

Oct 12, 1960.

Dear Dick, "Evasive" would imply that I am avoiding deliberately (since my eyes are supposed to be wide open) a logical or reasonable reply to your questions & remarks. So let me take all your specific questions as a minimum and segregate the topics, thus:-

(1) GOD Why did I choose this particular word?

(You & I know it is semantically precarious & carries a heavy "charge" of meaning, put there by theological know-it-alls.)

(a) Well, first, what is the origin of the word? The Jews used Yahweh (or at least JHVH leaving the vowels to be forgotten as the name was tabu), Jesus used "abba" (Father) in Aramaic. The Jews also used Adonai (Lord), Elohim & other words.

"God" is not cognate with "good" apparently & is some old German or Gothic deity, now obsolete. He may have had a wife & may have required weird rituals. I wish I knew more of his origin!

However some names for the One are very impersonal & ineffable like the Tao (Way), the Brahman, the Dharmakaya, etc. Others are personal like Allah, Jehovah, (Yahweh), God, Krishna, Siva, Brahma (the masculine member of the Brahman trinity - there is one temple to him, none to the Brahman), Chemosh (the god of the Moabites who amuses me by his name somehow, as also Lord Dunsany, & to whom Solomon made a "high place" outside old Jerusalem, but who was a bloodthirsty old ruffian, worse than Jehovah if possible) & so forth.

Now the first group we naturally call IT. (including the "Absolute")
The second group we naturally call HE.

(She's are rarer, Isis, Diana, Kali, etc.)

INEFFABLE DEITIES

I find in practice that I have a harder time with Buddhists for example because they will only exchange ego's pride for their ineffably ineffable.

Since the ineffably ineffable is so remote they too become inaccessible, since ego has pitched his goal deliberately (!) out of reach, inconceivably.

He JUMPS RIGHT OVER THE HORSE. "He" means a Buddhist student e.g. whose "Dharmakaya" is very remotely ineffable (like the word "Absolute")

HUMANLIKE DEITIES

Conversely the Jews, Christians etc. have an anthropomorphic "God" whatever they say to the contrary. In practice he reflects their anger, frustration, racism, weariness, & so forth. They JUMP SHORT OF THE HORSE.

We want to jump RIGHT ON THE HORSE of course. Now since the One Self is intimately associated with us, although NOT on a "personality" basis I have less trouble PULLING THE JEWS, CHRISTIANS UP A BIT than PULLING THE BUDDHISTS, TAOISTS, HINDUS, INTELLECTUALS, PHILOSOPHERS, ETC. DOWN A BIT, A BIG BIT!!

It is a practical matter. Ego can take a delight in being very SUBTLE, very OCCULT, very INEFFABLE whereas the primitive religionist can be too childish, affectionate, etc. instead of CHILD-LIKE, SIMPLE, LOVING.

over
pleas