



The Rainbow Journal

No. 86 October 2015

Contents

FROM THE EDITOR	2
EQUALITY AND FAIRNESS	2
BEING RIGHT	3
THE BEGINNINGS OF WISDOM	5
WHAT IS UNQUESTIONABLY TRUE?	7
CHRISTIAN INTOLERANCE EXPOSED	9
FROM THE EDGAR CAYCE READINGS	11
FROM HERE AND THERE	12
CHRIST IN YOU	12
OUR CLOSING THOUGHT	13

Journal of:

The Edgar Cayce Society of New Zealand

Website:

www.edgarcaycenewzealand.com

Link to Search for God Lessons:

www.improvetransform.com

Email:

rainbowjournal@live.com

FROM THE EDITOR

The Buddha said “We are what we think. All that we are arises with our thoughts. With our thoughts, we make the world.” This is very true for it is what we think and believe as individuals, communities and nations that determines our behaviour. It is because of our faulty beliefs concerning God and our relationship to each other – out friends and enemies – that causes constant strife and warfare. *BDA*
ΩΩΩ

EQUALITY AND FAIRNESS

One can get exasperated at times doing dictionary word searches in the quest for understanding of meanings of words. Sometimes the very word searched is used to describe the meaning of that word. For instance if you look up 'equality' in the TheFreeDictionary a definition is “the state or quality of being equal” - no help at all!

I am sure that most of us believe in 'human equality' but we can be confused as what is meant by 'equality' as against 'the same'. In many cases we use these two words interchangeable as in: “We all should have equal rights under the law.” and “We all should have the same rights under law.”

When we look back at history we find that one of the great achievements of the French Revolution was the popularization of the idea that within a state there should be a single status of citizen, with all citizens having 'equal rights' before the law. This idea of equal treatment as being treated in the same way, without any special exceptions for the rich, the nobility or the clergy, for example, gradually became standard within western liberal democracies. In the United States the idea of a common citizenship was present from the outset of its becoming independent: it is encapsulated in the notion that everybody is entitled to the equal protection of the law.

In recent decades, however, this idea that equal treatment means the same treatment has come under fire, as the same treatment can actually be a

formula for unequal treatment, because it fails to take account of the way in which a law that applies to everybody may have a disparate impact on people – especially groups with a minority culture or religion.

As an example of the difference between 'same' and 'equal' could result in particularly unfair and bizarre treatment would be in the army that issued all the soldiers with size 8 boots. That would be treating the soldiers the same but obviously not equally in the relevant respect for equal treatment would require each soldier to have boots that fit.

There is also a problem in deciding between equal and fair treatment. A mother said she had always tried to treat each of her children in the same way. She was questioning if she had done the right thing. Her youngest son, who had serious mental and physical problems, had since died. She had worked hard not to favour him, giving him as little extra attention as possible. Now she wondered if she should have dealt with him in a different way, since his needs were so much greater and his life span predicted to be short. “I thought that treating him special wouldn't have been fair to my other children,” she told me, “but he was special.” This woman had mistaken equal for fair.

I think we all sometimes inadvertently make the same mistake. Many systems in our culture are also set up based on a confusion of these two concepts. “Equal pay for equal work” is certainly an accepted standard in our

society, but can a system be considered really fair that ignores the difference between one person and six people living off the same wage?

An example of what I considered was a confusion between equal and fair was in a recent case discussed in a TV documentary based on the theory of “zero tolerance” policy regarding sexual abuse. Zero tolerance gives equal punishment to all abusers. But fair and equal are not the same. It takes into account no individual circumstances, including the age of the culprit and the severity of the sex crime. An example from the U.S. was about a crime committed by a boy, 13 at the time, of sexual misconduct with a nine year old girl. Two years after the offence he was tried as an adult and given a ten year prison sentence.

While the boy was wrong in doing what he did, the circumstances were very different from adults committing similar and more serious offences yet treated the same under law. The boy was immature, and naive To mete out equal punishment for crimes committed under very different circumstances is more harsh than courts could justifiably inflict. In an attempt to respond to public pressure and, perhaps, to atone for past mistakes, the courts have chosen equal instead of fair. Despite their good intentions, such a

choice is a perversion of the justice that we as a society are seeking to achieve.

Perhaps equality has more to do, after all, with mathematics than with - fairness or with Christianity. Being fair is about justice, about giving and receiving according to need. It is about differences, not likenesses. It takes a lot more thought, a lot more care to be fair than it does to be equal.

The “eye for an eye” mandate from the Old Testament, “a life for a life” decision in our present penal system or the “zero tolerance” policy over certain crimes all certainly illustrate the principle of equality. None, however, speaks about what Jesus came to teach us. His message was about giving most to those in greatest need, rather than making certain that some score is evened out. In Jesus’ parable of the prodigal son, the decision of the father to throw a banquet at the younger son’s return describes well what fairness means; the elder son understood only equality.

While it is not always easy for us to distinguish what is fair from what is only equal, we, like the mother and judges, are challenged by the Spirit within to continue in our attempts to do so. We can be thankful that our fair, loving God rejoices at our efforts. - BDA ΩΩΩ

BEING RIGHT

Somewhere in your town there is a row of graves at the cemetery, called smarty-pants lane, filled with people who were buried at poorly attended funerals, whose headstones say “Well, at least I was right.” - Scott Berkun

Have you noticed that sometimes people will argue over facts – over things that can have only one correct answer. A recent example of this is when my sister and I disagreed on who won the local seat in the recent government elections. I thought that the TV news announced one

candidate as the winner while my sister said it was another. Fortunately for me, because I was uncertain of the facts, I limited the bet I took with her to ten cents, so there was a small monetary cost to me compared to the disappointed of finding out I was wrong. Have you noticed that when we argue we have a strong *desire* to be right and we can feel quite bad when we have been proved wrong?

When communicating with others our need to be ‘right’ is irrational, but,

sadly, seems to be very common. It is irrational because don't we instinctively wish to know the truth? If that is the case then others would be doing us a favour in correcting our mistaken beliefs in what is true. When it comes to religious beliefs many of the things we hold as true relating to our religion cannot be proven beyond doubt so it is therefore pointless to argue over whether these things are true or not. A good example is the Christian belief in the virgin birth of Jesus. Furthermore whether or not this birth was a virgin birth will have no relevance in the way we live our lives so it would be pointless to argue and cause dissension over this belief.

Along with beliefs there are opinions which people argue over. Opinions are merely our views on certain matters and as such are not matters which could be found as true or false. For example many people have strong opinions over abortion, a subject of such importance to many people that it even becomes an issue when selecting candidates (in the U.S. at least) for elections. When we judge people it seems that whether or not their opinion agrees with ours that counts.

The problem with our beliefs and opinions is that we live in a world of dualism. In this world we rarely see matters as being as consisting of a variety of shades but see them as either black or white, good or evil, right or wrong. The pronouncement that you are either for me or against me stems from the notion that beliefs other than our own are 'wrong' and those that hold these 'wrong' beliefs are therefore less deserving than us. At times politicians use this argument to deflect opposition to their agendas by stating that if we go along with what they say we are patriots whereas if we disagree we are traitors.

In the text of 'The Course in Miracles' it is stated that there are only

two ways we communicate with people, which is either with love or by attack. When people agree with us and go along with our beliefs we are inclined to treat them affectionately but when they disagree we mostly go into the 'attack' mode where we prepare to defend our beliefs with all the ammunition we can muster.

Consider what we are doing when we make pronouncements that you are either for me or against me, or that it's my way or the highway, or that I'm 'right' and you're 'wrong.' Aren't we being self-righteous, judgemental, narrow-minded, and alienating? Aren't such attitudes divisive and dysfunctional? Don't they disrupt harmony and peace and lead to conflict and suffering?

As one writer stated "To be dead right is to be dead. To be cut off from the untold riches of life. It is also to be unhappy. For it is impossible to control the thoughts and opinions in the minds of others." So, when they fail to live up to our demand for agreement, we feel frustrated and disappointed. Does it make any sense to follow the road to unhappiness?

If the demand to be 'right' is self-defeating, why do we engage in it? One reason is the discomfort of uncertainty. Living in a world of uncertainty makes some feel like the earth is crumbling beneath our feet. There is no stability, nothing to hang on to - except our opinions and beliefs. Yet, when we change our perspective and think of uncertainty as surprise, wonder, awe, growth, opportunity, and delight, we can embrace it. Another reason for tenaciously clinging to our opinions is the fear that changing them would lead to the loss of our identity. But we are not our opinions. We are people who hold opinions and can let them go if we choose to. When we learn from others, we don't lose our identity, we expand, enhance,

and enrich it. A third reason for wanting to be 'right' is low self-esteem. Some need to show off their 'superiority' to compensate for their feelings of inferiority. They are afraid of appearing stupid and need the approval of others. But the way to grow superior is by opening one's mind, not by closing it.

To awaken from the delusion that our opinion is the only 'right' one, all one has to do is study history and the evolution of science. For when we do, we will quickly learn that we are fallible creatures. Even the brightest minds changed their opinions on innumerable occasions. In fact, that's how they grew so bright, by integrating opinions that at first appeared diametrically opposed. And by willingly adding the opinions of others to their own. They weren't afraid of accepting new ideas and making mistakes.

Here's how Lewis Thomas (1913 ~ 1993) explains it in his book "The Medusa and the Snail":

"Mistakes are at the very base of human thought, embedded there, feeding the structure like root nodules. If we were not provided with the knack for being wrong, we could never get anything useful done. We think our way along by choosing between right and wrong alternatives, and the wrong choices have to be made as often as the right ones. We get along in life this way.

"When the populace of a certain village were evenly divided on the 'right' way to punish a disobedient child, they decided to seek council with the village elder. The spokesman for Opinion A gave his view to the elder. As the others listened in silence, the elder spoke, 'You are right.'

"While maintaining his decorum, but visibly upset, the spokesman for Opinion B said, 'But Wise One, you have given your counsel before hearing from me!' He then shared his opinion with the elder. After listening to it, the Wise One said, 'You are right.'

"But, Honourable One,' protested another villager, 'you have just agreed with two opposing viewpoints!' The Wise One turned his way and said, 'You are right.'

"We can never be right until we realize everyone is right. The truth is owned by none and shared by all. Whether you agree with this or not, 'You are right.'

"Little Bobby looked up and said, 'Mommy, why do all the big people disagree and get angry with each other?' 'I don't know,' she replied, 'it's always been that way. Maybe you can change things when you grow up.'

"How?' asked Bobby.

"Well,' she said, 'Instead of trying to be right, try to be loving.'" *BDA ΩΩΩ*

THE BEGINNINGS OF WISDOM

Have you ever noticed that when we have an argument with someone it is rarely about learning something new or attempting to understand another's point of view, but more about proving ourselves right and the other party wrong? Of course for a discussion to be an argument there must be differing points of view but generally in an argument we are not so much interested in the other person's viewpoint as in

putting across our own. Depending on the subject being discussed the argument can become quite emotional with the parties ending up using quite irrational statements to justify their standpoints.

Sometimes when a couple may see themselves as arguing, all they are doing is verbally fighting with each other with no interest in what is really being said.

I can recall when I was a boy my father, who was heavily involved in his

church, would be visited at home by his brother, a fellow church member, when conversations invariably turned into arguments over religious matters. On more than one occasion, after the arguments reached a boiling point, my uncle would storm out of our house in anger. When it comes to arguments on religious and political matters, they are based on beliefs and faith rather than factual evidence, so exposure of underlying truths tends to play a small part with the result that no one really changes the beliefs and opinions of the other party.

One of the worlds greatest philosophers, Socrates, believed that wisdom was not about expounding our theories and opinions but more about realising the limits of our own knowledge and understanding. The consequence of not realising the limits of our knowledge is that beliefs and opinions are usually based on the flimsiest of background information. The method of debate most often used by Socratic was to show someone that they were wrong, rather than putting forward his own opinions. He would do this by disproving the other person's point with a series of questions, often resulting in the person ending up puzzled or confused - not because of Socrates' arguments but by the insecure foundations of his or her own arguments. Socrates believed that the first step to knowledge was recognition of one's ignorance and the methods Socrates used always had a compassionate motive, which was to teach his pupils the beginnings of wisdom. As was aptly described by Plato in his letters:

“It is only when all these things, names, definitions, visual and other sensations are rubbed together and subjected to tests in which questions and answers are exchanged in good faith and without malice that finally, when human capacity is stretched to its limit, a spark

of understanding and intelligence flashes out and illuminates the subject at issue.”

Our viewpoint has a great bearing on what we perceive to be true. The world looks very different from the top of a mountain than from the bottom of a deep valley. A worker has a very different viewpoint than that of his employer. The worker see himself as being exploited to maximise profits for the company shareholders while the manager see the employer as an expense, and like every expense the amount paid must be controlled to make the business workable. When disputes arise they come from these very different viewpoints, so unless the parties find some common ground for discussion disputes will be difficult to resolve. In industrial disputes it is often the party that has the most power that wins the case rather what is fair and reasonable. In times of very low rates of unemployment and when unions are strong the unions can make great gains in employees working conditions and pay while when there is high unemployment and weak unions, the bosses can pretty much dictate their own terms with a 'take it or leave it' attitude. It is the case of the strongest party winning.

This is the same with arguments between individuals. The strongest party will dominate the argument and usually get his or her own way irrespective of the rights or wrongs of the statements put forward. That does not mean that the other party will accept the situation, for the result will more than likely end in resentment, so the 'winning' was at a cost.

As we begin to realise that our knowledge is limited, that we tend to impose our opinions on others, even though they are usually based on this limited knowledge, and that our beliefs are based upon our standpoint, at the top of the mountain or in a valley, then we

begin to acquire a little wisdom. With this wisdom, and the realisation that our knowledge on such matters as religion is modest, we will ever be seekers for the

truth, knowing that we will never 'know it all' but it will be a lifelong journey towards enlightenment. BDA ΩΩΩ

WHAT IS UNQUESTIONABLY TRUE?

When I was a boy my father and mother attended adult evening classes on the subject of logic. I used to hear them discuss the content of the course and some of the logic exercise they were assigned. I remember one exercise which was supposedly based on the following true story:

During a long church sermon one of the congregation, a man in his fifties, fell asleep and had a dream in which he was sentenced to death by beheading for the crime of blasphemy. He was taken to the place of execution where he knelt down and his head rested on the block. The executioner raised his axe and at the very moment the axe began to fall on the condemned man a church usher tapped him on the back of the head with a stick to wake him up. The traumatic feeling of the tap on his neck at that particular instant was so great that he died of shock. Why was the story questioned? (Answer below).

My father came from a very religious background and our family regularly attended church where he gave lectures. However as he grew older, my father experienced greater and greater conflict between his religious beliefs, based on the authority of the Bible, and what his logical mind caused him to question as the truth of some statements in the Bible. There was a struggle between his religious faith and reason. Around that time scientists had developed a way of estimating the age of carbon-bearing materials by a method referred to as 'carbon dating'. They used this method to estimate the age of certain fossils and claimed that some of the fossils came from mammals which lived on the earth

millions of years ago. This contradicted the belief, based on the narratives in the early part of the Bible, that the earth was only around six thousand years old. A response from certain religious authorities in my father's church to these new findings was the claim that God deliberately put the fossils on the earth 'to test our faith' in what was written in the Bible. In the end my father's intellect won out over his faith and as a consequence he abandoned the Church altogether and sort knowledge and guidance from non-Christian literature.

The phrase 'gospel truth' refers to a statement that is 'unquestionably true.' This phrase has come about because there was a general consensus of opinion amongst the Church hierarchy which became canon law that the whole of the Bible was the word of God and as such must be true and never questioned. In fact at one time even to express doubt in the validity of what was in the Bible was considered as heresy. Nowadays, in the western world where the Church has lost its power over dissenters, people are openly questioning the credibility of some of the contents of the Bible. Dissension comes from scientific and scholarly sources¹ as well as the result of application of logic to some of the bible statements. The four Gospels, which deal with the founder of Christianity, have come under great scrutiny both from sources within and outside the Church. There is much questioning over whether some of the happenings as recorded in the gospels ever occurred. One of the questions being asked is: How did these

¹ SEE: Can the New Testament be Trusted? – G.A.Wells; The Pagen Christ – Tom Harpur

supposed happenings get into the Bible and who originally recorded them?

Because reporters, as we know them today, did not exist in biblical times one wonders how the stories and dialogues surrounding Jesus, which appear in the four gospels, were originally obtained and preserved. The earliest surviving complete copies of the gospels date to the 4th century while estimates of when the original documents were written varies greatly but the general consensus is that they were written between the years 70 and 110 AD. On the historicity of Jesus Wikipedia states: "According to traditional Christian Church teaching, the Gospels of John and Matthew were written by eyewitnesses" however there are no claims within these gospels that the authors *were* eye witnesses. In fact there are some events described in the gospels in which it appears there were *no* eye witnesses.

Let us look at a few of the gospel stories applying logic and a little reason. Keeping in mind that the gospels were written *at least* 35 year after the death of Jesus, which means that it is highly unlikely that there would be any living witness to the events prior to and surrounding the birth of Jesus, so we must ask the question: Who first came up with these nativity stories? The reported individual incidents by themselves were comparatively insignificant (at least to bystanders at the time) and happened to people who were unimportant so their activities would not have been newsworthy, which begs the question: Who recorded them? Rather than these stories fulfilling Old Testament prophecies, could it have been the other way round in that they were made up some time *after* the death of Jesus to be in line with these earlier prophecies?

There are no accounts in the gospels of Jesus' early childhood except for the event when the boy Jesus became lost

and was found in a temple debating with priests. Again one wonders who recorded the conversation between mother and child when Mary and Joseph found Jesus and how did the person who reported the event know that "... *they* (Mary and Joseph) *did not understand what he was saying to them.*" (Luke 2:50). Then we come to the temptations of Jesus when he fasted for forty days and was tempted by the devil. Who reported this event when it appears that he was alone in the wilderness during this period?

Another important event supposedly occurring not long before the death of Jesus was described in Luke 22:39-46 "*Jesus went out as usual to the Mount of Olives, and his disciples followed him. On reaching the place, he said to them, "Pray that you will not fall into temptation." He withdrew about a stone's throw beyond them, knelt down and prayed, "Father, if you are willing, take this cup from me; yet not my will, but yours be done." An angel from heaven appeared to him and strengthened him. And being in anguish, he prayed more earnestly, and his sweat was like drops of blood falling to the ground. Then he rose from prayer and went back to the disciples, he found them asleep, exhausted from sorrow.*" Again one must ask: Who heard the prayers of Jesus, witnessed the sweat falling off him and saw the angel? According to the gospel his disciples were asleep at the time.

Then there was the conversations between Jesus and Pontius Pilate when they were supposedly alone together. Jesus certainly did not relate this event as he was put to death not long afterwards and would Pilate bother to record what was said?

There are many more events and dialogues in the gospels like the above when it appears there were no eye

witnesses to what was said or happened so it would be reasonable to question how they came to be written and later transcribed into the gospel text. We may very well conclude that many of the events in the gospels never happened. So where does that knowledge lead us? Firstly it is a warning that we should not take what is written in the Bible literally and historically factual for by doing so has led to conflict, divisiveness, persecution, misunderstanding and even wars. We only need to look at the history of Christianity over the two millennium to confirm this. This does not mean that the Bible no longer has any value. On the contrary, by seeking the spiritual truths behind the written words we will be lead towards those truths hidden inside each of us which will open our eyes to who we really are and the relationship each one of us has to God and each other.

From the Edgar Cayce Readings

(Q) What present printed version of the Bible gives the nearest to the true meaning of both the new and old Testaments?

(A) *The nearest true version for the entity is that you apply of whatever version you read, in your life. It isn't*

that you learn from anyone. You only may have the direction. The learning, the teaching is within self. For where has He promised to meet you? Within the temple! Where is that temple? Within! 2072-14

There have been many versions of that which was purposed to have been written, and has been changed from all of those versions - but remember that the whole gospel of Jesus Christ is: "Thou shall love the Lord your God with all your mind, thy heart and your body; and your neighbour as yourself." Do this and you shall have eternal life. The rest of the book is trying to describe that. It is the same in any language, in any version. 262-60

Read them (Scriptures) not as history, read them not as axioms or as dogmas, but as your own being. For in the study of these you will find that you draw upon that force from which the writers of same gained their strength, their patience... 1173-8 BDA ΩΩΩ

ANSWER: The logic which questioned the validity of the story was based on the premise that if the man died from shock when he did, no one could possibly know what he was dreaming! BDA ΩΩΩ

CHRISTIAN INTOLERANCE EXPOSED

Probably at no other time in the modern history of the U.S. has it suffered so much in the midst of incredible grief, requiring support and the unity of its people, as was the period immediately following the 9/11 terrorist attacks on the Twin Towers. Yet it was at that time of great need that its own religion let the country down.

The following article published in the Los Angeles Times on 1st December 2001 says it all:

LUTHERAN PASTOR ASSAILED

*Joining Interfaith Event Called Heresy
St. Louis – To the Rev. David Benke the ceremony at Yankee Stadium*

was a blessing, an opportunity to join other religious and civic leaders in offering comfort to a nation raw from the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. He joined the celebrities and politicians on stage to sing patriotic songs and to pray.

It was, he thought, his duty as a pastor.

But some fellow clergymen took quite a different view. They saw his participation in an interfaith event as heresy.

Six pastors from the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod filed formal charges last week calling for Benke's

expulsion from the church.

Others have petitioned to oust church president Gerald Kieschnick for condoning Benke's participation in the event and himself for praying with chaplains from other Lutheran denominations after a tour of the World Trade Center wreckage in October.

Benke "participated in idolatry by participating with non-Christians" at the Sept. 23 service, one of the dissidents, the Rev. David Oberdieck, told the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. Oberdieck would not comment further Friday, saying the dispute was a "family matter" that should not be aired in the "secular media." But he stood by his interpretation of Benke as an idol worshipper.

He and other clergy also accused Benke of "syncretism," which means promoting the view that all religions are equal. The 10-page petition against Benke called his participation in the New York ceremony "an egregious offence against the love of Christ" that gave "the impression that the Christian faith is just one among many by which people may pray to God."

According to these critics, by standing alongside "heretics" such as Muslims, Jews, Hindus and Christians of other denominations, Benke implicitly endorsed their faiths, giving the impression that all offer an equal path to salvation.

Church leaders hold that they must not pray in public with anyone from another faith, even Lutherans of other denominations. They believe in worshipping only with those who interpret the Scriptures and understand God in precisely the same way they do.

"We can't go to the communion rail with someone who thinks of

communion in a completely different way," explained the Rev. David Strand, a spokesman for the church, which is based in suburban St. Louis.

The nation's largest Protestant denomination, the 16-million-member Southern Baptist Convention, hews to a similar tradition. "I do not have an ecumenical bone in my body," the Rev. Paige Patterson, a former president of the church, has often said. And indeed, many Southern Baptist clergy made a point of staying away from interfaith services after the Sept. 11 attacks.

Yet Benke and Kieschnick insist that the Yankee Stadium ceremony was not a formal worship service and thus was not off-limits to Missouri Synod members. They viewed it as a secular event, organized by Mayor Rudolph Giuliani and hosted by actor James Earl Jones, that included some prayer.

When it was Benke's turn at the microphone, he recited a brief prayer that opened and closed with references to Christ. Although he stood in respectful silence while other religious leaders spoke, his supporters insist he was not worshipping with them. Nor was he assenting to their views.

"To suggest that when the imam was praying to Allah, Dr. Benke was praying right alongside...it's an insult to even imply that was what he was doing," Strand said.

As for Kieschnick's impromptu prayer session with chaplains from other denominations, Stand said the same justification applied.

The above is proof that at least some religions, rather than preach the gospel of love, advocate divisiveness and intolerance – no wonder we are constantly either at war or preparing for war! ΩΩΩ



FROM THE EDGAR CAYCE READINGS

(Q) What is gospel?

(A) *News, tidings, understandings; that which bespeaks the sounding of warning, knowledge, awakening - if there will be the considering in the mind of the hearer. Gospel. Glad tidings.*

(Q) What is truth?

(A) *That which makes aware of the divine within each and every activity; that is of the mental, the material, the spiritual self - and is a growth in each and every soul.*

(Q) What is judgement?

(A) *With what judgement shall you be judged? Law is love; Love is law. Judgement is weighing love, law, according to the intent, the purpose of the activity in its relationships to yourself and to the force that impelled same. A weighing of evidence in an activity; as Law is that through which, by which, in which all are judged. 262-81*

A TIME TO CHOOSE:

Today is set before thee good and evil. - Choose; knowing that the abilities are present. As to what you will do with the knowledge which is innate, or that intelligence which is the "I AM" within self, depends upon what is set as the ideal, and the ideal relations with the groups, individuals, or associates. Know that, to use such for self alone is to use for self's undoing; but to use for the magnifying of that which is held as the ideal is a development of self mentally, spiritually, materially, toward the ideal set before self.

274-1

. . . as has been the warning, there

is today set before you life and death, good and evil, and what you choose with the will of your own soul - upon that depends what the growth of the soul will be. 288-36

Now, there is today set before you good and evil. Choose that which would be well spoken of by others for the physical gains, or that which will bring content, peace that surpasses understanding from within, in that hope that may be built in the lives of individuals through the efforts of the entity in those directions that bring for the better things. 500-2

For, as has been indicated of old, there is daily set before each individual good and evil, life and death. And man chooses; he chooses through the gift of the will from the creative forces. Thus each choice, each decision, should ever be tempered with spiritual purposes, and these apply whether in the trade relations, the marital relations, friendships, just acquaintances, or in the so-called business dealings or with the public. For, this is creative. And that which is creative grows. That which would take advantage of or belittle the hopes of any individual, under any circumstances, is belittling, degrading, retarding to that soul entity who uses same. 2727-1

How to determine that which is good and that which is evil? In the application does the seeker find that which answers to what it has set as its ideal, that it may worship, that it may become one with in its consciousness, in its sphere. 5752-3



FROM HERE AND THERE

THE ECONOMY

In New Zealand there has been a great deal of bad tidings in recent years as to what is going on in our country. We have very high rates of suicides, our prison population per capita is one of the highest in the world, around a quarter of a million of our children out of our total population of 4.5 million are said to be below the poverty line, we have very high rates of youth unemployment, more and more people are becoming homeless, living on the streets and many people have to hold down two or more jobs just to make ends meet. We could call that the bad news.

The good news, according a leading bank official new Zealand has 'a rock star economy.'

It makes me wonder what is this thing called 'the economy'? Is it more important than people? - *W.A. Black*
CREATED IN THE IMAGE OF GOD

Do not let a moment go by in which you have an opportunity to tell someone how magnificent they are. Do not let an opportunity pass in which you may offer praise. Give people the gift of self-esteem, and you will have given them a gift that many cannot find a way to give themselves. Yet when they find themselves through you, and return to their own most glorious vision and their own grandest idea of who they really are, they are lost no more, for you have returned them to themselves. Once they were lost, but now they are found. - *CWG*

CHRIST IN YOU

PART II SECOND LESSON

Born of the Virgin

We were discussing the journey of spirit through matter and its goal. This knowledge is valuable to students at your stage of evolution. You have learnt the truth of Being, your high calling, and some of the first steps in the great path. When a traveller is going into a strange country he is sometimes brought to a seeming stop by huge tracks of forest land, tremendous rivers, and mountainous heights. The spiritual life up to the present has been one shared with others of like thought and habit as yourselves. Some of you are seeking father on, and this means that you are called as Abraham was, alone and in faith. Only the called see the burning bush and hear the great I AM. One of the obstacles we want to help you to overcome is the mystery of the incarnation, or, as we stated at the first – the journey of the spirit. To woman and to woman alone came this understanding, and it will again be

revealed to the feminine in the new age. Woman is having her true place in revelation and prophecy, and to woman shall the great mystery be made known.

You have learnt through previous lessons that there is perfect unity between God and man. This consciousness is slowly dawning over the whole earth. Now, only by keeping this truth in mind can you comprehend our lesson. Even as God and man are one, so also there must of necessity be one only, and in this one is the all, manifesting through every channel. God is the two in one, of both natures, ever self-creative, and the ultimate end of our race is unity. All life was symbolised by the life of Jesus Christ in every particular. He came of the perfect unity of the two natures. Mary symbolises this truth, and here we would say – lest any err by worship, or undue adoration of type or personality – that Mary was the body of flesh used for this holy manifestation, for the teaching of

the world, and not because of her separate worth. Seeing that the outer self is a separation, it cannot be known as the complete Self.

The race is rising to the knowledge of the purity of God, the sinlessness and love, wherein is harmony and some here and there are learning that the age of passion, desire, and lust is passing away. There is stealing over men's hearts the love-nature of God. It is through our love-nature that we learn the complete allness of God. He is making of the twain one flesh; this is the marriage of the two natures. Jesus Christ was born directly from the two in one – as He willingly chose to take up the life on earth, from the beginning. In every way He stands for our race – man. Yes, Jesus was God incarnate, and we shall be like Him. He was creative, His seed is in all, the holy

child must first be born in you ere you can comprehend the mystery. Life is a spiritual essence. Birth is a spiritual fact, invisible at present to mortal eye. Jesus of Nazareth was God-Man, coming by the path of one body of flesh.

Let us make quite clear that God has always been manifest in the world. The coming of Jesus was the symbol of the supreme wholeness and perfection of man by Christ of God. Learn by this wondrous life the love of God and the great unity. I and the Father are one.

When you have risen out of your false belief in separateness, and know in your heart that God is All in All, then and then only, will you slide out of the false consciousness of sin, suffering and pain, leaving it like a wornout garment, rising into pure life, renewed and regenerated. ΩΩΩ

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.