

Theology, the study of God

Zoology is the study of animal life. It is a science.

Theology is the study of God. It is a science, no doubt. Repeatedly we find the term “theological science” in the Catechism.

When studying an amoeba, an owl, or an elephant, these animals are the objects of study. Their bodies and living habits are investigated.

When studying God, He is the object of study. While one cannot investigate His body and living habits, one investigates the words of His Son, Christ, as the science of letters does it with the words of Shakespeare or Goethe.

But whether amoeba, owl, elephant, or God – all are equally objects of study to the studying subject: man.

Theologians, the “authorities on theology” (Webster), i.e. the authorities on the study of God, are scientists. Scientific work requires the division into subject and object. Without this division science cannot come into existence.

This division is due to the Fall. By the Fall man broke away from the original Wholeness into Separatedness and found himself in a subject-object world.

Only a people having profoundly experienced the Fall and is conscious of it, can arrive at such a science built on Aristotelean logic. In Japan or China e.g.

no such science originated, quite in accordance with the fact that no such experience of the Fall exists there. Nowhere else do we find a story equivalent to the Biblical Fall. If the experience were there, the story would exist, but it doesn't. There is no feeling for original sin. There is ignorance, but not sin.

Being men of Western culture, theologians are heirs of original sin. Being Christians they are redeemed by Christ. But being theologians working on the study of God along the lines and by the means of subject-object separation, they counteract the redemption and reveal their heirship to the Fall in a striking way. Here is the theologian, the subject, and over there is God, the studied object. This very thought, is the Fall, not as a past historical event, but as an event constantly repeated by the theologian's consciousness. Theology is the perpetuation of the Fall. By theology the Fall has become chronic. The fallen nature of theology, its way of “knowing good and evil”, became most evident in the Inquisition that under the name of the Holy Office terrorized Europe for more than 400 years.

The ordinary theologians succeeded through the centuries to widen the gap ever more, between an Almighty God on one side, and a miserable human creature on the other, man who can only be saved by God's incomprehensible love and grace. In not transcending “good” and “evil” the theologians

undermined the influence of this love and grace of God and still do so. The same Almighty God and His incomprehensible love and grace they did not hesitate to make the objects of their studies.

What has qualities can be studied. An amoeba, an owl, an elephant to a certain degree can be investigated scientifically according to their qualities, although even they escape science in their True-Reality. Even though knowing all about an owl's shape, colours, weight, ways of procreation, provision of food and other living habits, we do not know anything of the owl's Reality. That cannot be learned by scientific approach, but only by inner experience: OWL!

Only objectified truths can be the subject matter of scientific study. Only an objectified god, disintegrated into many qualities, can be investigated scientifically. God has nothing that could deliver Him into the hands of scientists. He only can be experienced: !!!

It is in the tradition of the Christian Church, however, to approach religion scientifically. This "approach" is a separation, an alienation. In the Catechism we even find expressions like "economy of salvation" and "deposit of faith", terms derived from the world of business and banking.

It is man's intelligence that studies God. As far as this intelligence goes, so far goes god. The one studying and the one being studied, they are not two. The size of the studied god is equal to the size of the studying intelligence.

"But we say that God is incomprehensible!"

Why then do you study Him scientifically? The word "science" is derived from the Latin "scire", precisely in its meaning of "to comprehend".

"But we rely on the Scriptures, on the words of Christ!"

They are hearsay, not personal experience. The meaning of these words goes as far as the consciousness of the hearer, of the reader, goes. The ordinary consciousness being caught in the subject-object realm receives only according to this capacity. A poor radio renders the most brilliantly performed symphony a disagreeable noise. Even with reports within the realm of the ordinary consciousness, we can observe such distortions: A reporter after having interviewed a natural scientist on his discovery comes up with a report on the scholar's activities without any experience and knowledge of his own in this field. He just repeats hearsay and willy-nilly interprets according to the state of his mind.

With theology the distortions are even worse, because the Bible is of another state of consciousness.

The zoologist, at least, comes into direct contact with the object of his study.

Where is the direct contact of the theologian with God? Did he arrive at deep enlightenment, at the sudden awareness of Unobjectified-Truth? For sure not. If so, he would not busy himself with theology; there would be no theology.¹ Such an experience thrusts science applied to God out of man's hands as a totally useless instrument in this realm. Let's hear Jacob Böhme:

“I don't need the formulas of philosophy and theology, since I haven't learned it from them . . . “

This is the reaction of a man who by deep enlightenment experienced God, who was “granted the vision of God ‘face to face’ ”, as such an experience is formulated in the “Supplements” of the New Catechism (p.569). Science can get no foothold on religion. It is similar to trying to climb a rock by the help of a boat.

The very precondition of science, the division into subject and object, direct outcome of the Fall, makes it impossible for science to be applied to religion. When reading and studying the Bible without having undergone the sudden overwhelming experience of enlightenment, without having caught a glimpse of the world where there is no I and no You, we cannot grasp the Truth, no matter how brilliant our intellect. To interpret the Bible led by nothing but the ordinary consciousness, to explain the Bible on this level of information is presumption. People who do not even know themselves, who never have experienced who they themselves are, how can they tell us about God? How can they make statements about God and formulate dogmas, doctrines infallibly? The inquisition is among the outcomes of this “infallibility”. Based on the doctrines procured by the infallible, the Church persecuted Meister Eckehart, Jacob Böhme, Angelus Silesius, and many others. Even the writings of St. John of the Cross were temporarily under suspicion. Where the experience of Truth manifested itself, the Church often attacked, leaning on the dogmas and doctrines of the theologians. But who attacks the Truth, attacks Christ. Truth evidently then is not what the ordinary consciousness thinks it is. This is the same today as in the times of Christ. Crucifying Christ is not just a past historical event.

Science studies phenomena and things which the scientist considers outside of himself. Theological science can study only an external god. But the Bible says:

¹ What is called “mystical theology” is not theology in the sense of a science. It is the account of personal experience.

“. . . behold, the kingdom of God is within you.” (Luke 17,21)

“ Thou art gods.” (Psalm 82,6 and John 10,34)

What can be done? By studying we cannot come to “know” God. There is only one way to arrive at the “knowledge” of God: to go deep own into ourselves, not by studying our body scientifically, not by psychologically externalizing our psyche, our soul, but by an almost artistic absorption in our-Self: without any thoughts, any ideas, ourselves just being there – without any qualities – sheer being – and there, in an instant, in a flash we experience Truth, that truth that ages of study and crowds of scientists fail to arrive at. This Truth has no colours, no form, no qualities whatsoever, and certainly no names. Even calling it “Truth” is wrong: It is that TRUTH which is not opposed by any lie. The TRUTH is neither true nor false, neither holy nor profane, neither light nor dark. It just IS! I just AM!

There is neither IT nor I. There is only IT. There is only I.

It is not a “uniting with God”. There are not two. It is not seeing God “face to face” – there are not two faces.

Undergoing this experience, we do not “get” anything “new”. We only realize that IT has been there all along without our having seen IT. And there is nothing but IT.

The inexpressible was given many names: GOD, TRUTH, REALITY, ABSOLUTE, PERFECTION, all synonymous. But none of these names can tell about this experience, neither can the word “Ungrund” of Jacob Böhme, or the word “KU” of Japanese Zen-Buddhists. What cannot be expressed by words, by names, cannot be the object of scientific study.

Without undergoing the experience we go on forever groping for some truth or truths. But the addition of all the truths in the world does not make TRUTH.

Without this experience we are behaving like blind young dogs, seeing nothing although being bathed in brilliant sunshine.

The way we see by our ordinary consciousness is nothing but blindness.

According to the original sin, we see everything as “good” or “evil”. Looked at by the ordinary consciousness, a saint is good, a blasphemous man is evil.

But this is not the only way to look at things. For a transformed consciousness a saint is Saint, a blasphemous man is Blasphemous-Man. Looked at by the ordinary consciousness, theology is one of the great absurdities the human mind has produced. For a transformed consciousness it is just: Absurd-

Theology. The broken glass is Broken-Glass, the furious boss is Furious-Boss. Seen by the ordinary consciousness, a crippled man is a poor defective being.

For a transformed consciousness he is: Crippled-Man.

“Then, shall we not try to cure a crippled man?”

But of course, we try to cure him. If we succeed and he gets healthy again, he is Healthy-Man. Before, he was Crippled-Man, Perfection. Now he is Healthy-Man, Perfection. Perfection, Reality, did not change in the least.

This is the world of CONSCIOUSNESS. Realizing all characteristics, each one without exception is THAT. But THAT, GOD, TRUTH, BUDDHA, CHRIST, MOHAMMED, REALITY has no characteristics. Such is the paradox of CONSCIOUSNESS. The paradox is there only for our ordinary consciousness. To live thus CONSCIOUS is to Live-in-Christ, is to live-Buddha-nature, is to live-Allah. In this CONSCIOUSNESS we transcend the Fall.

Is theology arrived at by the awareness of this CONSCIOUSNESS, by being this CONSCIOUS?

Kamakura

January 31, 1971

(Brigitte D’Ortschy)