

Charity's Views on Jesus Christ

Before I report what discussions I had about Jesus Christ with Charity, the CIE who was my Spiritual Professor and teacher, I must clarify a few terms she used. One is "The Great Teacher." While I have covered that under my Course Manual on The Human Essence <http://www.dissociation.com/2007/docReader.asp?url=/GreatTeacher.txt>, I would like to repeat some of that here.

In the process of reincarnation, certain individuals were asked by Charity to be her students, so that they could progress over many lifetimes to be the experts on their subjects of interest in their time and place. If they agreed, then they ended up being such an expert in their last incarnation. Charity reported that Jesus Christ had been one of those chosen individuals. This life we know about in Israel was his last incarnation, and he was then destined to not reincarnate as another human being. He would join the group of Personalities who had already become part of the "Think Tank in Thoughtspace" called The Great Teacher. Prior members were Plato and Aristotle, among many other leaders of their time and locality. Their Personalities had been upgraded to be like Essences, so they no longer needed bodies to function, and they gave advice to the CIE, such as Charity, based on their extensive knowledge of living on Earth in many incarnations.

Charity also told me that the CIE supervising the Essence of Jesus were totally in charge of his body, therefore his speech and action, during the three years of his ministry, from age 30 to 33. They had to make sure he did not use his free will to deviate from the schedule and script which The Creator had laid out for him to follow. He was not allowed to make any mistakes, due to his own emotions, in what he was needed to do during those three years. However, there were no recording devices, such as tape recorders, video-recorders, or cameras to accurately record what he did and said during his ministry. Unlike today, there were no reporters on duty to listen to him and write daily reports of his sermons. Whatever he did do and say was perfect, and according to the Life Plan he was needed and expected to play at that time and place.

The other term one must understand is "Free Will." When Charity uses that term, she means making choices which deviate from one's Life Plan, as laid out by The Creator. Free Will is used primarily by the emotional Personality of an individual and leads to talk and action which might upset others, or lead to actions which will hurt the individual or others. I often call it "Free Will To Mess Up," as it will often lead to results that are not pleasant and orderly. The Creator designed it as a teaching device for us humans, as a trial and error method of teaching. Without making "mistakes," we cannot learn very much. But this type of Free Will must not be confused with the political definition, which is freedom from domination by any government agency on what we can do or say. That has a positive connotation and could be construed as "obeying a Higher Power." In that case, an individual exercising his free will to speak the truth in a politically sensitive situation might be following his Life Plan, and therefore not exercising his Free Will to Mess Up.

Also, in this conversation, which took place in 1995, I quote some passages in the Bible, and also

in books written by biblical scholars. I do not know exactly which books by which authors I was reading in those days, except for the reference to a female author. That one is Elaine Pagels, a biblical scholar at Princeton University. So I can't give accurate references and hope the reader will forgive me. I would like readers to pay attention to the words which are quoted, as that is what Charity and I were discussing at the time. The one group I can be sure of were The Jesus Seminar group of scholars, who were located in Santa Rosa, California, when they wrote their books on what they thought Jesus really said and did. Robert W. Funk is the primary editor of those two books, "The Acts of Jesus: What Did Jesus Really Do?" and "The Five Gospels."

So now I will start reporting on that conversation with Charity about the life of Jesus, and it seems that I had read something from these biblical scholars's works just mentioned. I believe that I implied that the CIE were operating in Jesus' day through religious leaders.

Charity: What you have quoted in terms of us as priests or pastors or reverends or bishops, the Pope, there was none of that. Our teaching was direct at that point in time, when part of The Great Teacher came down onto your Earth.

Ralph: The one called Christus.

Charity: The one that has been called Jesus Christ.

Ralph: Known as Christus to the Romans, who claimed to be King of the Jews, which is why they executed him.

Charity: At that time, humans had basically stopped listening to us. There was a movement on foot that our teaching was not giving the humans a free will to go about with what they needed to do. By bringing down part of The Great Teacher at that time was to have the humans realize that, with their free will, the world was not destined to survive because of the attitude of destruction, of hatred, of not following and listening to Essences, by doing their own free will. Before that time, when we were doing our aspect of teaching, and they were most cooperative, they enjoyed and were beginning to revere ourselves. We did not want that to happen.

Ralph: That's when we had all these gods to worship?

Charity: That was what you humans had to have to – What we basically had to do, because of the reverence that they were showing unto ourselves, we had to take away that reverence and submit it into, as you would quote, the gods. They had the serpents; they had the Apollo, Mercury; they had Zeus, I think is another aspect. You had Aphrodite, as another. You had Diana. We gave them that part of it to take the reverence away from ourselves. We did not want that. That is not our teaching method. We are not to be revered, no matter what. We are not to be worshiped. That is not our responsibility. The Creator is to be worshiped. The Creator is to be revered. We are not. We are to carry His message.

Ralph: But there was this conflict then between those groups who had this god of this and this god of that, and they had these gods living as human beings.

Charity: Correct

Ralph: The gods were mating, having children, coming down to earth, and breeding children who were half gods.

Charity: That's correct, because humans needed that aspect unto themselves to make the gods more personable unto themselves and brought them bodies they needed to have, to make themselves feel the same as The Creator would feel. That would be what you would call the beginning of The Deception.

Ralph: The other conflict then was the Jews and the sect that became the Christians, which was not anywhere else in the world.

Charity: No.

Ralph: There is only one God. But the Jews had labeled this as a vengeful God that would punish people that didn't obey His rules, and I have heard that in the Jewish temple since that time, which seems like a bad, hostile parent.

Charity: Right.

Ralph: It doesn't match. And Christ said it's a loving God that loves all of you even though you are a doing awful things. Which is a more positive thing which is what my father was teaching, as an improvement over the Jewish God. But there is still only one. Nobody debated that, and they would not have a god of this and a god of that and a god of the other. But then they also prided themselves on sacrificing themselves. Like Christ was killed, so if they were killed, they were like Christ, and you end up annihilating a large portion of the population that way, which is not a very productive way to proceed.

Charity: No, it is not.

Ralph: I couldn't quite see why they were all laying themselves open for execution.

Charity: What they saw in part of The Teacher was the aspect of a forgiving nature which most of the humans up until this time also did not have. They saw in The Teacher something that they wanted to have. Therefore that is why they were sacrificing themselves to be the same as what The Teacher was.

We don't care what kind of religion they care to worship, just as long as it does not indoctrinate or change the role of the human at that time. We chose for them not to be a follower of things and follow blindly.

Ralph: Instead of listening to their own Essences, listening to the turned Essence of a cult leader.

Charity: Most correct.

[I will now skip to a latter part of the conversation.]

Charity: The term “Jesus Christ” is part of The Great Teacher, OK? He’s not the son of God.

Ralph: He said so.

Charity: He may say so.

Ralph: I’m just telling you they’ve got it quoted.

Charity: In what book?

Ralph: I can show you here [in the Bible]. Really, she went through this. If I can find that part. Because that was an issue. That was one of the battles. OK, it depends on which Gospel you’re reading.

Charity: Again, it’s from the book you call Bible.

Ralph: That’s correct, and what I am saying is –

Charity: And it’s a man made concept.

Ralph: Correct, that’s what she is pointing out here. You’ve got four different men writing four different books about the same general area and subject matter, written at different times from different perspectives, from different regions. Now when it comes to “the son of God” statement, here is one which is written in the Gospel of Thomas, which was not approved for the Bible, and where it is stated, “The kingdom of God symbolized a state of transformed state consciousness,” and not some physical place where Christ will be the legal ruler.

Charity: Right.

Ralph: Which is something he could not get over to his disciples.

Charity: Correct

Ralph: Nor to the Romans who executed him for saying, “I’m the King of the Jews.”

Charity: Correct.

Ralph: [Here is describe how each Gospel writer had a different view of just who Jesus was.]

Charity: We have a question for you. If the Creator had created a son, why would he send His “son” down when he has ourselves to do His work?

Ralph: I don’t know.

Charity: The Creator is eternal. Therefore The Creator does not need to fashion a son to replace The Creator, because The Creator is forever.

Ralph: When, that’s why I have been a bit confused. Here is the quote out of John which we hear, John 3:16-18. “God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten son that whosoever believed in him should not perish but have everlasting life. Whoever believes in him is not condemned but whoever does not believe in him is condemned already because he has not believed in the name of the only begotten son of God.” Now that’s quoted over and over again.

Charity: We are sorry, but again our question is: if The Creator is to live forever, why would he fashion a son to take over when The Creator is no more?

Ralph: Which only lived 33 years.

Charity: Right.

Ralph: Well, now Thomas has a different message.

Charity: Answer our question.

Ralph: I don’t have an answer to it. I’m just saying we were talking about –

Charity: That long statement that makes no sense.

Ralph: There is a lot about human mother Mary and about what they had to – Thomas offers a different message. Far from regarding himself as the only begotten son of God, Jesus says to his disciples, “When you come to know yourselves, and discover the divine within you, then you will recognize that it is you who are the sons of the living father.”

Charity: Correct.

Ralph: Jjust like Jesus”

Charity: Correct.

Ralph: Now the Gospel of Thomas was not approved for the Bible.

Charity: Of course.

Ralph: It makes the same point. One is to become, not a Christian, but a Christ. This I believe is a symbolic meaning, the writer says, attributing the Gospel of Thomas to Jesus' twin brother. In effect, you, the reader, are the twin brother of Christ, when you recognize the divine within you. Then you will see, as Thomas does, that you and Jesus are, so to speak, identical twins.

Charity: Correct.

Ralph: Now that is something I can relate with.

[Here I go to a later part of the discussion.]

Ralph: Let me point out here and maybe you can clarify this one, as he mentions that “the angel of the Lord”, he is talking about Jesus “being given flesh in union with his human mother Mary and the spirit of the living God.” Now, here again, we have the immaculate conception idea.

Charity: Is that the term, is that the one that they state that The Creator entered a human and created a baby?

Ralph: That's exactly what it says here.

Charity: That is impossible.

Ralph: Let me clue you in on the why of that one. That's covered in here, too. The concern was that, again, that was a part of the terminology of the day, the translation. It is unclear whether or not Mary, mother of Christ, and Joseph, listed as his father, were married or not at the time of his birth. If they were married, there is no problem. But one translation of the word that they use for Mary, which was basically “young woman,” was as a “virgin”. She had not had sexual intercourse. And therefore, when she became pregnant, it was an illegitimate pregnancy. Now the writers could not support a person with an illegitimate pregnancy to be King of the Jews.

Charity: Correct.

Ralph: So they had to make a story that she was not illegitimately pregnant, she was pregnant by God. Joseph never had sexual intercourse with her. Therefore it was not an illegitimate pregnancy, because they weren't married yet. It was a divine pregnancy. And I'm saying that's the way they wanted to cover themselves in case the translators made this an unwed woman having a baby.

Charity: First of all, that's incorrect. Because The Creator cannot do that.

Ralph: I didn't think He needed to. If He wanted to make a baby, He could make a baby. It would be right there.

Charity: The Creator has created everything. Why should He bother to create another human being when the human beings are creating themselves?

Ralph: I'm just saying that this was the political cover of the possible illegitimacy of Christ. They were very concerned about his physical heritage. It's like kings. You've got to be the son of a king and the grandson of a king to become a king. If he wasn't the grandson of some great people, then he was not eligible.

Charity: Right.

Ralph: I don't think there was any guarantee that Mary and Joseph were or were not married. Nobody know that.

Charity: Right, but the term that we are stating here is that, first of all, The Creator does not need to do that. The Creator is not going to do that. If the Creator chose to make another human being, He would make another human being and place it onto the world.

Ralph: He made the first ones, anyhow.

Charity: Right, so why would The Creator bother to have a human carry a so-called seed of The Creator when The Creator has no gender basis anyway?

Ralph: He wouldn't have any sperm hanging around anywhere, either.

Charity: The Creator has no body parts.

Ralph: Right, He's got nothing to contribute.

Charity: So that's our question. How can that be, when The Creator is not a gender based entity?

Ralph: Well, let me ask you then bluntly, was Jesus the Christ the bona fide regular child of Mary and Joseph who were listed in the census as his parents? Born, just like I was with my parents?

Charity: I don't know if you are ready for this.

Ralph: OK. That sounded like a simple question.

Charity: It might blow your belief system away.

Ralph: Look, I've already lost every belief system.

Charity: Yes, it was their child. Pure and simple. It was their child. It was nobody else's child but theirs.

Ralph: They came to Bethlehem, and the child was born while on the trip.

Charity: That's the normal aspect. They were married; they had a baby.

Ralph: They planned the whole thing?

Charity: Right.

Ralph: Ok, because also, we talked about Essences having control of the pregnancies, so if there was no need for a baby, Mary's Essence would have stopped the pregnancy.

Charity: Right, that's correct. But you have to remember that part of The Great Teacher had to be born and that was part of The Great Teacher.

Ralph: And that was the last incarnation. He had been born many times before building up to this one, right?

Charity: Yes.