

This is a conversation between Ralph Allison and Charity, a Professor CIE.

BIBLE

Charity: What you have quoted in terms to 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 -

C: The one that has been called Jesus Christ,

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

C: 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 that soon was going to happen was, is not destined to survive because of the attitude of the 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. We wanted the humans to

R: That's where we had all these gods to worship?

C: 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 Aphrodites, 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.

R: 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.

C: Correct

R: mating, and having children, coming down on earth and breeding children that were half gods

C: That's correct, because the humans needed that aspect unto themselves to make the Gods more personable unto themselves and brought them the 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.

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

C: No.

R: 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 bad, hostile parents.

C: Right

R: It doesn't match. And Christ said, "It's a loving God that loves all of you even though you are 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 still is 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.

C: No, it is not.

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

C: 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 do not have "a forgiving nature." They saw into 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.

C: 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. That is

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

C: Most Correct.

R: Alright. So his next comment is "It is often difficult to sort through what is my flesh or humanness and what is truly source from the spirit of the living Christ"

C: We know it is difficult for him to decide which is part of his free will and which is part of his Essence. But it is not the spirit of the living Christ. We are most sorry on that aspect. It is Essence, not spirit. The spirit of Christ again is there for, again, a part of the Teacher.

R: The concept is similar to what you have described to me about your functions. "In my spiritual tradition, when I have detached myself, my emotions and my preconceived thoughts or notions and I'm not trying to control outcomes for others, the Holy Spirit fills me."

C: That's not the Holy Spirit, it's the Essence that is then allowed to communicate with his Emotional Self. And we would like an explanation regarding Holy Spirit and filled.

R: Good luck. Then we have "this Holy Essence"

C: No. (laughs)

R: "has promised to never depart from me"

C: Of course, it's not going to leave. The Essence is part of the human.

R: But it doesn't have to go promising anything.

C: There's nothing to promise, it's there. It's going to be there forever, until the day he ceases to exist.

R: Anything that has to be promised has to be separate in the first place.

C: That's correct.

R: And it has no essential part to play.

C: Correct

R: Therefore anything that is promised to him has to be there anyhow. "and will dwell with me until I am separated from this flawed body and reunited with my maker who will give me a flawless body."

C: No.

R: "with the Essence which he entrusted me to dwell in without any dichotomy."

C: That makes no sense unto ourselves. What he is stating there is that he's going to come up to The Creator and be given a spiritual body that when the Christ has come down and resurrected, will then come back. And that body will come back. My question is, "What body is going to come back?"

R: You see, none of them are going to take that into account.

C: Again, Holy Essence does not equate. And fills, we're sorry, it's part.

R: It can't fill, because there's no vacuum.

C: That's right.

R: "When this Holy Essence fills me, I become somewhat more like a vessel or channel having let go of those emotions and cruddy thoughts that distort or distract from what the Holy Spirit seeks to accomplish."

C: Again, he's using terms. Holy Spirit is ourselves, the CIE, therefore he is correct on that aspect. If he's listening to his Essence, of course it's going to keep him away. And that he can be

communicated with the CIE.

R: Now, "this Holy Spirit is part of a trinity which is of the same Essence and in harmony with each other's functions and will."

C: No. Read that one more time.

R: "The Holy Spirit"

C: The Holy Spirit does not equate, that's the CIE.

R: I'm just saying, that's what we were talking about before. "is part of a Trinity which is"

C: We are already a trinity, we are the Spiritual Guardian, the Teacher and the Professor.

R: He didn't know that.

C: We gave him that definition. Becky did.

R: I don't think he knows it. "which is of the same Essence" and that's not true.

C: The Teachers of the Essence

R: "and in harmony with each other's functions and will" OK but

C: Will – no. Each other's functions, yes. To have the desired functions. OK.

R: OK, Somehow, I'm thinking that he

R: When the terms themselves are not being clearly defined

C: Correct

R: "in summary, my ability"

C: This sounds similar

R: This sounds similar to the CIE as you have described to me. "In summary, my ability to fathom and understand the wisdoms and mysteries of life and truth."

C: We're sorry, we're not

R: The other thing, there is something called "mysteries of life and truth"

C: There are no mysteries of life and truth. Life and truth are one, and there are no mysteries. You listen to your Essence and you will not have mysteries. Go ahead.

R: "mysteries of life and truth are – his ability completely inadequate" I agree with that. "and shallow. Without the counsel of this Holy Spirit, given to me by my Lord and Master, Jesus Christ, the son of the Creator, the Holy Father that preexisted as the Angel of the Lord prior to being given flesh in union with his human mother Mary and the spirit of the living god."

C: No, no, no, etc.

R: I just had to get it all in there.

C: No, no, no, no

R: That is all organizational religious gobbledegook.

C: Well that states in the whole attitude, first of all, the term "Jesus Christ" is part of the Great Teacher. OK? He's not "the son of God." It is

R: He said so.

C: He may say so.

R: I'm just telling you, they've got it quoted.

C: In what book?

R: I can show you here. Really, she went through this. If I can find that part. Because that was an issue. That was one of the battles. Ok, depends on which Gospel you're reading, ok and

C: Again, it's from the book you call Bible.

R: That's correct, and what I'm saying is

C: And it's a man made concept.

R: Correct, that's what she's pointing out here. You've got four different men writing four different books about the same general area and subject matter. OK, written at different times from different perspectives. From different religions, 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 more "The kingdom of God symbolized a state of transformed state

consciousness," and not some physical place where Christ will be the legal ruler.

C: Right

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

C: Correct

R: Nor to the Romans who executed him for saying, "I'm the King of the Jews."

C: Correct

R: It is "one enters that kingdom when one attains self knowledge." And that is what the Gospel of Thomas, which of course was rejected by the people who put the Bible together. So then, in that one, when he says, "Who is Jesus?" they give a different answer from that in the Gospels in the New Testament. Mark, for example, depicts Jesus as a utterly unique being, the Messiah, God's appointed King. According to Mark, it was Peter who discovered the secret to Jesus' identity and he asked, "And who do you say that I am?" and Peter answers him, "You are the Messiah." But the Gospel of Thomas tells a different story and, when he said, "Compare me to someone and tell me who I am like," Simon Peter tells him, "You are like a righteous messenger." Matthew says, "You are like a wise philosopher." And Thomas says, "My mouth is wholly incapable of saying whom you are like." And according to these interpretations, Matthew's claim was that he was a Rabbinic teacher, Peter said he was the Messiah, righteous messenger, but Thomas represented an inferior level of understanding and could not assign a specific role to him. He transcended that moment of relationship of disciple to master and Jesus declare that Thomas has become like himself. "I'm not your master for you have drunk and become drunk of the bubbling spring. Whoever drinks from my mouth will become as I am, and I myself will become that person and things that are hidden will be revealed to him." Then it says, according to John, Jesus is not a mere human being, but a divine eternal word of God, God's only begotten son who descends to earth in human form to rescue the human race from eternal damnation. Now that's the key thing they keep bringing up.

C: 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?

R: I don't know.

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

R: Well, that's why I have been a little bit confused. OK, 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.

C: 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? Is that not

R: Which only lived 33 years.

C: Right

R: Well, OK, now Thomas has a different message.

C: Answer our question.

R: I don't have an answer to it. I'm just saying we were talking about

C: that long statement that makes no sense.

R: Anyhow, there is a lot about human mother Mary and about 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."

C: Correct

R: "just like Jesus."

C: Correct

R: Now the Gospel of Philip, which again was not approved for the Bible

C: Of course,

R: makes the same point. One is to become not a Christian but a Christ. This I believe is a symbolic meaning, the writer says, is 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.

C: Correct.

R: Now that is something I can relate with.

C: Relate with

R: Now, one who seeks to become not a Christian but a Christ, no longer looks only at Jesus and later to its church and its leaders as most believers do, as a source of all truth, so while the Jesus of the Gospel of John declares, "I am the door. Whoever enters through me shall be saved," the teaching of Silvanus points in a different direction. "Knock upon yourself as upon a door, and walk upon yourself as upon a straight road, for if you walk upon that road, it is impossible for you to go astray. Open the door for yourself, so you may know what is. Whatever you will open for yourself, you will open."

C: Correct

R: "Why did the majority of the early Christians reject such writings as Thomas and accept other, possibly later accounts such as Matthew, Mark, Luke and John? Thomas appeals to people engaged in spiritual transformation but it does not answer the practical questions of potential converts who lived in and near Jewish communities scattered throughout the cities of Palestine and the imperial provinces. New converts asked questions like these: Do you want us to fast? How shall we pray? Shall we give alms? Are believers to follow traditional practices or not? According to the Gospel of Thomas, when disciples asked the living Jesus these very questions, he refuses to give them specific directions, answering only, "Do not tell lies, and do not do what you hate, for all things are manifest in the sight of heaven." That didn't tell them what to eat.

C: Of course not. It's not going to, either.

R: Isn't that strange? This enigmatic answer leaves each person with his or her own conscience. for who else knows when one is lying? And who else knows what one hates? Profound as such an answer may be, it offers no programmatic guidelines for group instruction, much less for the formation of a religious institution. The gospels included in the New Testament, by contrast, do offer such guidelines. According to Matthew and Luke, for example, Jesus specifically answers each one of these questions authoritatively and specifically. "When you pray, say 'Our Father which art in Heaven, etc.'" When you fast, wash your face. When you give alms, do so in secret. The rules are laid out.

C: Right.

R: The rules of God are stated.

C: Correct

R: In only the four that were published, and not in the 30 others that were not.

C: Correct

R: As for the cultural laws, Mark says that Jesus proclaimed all foods clean. Furthermore, while Thomas says that finding the Kingdom of God requires undergoing a solitary process of self-discovery, which I think you've been trying to encourage

C: Of course

R: the Gospels of the New Testament offer a far simpler message. One attains to God, not by spiritual self knowledge, but by believing in Jesus, the Messiah. Now that God has sent salvation through Christ, repent, accept baptism and forgiveness of sins, join God's people and receive salvation. That's much simpler than doing any thinking. I know.

C: How is that simpler. We don't understand.

R: You follow somebody else's rule.

C: So, in other words, it turns into a cult system.

R: You said that, not me. I'm saying that, going back in her other work, it was a matter of the times and there was the Gnostics who were saying, "Look up to your Essence and listen and pay attention since that is where you are getting all the answers." Also, they could only deal with highly mature people. They could not deal with baby Essences. Obviously they were not ready for this. Now, when you are doing that, you are dealing with a small percentage of the total population. Like, with multiple, maybe 8% of the population can do that to begin with. A church can't afford to operate on only 8% of the population. They need a lot more to pay the fees to run those churches and to fill up its congregational seats in the churches. So they, the bishops, decided that we must make it easier to get into our church. So all we need to do is say, "Everybody come in here, say this little ritual, dunk your head under water, and be baptized and you can be a member." Now it's a lot easier to get a lot of people that way then to expect them to learn anything while maturing.

C: So, in other words, by believing in something that will take care of you humans for a eternity, is a lot easier than trying to come to the realization yourself that you are what you are and you need to take care of yourself along with others. Is that not correct?

R: Well, what I am saying is – I'm pointing out that the Gnostics were interested in personal spiritual improvement. And they spent a lot of time trying to figure out how to do this, the same as I have.

C: Of course you have.

R: But they become part of the whole worldwide body of Christ this way. Now, that's quite an accomplishment for people who have been on the outs.

C: Right, we understand that.

R: So, that was a very practical way to go instead of expecting – you're not going to recruit into the church very many gnostics because they are not going to listen to the bishop.

C: Right

R: They are no use whatsoever in raising money to build a new chapel.

C: OK, we understand that. You understand on how you can answer him?

R: Not really. I'm sorry, we've got one last line down here. Let me also 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.

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

R: That is exactly what it says here.

C: That is impossible.

R: Let me clue you in on the why of that one. That's covered in here too. This gal's really got a lot of ideas. The concern was that, again, that was part of the terminology of the day, the translation, they – 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.

C: Correct

R: So they had to make a story that she was not illegitimately pregnant, she was pregnant by God. This husband over here got nowhere near her. And 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.

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

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

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

R: 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.

C: Right.

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

C: 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, to make another human being and place it onto the world

R: He made the first ones, anyhow.

C: 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?

R: Wouldn't have any sperm hanging around anywhere, either.

C: The Creator has no body parts.

R: Right. He's got nothing to contribute.

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

R: 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?

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

R: OK. That sounded like a simple question.

C: It might blow your belief system away.

R: Look, I already lost every belief system.

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

R: They came to Bethlehem and the child was born while on the trip. It's OK.

C: That's normal aspect. They were married, they had a baby.

R: They planned the whole thing?

C: Right.

R: OK, because also, we talked about the Essences having control of the pregnancies, so if their was not need for a baby, Mary's Essence would have stopped the pregnancy.

C: 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.

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

C: Yes.

R: So you have that personal knowledge of how this comes about, and she is an average person. In that regard, she is quite typical of Americans. That is something that we need to understand why there is a difference, because you have the Ten Commandments coming out there which said "God said, thou shalt not kill" Number one.

C: The Creator did not make up the Ten Commandments.

R: Really! I thought that was one of our guaranteed basic set of rules.

C: No.

R: No? Well we better get back and explain the Ten Commandments, then. Moses came down with his tablets and they were written there and he said they were written by God, if I remember the story correctly.

C: You can remember the story.

R: That's all I've got -

C: It's a story

R: Can you enlighten me? Because that is the basic rule for our civilized Christian country. The Mohammedan countries use Mohammad's rules.

C: The Creator does not have rules.

R: That's important, let's clarify that. How come the Ten Commandments are as solid a contribution from the divine powers of the world as we have in our history? You say it is not the way the Creator tells us to do or not to do.

C: The Creator – there are no rules. As what you would define as rules.

R: Wh000! You made your blockbuster, now would you elaborate on that?

C: Elaborate on "no rules"?

R: Yes, We have the Ten Commandments that are definitely a set of rules that we are told came from the Creator.

C: That you were told

R: Yes, that is what I am saying.

C: Where did the book that is telling you humans that this came from The Creator?

R: It was a tradition that was passed on for many eras, whoever wrote the books of the Old Testament that go way way back. I can't give you the author obviously.

C: In other words, it was a human

R: It was a tradition that was passed on through many eras of the Hebrew culture.

C: Which is another human line

R: Obviously we can only read books written by humans.

C: So this is justified as a false word or a – It could either be a total falsehood or it could be a rule that you humans needed to have at that time to make their lives justifiable with other culture. In our lives, what you call a rule is not a rule. It is a fact.

R: Now we are getting some basic accepted principles that you are calling into question.

C: First of all

R: Rules of God is a basic issue of all religions

C: Can you quote the Ten Commandments to us?

R: Well, number one is Thou shall not kill.

C: Which is correct. You cannot , there is no justification to ever destroy another Essence.

R: So I could easily say that rule is one of The Creator's rules.

C: It's not a rule. It is a fact. There are no rules in our realm.

R: Well, I don't want to haggle on the meanings of words. But I have to represent the entire human race this way. We have a concept, that is propounded to everybody everywhere, and I heard it last in that Jewish synagogue, that everybody must learn the rules of God, then when you've learned them, you must obey them all.

C: There are no rules of The Creator.

R: You are going to make a major controversy with just that statement alone. Just to let you know I'm just pointing this out. This is another sacred cow down the tubes. I have to deal with these sacred cows. I just have to understand why you are saying this. OK? But that particular, no. 1, thou shalt not kill, we consider a rule of God. That's the way it's labeled. Rule Number One. You say it is a principle to be followed by. OK. Nobody has a justification for killing any other human

in their lives.

C: Any other Essence.

R: Well, I don't have the right to kill Linda.

C: No, you don't.

R: Now, however, in our culture, everyone of those ten commandments seems to have a list of exceptions. And one of the list of exceptions, for example, is in wartime. You train people to go out and kill other people as soldiers.

C: Correct.

R: On both sides. That's a sample of an exception. Another exception is in self defense. If you are being assaulted by somebody, who is sticking a knife in you, and you have a gun, you have the right to shoot him because he's sticking a knife in you, and you're defending your life. Very few people would argue about that.

C: But the Essences already know what's going to happen to them, so therefore it is not an exception to the rule.

R: That's where it gets a little complicated.

C: How does it get complicated? It is a very simple, straightforward aspect that we deal with.

R: I'm looking at my lesson to Linda of situational ethics vs. legal ethics, where you get the

C: Right

R: the problem. And a rule is part of the legal ethic, and if you write out a rule this implies there are no exceptions, and you can be punished by somebody who enforces these rules if you break them.

C: But there are no rules in our realm.

R: So you don't need exceptions

C: There are no exceptions.

R: With no rules, you don't need exceptions.

C: Correct, because there are no rules.

R: You still have a principle to follow; the principle the Essence must choose when this body is to die.

C: Correct. Also they know when the body is going to cease.

R: They know and they are the ones who would be unhappy if you put them on a life support system beyond the point that they would wish.

C: Correct.

R: And see that is where we are going overboard on that because, as a human doctor, if I don't put someone on life support, I can be accused of killing them and violating the first commandment.

C: But you are not.

R: Tell that to our lawyers. They will take my license away for that.

C: You are following what the space we reside in dictates.

R: As I told Linda, when I was on Emergency room duty, my Essence knew that, all the doctors and nurses know that. It is the other folks telling us how to operate that gets in the way.

C: Correct.

R: If they would leave us alone, it wouldn't be a problem. You don't have people wanting people to die quickly. You are doing everything you can to maintain them, but you are not being foolish about it. You evaluate everything right there and you make judgements. There is nothing wrong with those judgements. The Essences are all there working together. I understand that.

Unfortunately, lawyers don't. Do lawyers have Essences? I'm not sure they do.

C: We just told you.

R: I'm kidding, but it seems as if they have forgot somehow that it's in there somewhere, cause they are not using those principles at all.

C: We understand that.

R: Now I do understand a little bit, I remember the history of the Ten Commandments, they had a new city and such being built there and there was chaos and disorder and Moses was their leader and he has to say, "Behave, folks, you know, Basically, here's our constitution for running this place. Don't kill anybody, Don't steal from people, Don't go stealing their wives."

C: What are the other avenues of these Ten Commandments? You quoted one.

R: Thou shalt not steal is another one.

C: Which means?

R: Don't take something from somebody that they own. Don't go steal his horse.

C: Why should that be a commandment from the Creator?

R: I'm just telling you, it's listed there as number two.

C: That does not exist.

R: If the man has a horse to get around, if you steal it, he can't get around. That's not right.

C: But why should one human have something the other human does not have?

R: Well, if the other human wants a horse, he should earn the money to buy the horse. Or he should ask to borrow the horse. He shouldn't go and sneak it out in the middle of the night without permission.

C: What's the difference between stealing per se and taking it without asking?

R: without permission. And therefore depriving him of something he rightfully owned in the first place.

C: But still there is not a commandment as per se or a rule from The Creator in our realm. We don't take something without asking. Why would it therefore be a rule of The Creator when The Creator knows what's – we all have the same aspects as all in our space.

R: Excellent point. I'm just bringing it up as another reason why so many people get to CMC and Avenal State Prisons, for stealing things.

C: That does not equate.

R: That's where we get the message that this is a no-no thing to do and The Creator disapproves of it, so therefore we should pass laws against it.

C: First of all, The Creator would not exercise That Rule at all because The Creator knows what we have in Thoughtspace, we're all the same for all of us. Therefore no rule would be passed or created by The Creator to make note of a human aspect. So that is not from The Creator.

R: Well, I think you can see it for a reasonable principle for a tribe of people setting up a little town.

C: That would be a reasonable explanation for another human to put that as a rule, but then use it as stating it, "It's not my rule," as stating the human, but God or The Creator's rule. That way it enforced why that rule was written down. Therefore as you say, it is not The Creator's rule.

R: I think you are quite logical about that. I'm just pointing out that was the second one that Moses brought down to his tribe from the mountain top where he said God gave it to him.

C: That makes two of the Ten Commandments. What's the third?

R: I don't have the book here but I do know others – Thou shalt not covet other gods before me.

C: Thou shalt not covet –

R: There shall be no other gods but me.

C: The Creator does not care who or what you worship, as we have told you. Just so long as you feel comfortable in your aspect and you have your spiritual growth. The Creator does not care. Therefore that is not another rule of The Creator.

R: Well, we have that rule as being proposed by everyone of those religious groups. We discussed this earlier that there were earlier times when the Romans and Greeks were worshiping a whole raft of gods. Jew, Hebrews, Israelites, objected to that and said there is only one God and stop worshiping all these other Roman and Greek Gods. This would enforce that.

C: What you are listing again is another rule that is brought down by a human that stated that you cannot do this, that there is just one thing that you can worship, and that is the only thing you can worship, that is not my law, but the Creator's. Therefore the Creator would not have said that.

R: The Creator did not care if they worshiped Zeus, and those other gods the Romans had?

C: Just as long as it helps your spiritual growth and you listen to your Essence.

R: Didn't the Creator support this change over to the one God idea which is pretty general right now?

C: No.

R: Didn't that make a difference on how people behaved?

C: No. The human population is still behaving the same way.

R: Ok, it has not been an important factor in their improvement which would hopefully happen and you would want improvement over the decades.

C: Well, of course. But anything that will make the humans feel more comfortable in their longing and finding a way of communicating with their Essences, is fine with the Creator. The Creator does not worry about how to come about with spiritual understanding. Or with your communication with your Essence.

R: Whether or not it is something The Creator would have laid down is another issue.

C: As we have said, The Creator created the human population. The Creator is not going to lay down these rules of conduct to the human population. All these are done by the human population to control the population.

R: Well, they've been used for that for a long time. Well, the next one beyond that is "Do not desire another man's wife, do not desire his house, his land, his slaves, his cattle, his donkeys or anything else that he owns."

C: OK

R: That's next to "do not steal" – do not want them. So I would think you would have the same reasoning as the "do not steal" issue. You are not there concerning yourself with owning these things.

C: No, you humans are

R: A good social rule

C: Of course, you are going through these somewhat fast.

R: I'm just trying to make sure we cover all the items, because those are all laid down as God's rules of conduct and every church goes by these things in what they preach. And then they stand up there and make you feel guilty if you have failed to follow them all. And that is a major control mechanism in our culture.

C: Again, it is a control feature that you humans have applied to other humans.

R: That is what it says." These are the commandments that the Lord gave to all of you when you were gathered at the mountain when you spoke with a mighty voice from the fire and from the thick clouds, He gave us these commandments and no others." No amendments allowed, I guess. Then he wrote them on two stone tablets and gave them to me."

C: Is that not what

R: There they were, written all out on the stone tablets.

C: Why would The Creator want to write out something that He delegated to the human population on fixed rules? There are no rules in our realm. Why should The Creator choose to have rules for the human population? Why would He need to change the avenue of the way things are run?

R: I'm looking at the setting of this, you see. Because, "Moses gave God's laws and teachings to the people of Israel. It was after they had come out of Egypt and were in the valley east of the Jordan River, opposite of the town of Bethpore, that he gave them all these laws. This was in the

territory that had belonged to King Sheehan, and the Ammorites, who had ruled in the town of Heshban. Moses and the people of Israel defeated him when they came out of Egypt. They occupied his land and the land of King Og of Bashan, the other Amerite king who lived east of the Jordan." So they come into this territory, conquered the people who lived there, and were setting up their own civilization.

C: Why would The Creator want to destroy another population?

R: I have no answer to that. I just quoted what it said here in this holy book. That they defeated him and occupied the land, which I assume the armies got into battle, and the Israelites –

C: Is this the book that Andy has said –

R: That's it.

C: This book here.

R: That's one version of it, yes.

C: Why do they quote this?

R: Because they have been told that The Creator practically hand wrote it.

C: Why would The Creator want to write this book?

R: These were documents that, whoever made the decision, thought were came – these were as true a version of the Israelites relationship to their God as existed.

C: This is what the humans believe and go by and live with. It makes no –

R: You have two parts, the Old Testament before Christ was born, and then the New Testament of Christ's birth on after that. What do you see?

C: (she reads and says "angels") First of all, The Creator would not have angels because The Creator does not identify ourselves as that.

R: They are all over there.

C: "but if I have no love, I am but a gong, however, I am a clanging bell."

R: St. Paul

C: (reading the Bible) They are talking about Faith "All the faith to move mountains, so if I have no love, I am nothing" What is he trying to do here? It sounds to ourselves that he is

R: The general principle is the conflict between God and Satan.

C: "I may give away everything I have and even give up my body to be burned, but if I have no love, it does me no good." Why would anyone want to do that?

R: I think we are talking about a formal religious sacrifice.

C: "Love is patient and kind, it is not jealous, or conceited or proud. Love is not ill mannered, selfish or irritable. It doesn't keep any records of wrongs. Love is not happy with evil, but is happy with truth. Love never gives up and its faith, hope and patience never fails." This just sounds like

R: Charity is the traditional phrase there. Faith, Hope and Charity.

C: "Love is eternal, there are inspired messages, but they are temporary. You speak in strange tongues"

R: What sections is that?

C: It looks like 1st Corinthians 13 & 14. "Faith, Hope and Love" What kind of love are they talking about? This makes no sense. It sounds like The Creator gives "speaking in strange tongues."

(looking at Bible)

C: "Meanwhile these three remain, Faith, Hope and Love, and the greatest of these is Love."

R: In the original one it was Faith, Hope and Charity. That is where the three things come from. Now, you asked about speaking in tongues?

C: Yes.

R: I have two different understandings of that. One is from what I understand was reported by the people that day and they were "taken over by the Holy Spirit". And they were in a foreign

country from where they had been born, and these people spoke a different language than they did and they didn't understand what these people were talking in this foreign country. You can imagine. When they were taken over by the Holy Spirit, they then were able to understand the language of these foreign people, even though they had not learned to translate it. That's what happened, I believe, to these people. It was a miraculous understanding of the foreign language. Now, that's not what it is meant when you talk about people today talking in tongues. Denny had this girlfriend next door to her for whom I got called once by Denny and she was speaking in tongues. What she was doing was talking in a singsong way, not a language I recognized but it could have been somebody's language. It was not just Jumble. It seemed to have a rhythm and a flow but it certainly was not English, or anything I recognized. She had been raised in a group that did this in their church services. They would go into this trance state and sing this particular kind of noise.

C: OK

R: They called that speaking in tongues. The Holy Spirit took over them and allowed them to speak in tongues. That is supposed to be a sign of being inhabited by the Holy Ghost.

C: That does not make any sense.

R: A lot of churches encourage their members to do basically what I consider hysterical fits and they go rambling on.

C: Do humans go by this book all the time?

R: Not really. I'm just pointing out that those rules that you read there are the core ten rules of the whole religion. And you didn't care much for nine of them. Not killing was the only one that you could fully agree that would have been written on the stones.

C: Of course. The Creator –

R: All the others were social control mechanisms a government should lay down for their people.

C: Of course

R: And that's what they have done. They take that and it becomes our criminal law. But all I can say is that the people who are Bible Toting Christians, they carry their Bible with them all the time, so they can look in a page and quote anything they want to support any idea they want to. Anywhere in her you can find a page that you can use to support any concept you want to.

C: Why would you want to do that?

R: It's a sacred book that you can't argue with. Because God wrote it, we are told.

C: The Creator would not like that.

R: Well, that is what all the churches teach all their members. I have to face that belief. (Bible reading that makes no sense)

R: My dad stuck pretty much to the New Testament, to things that Christ is quoted as having said. Though we have these other books here which indicate quite likely he didn't, that many of these things were made up by the writers several hundred years later.

C: Of course they were.

R: Again, as a use of Christ as the person saying things they wanted people to hear.

C: It is part of the Great Deception, as we have explained.

R: We have this one. This is a good one. "I praise you because you always remember me and follow the teachings that I have handed on to you, but I want you to understand that Christ is supreme over every man, the husband is supreme over his wife, and God is supreme over Christ. So a man who prays or proclaims his message in public worship with his head covered praises Christ. And any woman who prays or proclaims God's message in public worship with nothing on her head disgraces her husband and there is no difference between her and a woman whose head has been shaved. If a woman does not cover her head, she might as well cut her hair. And since it is a shameful thing for a woman to shave her head, or cut her hair, she should cover her head. A man has no need to cover his head because he reflects the image and glory of God. A

woman reflects the glory of man because man is not created from woman but woman from man."

C: We don't understand.

R: That is what we call a sexist statement, which would

C: It is putting down another human being. You should not put down another human being. Why would a part of The Great Teacher choose to put down another human being?

R: All I can say is that this is one of the documents that was declared proper to put in The Creator's own book. And for your information right now, it is being used by certain groups to teach young men how to treat their wives.

C: That way?

R: There is a movement right now, I read about,

C: They will destroy part of the human population by that kind of rule.

R: But they put this in Christ's own words in here. In quotes, that makes it very powerful. How can they argue with it?

C: Why would part of the Great Teacher ever say anything in the avenue of hate, that's the best word we can think of, and put them on another species that The Creator created? And part of The Great Teacher is supposed to be the Son of The Creator. Why would The Creator deem for his Son to say those things to something The Creator has created?

R: I have no answer, of course.

C: We would like to know why.

R: I've read these other books, also, and you commented that mankind decided originally to be male dominated. Well, this supports male domination. And in those days that this was existing, two thousand years ago, clearly woman were not allowed to have any political rights, they were practically owned by their husbands. All of this I think you can see could well have been manufactured to support that, to keep everybody in their place. That there would be peace in the land.

C: But it does not keep peace in this generation, because the quote of the species is rebelling against that oppression, so why are the humans trying to state the same thing and using oppression as a way of putting another species into control mechanism? First of all, The Creator is not going to put a control mechanism on any other human. That is why the Essences have a difficult time most times to get their message across to the human population. So if you can answer our question, please feel free to try.

R: You didn't find me toting this around as a guide to my living, did you? I'm just pointing out that I think those explorations of the other gospels clearly indicate that Christ probably never said any of this.

C: Of course not.

R: And as a matter of fact, there is a whole group in England that meets together to decide what's likely what he said and what he didn't say. And this I don't think would pass muster. But that kind of attitude of judging what Christ said or didn't say is not accepted by these conservative religious people, because everything in there is equally true from their point of view. They have no other standard. You have another standard, they don't.

C: These humans, don't they use their own thoughts, their own reasoning tools?

R: Didn't you read Andy? Did he use his own reasoning tools?

C: No.

R: No. Does that answer your question?

C: Yes.

R: When you do, you become a heretic and they kill you.

C: On this avenue, I think we might want to stop.

R: Now in this they put homosexuals. Homosexuality is

C: That is not a mental illness. You have been a homosexual in your prior lives.

R: This we have a political battle about this all the time, about whether or not somebody is born homosexual or whether they become that way. Would you care to make any statement about why some people are innately attracted to a person of the same sex instead of the opposite sex'?

C: Each human has to experience all avenues of everything. When you were going through your lives, the ones that are starting now or condemning the homosexuals, will be homosexuals themselves.

R: This will be one of their lifetimes, whether they choose it or not?

C: Of course

R: Ten percent of the population are homosexual, if you add them up. In any culture, any group, any nation, about 10% prefer the same sex for their attraction. And they just happen to be the group who have ???

C: They don't have a problem

R: Well we have the religious right who look in the Bible and it clearly says in the Bible that man should not do that. God disapproves of that. It says so right there.

C: Show me where it says that.

R: I'm not going to pull the Bible down cause I'm not a religious writer but I've heard it quoted, but you can find anything quoted too, but

C: We have already stated

R: Man wrote it.

C: Right. The Creator does not care.

R: The real thing is as many books I have on Jesus teaching, people writing these manuals were writing to large groups, not to individuals, and in large groups, homosexual behavior does not keep children being produced, so that is not good for increasing the work population. So they wouldn't want that since you wouldn't have enough children to do all the jobs you have in an expanding economy. So its not good for the group. But for that 10% it's true.

C: It was written by man.

R: Written by man, OK. We don't have a God up there that hates homosexual, is that what you are saying?

C: The Creator does not hate.

R: Well, you can hear all these people on TV talking about what He doesn't want.

C: It is what the humans want and they use the Creator to by stating that – they are always using Him

R: They use him as a bully boy, somebody with a bat who is going to hit you if you don't do what they want.

C: Why would the Creator design some humans with homosexuality and some that are not? Some are gifted in music and some are not. Why did the Creator not design all humans to be the same?

R: Nobody's figured that one out. Does the Creator test our faith in God? That is a question that is repeatedly brought up.

C: Well, first of all, The Creator is not human, so why would The Creator want to test?

R: I really hadnt figured that one out either. What would be gained by that?

C: The Creator is not human.

R: You do have a story in the Bible of Job where this seems to be what was going on and he was being tested.

C: That is your human's book.

R: That's right, and Satan was right there to prod Him on.

C: Which we do not have.

R: So therefore, without Satan there, He would not have done it anyhow. So it was a nice

mythology.

C: Of course.

R: And they said even great saints die of cancer. How could that be, if they are so great? With all the beliefs they have and the spirituality they have, they eventually die.

C: Yes.

R: Their life plan says so.

R: And each one will think their standards came from God. But God keeps changing his mind every thirty years.

C: The Creator does not change.

R: But that is the impression they have to have.

C: But of course. And that is understandable. But by following these principles, you can see that The Creator does not change. The Creator is forever. The Creator does not care about social controls.

R: Oh, how could you say that? We have seen that from Moses on down, from the Ten Commandments. God told us to behave this way.

C: The Creator did not tell them that.

R: Well, that is the word he passed on to his people.

C: It was not.

R: And you are telling them that Moses made those up by himself.

C: Of course.

R: Well, I would say the CIE at that time needed them made up.

C: Of course.

R: So they made it appear as if this miracle occurred and God must be behind it.

C: We have an avenue in favor of that. If The Book is correct, which it is not, when your human called Moses came down from the mountain with the tablets, but then he broke them, correct? And therefore he had to make new ones. Did he make them? Or did he state that the Creator did? R: The Creator gave him the first ones.

C: But then he broke those.

R: I presume he had to carve out new ones that he would believe are identical to the first ones.

C: How would Moses have remembered what the first ones were?

R: His Essence memory was very good. That gave him a perfect chance to write in anything he wanted. And he had a responsibility to run this group of ragtag people who didn't know how to get along with each other.

C: Correct.

R: He had like a gang trying to set up some procedural rules so they

C: Correct.

R: He didn't have a parliament, he didn't have a police force, he didn't have any tools that they had agreed upon. Nobody elected him leader and gave him authority over him.

C: Yes.

R: And the only authority they recognized was their God.

C: Right.

R: So you will have to admit he was pretty smart.

C: And by using that power he was able to develop the social controls that are in process now.

R: But because they are in the Bible and the Bible has been declared by these church people to be the word of God, you see, the inspired Word of God.

C: We would like these humans point out where The Creator wrote.

R: It was interesting reading this book on The Disappearance of God, where he discussed who – his first book was "Who Wrote the Bible?" and that's an interesting concept because there were at least 40 editors who brought in the documents at different times, at different places, and they

never worked under the same roof. They were never even in the same century many times. Eventually, it all got put together in an order that does make sense reading from one to the other. It is not a hodgepodge, but like this part was done first, and that part – That's another job the CIE had going on, because there were no humans there who actually structured the manufacture of it. They physically weren't there.

C: So how can the humans state that the Book was written by The Creator? And why is it in a certain order?

R: Well, I'm just saying, is the explanation I would expect them to give you is No. 1, each of the writers was inspired by God at the time he wrote it, otherwise it wouldn't have been an acceptable chapter. OK? Then each of the editors was inspired by God to see one as better than that one and make the choice as to how it should be – the editors choose which ones of the submissions are going to go into the final book.

C: So they were all inspired

R: Right, by direct contact

C: to write the chapters for the book.

R: That's right.

C: They were all inspired. Each one of the authors was inspired.

R: Right.

C: Therefore each editor was inspired, but each editor was inspired to only accept certain pieces of certain inspired work of a certain author. Correct?

R: Correct.

C: So therefore not all of the authors who were inspired by The Creator had their works put into the Book.

R: Then we have a process

Phone rings.

R: Each writer thought he was inspired. So naturally he wrote his chapter. Each editor was inspired to review shall we say 15 chapters of which he could accept 5, shall we say. He decided which ones of these was really inspired. Because his inspiration told him, "This one really fits." And these others he considered uninspired. And they were not only uninspired, they were declared illegal and the people were under the penalty of death, because that was heresy. Which is why they had to bury them in the desert.

C: Still on the avenue that no humans can give us an appropriate answer.

R: I'm telling you what would be the answer. Some people would say editors, all editors, are super inspired, you see. Like Mr. Kluft, he is super inspired that mine is not scientific enough to publish. So power, control, I believe we call it.

C: Yes.

R: But actually looking about the Bible, I don't know what he said about the Old Testament but that was what his first book was about. But with the New Testament, the book on the Gnostic Gospels made it very clear that this was politically correct information that must be put together, because if it went out and was seen by the Romans, who had just beaten the Jews in their rebellion, they would be slaughtered. And the bodies needed to stay alive, and the truth was not safe. And they are now having a lot of discussions about what really went on back there. I was talking to Heidy about this, that since Christ had the CIE in him, speaking, we can trust what he said as being correct. But we don't know what he really said.

C: Correct.

R: There are all these other stories buried in the desert that could or could not have been true. That's which they did approve are sanitary. It met the political correctness requirements of the day. We have political correctness now. You don't want to say something that will be critically incorrect.

C: Correct.

R: But then you are not being honest, too. But these are the things that happened, it was interesting how he tabulated the authorship process, that it all did get done without any physical publisher keeping track of all these people and having them, like you do now, having one who is responsible for each section of it. It wasn't that, yet it got put together in an order that they can see is sequence, so somebody was looking after that.

C: Right.