

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

SEX, PROSTITUTION

Ralph: Well, ethics we were talking about. That's going to be a biggie. You're concerned about ethics. And I'm concerned about ethics. What are ethics? An example was that movie, A Little Whorehouse in Texas last night, which is a typical example of the conflict that goes on. All the laws, all the religions, and the constitution say that prostitution is an evil, bad, illegal, awful thing to do, yet it has been on earth ever since there have been humans apparently, as far as our recorded history can tell. It hasn't been abolished by all the laws that have been passed against it. And that story was how it fitted into this little town and they didn't mind it in this little town, but the outside do-gooder comes in and says, "Oh, you bad people, here, you are breaking the morale code of Texas in allowing this evil institution to exist here," and they threw him out of town. And that is a typical example of the bald conflicts that occur. So, how do you talk about such things? Charity: Regarding what aspects?

R: The ethics of the prostitution. Do you approve of prostitutes operating? That's the kind of thing people would ask. What do the CIE think about these prostitutes?

C: What is prostitution?

R: Those are women who are selling their sex for money. They will have sexual intercourse with men if they are paid cash for it.

C: So, it's an occupation, is it not?

R: Yes, it's a way of making a living.

C: OK, so what's the problem?

R: What's the problem? Well, I believe there was a book that defined it, it was called Everything You Wanted to Know About Sex But Never Dared Ask. And his principle was that sex was only right if it's done for procreation or fun.

C: Who wrote it?

R: That was the psychiatrist who wrote this book. Now I thought it made pretty good sense to me. But when it's being done for profit, and therefore also exploitation, it gets into a business,

C: Exploitation of who?

R: of the women.

C: But if the women are doing it for money, making it an occupation, how is it exploitation?

R: Well, let me put it this way, from what I know of some prostitutes, they also are exploiting the other direction, because most of them hate men, and this is a way of taking something from men that ordinarily would be given without cash. They are exploiting the men too. It is a manipulative device in both directions, depending on the attitude of the person. Many of these women don't have any field, they don't have any marketable skills and therefore there is no business they can go to work for, and this they don't need a marketable skill for. They just lie there.

C: Are they doing it for – see, we don't understand.

R: There are different women, of course.

C: It sounds to us that the Essences that they have have completely turned and are using their charges for complete destruction, for annihilation, or just don't want to be an Essence anymore. Therefore they have the body doing what it's doing now. Faith has told you that she is in charge of all matters of jobs, by matters of jobs, the Essence also has to be ready and willing to accept the occupation that it is ascribed to by the Guardian. It seems to us that the Essences of these women are therefore have turned or are turning or on their last existence with life time to be able to bring them back to school.

R: This is a good example of a behavior that has been disapproved of by every legal code that we know of, but, it has been approved of by the people in every culture anyhow and we have the state of Nevada, next door to us, that has made it legal – you get a license and you're examined

and it's all done as a legal business. It's the only state in the country that has it as a legal business, and you have places in Holland where they have blocks where these ladies have their apartments and you can come in and have sex with them for money. And it's part of the business of the city. So you have the universal, let's let 'em lie, but we'll still make it a bad thing officially. It's a good example of one of the hypocracies of our world.

C: Called a two way sword?

R: Everybody raffles against it, but you have some of our better leaders going out and using these prostitutes for one purpose or another, for themselves or to entertain visiting businessmen. We just had a recent trial with Heidi Fleiss in Hollywood who was doing this with visiting businessmen that had a lot of money.

C: They did not feel comfortable with the mate that they were proscribed with?

R: No, it's more of entertainment when they are visiting a foreign country. In many countries, like Japan, this is a custom that they want a woman to go to be with when they visit the United States or England or Germany. This is part of what they consider entertainment, like going out to the opera for some other people.

C: But for humans that is not entertainment. Entertainment per se as we understand it, it sounds to us that they were trying to get hold of something to satisfy the innate urges that the Creator has instilled into all humans.

R: Well that's part of it, but I think many people like having some nice person of the opposite sex to be with and talk with, enjoy the company of when they are in a strange town.

C: If that is the correct terminology, they are not – in the terms of the mate situation, it is still the correct term for the mate at home, for they are still mated. The ones to they come to another country and enjoy the company of another one of your species, then they therefore are not mates because they are not mated.

R: It is a one time

C: But what you had just stated to us was that they go out and enjoy the company and that's it.

R: Most, what I've heard, not having done it myself, a lot of people who hire prostitutes for an evening of company are not looking for the sexual activity as the primary goal. They are lonely and these prostitutes learn to be social and entertaining and they talk a lot. That's what they are really appreciated for. The sex is the ticket to get in the door. They will have sex at the end of the evening, but many guys, I understand, that hire them, are lonely people who haven't got any social skills and don't have any girlfriends to take out and they don't have a wife. So that is the local people. The visiting ones see this as sort of a , when they are out of town, their relatives aren't going to know about it at home, and they can pretty well pretend they are single. And a lot of men do this. I've seen them in the AF, pilots did it frequently going to other countries for training. Pilots were unique in this, I understand. They could simply dissociate themselves from the family at home. They weren't criticizing it, the family at home. In their minds, they didn't have a family at home. When they landed there, there was not family at home. And some set up a whole new family in the other country. They married another woman and had children in another home for six months there and back for six months at the other country. They dissociated between the two. And there were some men who were able to do that and it was a major problem for the AF for the wives at home got very upset. Those are different ways of it happening. All of that is considered BAD when you have sex outside of your marriage partner.

C: Because of the physical act, then that is considered

R: That makes it bad, yes. You can socialize and they won't consider it bad.

C: But if you go to the point of coming to wherever you are, in the company of someone of the opposite gender, to converse, to talk to, to enjoy a movie, or whatever, that is accepted.

R: That is moral, yes.

C: But to have, to bring it one step farther, then that is not appropriate.

R: Correct. That's the code.

C: That makes no sense to ourselves.

R: Well, that is why I am bringing it up.

C: So, if, for instance, with you talking to Linda, then you are in the acceptable standard.

Therefore there should not be any, by any other humans observing the situation, they would know there is nothing else that goes further, correct?

R: Well, if they don't see anything gross, like if we do not go into an apartment and stay there overnight and come out the next morning after breakfast, if we do that, then anyone would assume that we were doing something immoral. Because we could have.

C: But if nothing had happened at that time, why would the assumptions be made that they would do that?

R: That's humans. They will assume that they were made. Then you must defend yourself against that.

C: Why would that be necessary?

R: If you came before a judge or referee, such as in a divorce court. "Did he or did he not have sex with that person he spent all night with?"

C: But that's not an issue if nothing happened. You might have come over as a friend.

R: True, and slept on the floor.

C: And needed to do such things,

R: You are right, but, humans will assume the likelihood, the probability that two people in an apartment with one bedroom all night long will have had sex. That is going to be an automatic assumption of 95% of people who face that situation.

C: The assumptions are inadequate, inconsistent. The only way that the assumptions – no assumptions can ever be validated. The only way that anyone could know what had happened behind closed doors would be the individuals there or, if they advertised it.

R: Or had a videotape.

C: Right, but if humans find it necessary to assume things that they do not have access to that will make their assumptions correct when no assumptions can be correct.

R: There are principles that have been decided by judges on these matters. They talk about what the reasonable man, or the average person would think of in these situations. Now these are hypothetical, average person, a person who doesn't exist. This is lawyer talk. You have to understand lawyers make up meanings of words to suit their purposes. But this is what we face. And they would say that the odds are over 50% that if two people of opposite sex spend all night long in an apartment, that they had sex. That over half of them would have had sex. A reasonable man would assume that and it would be true. That means you count up 100 people and 51 of them had sex under those conditions.

C: What do they do with the other percent?

R: I'm just telling you what they talk like. I'm not debating your point. This is what we are faced with in our society. In the present world, this gets into politicians running for office, and the newspapers reporting about the girlfriends they had 20 years ago, you have one going right now with Mr. Gingrich who is the head of Congress and they are now coming up and they are saying that during his first marriage, he had sex with a campaign worker one time. You are talking about 25 years ago. Therefore – nobody says that is true or not, but they claim that probably happened. And therefore they are all concerned about the appearance of impropriety, of a sinful act. And this is the culture of the day, now. The newspaper people are looking for the appearance of an unsavory behavior that can besmirch this man's reputation. You didn't have to have done it, but if you went behind closed doors, with a female and was there longer than an hour, someone is going to think that he must have had sex with her during that hour. And that is the appearance of evil. We have gotten to that point. This is not a healthy development, but I'm letting you know

that is what we have gotten in our culture by now. So the business of ethics is a two edged sword because there is nobody on earth that can't be caught on an appearance of an undesirable act when you use the kind of standards that I mention. And we are at the point where you don't dare touch a female of the opposite sex or go behind a closed door with them. Because then the appearance of impropriety will be brought up and you can't even have that if you are going to run for public office.

C: Any human can become in a situation like that.

R: That's exactly true. That is why you aren't getting very good people running for public office because the smart one don't, those with any ability, why should they waste their time? You can't defend yourself, there's no way you can prove you didn't do something.

C: Correct.

R: And that's what they're asking. Prove you didn't do something immoral when you two were behind that closed door.

C: You can't prove anything because it's going to be impossible to disprove it.

R: Correct. In the past, its been up to the accuser to prove something happened behind that closed door.

C: Is there not a law in your justice system that states you are innocent until proven guilty?

R: What about these big ethical issues of the day. Prostitution you mentioned already, with women selling their sex for money, and you don't get all up in arms about it. I thought that would be something that you would think would be a generally poor use of their body.

C: They are not hurting themselves. Why should we be concerned?

R: Because, again, one of the rules of God, as pronounced by the churches,

C: Did you happen to bring the book so we could finish up?

R: I'm sorry. I don't know where it is. You are not supposed to have sex for any purpose but for having children. That is very clear in the Catholic church at least. You cannot even have fun. I mentioned that. The Catholic Church would never approve of that, you are not supposed to have fun that way.

C: The Creator made the human being to have, as we understand, a drive so how can you, as a human, keep that drive from not occupying and not being used and discharged'?

R: The Catholic church has said, "You should stay away from all women and only live with men if you are a man." That is what the priests do. Then they start molesting little boys and becoming homosexuals. So I don't think it works out too well.

C: So what we understand is that it is a rule of the Church or the religious function to put this onto human beings to make them perfect unto the sight of The Creator, correct?

R: Yes, the results are in the quotations in the book on The Origin of Satan, that the idea of being pure spiritually included castration, of all things, so they couldn't have sex or babies. They cut it off. That was supposed to make them even purer. Some of these great theologians did that.

C: It that is supposed to have made them purer, then they would not have been born into a male or female species.

R: We only have those two choices.

C: You have what we are.

R: These are the only two choices we've got.

C: Or they would not have been born, therefore no aspect of a human is perfect, nothing

R: Ok

C: So why try to be something or attain something that is totally unobtainable.

R: Because that makes you like Christ. I think that would be the card that they would use.

C: And Christ was supposed to have been the son of The Creator

R: Because he never had sex with anyone all his life.