

THE OTHER SIDE OF HEALING IS HURTING ----- ELLIOTT #1920

"Wholeness" and "healing" have become, illicitly, synonyms--and the two together have become, blasphemously, synonyms of "holiness." This thinksheet seeks to clean up this gooey mess.

1. Who profits from the gooey mess? Certainly not Biblical religion, which (1) sees holiness as only a derivative human quality (derived, by our opening to grace, from God's nature), (2) understands healing as (a) divine action undoing damage done directly or indirectly by God, (b) whose will the healing is working out within-and-beyond the individual, and (3) thinks of wholeness eschatologically-liturgically, ie, as the future fulfilment of the divine will to doxological oneness, all creation praising God with joy. To put the Biblical perspective negatively, none of our three words can be legitimately applied to humanity collectively or distributively. The tone and tenor of the Bible stands against the "saved" individual (orphically-narcissistically), the "saved" people (nationalistically-chauvinistically): it is for the "saved" creation, finally rescued by divine power-grace from suprahuman and human betrayal-disobedience. ("Love" softens this paradigm, thank God.)

2. Who profits from this unbiblical-antibiblical gooey mess? So many I'll mention only a few: (1) HPers (human-potential-ers of all sorts); (2) Therapeutae, religionists the heart of whose religion is the mystery/science of "the healing process"--healing being "where the action is"; (3) Christian and Jewish clergy who are (a) intellectually lazy and thus inclined to cognitive gooeyness, or (b) convinced that Biblical religion is at heart a therapeutic cult; (4) false shrinks who promise "wholeness" to their customers oracularly (ie, ambiguously, so they're "covered" if the customer winds up with something less); (5) social-changers who belabor unwhole society with victims' unwholeness, the victims being viewed mainly as passive mirrors of society's unwholeness, sickness, and unholiness (holiness being located by them in "the person": "moral man, immoral society"); and (6) single-energy-flow scientists and philosophers (eg, Teilhard) for whom the antonyms of our three words are illusions or underdevelopments.

3. Honest religion being highly improbable (as truth-evading is a prime function of religion), I have no hope "till Kingdom come" of radical religion's making much impress on populace, the religious authorities, or state. Neither did Jesus, though he's been perpetually transmogrified so as to be "relevant" to this or that. The instance this thinksheet is primarily concerned with: The Biblical God, primary Source of hurt and healing (roughly parallel to the Hindu Kali), is to be feared and loved--but the gooey revisionists would have us scratch that "feared," so that "God" will be "on the side of" whatever we want the divine to support: ourselves, "healing," "the poor," et al. This makes mishmash of much of Biblical teaching--eg, atonement.

4. God's power to hurt is a healthy factor in repentance and conversion. Eg, Ac.13.12: The governor is (my tr.) "overwhelmed with astonishment" at Christian teaching vis-a-vis the blinding of an antiChristian magician. Feel the threat in such Biblical phrases as "May God do so to me and more also...." and "Escape from the Wrath to come!" The current American evangelical revival revives this dark side of God, the Hurter-Healer. My guess is tha the gap between this the Biblical God and the Healing God will widen.