

Where Is Love in this War?

by Rev. Arthur W. Chang

As one committed to Process Science of Mind I find myself from time to time thinking of the issues of my day and the way the central tenets of the Principles I hold dearly apply. For it is not merely God in which I am interested, as if God was some mere abstraction of philosophy or idol worshipping-I am interested in what God looks like in the world of creation, evolution and in our ongoing human affairs.

It is Valentine's Day as I write this article and initially I had no intention for it to be The *Word* article. Rather I wrote its unedited version for the Founder's Compassionate Care Ministry and sent it to nearly one hundred people on my e-mail list whether they wanted it or not. I am aware that the prophet must have been the early version of the latter day telemarketers who call us during dinner and on weekends without any regard to whether we want to hear from them or not. Of course, William Hocking says, "A prophet is a mystic in action." So the tradition is whether people wanted to hear it or not, the prophet, who was often far from being perfect, was an avenue of God's Truth. Though I can make no such lofty spiritual claim, as one who practices a Process Spirituality, I cannot ignore, and not participate in, the process of interfering with the world in the name of love and peace.

I have, therefore, been wondering what the world would do without love; where would it be without it. In Old Europe, where the battle lines were often drawn between kingdoms, young royal women were married off into the royal families of other nations to provide, at worst an unholy alliance, and at best, a new bud of hope for better relationships and even friendships. This practice, perhaps, gave a more concrete expression of St. Paul's phrase, "Better to marry than to burn." We may say of Old Europe, love was a pawn that meekly went about its business of being the catalyst of transaction of commerce for that turning world.

Today with the battle lines of war clearly drawn between the "righteous" and the "unrighteous," and where we are quickening the pace of cementing the attitude of "Get them before they get us," and further, "You are either with our President and our country or you are not," I cannot help thinking about the earlier incarnations of those polarizing phrases during the Vietnam war. How strangely right the opposition to that war seems to be with time! "But what about Hitler?" you shout, and I say touché! Only this is neither Vietnam nor Germany and working as if it is, is the big danger. We need to see as clearly as we can what stranger forces we are going to unleash upon our world and

whether war is the only option. This is the time for all reasonable men and women to come to the aid of their country and their world.

Where is love in these issues of life and death and the aftermath of war and all this in respect to the ascendancy of terrorism in the American consciousness? Is terrorism the lost face of love, a love too narrowly focused, self-absorbed, and too divisive; a love that does not see itself as a servant to a greater cause of wholeness, justice and peace as it did in Old Europe? Is it still better to marry, to relate more lovingly than to burn in the fission and fusion of energy that could be better spent serving us than killing each other?

Where are the voices of reason in all this war-making and what should be their role? Are they to be hushed into a pseudo-patriotic silence or does the gravity of our situation warrant the best thinking of which we are capable? Are we so filled with the venom of fear and hate that even "reason" now sounds more like t-reason? Are we not to question our own actions in the name of the broader portfolio of love that nudges us, individuals as well as nations, to the production of the young, the future-towards evolution? And what kind of future is there to be for our young people? Is the way of the Middle East the new model of the ubiquitous "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth," not a civilizing justice as the Hammurabi/Mosaic rule first intended, but a tragic personal, vindictive war without end-Amen?

Is it of any importance to us that the less powerful have already displayed the propensity of a more wide-spread terrorism by the use of suicidal bombings that can go on for countless generations? And is the won peace to be merely the time of gestation for others to find a new strength to attack us again after we have beaten them into submission? Could love really play a bigger role? Is war our only option?

What, for example, would happen if we gave Iraq more time as France, Russia and Germany suggest? What would happen if we wait for consensus from the greater World Body as the former President, Mr. Clinton, suggests? After all, but for term limits, he might still be president, his personal challenges notwithstanding. Would we be less patriotic if we wait? More foolish, you think? What if this thinking led us to a way to work out these conflicts without a war, without the loss of young American lives-would that be any less acceptable to us?

The world we live in is the dangerous place we have made it. The danger arises when love is fractured and relationships fall apart, and anger, resentment, and force take love's place. There may be no royal princesses to marry off to our enemies but love is not limited to one form. Perhaps a good place to start is for nations to simply sit down and talk with each other about their concerns and work harder for a new peace, one with love, to break out all over the world.

I believe Process Science of Mind must engage the issues of the world and not work as if Principle is something separate from creation. Our two central principles are Love and Law: the way all things are one-and the way all things, not *appearing* as one, still *work* together as one.