

LOGOS Seminar

Report by Heather Porter

Who are we referring to when we speak of the “New Child?” This was the first question we explored in the LOGOS Foundation Conference at Sunbridge College in June, led by Georg Kuhlewind. He was joined by several other leaders in the field of education and health, who each offered us their wisdom from a unique perspective: Linda Garofallou, from her work with infant massage; Mariola Strahlberg, from her experience with Brain Gym; Will Crane, from his experience in spatial dynamics; and Gregor Simon-MacDonald, from his work in caregiving. After days of delving into the various qualities found in this new state of consciousness, it became clear that we are not referring here to the child who is incarnating too quickly due to dietary, environmental and other influences, but rather to the child who is remaining

exceptionally open to the spiritual world and thus has great perceptual gifts. But many of these new children are living quite outside of the (physical) body and are having trouble orienting to the world of space and time. As a result, they are having difficulty attaining healthy ego integration.

The next question we explored was, “How can we help these children and support them in their process of incarnation?” We spent the days gratefully receiving the knowledge and experience from the speakers as well as the participants, doing meditative exercises together, and essentially trying to experience living from the perspective of these children. In the end, however, I believe a number of us were struck with the perhaps unexpected questions arising in our minds, such as “Where do you draw the line

between the 'new child' and other children, or even myself, or can you?"

In the field of early childhood education and health we speak of the "Indigo Child," "Crystal Child," or "New Child" because to give a name to a newly born state of consciousness is necessary or at least helpful in recognizing it and communicating about it as we do our work in trying to meet the needs of children. But as great poets know all too well, as soon as a word is put forth, it frustratingly limits what is truly indescribable. It puts an undefinable experience within definable boundaries. Alas, we live in the world of language. Naming is necessary, and clear expression is a beautiful challenge that we face as human beings.

But what happens if the name is removed for a brief time, and only the characteristics remain, endless in number? How does this change one's perception of a subject?

In retrospect, I see that I went into the seminar with my impressions about the "New Child" somewhat bound up within the name, inside a box. (How easily can our thinking unknowingly fall into that box, even with the best of intentions!) With deep gratitude, I left the seminar with a more experiential understanding of this new state of consciousness, outside of the boundaries, outside of the box. I left with a much broader view of the continuum, without the dividing lines. It is so easy to slip into dualistic thinking, such as the difference between "that child and this one," or between "that child and me." This seminar reminded me that every one of us lives on the continuum somewhere, and though we are each unique, every one of us is connected to a degree. If you'll forgive the linear image, I find it helps to give clarity: in terms of perceptual openness we have the well-balanced but still open "Indigo" children at one "end," somewhere in the middle are the numerous children with so-called ADD, and further along are autistic children who live in extreme openness and vulnerability, most extremely outside of their bodies.

Though it is impossible to relay all that was shared and experienced in the seminar, I would like to reiterate this particularly important point: we need to remember that these challenged

children are quite literally further along than we in certain gifts—they're already passed something that for us is still a task, as Mr. Kuhlewind says. And it is our job to become more like them in many respects, not the other way around. To protect their keen perceptual gifts, we can't try to hide. We need to have the courage and humility to be honest, through and through—to resist hiding a little sadness behind a happy face, for instance. What happens when we hide, even in the slightest? We give them reason to doubt their perceptions, which prevents healthy ego integration, and eventually leads them to feel wrong, bad or even "crazy" as they grow into adulthood. We need to, particularly through meditative exercises, extend ourselves into their world, and resist the temptation to try to make them fit into ours. We need to help them through their strengths, never through their weaknesses – to observe what the child likes to do well, and start from there.

The answers to the questions of how we can best help with each unique child, within each unique moment are available to each of us. Of course, we all know that it takes work—but almost entirely from the "soft will," as Mr. Kuhlewind calls it. It needs to come from our higher will, our gentle will, not our "hard will." Less is more, and to do less from the hard will takes incredible strength and courage for most of us. It requires us to pause when a particular child is having a difficult moment—to simply observe, lend support with our attention, and let him or her just be (unless of course physical safety is threatened). To offer the child unconditional love with the unspoken message that they're okay, they're not wrong to be who they are—this is truly the best gift we can give them, and indeed must give them.

Heather Porter graduated from Sunbridge College in 2004 and is currently pursuing certification in energy healing with the intention of working with parents and children. She attended the LOGOS Conference at Sunbridge College June 2005.