

BI 20

THE LIE

THE PROCESS  
CHURCH OF THE FINAL JUDGEMENT  
LONDON  
April 1970

COMMUNICATION TO ALL BRETHREN (INFORMATION)

Brethren, As it is,

The basis of conflict is a lie.

And the lie is the image of divergent interests.

Truth is awareness of reality. A lie is unawareness of reality.

The truth which prevents conflict, is awareness of a fundamental unity. The lie which creates conflict is unawareness of a fundamental unity. The awareness is blocked by an apparency of divergent interests.

And conflict within expresses itself as conflict without. Strife between the soul and the body and between the two sides of the mind within one individual, manifests outwardly as strife between individuals, as strife between groups of individuals, and finally as strife between masses of individuals. And at the root of every conflict is the same lie; unawareness of the fundamental unity.

But outwardly every conflict is different, and therefore has its own particular manifestations of the lie. The basic lie is the same for all conflicts; the superficial lies, which stem from it, are different.

Consider any controversial subject; any subject on which there is strong and aggressive disagreement.

On both sides there are positive attitudes, ideas, viewpoints, opinions, desires and interests, upon which there is no disagreement.

For example, let us suppose that both sides are agreed that peace is a good thing, that relief of suffering is a good thing, that the halting of pollution is a good thing, that unity is a good thing, that happiness is a good thing, that contact is a good thing, that co-operation is a good thing, that love is a good thing, and so on.

No conflict here; no lies.

But as either side steps into an area either of defence or attack, as soon as disagreement manifests, lies begin to appear. They must, otherwise there would be no basis nor material for antagonism, for condemnation, for accusation.

'It, he, they, are wrong; I am right.' This is fundamental to each side of the conflict. And from that basic precept, every argument, every piece of evidence, which the mind throws up, is calculated to reinforce it.

There is no detachment—moments of apparent detachment, and a great deal of protest of detachment, but no real detachment.

The Game is one of conflict, and we all live by it, whether we are willing to admit it or not. It is our life pattern and we conform to it. And for that we need lies.

But lies are not necessarily deliberate and conscious untruths. They are usually

superficially and always basically, the result of sincere ignorance.

For all the time, whichever side of a particular conflict we are drawn towards, the mind is sifting and filtering in favour of that side; taking what will help, rejecting what will hinder. There is no consciousness of this. It is compulsive and automatic. Consciousness is not required; in fact it would hinder the operation with scruples if it were allowed to intrude.

The result is lies. The mind creates them for us; half-truths, distortions, misjudgements, inversions, biases, prejudices, miscalculations and anomalies.

Each side, in so many words, calls the other side a liar. 'What he says is wrong, and therefore not true', is the basic argument in every open conflict.

'What they say is a lie.' That is the theme song on both sides.

At the cooler end of the scale it means: 'They have their facts wrong. They are mistaken.' At the other end, when the threats involved have grown to desperate proportions—either threats felt or threats actually voiced—it means: 'They are deliberately deceitful. They are insincere.~

The absurdity of this is so obvious that it seems incredible that we can go on taking part in these charades. But it's the nature of the Game. We must go on. All our instinct tell us to go on.

If the powers of the East and the powers of the West, sat down and really looked at the struggle between them and the manner in which it is waged, they could not fail to see the absurdity of their accusations against one another.

Are we really to believe that there is scarcely a grain of sincerity in the corridors of power on either side? Are they all self-seeking charlatans, who lie and cheat and scheme for their own personal ends?

Even closer to home; are we to believe either of two major political parties in their accusations against each other, of lies, treachery, betrayal, double-dealing, unscrupulousness, power-seeking, greed and insincerity; or the accusations of a third against both of them?

And even if we do not, even if they themselves do not, there is no way out. If we and they believe their accusations, then the blindness has reached insurmountable proportions, and if we and they do not believe their accusations, then we are already deep into the territory of conscious and deliberate lying!!

But again, it is the Game. And in order to play it, we must be convinced, or at least convince others, that our opponent is some kind of a liar. Our entire case is founded on this.

And it is true; but, mutually true, not unilaterally true as we have to believe.

2

Take any movement or party or group or structure or ethic or ideology or religion or philosophy, which has had any impact, any significance and importance, and listen to the cases 'for' and 'against.

The case 'for' could be truth. It could be based purely on accurate validation. But assuming the existence and effect of a case 'against'—whether potential or actual— the advocate 'for' almost certainly feels the threat of opposition. Therefore he almost certainly enters the area on the defensive, which is already the territory of lies, sincere lies, unconscious lies, perhaps; but lies; positive lies, in favour of his client, negative lies against the opposition, and of course accusations against the opposition, of lying; deceit, prejudice, stupidity, misrepresentation, and so on.

The case 'against' is in the territory of lies from the start; because by its very nature it sets out to attack. The prosecutor is automatically within the conflict. All his mental processes assist him in his work, and the result is inevitably, lies; honest lies, sincere lies, perhaps; but lies. And, naturally, accusations of lying; deceit, treachery and insincerity, as well as. misjudgement, miscalculation and error.

You only need to compare the two cases, the one 'for' and the one 'against', to see the extent of the lying between them.

And the advocate 'for' can detect all the lies—and a few more—in the case 'against. And the prosecutor can detect all the lies—and a few more—in the case 'for'.

There is virtually no truth in the situation on either side. Because on both sides there is the drive of conflict; the drive to attack and defend. This precludes detachment, and makes lies inevitable; all stemming from the basic lie, which is unawareness of the fundamental unity between the two opposing sides.

This basic lie can be summed up in the attitude: 'My side is right; yours is wrong.' From this stems all the ancillary lies, the ammunition for the game of struggle.

Everyone is willing to admit that this attitude is a lie on one side—the other from his own. But who is willing to see that it is a lie on both sides?

'I am good; you are bad.' 'I am right; you are wrong.' This is the expression of the fundamental lie.

Because we see only the superficial difference, we assume it is basic. And of course, if one side must be 'right' and the other 'wrong', then we have no choice but to make ours 'right' and theirs 'wrong'!

If later we change our minds, we may change sides. But the situation remains exactly as it was.

3

And why is this attitude a lie; the attitude, 'I am right and you are wrong'? Because it stems from unawareness of the fundamental unity between us.

It is impossible, basically, that one of us is 'right' and the other 'wrong'; because we both stem from the same basic source point; we are both channelling the same life force. We are two aspects of one existence. If we are opposites, then we are balancing opposites, not conflicting opposites.

But who is aware of this—truly aware of it?

Even when someone admits that all men are brothers, he qualifies his admission with the assertion that his brothers on the other side of the fence have gone astray. They may be his brothers, but they are still wrong, and they are still liars and cheats. How sad!

This is no awareness of unity.

And even when someone cries: 'Peace! No more war!' all he means is: 'Stop killing each other. Let's just shout at each other and accuse each other and insult each other.' He is not advocating unity, but simply different and less physically drastic weapons. And possibly he is also waging his different kind of war against a different kind of enemy.

Conflict remains. Disagreement flourishes. Antagonism abounds. The lie is still firmly entrenched.

The lie is the basis of the Game. And lying is the nature of the Game. We must lie in this way to fulfil our conflicting roles in a Game whose very nature is conflict, and therefore requires conflict to keep it going.

The Game needs lies to promote it. We are the players and must provide the lies. So we must be subject to the fundamental lie, which is unawareness of the fundamental unity.

And we Processeans are no exception. We live like every other human being in blindness of the fundamental unity of all humanity. For us, one way is 'right' and the other is 'wrong'. We are 'right'; they are 'wrong'. We feel it, we see it, and we express it. But it is still a lie.

What we call 'wrong' and 'GODless', is no more nor less than the other side of the same coin. It is as much a part of us as we are of ourselves. It is simply the other side of the Game. Even the most GODless island rises ultimately from the same seabed as every Process island.

To us it looks evil, because we are this side of the Game. To it we look evil, because it is that side of the Game. But basically we are both parts of the same divided and conflicted Game.

4

The Game and the players of the Game, which is all of us, create the anomalies by which the Game is played and propagated.

Examine the nature of sincerity.

What is sincerity? What is insincerity?

Is someone insincere because he dare not admit the facts? Then is fear insincerity?

Is someone insincere because he chooses one path in preference to another, and fights for it with every weapon he can find? His choice is his own, for whatever reason.

Is someone insincere because he justifies, to himself and others, what he feels is an inadequate way of life?

Is someone insincere because he presents an image of himself to the world, which has little connection with the way he really sees himself?

Then all of us, on one count or another, are insincere. All of us are liars.

And which of us does not believe that his way is 'right' while its diametric opposite is 'wrong'—despite outward protests of tolerance; live and let live?

Even fiction encourages us in the view that there are those who are primarily if not all 'good', and those who are primarily if not all 'bad'.

As children, from the earliest age, we are brought up on this view of humanity. We are fed and nourished on it. The nature of the divisions vary, but there are seldom no divisions.

Even the ultra-tolerant are strictly and severely divided against the intolerant. One thing you cannot be tolerant of is intolerance. Because no human being can simply be tolerant; he has to stand for tolerance. This gives him an outlet for his own suppressed intolerance—which is usually what tolerance is—but

it also defeats his purpose.

Prejudice is an unhappy state. But the unhappiest state of all is prejudice against prejudice. Because it is an anachronism.

Intolerance is misery. Intolerance of intolerance is lunacy—but just as inescapable.

Each and every one of us is prejudiced and intolerant. When its us, or someone with whom we agree, we call it morality or ethics. When its those with whom we intensely disagree, we call it what it is; prejudice and intolerance.

We have conditioned ourselves to the belief that some people are 'right' and others 'wrong', and that the world is divided between them.

And we have taught ourselves that we must be identified with the 'right' side. (There is no escape in identifying with the 'wrong' side, because that then for you becomes the 'right' side!)

When we discover that such black and white distinctions do not really exist—not in people, only in the pressures from within—that even within this basically false division of 'right' and 'wrong', people are a compromise, part one and part the other, then we have to manufacture the distinctions.

Because we must take part in the battle. We must fight for what is 'right' against what is 'wrong'. Therefore we must make ourselves primarily if not all 'right', and certain others—depending on which battlefield we choose—primarily if not all 'wrong'.

And we must remain unaware that basically we are all the same; each playing the separate and individual role that he must play to make up the Game.

And to escape from it is not a matter of seeing the other person's point of view. We can do that and still disagree with everything he stands for.

It's not a matter of recognising that it might be us who are 'wrong' and they who are 'right'. We can do that and change sides.

It's not a matter of seeing that everyone is basically good. We can do that and still be convinced that some of them have gone or been led astray.

It's not a matter of further compromises, but of recognising that each of us, together with the opposites for which we stand, is an essential part of one and the same pattern.

What I call 'right' and 'good', and what they call 'right' and 'good'; two diametric and conflicting opposites; are two halves of one basic whole. In fundamental terms neither is either 'good' or 'bad', 'right' or 'wrong'. They are both realities; and two halves of one overall reality.

And each is based on a monumental lie. And the lie is blindness to the fundamental unity which exists between it and its other half.

When I condemn them, it is because I do not see that they and what they stand for are basically the same as me and what I stand for. When they condemn me, it is because they do not see that I and what I stand for, are basically the same as them and what they stand for.

Both of us might know about it analytically. We might speak of the brotherhood of man and all men being equal. We might even agree on the facts set down here. But we do not feel it. Therefore we do not truly know it.

Our feelings tell us that we are in opposition, not only to, but against one another. And those feelings are the manifestations, the expression, of the lie.

And as long as that lie persists, as long as our unawareness of the fundamental unity continues, those feelings will continue, and the resultant conflict will continue, expressed or inhibited, it makes no ultimate difference.

And it is the nature of the Game that the lie should persist.

5

If I were to say that because of these facts, it is 'wrong' to feel or express or manifest conflict, the whole value of knowing these facts would be lost. I would simply add another dimension to the conflict.

No; I say simply that conflict is the nature of the Game, and we are all parts of the Game. And conflict both stems from and propagates lies.

We shall continue to condemn what it is our part in the Game to condemn, as long as we feel it. And our opposition will continue to condemn what it is their part in the Game to condemn—us—as long as they feel it.

We belong to the Game and they belong to the Game. So we are subject to the lie and they are subject to the lie.

Like gladiators in the arena, we are forced by the Game—as long as the Game is one of conflict—to fight against one another. We have no more choice than they have.

But, if this knowledge can give us that grain of detachment, that glimmer of light within the darkness of the lie, then that is its value.

When you feel the instinct to oppose, to condemn, to express the feeling of being 'right' against what seems to be 'wrong', in the form of antagonism, then stop for a moment and look for the lie. Look for the superficial lies which the mind throws to you as weapons, and also remember the basic lie of divergent interests.

Do this and you will experience at least a part of that grain of detachment, that glimmer of light.

But the knowledge carries no 'should' nor 'must' with it. That would make it useless. It carries no 'morality' nor 'ethic'. That would destroy its worth. It is to be absorbed by whoever's part in the Game it is to absorb it, and whatever comes from that absorption, whatever degree of freedom or release or detachment comes from absorbing this knowledge, is another vital and inevitable aspect of the Game.

He that hath an ear, let him hear. He that hath not, let him not. Neither is right, neither is wrong; neither is good, neither is bad; just two sides of one coin.

So be it.

- Robert

ROBERT DE GRIMSTON