



The Rainbow Journal

No. 99 January 2017

Contents

FROM THE EDITOR	2
WHAT DOES JUSTICE MEAN?	2
MORALITY'S INNER GUIDE	3
THE CONVERSION OF A CATHOLIC PRIEST	5
DO ISLAMIC HOLY BOOKS PREACH VIOLENCE?	7
A HUMANIST'S VIEW OF EVIL	8
THE UNIFIED THEORY OF LOVE	9
FROM HERE AND THERE	11
CHRIST IN YOU	12
LOVE	13
OUR CLOSING THOUGHT	13

Journal of:

The Edgar Cayce Society of New Zealand

Email:

rainbowjournal@live.com

Link to Search for God Lessons:

<http://www.improvetransform.com/>

FROM THE EDITOR

Although there are always a few undelivered messages received following the distribution of the Rainbow Journal using a bulk delivery application, with the last issue distributed in late December we received rejection notices for *all* emails using Yahoo and its related 7mail email service providers. Possibly the email were seen as malicious or junk mail. I am therefore bypassing the bulk mail application and distributing the Journal in small groups. If you did not get the December issue and would like to receive a copy please email me at the address on the cover.

In this issue I have attempted to discuss a range of topics particularly in relation to this day and age when we, as the human race, seem to be losing our way and do not know where to look to find solutions.

The next issue of the Journal will be the 100th so I am wondering if it could be celebrated in some way. Possibly the reprinting of some of the articles published over the last 11 years would be appropriate. Any suggestions? *Brian Alderson ΩΩΩ*

WHAT DOES JUSTICE MEAN?

There seems to be many definitions and understandings of what "justice" actually means and it can be difficult to give any precise explanation.

Sometime dictionaries are no help at all as they give a circular definition using the word to define itself. It is like defining the 'cat' as "an animal that looks like a cat." The first definition of 'justice' I came across using an online dictionary was: "*just* behaviour or treatment. A concern for *justice*, peace, and genuine respect for people." When we look up the meaning of 'just' we find: "based on or behaving according to what is morally right and fair." So we would then need to decide what is 'morally right' and/or 'fair.'

One form of justice is called 'social justice' dealing with how people should be treated in our modern-day materialistic societies. Sometimes this 'justice' may be defined in terms of equality in that everyone should be treated the same regardless of their wealth or social standing. Some people define 'justice' in terms of equity in that people should get benefits in proportion to what they contributed to producing those benefits. In other words, the harder and better you work, the more you should get as a reward for that work. Still other people believe in equity with a bottom 'safety-net' level which protects people who, because of misfortune or disability, are unable to work or even help themselves. There appears to be no rational way to compare these different approaches, other than to observe that one is more consistent with one culture than another, and that some yield more benefits, or more harm than another.

Then there is justice' when it comes to the treatment of those that cause harm to others in one form or another or disobey the laws on the society they live in. For many 'justice' is just another word for 'revenge' and 'retaliation'.

Yet this concept of retaliation, while very widespread, tends to cause escalations in violence and can yield enormous harm. So when people from different cultures and nationalities come into conflict, as seems to happen so often these days, such differing definitions of justice can be very hard to reconcile.

A different use of the term 'justice' is also problematic. This involves the concept of criminal justice. While each culture has its own criminal justice system,

these sometimes clash with internationally accepted standards of human rights and other international laws. This yields difficult problems regarding the prosecution of war crimes, human rights abuses, and acts of genocide. Our current international organisations do not seem to have the ability to deal with these problems as in the case of Syria and a number of other conflict zones across the globe.

So we can see that there is no simple determination of what is 'justice' but rather it is an *ideal*, something that we must constantly strive to achieve, not by imposing it on others but by ourselves acting in a just manner.

EDGAR CAYCE ON JUSTICE

"In judgement then, as so often given, study to show yourself approved unto God. That is presupposing that your ideals are the law of the Lord; rightly stressing the words of truth and giving due consideration, being all things to all peoples. Put yourself in the other individual's place, and not merely because "I think it is this or I know this is true," but consider. For if mercy and justice were measured by the heavenly Father, as it would be by yourself, would you be consistent? Consistency is the jewel that most souls need. You cannot be one thing today and something else tomorrow. There must be consistency". 4038-1

"If you would know Him let your life and your experience be that your deeds and your acts are the fruits of the spirit of truth. Against these there is no law. Love, justice, mercy, peace, brotherly love, kindness, these come from the throne of grace, and your experience of the soul may be from such. Come, my children. Bow your heads. Call you on the Lord while He may be found; for in His day there shall be peace and glory and harmony and brotherly love. Seek to know Him, and that you receive in your experiences - as you approach through all those channels that may attune themselves to the throne of grace - will be the knowledge and understanding that, 'As you do it unto the least of these, my little ones, you do it unto me.'" 5752-6

"Let justice and mercy, let joy and harmony, let yourself be the way; for 'He that would be the greatest among you, he is servant of all.' Grace, mercy, peace, the love of the Father through the Son abide with those that love His coming. Be patient, be kind, be just in your judgements, in your actions towards your fellow man; for only in such will you find peace and harmony. For some cry Peace when they themselves become, through the condemnation of self in others, that which is the stumbling-block to many. Make a joyful noise to the Lord for the mercies, the promises, the glories that may be yours in the earth through the love you may show to your fellow man." 262-73 - BDA - ΩΩΩ

MORALITY'S INNER GUIDE

Larry Nucci, psychologist and author, in his book "Nice is Not Enough: Facilitating Moral Development" states that children instinctively distinguish between the domain of social conventions, and the moral domain. Children identify morality with those actions that have an intrinsic effect on the welfare of others. They understand that harming another as being wrong and acting fairly as being right. No one needs to tell them this is the case; they know it as a matter of course. The inherent nature of morality, as defined in this narrow sense, is underscored by the finding that children everywhere make these same distinctions and do so without rules telling that it is so. Nucci concludes that morality is independent of

social rules regarding proper behaviour.

Drawing the difference between these two domains-the moral and the conventional-allows us to better understand the ways in which children comprehend the world and how they understand their own actions. At the same time, the distinction helps to reveal the underlying and universal nature of morality. Nucci's research indicates that concepts of human welfare, fairness, and rights are inherent, not socially conditioned or constructed. In both domains, some behaviours are deemed "right" and others "wrong."

Nucci gives this example, taken from an interview with a four-year-old girl. In the first interview, the girl is operating in the area of social conventions. Something is wrong because there is a rule that says it is wrong. Without the rule, it would no longer be wrong.

"Did you see what just happened?"

"Yes. They were noisy."

"Is that something you are supposed to do or not supposed to do?"

"Not do."

"Is there a rule about that?"

"Yes. We have to be quiet."

"What if there were no rules, would it be all right to do then?"

"Yes."

"Why?"

"Because there is no rule."

Contrast the interview, which is an illustration of thinking in the social domain, with the one that follows.

"Did you see what happened?"

"Yes. They were playing and John hit him too hard."

"Is that something you are supposed to do or not supposed to do?"

"Not so hard to hurt."

"Is there a rule about that?"

"Yes."

"What is the rule?"

"You're not to hit hard."

"What if there were no rules about hitting hard, would it be all right to do then?"

"No."

"Why not?"

"Because he could get hurt and start to cry."

Here the girl is operating in the moral domain. There is no rule that told her it is wrong to hit hard. It is wrong because hurting others is wrong in and of itself.

Without a rule, it would still be wrong.

Children distinguish between rules that are in the moral domain and those that are social conventions. They identify moral issues as those having to do with welfare and physical harm - pushing, shoving, hitting, killing, psychological harm - hurting others' feelings, ridiculing, name calling, fairness and rights - stealing, breaking promises, not sharing, destroying others' property, and positive behaviours - helping another in need, sharing, donating to a charity.

In justifying moral behaviour, the criteria refer to the benefit or harm or the

fairness or unfairness that the action would cause. For conventional issues, they turn to the norms and expectations of authority. What emerges from the work of cognitive psychologists is that, at young ages, children know the difference between social convention and morality, and they know it without being taught. You might say that they understand very well the point made by Socrates in his conversation with Euthyphro: "Social conventions don't make for morality. It is morality that judges social conventions."

One may ask that if children naturally have a sense right and wrong, based on how actions help or hurt others why is it that once we grow up this natural sense of morality often seems to disappear or least be overruled by mental constructions; current ideas about situations which change from time to time.

It appears that as we grow older sometimes our morals have become little more than ideas about how things should be based on what we believe about God and how we interpret religious edicts and social laws. These can conflict with our inborn sense of morality which may be referred to as our 'conscience' with which we struggle as we do things out of selfishness or other, less than noble, reasons. Thus we know it is wrong to steal but it is OK to falsify our tax return even if it pricks our conscience as we do so.

Religious commandments, social conventions, and codes of conduct can assist us in making moral decisions, but they are no substitute for ethical judgements based on the voice of our inner moral guide. Codes, laws and ethical regulations can only suggest a course of action, not mandate a good, moral, and just one. *BDA - ΩΩΩ*

THE CONVERSION OF THE CATHOLIC PRIEST WHO BLESSED THE ATOMIC BOMB CREWS

Seventy years ago, on Aug. 6, 1945, the single most destructive weapon ever unleashed upon human beings and the environment - the atomic bomb - was dropped by an American B-29 bomber on the Japanese city of Hiroshima, killing approximately 80,000 people instantly. Three days later, a second atomic bomb was dropped on Nagasaki, immediately killing an estimated 40,000 people, with tens of thousands dying later from the bombings because of radiation poisoning. Blessing the crews and their two missions was Fr. George Zabelka, the Catholic chaplain to the 509th Composite Group - the atomic bomb group.

In a 1980 interview with theologian, peace advocate and later Catholic priest Charles McCarthy in *Sojourners* magazine, a Christian social justice and peace publication, Zabelka said during war, the destruction of civilians was always forbidden by the church.

"If a soldier came to me and asked if he could put a bullet through a child's head, I would have told him absolutely not. That would be mortally sinful," he said. But in 1945 on Tinian Island in the South Pacific, where the atomic bomb group was based, three planes every minute would take off around the clock, Zabelka said.

From the interview: "Many of these planes went to Japan with the express purpose of killing not one child or one civilian but of slaughtering hundreds and thousands of children and civilians - and I said nothing. As a chaplain I often had to enter the world of the boys who were losing their minds because of something they

did in war. I remember one young man who was engaged in the bombings of the cities of Japan. He was in the hospital on Tinian Island on the verge of a complete mental collapse.

"He told me that he had been on a low-level bombing mission, flying right down one of the main streets of the city, when straight ahead of him appeared a little boy, in the middle of the street, looking up at the plane in childlike wonder. The man knew that in a few seconds the child would be burned to death by napalm which had already been released.

"Yes, I knew civilians were being destroyed. Yet I never preached a single sermon against killing civilians to the men who were doing it. I was 'brainwashed! It never entered my mind to publicly protest the consequences of these massive air raids. I was told the raids was necessary; told openly by the military and told implicitly by my Church's leadership. To the best of my knowledge no American cardinals or bishops were opposing these mass air raids. Silence in such matters, especially by a public body like the American bishops, is a stamp of approval.

"Look, I am a Catholic priest. In August of 1945, I did not say to the boys on Tinian, "You cannot follow Christ and drop those bombs." But this same failure on the part of priests, pastors and bishops over the past 1700 years is, I believe, what is significantly responsible for Hiroshima and Nagasaki and for the seemingly unceasing 'Christian' blood-letting around the globe.

"It seems to me that Christians have been slaughtering each other, as well as non-Christians, for the past 1700 years, in large part because their priests, pastors and bishops have simply not told them that violence and homicide are incompatible with the teachings of Jesus."

Zabelka said that 75,000 people were burned to death in one night of fire bombing over Tokyo. And hundreds of thousands were killed in Dresden and Hamburg, Germany, and Coventry, England, by aerial bombing.

"The fact that 45,000 human beings were killed by one bomb over Nagasaki was new only to the extent that it was one bomb that did it," Zabelka said.

Whether it's from one nuclear bomb or conventional bombs, bombs kill.

Jesus did not teach us to kill, but to love everyone unconditionally - even our enemies.

After years of soul-searching, Zabelka's complete conversion from a strong proponent of the 'just war theory' to a total pacifist was announced in a 1975 Christmas letter to friends, stating, "I must do an about face - I have come to the conclusion that the truth of the Gospel is that Jesus was non-violent and taught non-violence as his way."

Zabelka dedicated the rest of his life to teaching, preaching and witnessing to Gospel non-violence. He died in 1992.

Love is the only remedy to the world's violent ills. In the end, the God of love, the God who is love, will unfold the fullness of his kingdom where all violence, all war, all injustice, and all sin have been conquered. But for us here and now, we can either choose to rationalize and condone violence and war, or we can help God build his kingdom of life and love.

In the biblical book of Deuteronomy, the author lays out a divine ultimatum for humanity: "I have set before you life and death, the blessing and the curse. Choose life, then, that you and your descendants may live, loving the Lord, your

God, obeying his voice, and holding fast to him."

May we always choose life. - *By Tony Magliano, National Catholic Reporter*
Aug. 3, 2015. ΩΩΩ

DO ISLAMIC HOLY BOOKS PREACH VIOLENCE?

They do, but so do *all* holy books in the Abrahamic tradition, including the Bible.

It's not about what our holy book says, therefore. It's about how seriously and literally we take it. I do not personally know any Jews who force their women to live elsewhere during their period, or stone anyone who has worked on the Sabbath, and for that matter I know very few Christians who give unto Caesar without bitching about it, or who turn the other cheek.

There is a great deal of focus lately on specific passages in the Qur'an, but what's actually relevant is what any given person makes of those passages. I can find literalists and extremists in any faith tradition, and you will if you look hard enough.

The reason people are talking about this is that they are – very understandably – trying to decide for themselves if they should have a reason to feel differently towards Muslims than towards other people of devout faith. The answer is unfortunately a bit complicated, but history teaches some lessons about it.

The ancient world, during which much of the Old Testament takes place, was a time of great violence over much of the known world, and the ancient Jews frequently waged violent wars of conquest and domination. (To be fair, they were not alone in that. Indeed, everyone seemed to be doing something like that.) The first Muslim caliphate took over much of that same part of the world, also mostly by violence, eventually expanding into the Ottoman Empire, which survived into the early years of the last century. And around a thousand years ago, Christians of Europe waged a series of attempted conquests of the same area, known as the Crusades, also for religious reasons. All of them racked up impressive body counts.

To paint all Muslims of today with broad strokes is as fallacious as painting all of any other large group the same way. There are over one and a half billion Muslims in the world today, spread through most of the world, observing numerous denominations - or none. To suggest they all read the Qur'an the same way is clearly ignorant; if that were true, there'd be only one denomination. It's the same reason there are several different Jewish denominations, and countless Christian ones: They do not all agree on it, but instead have numerous different interpretations.

If one delves into the ancient books of any Abrahamic faith tradition, or even just studies their documented history of the last few millennia, one is going to find a lot of blood. That is not specifically relevant to those living in modern times.

The vast majority of Jews, Christians, and Muslims are not violent people and have no interest in revisiting the barbarity of ancient times. - *Daniel Hayes* - ΩΩΩ



A HUMANIST'S VIEW OF EVIL

Some non-religious people and humanists avoid using the word 'evil' because they associate it with religious texts and rules and punishments, or assume that it derives from the word 'devil'.

Others see evil as a word that we need to express outrage and horror at certain kinds of act, alongside words like 'wicked', 'terrible', 'disgusting', 'shameful', and so on. "Wrong" or 'very, very, very bad' are not strong enough to describe, for example, the Holocaust or the terrorist attack on the World Trade Centre on September 11, 2001 - but 'evil' is.

Although 'evil' can be a useful word to describe actions or sometimes natural events that cause great suffering, humanists still have reservations about some of the ideas lurking behind the word. No humanist could accept the concept of evil as a supernatural force, or as something caused by demons or devils, or that people are born with.

People sometimes describe others as 'evil' to avoid having to understand them or think about the causes and cures for evil. Humanists, people who seek to live good lives without religious or superstitious beliefs, think that we should try to understand what makes people to do evil deeds and cause suffering to others. There are reasons, ranging from lack of empathy with others and ignorance to the idea that 'the end justifies the means'. Exploring these ideas is a useful thing to do.

The existence of evil in the world is a particular problem if you believe in a loving, all powerful, all knowing god. For many, evil and suffering - for example, wars, terrorism, illness, natural disasters - are powerful arguments against the existence of such a god. As the Greek philosopher Epicurus put it about 2300 years ago: "If the gods have the will to remove evil and cannot, then they are not all-powerful. If they are neither able nor willing, they are neither all-powerful nor benevolent. If they are both able and willing to annihilate evil, why does evil exist?"

Sometimes personal experience of great and pointless suffering - the death of a child, perhaps, or living through a war which achieves nothing - causes religious people to lose their faith.

There are standard religious explanations for evil and suffering. Some people believe that this life is a 'vale of tears' as a test or preparation for another, better, life after death. Some say "God moves in mysterious ways", or that evil and suffering are part of a divine plan, which we must accept. Some believe that God gives us free will and it's our fault if we misuse it. Some believe that evil is a punishment for the 'original sin' of Adam and Eve, which caused us all to be born 'sinful'. But these ideas will convince only the religious.

Humanists don't believe that suffering is punishment or test, because they don't think there is a god to punish or test us. Nor do they believe in an afterlife where evil will be punished and goodness rewarded. Humanists don't believe that there is a controlling deity who moves in mysterious, or any other, ways. Nor can they accept evil and suffering as part of a divine plan which they have to accept rather than fight. Instead, they think that human beings have a degree of choice and control over their lives and must take some responsibility for the way they turn out. Some evils, for example, war, famine and poverty, are caused or made worse by human greed and folly. Others, like illness, floods, or earthquakes, may have natural causes or happen by chance, just because the world is the way it is, but they too may

be caused or made worse by human actions. Often, though, those who suffer the most are not to blame.

Surely a loving god, if one existed, could have made a world in which natural disasters didn't happen, in which viruses and cancers didn't exist, and in which human beings had limited free will (just as we have limited physical and mental capacities)? This 'limited free will' would mean that we were incapable of doing evil. Most people, after all, already have this kind of limited free will and don't find it a problem - they couldn't deliberately kill one person, let alone commit mass murder.

Would the world be a worse place if no one could?

Humanists also object to Christian ideas about 'original sin'. Punishing humans for the sins of their ancestors would be by human standards extraordinarily cruel and unjust. The idea that we are born 'sinful' seems to be based on an unjustifiably negative and pessimistic view of human nature, and particularly of babies. Although humanists recognise that human beings can be aggressive and selfish, they do not believe that all human beings are innately flawed and 'sinful' and that suffering and evil are inevitable.

Humanists believe that it is up to human beings to fight evil and suffering and solve the world's problems if we can. They are, as a result, sometimes accused of unrealistic optimism about human nature and human capacities. Their reply to that is that they are not entirely optimistic, though they do believe that human beings are humanity's only hope and that there has been some progress over the centuries in extending the range of our compassion and care and respect for others.

The writer Philip Pullman (a humanist) put it well on Radio 4 recently when he said that that he was 51% optimistic about human nature. Most humanists have a fairly balanced attitude based on the observation that on the whole humans behave quite well, sometimes even with great kindness and compassion, and that really evil actions are unusual. The fact that we call terrible acts 'inhuman' shows something about our normal expectations of human beings. The philosopher A J Ayer wrote, in *The Humanist Outlook*, in 1968: "If the capacity for evil is part of human nature, so is the capacity for good."

Humanists don't necessarily believe in 'turning the other cheek' or just accepting evils and injustices passively - this would just increase suffering by encouraging evil actions. But most rational people acknowledge the benefits of eventually forgiving and forgetting even the most terrible of wrongs. The desire for punishment or revenge can dominate the mind of the victim to an unhealthy extent, and revenge can simply perpetuate and multiply wrongs. There will always be some suffering in the world that we cannot do much about - and we have to learn ways of coping.

Humanists do not believe that a deity will help us to end evil and suffering, but that we humans must all do what we can to alleviate and prevent them, because happiness is the ultimate good. The nineteenth century American humanist Robert Green Ingersoll summed up this philosophy in *The Gods* in 1876: "...happiness is the only good; ...the time to be happy is now, and the way to be happy is to make others so."

So humanists believe that we should live, vote, choose jobs, relate to other people, spend and invest our money, in ways that respect other people's rights, minimise suffering, and increase happiness. - *British Humanist Association*. - ΩΩΩ

THE UNIFIED FIELD THEORY OF LOVE

Being avid about spirituality and intrigued by Einstein's relativity, Newton's quantum mechanics, and the intoxicating String Theory, I have noticed something that many people take for granted or even dismiss all together. It's here, always has been, waiting to be embraced.

A Unified Field Theory of everything, that sounds so godly. An explanation of how everything works and the way it works together. Let us consider the idea of love, and don't laugh just yet! Love is such a simple yet powerful force.

Unconditional love is godly. However, the thought that Unconditional Love, or just Love, is what binds the Universe, binds the protons, neutrons, and electrons in subatomic particles, binds the subatomic particles together within molecules, binds the leaves to the tree branch, binds the spokes to the wheel, and binds people to each other, seems so simple yet it is also the next great leap in the evolution of human consciousness. How fitting to be the next great step in scientific development as well.

We are beings made from, and of, love. How else would we have gotten here, and have made it this far? We may have taken some wrong turns along the way, but the detour will eventually lead us to where we are going, offering many needed lessons along the way. Once consciously on the path of spiritual unconditional love, there will be no more distractions from harmonious living. Imagine doing what ever you want to do without any hindrance. Of course there are a few rules such as ethics for the betterment of all, although once unconditional love is commonly practised in mainstream society, every idea and creation is for the betterment of everything already. It's like green living made manifest through the oneness of nature and every thing in the cosmos.

Systems consciously based on love work better. A world without wars, where people treat each other with compassion and others providing when someone is in need sounds as harmonious as planets orbiting around the sun, and is currently as chaotic as electrons whizzing around an atom. While it's a beautiful process, we do need more practice. History teaches us that civilizations progress rather cyclically. Much like when the world was realized to be round, when neutrinos were discovered to travel faster than the speed of light, or when colonies of microorganisms were found in droplets of water, the time is come where harmonious living is being adopted and a Unified Field Theory of everything is embraced.

Mainstream culture usually chaffs at the idea of love being anything more than intimacy, let alone scientific revelation. Love is more than what it is portrayed on daytime soap operas, or bantering insults between guys. Love has to do with acceptance, and when there is a team of acceptance—things happen, miracles unfold. If the proton did not love the neutron or the electron, would they have such a strong bond? If people did not love each other would there be communities? If the universe was not a loving entity, would any of it or us even be here? I think not.

Humans also make the universe, and love, out to be overly complex. I would bet that a dolphin's view of the universe is not nearly as complex as ours, yet they seem to live happily and without concepts such as economics. They know all about love and it's oneness and totality within life. They are obviously aware of a Unified Field Theory too, even without the need for complex equations. Mainstream

thought, as I have observed, is if something is not complex then it is not important or worth anything. Considering miraculous breakthrough innovations have their start as simple concepts, such as the printing press, automobiles, disease treatments, or even relativity-yes it is quite a simple notion-lets not throw out the idea of love just yet.

Love unifies, this in itself defines the theory. I mentioned that even inanimate objects use the principal, perhaps not on the same level as humans practice it, but regardless the bonding effect takes place, otherwise these keys I'm typing on would be flying off of the keyboard as I press them with my fingers. I also could not imagine a world without the love from motherly compassion or fatherly support. I see much scientific similarity when I offer to help an ailing neighbour shovel snow from the path as when a hydrogen atom forms a covalent bond with another hydrogen atom.

Love also is bridging the gap between science and religious concepts, thus further developing a species of spiritual humans. Science is lagging behind on the concept, particularly from a spiritual love foundation. Sooner than later the two will be joined as one, spiritual science, and tremendous ethical, unifying, breakthroughs will come forth for the betterment, and benefit, of everything on Earth including the one human race.

So how about Love as a possible solution for the Unified Field Theory of everything? I am neither a mathematician nor a scientist; therefore I will not attempt to formulate equations and proofs. I am only able to offer common spiritual sense, also known as intuition, and perhaps an idea of what to use as the signifier for love in the equation: The letter L or the universal symbol ♥. - *Lawrence Dugan*

FROM HERE AND THERE

I ask people why they have deer heads on their walls. They always say because it's such a beautiful animal. There you go. I think my mother is attractive, but I have photographs of her. – *Ellen DeGeneres*

Terrorists did not try to carry out genocide against the Armenians in Turkey; they did not deliberately starve millions of Ukrainians; they did not create a system of death camps to kill Jews, gypsies, and Slavs in Europe; they did not fire-bomb scores of German and Japanese cities and drop nuclear bombs on two of them; they did not carry out a 'Great Leap Forward' that killed scores of millions of Chinese; they did not attempt to kill everybody with any appreciable education in Cambodia; they did not launch one aggressive war after another; they did not implement trade sanctions that killed perhaps 500,000 Iraqi children. In debates between terrorists and statist, the burden of proof clearly should rest on those who place their trust in the state. Terrorists' mayhem is wholly conjectural; the state's mayhem is undeniably, factually horrendous. – *Robert Higgs - (Edited)*

Consider the 'black woman' in Africa who has not experienced white racism and does not identify herself as a 'black woman' - African, a woman, yes but not black. She only became 'black' when she came to the U.S. where privilege is organized according to race, where she is assigned to a social category that bears that name and she is treated differently as a result. - *Judicial Watch*

Peace is not something we aim for. Peaceful is something we are. -NDW

Why are human beings the only animal species that is ashamed of their bodies so must cover them? - Anon

When it comes to war we *all* are enemies! - Anon

Everything would change on your planet if you simply stopped telling yourself that you are doing the will of God when you harm each other.

The greatest interest of all humanity is Life. This is the greatest interest of God as well, but you claim otherwise. You imagine that God has a greater interest than human life, and that is what allows you to waste it with impunity. Pure humanism would never allow you to destroy life sanctimoniously. Only organised religion would justify such travesty. - *The New Revelations*. - ΩΩΩ

Over 95% of the violence in the world is found in TV entertainment, the media and computer games. - *Mediawatch*

CHRIST IN YOU

PART III

SIXTH LESSON

Workers Together With God

There really is no such thing as space. For you, as for us, the spiritual law of attraction operates, but your consciousness of limitation, of distance, makes you blind and deaf to a great extent. At a later period of your unfoldment, to desire is to possess. Thus, if we wish to see you, our thought is a vital force, we are in your actual presence immediately; we are so close to you. Thought is so potent, so swift; every thought of ours becomes an outward expression; although you may not see it, you cannot think without a result. Be very careful that you think from the spiritual plane. The phenomena of time and sense are like children's toys to us. They will be discarded as you dwell in the higher consciousness. What divides us now is simply and only that you are not dwelling in, not breathing, seeing, hearing from the spiritual plane. Every effort to rise helps another; but see to it that you are watchful, vigilant, purposeful and loving.

You partake of the inflow and the outflow of the breath of God. This is best described as waves, impelled by an irresistible law, and your whole planet is continually being swept over by this mighty healing breath. I am explaining this for purposes of healing, and hope to explain later that there are periods of outflow and recall. We wish you to breathe forth your healing currents in unison with the mighty good. Your co-operation is necessary for individual needs.

Noon and sunrise are good times for raising conditions of false consciousness into the great One, especially the conditions known to you as feverish and nervous, or the consciousness of weakness. Other cases I hope to explain as I see you coming into contact; but previous to the expression of your desire for the healing of the body and a change of circumstances, *breathe out a strong positive assurance of man's unity with God*. Your highest good is to banish the idea of separation from

God.

Bands of us are striving to influence men and women to free your land of asylums, reformatories, prisons, and similar places. Their inmates could be helped and healed so much more easily if they could be brought in contact with those who have learnt the great truths we come to teach. We do not give these lessons for any other reason than to help your world, which we love. We hope to be of practical help in freeing your world from suffering, which is caused by ignorance. By this I do not mean that you escape discipline, but how can you begin to learn your real purpose for being if you are in bondage to false conditions? God did not purpose that your life should be spent in overcoming false conditions. He has a magnificent purpose, a part for you to take in His work.

God bless you and keep you alive unto Himself and dead to sin. Amen. ΩΩΩ

LOVE



OUR CLOSING THOUGHT

“What is it all about then? ‘You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, your soul, your mind, your body, and your neighbour as yourself.’ The rest of all the theories that may be concocted by man are nothing, if these are just lived. Love your neighbour as yourself in the associations day by day, preferring as did the Christ who died on the cross rather than preferring the world be His without a struggle. Know, then, that as He had His cross, so have you. May you take it with a smile. You can, if you will let Him bear it with you. Do it!” 3976-29 ΩΩΩ

This is a free publication for on-line readers with no advertising. Please let us know if you would like to add any of your friends to our distribution list.