon, if one confines oneself to Euclid's 3-dimensional space. This is good enough for ordinary purposes, but even looking at an ordinance-survey map its inadequacy shows in the deviation between grid-North and true-North. And in the navigation of aircraft on inter-continental flights it is useless. So it does not fit in perfectly with human experience. Another system is Newton's theory of gravitation; this again is a perfect system and cannot be improved upon. It is satisfactory for large areas of science, and good enough to get men onto the moon, but proved unable deal with electro-magnetic fields and light and radio waves. Its application was more widespread than Euclid, but still did not fit in perfectly with experience. Einstein's system did not modify Newton; it was a new Relativity system, and fitted in better with modern astronomy. And so we go on. But these are small systems, and every country develops its own vastly bigger system that embraces language, what it regards as common-sense, art, science, and all its spiritual values. The scientific systems exist within it, and often influence it profoundly. Newton's system did in Britain and France; the encyclopaedists may even have helped to trigger the French Revolution.

The same is true of the mental or spiritual world: psychology and theology. These systems too never fit in perfectly with experience, and always need to be refined. For the Church to claim that its Creeds were immortal truth, as it sometimes has done, is just nonsense. It is as absurd as claiming to have plumbed reality on finding a new sub-atomic particle that exists for a fraction of a second. And Man's Relationship with God is simply my exposition of the new and unconventional system of thought, that my spiritual adventure demanded.

All conventional thought takes place within the well-tried system of thought that a community has evolved, of which the conventional thinker is a member. It is extraordinarily difficult for anyone to think thoughts right outside the culture and the system of thought, in which he, or she, has been brought up. Even rebellious children end up being like the parents from whom they have rebelled. Partly this is genetics, no doubt; but partly it is the influence of the culture and the system of thought in which they have lived. One may momentarily be able to voice some outlandish idea. But the ability to live out that idea in one's daily conduct is quite a different matter, because it demands a system of thought to back up the outlandish idea; and that system simply does not exist until you create it. Every distinct society has its own system, and a language to accompany and accommodate that system, which have evolved over a long period of time. None of these cultures and systems of thought will fit in perfectly with the reality of the created world, anymore than scientific systems do. They will have their good points, and their bad ones. And there is nothing whatever wrong in convention, indeed most people depend on it to lead their lives, except that in time a conventional society will ossify or stagnate. New thinkers are vital to the life of any community, though always opposed.

Both in my experience and from my reading, I reckon an individual needs an apprenticeship of three, four, or even five years really to think up something new, and think it through. And of course conventional people will look askance at him. Scientists have usually greeted new ideas with cautious opposition, until the idea appears to be confirmed by experimental proof; but then science's approach to life is comparatively superficial. In religion, where ideas mean life and death, new ideas are met with diabolical fury. As St.Paul wisely says, it is best to make sure that having preached to others, one is not oneself a castaway. And it is probably right that Jesus was tempted in a way few of us can appreciate, and as none of us could have withstood.

So far I have been using religious language, which as I have repeatedly pointed out many people do not share. But one can avoid the language of Incarnation, and free oneself from the confines of orthodox Christianity by taking the human mind as one's starting point. In taking this as one's starting point, one is limiting one's view of life; but one can still bring in religion, if one wants to, by saying that the spirit of God lurks in the depths of the psyche. And taking this starting point is surely more likely to lead to success in dealing with the problems of Artificial Intelligence and Cyber Space, than starting with the view that the soul is miserably sinful? It always surprises me that the Church does not champion Ptolemy's astronomy as opposed to Copernicus, Kepler and Newton. But perhaps it considers views on astronomy irrelevant to life, as St. Ambrose did. If it considers the problems of Artificial Intelligence irrelevant to life, it is in for a rude awakening. You either solve them or perish. That is why I think that for the C.of E. to dismiss Jung's offer of a conversation about his findings in regard to the human psyche was a most disastrous decision.

We are entering a new world, in which the very existence of human society is at stake, and the Church does not even know the vocabulary to take part in any debate. Even if one clings to the historical tradition of one's country, as I do, is it not time to clear the decks and be prepared to tackle the problems of the future with as few preconceived ideas and as much ingenuity as possible? Are not two salient features of the mechanical world that threatens us, a demand to be able to communicate world-wide with everyone and everything, and a robotic push-button procedure to replace human contact? A belief in telepathy, and a working knowledge of archetypes in the subconscious, would seem the minimum knowledge necessary to begin to suggest a spiritual solution. Unless you believe Spirit is supreme, you are going to lose! So is not the best course to ask God himself how He proposes to out-trump these mechanical dangers? And for that, you need an indwelling with Him. You need Him deep in the psyche.