

March 2025 COJ Retreat - Lecture 4

Christ Consciousness and Personal Cosmology - Session 4

Great guys, you're all welcome. So this is session four and I hope you all have your outlines. So it's "Christ consciousness and a personal cosmology."

Every one of us has an internalized GPS system. It determines how we think, how we speak, and how we act. The problem is this internalized GPS system or this kind of internalized philosophy of life has been acquired unconsciously, and it is when we are in a situation we activate it unconsciously.

Typically, we've acquired our cosmology from parents or teachers or school systems or the church or whatever, and so it's not really ours and we haven't really examined it. Moreover, when we are in a particular situation, it's unconsciously activated. So most of us don't know why we said that or why we did that.

All the great teachers have told us that it is really important to bring this unconscious philosophy of life to full consciousness. So you have people like Socrates saying "the unexamined life is not worth living," and you have Gautama Siddharta calling himself Buddha, which literally means "I am awake." And you have Jesus Christ saying, "If the householder knew at what stage the thief was going to break in and steal, he wouldn't go to sleep." So all the great teachers are telling us coming awake is essential—you can't become enlightened while you're still asleep.

I believe that part of the importance of the human journey is to create your own personal cosmology. With two other authors, I did a book several years ago called "Why? What Your Life Is Telling You About Who You Are and Why You're Here," and we went through this notion. I believe that it's important for every one of us to spend quality time on a regular basis, in a disciplined fashion, creating your own personal cosmology.

To get you started, I suggest that the scaffolding for a personal cosmology is the answer to four basic questions. And once you answer those four basic questions, then you can flesh it out into a more fully developed version.

The four questions are:

1. Who is God? Who do I think God is?
2. Who am I? When I say "I," to what am I referring? Am I referring to the spirit in the space suit? Am I referring to this 150 pounds of guy called Sean? Or what do I mean when I say "I"?
3. What do I mean by the word "neighbor"? Who is neighbor to me?
4. What is my mission?

For me, these are the four questions around which one can build a personal cosmology. Who is God for me? Who am I? Who is my neighbor? And what is my mission? I would regard the creation of a personal cosmology as the "how" of accessing Christ consciousness. It's an ongoing experience.

A Metaphor for Building a Personal Cosmology

To give a very quick synopsis of this topic before I dive in more deeply, I've used this example several times before. Imagine you've just bought a 5,000-piece jigsaw puzzle. You come home, you take off the cellophane wrap, and you put it on the table where you intend to create it. Then you go to do some gardening in the back.

In the meantime, your three-year-old son finds the jigsaw puzzle, opens it up, and the pieces are scattered all over the house. There's some in the bathroom, some in the bedroom, some in the kitchen, some in the dining room, and your dog has joined in the fun. Your dog found a cornflakes box and shredded it. All the pieces of the cornflakes box are mixed in with the pieces of the jigsaw puzzle.

You come back and you find, "Oh my God almighty!" So, the first task you have to do is to gather up all the pieces, and there's a word for that in philosophy—it's called epistemology. Epistemology is how we gather the data, how we know what we know.

Basically, there are three ways we know what we know:

1. We know from teachers that told us stuff, whether they're parents or priests or scientists or the news media. So that's one way in which we gather information—we pick up the pieces.
2. The second way is personal experience.
3. And the third one is figuring stuff out for yourself, either through meditation or time spent in nature.

These are all parts of developing a personal cosmology. Epistemology is the first stage—how do you gather your data? How do you take all the pieces together?

The second piece is how do you now sort out the real jigsaw puzzle pieces from the pieces of the cornflakes box, and that's called ontology. Ontology is the part of philosophy that deals with, faced with any proposition, how do you determine whether it's actually true or false? How do you decide whether to believe in it or not believe in it?

And then the third part is you've now figured out what are the real pieces of the jigsaw puzzle. Now the question is, how do you assemble the puzzle? In philosophy, that's called cosmology.

So you have:

- Epistemology: gathering the data
- Ontology: deciding which data are true that you believe in
- Cosmology: assembling the pieces you believe to be true into a working model for yourself

Ingredients for a Personal Cosmology

A personal cosmology must be far bigger than mere ethics or religion. A religion is not an adequate cosmology, or a system of ethics is not an adequate cosmology. It's a part, but it's not the whole thing.

It must be mystical to be useful to you and to provide a proper kind of GPS for you. Your cosmology has to be mystical.

It must be able to account for everything that you experience, whether your experiences are thoughts or relationships or stuff you're reading. It must account for all of life. Your cosmology must be able to explain all of life to you—life before you incarnated, life where you're incarnated, life after you die, and then life during reincarnation.

Your cosmology must be able to give you an opinion on all these areas. It must be able to give you a theory at least about extraterrestrials, extra dimensionals, angels, demons—everything that you come across in your reading or your thinking or your dialoguing. Your personal cosmology must have some theory about that; otherwise, it's not serving you. It becomes really important that you're casting a really wide net.

Developing My Own Personal Cosmology

Now, how do you set about creating a personal cosmology? I mentioned this morning that one of the things I did in Kenya was to sort out my own existing personal cosmology, which was largely formed by growing up Irish and Catholic and going through eight years in seminary training, studying mathematics and mathematical physics. Then I was in Africa, living on the equator, and I had all these belief systems. I had time on my hands because the sun goes down at 6 p.m.

So I started taking them one by one, tenet by tenet, and examining them, asking myself the questions: How do I separate real truth from mere cultural belief systems? How do I hospice the old cosmology and midwife a new cosmology? That was the task I set myself in Kenya.

Some of the things I rejected in that exercise:

1. **Papal infallibility:** I do not believe that there's anybody in Rome who's infallible. The official definition is when the pope speaks ex cathedra, from the chair of Peter, on matters of faith and morals that affect all the faithful. In actual fact, there's only been one infallible decree in the last 150 years according to that definition—the assumption of Mary into heaven. In spite of the fact that they claim infallibility, they've never exercised it. The doctrine of infallibility was actually created in 1871 at the First Vatican Council. For 1,871 years, the popes didn't realize they were infallible. What kind of infallibility is that? If you don't know you're infallible, you can't be infallible.
2. **Catholic teaching on birth control:** That every act of intercourse must be open to the patter of tiny feet. That didn't make any sense to me.
3. **The idea that women could not be priests:** I threw that out immediately.
4. **The notion of limbo:** That there are souls in limbo, little babies who were born and died before they could be baptized. They never committed any personal sin, but they are stained with original sin. So they can't go to heaven and have to be in limbo. And every so often God sends out an angel to change their diapers. I couldn't believe that.
5. **The notion of purgatory:** That there's a place, kind of an interim place, where God is punishing us until we learn our lessons and then we get into heaven.
6. **The notion of hell:** That there can be any place in which we're permanently separated from God. You can no more separate a soul from the sight of God than you can separate sunshine from the sun itself.

Some of the things I accepted were the golden rule and forgiveness of your enemies—these made sense to me. So that was the beginning of my working on my own more current personal cosmology.

Question 1: Who is God?

I addressed each of these four questions. The first thing to recognize, and I've said a little bit about that this morning, is that we have to learn the language that we're using to wrestle with the notion of God. There are several different kinds of god-language:

1. **Cataphatic language:** These are Greek terms. Cataphatic language is the language of the theologians. They're trying to use their left brain to understand who God is, trying to unpack the

ineffable by the use of reason. It's totally ridiculous, and it led to all kinds of problems in the church. For example, in 1054 there's this schism between Eastern Orthodox Christianity and Roman Christianity, and it's all based on a single Latin word: "filioque," which literally translates as "and as the son." When they're trying to define the Trinity, trying to make sense of it rationally—that there's Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—they came up with a definition that the Father is uncreated and unbegotten, the Son is uncreated but begotten of the Father, and the Spirit is uncreated and begotten of the Father as well. But the Catholic Church changed one word and they said, "Yes, we agree. The Father is uncreated and unbegotten. The Spirit is uncreated but begotten of the Father. And the Son is uncreated but begotten of the Father and the Son." "Filioque" split the church, and for 900 years, these two groups have been killing each other. Reconciliation happened between Pope John the 23rd and the Patriarch of Constantinople. That's where theology and cataphatic language gets you.

2. **Apophatic language:** This is the language of the mystics. Lao Tzu said long before the Catholic church, "Those who say don't know, and those who know don't say." So any cataphatic language is going to miss God completely. Hinduism would have the phrase "neti neti"—not this, not that. Is God X? No, God is not X. Is God Y? No, God is not Y. How about Z? No, God is not Z. Zen Buddhism would use the koan to try to get you out of rational thinking into the experience of the ineffability of God and not to get stuck in the notion of the theology of God. Meister Eckhart would say famously, "I pray daily to God to rid me of God." I want to get rid of theology and instead experience the mystery. Buddhism has this great phrase, "If you meet the Buddha on the road, kill him." I have a little statue in my home that says that. What does it mean? It means if you create some kind of a theology that thinks that it's captured who the Buddha is, get rid of it before it kills you.
3. **The language of teachers:** If you need to be a teacher in any way, you can't get stuck in cataphatic language, and you can't use apophatic language when you're trying to teach an audience or young people particularly. So, you're going to use parable and metaphor and story. That's exactly what Jesus did as a teacher. When he's challenged by an audience, "Why are you always talking in these ridiculous stories?" in two different places in Matthew's gospel, chapter 13, his audience said to him, "Why are you always speaking in stories? Talk plainly to us." And he gives two different answers. The first time he says, "I speak in stories so that seeing, you may see but not understand; hearing, you may hear but not comprehend." Why would somebody speak in such a way that his audience can't understand or comprehend? Because Jesus is saying, "If you're listening to me with your little literal mind, you're not going to get it. Even if you listen to me with your symbolic mind, you're still not going to get it. The only way you'll get what I'm saying is to go into your mystical mind, into wisdom, not just knowledge." The second time he's asked, he says, "I speak in parables so that I may reveal things which have been hidden since the foundation of the world." In other words, there are some truths which are so deep that the only way you can deal with them is in some kind of an artistic format. You can tell stories about it, you can dance it, you can make music about it, you can make art of it, but you can't deal with it in left-brain activity. This is the great message when talking about the languages of God. You have to be open to the language of mysticism; otherwise, the whole thing is just going to go over our heads.

The Evolution of Language and God Concepts

I believe that language was only invented about 70,000 years ago. Homo sapiens has been on the planet about 200,000 years, but we didn't have language. Homo sapiens means "wise person." So we were wise, we had rationality, but we didn't have language. Language is the ability to manipulate symbols intra-cranially. That's what gives birth to language, and we didn't have that ability until 70,000 years ago. Then we have homo sapiens sapiens—wise, wise human beings. That's when we had language that we could articulate.

I believe that we invented three kinds of gods:

1. **Regional divinities:** These are like the local mafia. You go into a particular piece of real estate in the Middle East or South America or Europe, and the gods who are in charge there—you have to bow to those particular gods.
2. **Tribal divinities:** For nomadic peoples who are wandering non-stop, we had to create gods that wandered around with us, that didn't abandon us when we went on safari.
3. **Portfolio divinities:** If you're interested in war, here's the god you need to follow. You're interested in art? Here's the deity you need to follow. You're interested in sex? Here's the god you need to follow. You're interested in agriculture? Here's the god you need to follow.

Then our language changed to accommodate that reality. This went through five stages:

1. **Theologians:** Theologians are people who talk about the gods, and there were many gods when we started thinking about the great epistemological questions and the great existential issues.
2. **Priesthood:** Now we think we've understood who the gods are. Now we want to talk to them directly. And so we invent prayer and ritual. The priestly cast is the group that's in charge of this dialogue where we talk to God and do rituals to establish communication with these gods.
3. **Prophets:** They purport to speak on behalf of the gods. So the theologians are speaking about the gods, the priests are speaking to the gods, and the prophets claim to be speaking on behalf of God, that they've been delegated by God to address the nation on God's behalf.
4. **Mystics:** The mystics don't speak about the gods, they don't speak to the gods, they don't speak on behalf of the gods—they speak as God. They make the statement, "I am who am." So the true mystic knows there is only God. The true mystic is speaking as God, not about God, not to God, and not on behalf of God.
5. **Silent mystics:** Those who decide not to talk at all. That's the ultimate realization that even if you purport to speak as God, human language is going to shackle you. So they choose not to speak at all. This is Lao Tzu: "Those who say don't know, and those who know don't say."

Who God Is Not

With that notion, I want to look at how I personally wrestle with the notion of God. I adopt the apophatic technique, which is to tell you who God is not. I cannot tell you who God is; I can only tell you who God is not.

God is certainly not, in my opinion, a dysfunctional parent who threw Adam and Eve out of the garden—who took these two people, before they even understood the difference between right and wrong, and because they ate of a forbidden tree, threw them out of the garden. As a clinical psychologist, I would be mandated to report this guy to CPS for child abuse. I'd be mandated to do that.

I do not believe that God is a cosmic psychopath who wiped out all of creation in a flood. That is not God as far as I'm concerned.

I do not believe that God is partisan. I do not believe that there's any such thing as a chosen religion, a chosen race, or a one true religion. When the Catholic Church says there's one holy Catholic and apostolic church, for me, that's balderdash. God is not partisan either by choosing a race of people or a religion.

I don't even believe that God is a creator. I don't believe that God goes into his workshop on a Monday and decides to create elephants, and then goes in on a Tuesday and decides to create mosquitoes. That is not how it happens.

Rather, there's a great philosopher around the year 200 called Plotinus, an Alexandrian, who said, "I do not accept 'creatio ex nihilo.' I do not believe in creation out of nothing. I believe rather in 'emanatio ab deo'—

emanation from source." Everything that exists is not a creation of God out of nothing. It is an emanation of the very source of God herself. Everything that exists is "emanatio ab deo."

The example I use sometimes: A few years ago, Johanna gave me a gift of a bunch of daffodils that I sowed in my garden on a hillside. After a few months, this big green stalk emerged, and a month ago, this beautiful yellow flower came out. I asked myself, is the bulb creating the green stalk? The answer is no. The green stalk is a manifestation of the bulb. And is the flower a manifestation of the stalk? No, it's not a manifestation of the stalk. It's an emanation from the source itself, from the bulb itself.

God is the bulb, and everything that exists is an emanation and a manifestation of God's very essence. So God is not a creator for me.

I do not believe that God is either a lawmaker, a lawgiver, a law enforcer, or a law punisher. There is no law made by God. The only agenda God has is that we remember who we are—that we remember we're holographic fractals of source.

I do not believe that God is a person. Now, I have a personal relationship with God. I live in the middle of the forest. The forest is not a person, but I'm a person. And the only kind of relationship I can have with the forest in which I live is a personal relationship. But that does not make the forest a person.

As a person, the only kind of relationship I can have with God is a personal relationship. But that does not mean that God is a person. As I explained this morning, the word "person" comes from the Greek "prosopon." When the early church fathers were trying to figure out the relationship of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, one of the things they said was that there are three "prosopons"—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

What they were intending to say was that these are three ways in which we experience God, not three ways in which God is ontologically present in herself—not three distinct, discrete entities. They were using the word "prosopon," which is a mask.

As I explained this morning, when a Greek actor came on stage, they would wear a mask to clue the audience in as to what kind of character they were going to portray. If the mask had a big grin, it meant they were going to be a comic character. If it had a frown, they were going to be a tragic character. So the audience knew immediately what to expect from the particular player.

When the Romans translated "prosopon" into Latin, they used the word "persona." "Per" means "through," and "sona" means "to make a sound." So you have a mask with two openings for the eyes and a big opening for the mouth. You're sounding out through the gap here—"per-sona"—you're making noise through the gap.

In other words, when we're dealing with God, we're just trying to figure out what mask God is wearing in this kind of encounter I'm having with her. But the problem was that the word "persona" became "person," and we get the word "personality," and now we think that God actually is three distinct, ontologically discrete entities.

So I do not believe that God is a person in any fashion. We can't describe who God is; we can only describe how we experience God. There's much more to Shakespeare than his collected works, and there's much more to God than her collected works. We can only begin to try to experience facets as the divine reveals itself through manifestation.

For me, there's a big difference between pantheism and panentheism. Pantheism is the belief system that God is the sum total of his works. I don't believe that's true. I believe rather in panentheism—that God is both the sum total of all manifestation and a lot more besides, of which we can say nothing.

As I mentioned, there's a lot more to Shakespeare than his sonnets and his plays—stuff we know nothing about, whether he was married, whether he had kids, whether he was a gardener, whether he liked to sing in the shower. We have no idea. So there's a lot more to Shakespeare than his collected works, and there's a lot more to God than her collected works.

That's all the things I do not believe about God. Now, you go figure out what you believe for God.

Religion and Spirituality

So there's this tug of war. Religion for me is basically the training wheels for spirituality. There's a place for religion. You're not going to put a 2-year-old child on a two-wheel bike and set him off. He's going to fall and hurt himself. So you have a little tricycle or training wheels until a child learns to master that, and then you take off the wheels and give him a real bicycle.

That's the purpose of religion. Unfortunately, often religion regresses to fundamentalism, which is the antithesis of mysticism.

I'm going to tell you what I mean by fundamentalism and then tell you what I mean by mysticism:

Fundamentalism has four stages, and it's true not just of religion—it can be true of politics, economics, educational systems, medical systems, or any system:

1. **Reduction:** You reduce a very complex system to a few one-liners, a bumper sticker. You take something like God and pretend to capture the essence of God by a bumper sticker, or you take the extraordinary healing ministries and reduce it to a simple formula.
2. **Creating an Enemy:** You then have to either identify or create an enemy figure. If there's not one obvious, you have to create one.
3. **Dehumanization:** You have to dehumanize the enemy. They're not people anymore. In the Rwanda massacre in the 1990s, where 900,000 people were killed in three months between the Tutsis and the Hutu, the Hutu who were creating that genocide talked about the Tutsis as cockroaches. Similarly, in the genocide of the Jews in World War II, the Jews were not human people anymore for the Nazis.
4. **Slaughter:** Then the slaughter begins. You reduce complex ideas to a simplistic notion, you create or identify an enemy, you dehumanize the enemy, and then you slaughter the enemy.

Mysticism grows in exactly the opposite fashion:

1. It moves from cataphatic language to apophatic language, from the simplistic to the mystical.
2. It regards all people as your neighbors. There is no enemy figure; everybody is your neighbor.
3. Rather than dehumanize, you offer "Namaste" to everybody. You recognize the divine in each person.
4. Instead of slaughter, you reach out with unconditional love.

So that's the tug of war we find ourselves in when religion is reduced to fundamentalism or science is reduced to materialistic scientism.

Question 2: Who Am I?

The second great question we ask ourselves is, "Who am I? When I say 'I,' to what am I referring?"

Part of the problem is that we're at the end of a devolutionary process where we've left God. We descended from being a divine unity to separate souls, to individual "atman," then to a mental body, then an astral body, then an etheric body, and then a physical body. Now we're beginning the evolutionary process going back up. But we're at the end of that loop right now, and so when we think of "me," unfortunately, most of us focus on this "meat sack," this space suit.

We have to begin to wrestle with our reality-making models. Very typically, our reality-making goes through the following stages:

1. It starts with the sensorium—these five senses that scan the environment, but what they're actually scanning is what the brain can deliver to us. At the quantum mechanical level, reality is just wave theory or particle theory, not a mountain or a river or somebody else. So the very sensorium itself is already telling us lies.
2. From the data, we create perceptions.
3. From the perceptions, we create our experiences.
4. From a bunch of experiences, we create our memories.
5. From our memories, we create our sense of self.
6. Finally, from our sense of self, we create our reality model.

That's part of the devolutionary process. So our sense of "I," our identity, is identified with the space suit, or with the ego, or with our emotions, or with our mind, or with our profession, or with our relationships, or with our culturally assigned roles—whether we're a boy or a girl, whether we're the firstborn in the family or the last born, whether we're the CEO of a company or the cleaner in the company.

Now, we have to reverse that process. As I said this morning, the whole function of incarnation is to give birth to God. That's our function. Who am I? I am a being who volunteered in a three-dimensional reality to give birth to God.

Meister Eckhart would say very famously in a Christmas homily around the year 1300: "Of what use to me is it that my savior was born of a virgin 1300 years ago if he's not born again in my life and in my times?" Every single one of us is meant to be a mother of God.

As I said to you, the word compassion in Aramaic is "rachamim," which is the plural of the word for womb. And so when Christ says, "You must be perfect as your heavenly father is perfect," what he's saying in Aramaic is, "You must be womb-like as the birthing principle of the cosmos is womb-like, giving birth to various versions until finally it gives birth to itself."

So that's who you are. You're a god-birther.

Question 3: Who is My Neighbor?

The third question is, "Who is my neighbor?" This has a very checkered history. Typically, "neighbor" means some kind of a special relationship, but initially, it's based on geographical proximity and not quality of connection.

Historically, when you think of "neighbor," it's the tribesperson who lives near you or is part of the same clan. It has to do with geographical proximity rather than the quality of the connection I have with a person. Then everybody who's not neighbor to me is grist for the mill—I can sack them, kill them, destroy them, and steal their produce.

Fast forward, and we get Jesus being asked the question, "Who is my neighbor?" The great response he gave was the Good Samaritan—that everybody is my neighbor. So "neighbor" then sets us out on this spiritual campaign of compassion and inclusivity.

It's very interesting that when Jesus tells the story of the Good Samaritan, who began his journey in Jerusalem and went down to Jericho, he's reversing what happened 1,010 years before, when allegedly the tribes of Israel came out of Exodus in Egypt and came into the promised land in 1210 BC. They crossed over at Jericho, and they sacked Jericho, then killed everybody they came in contact with—every man, woman, and child.

The slaughter began in Jericho and ended in Jerusalem. It took them 200 years to capture Jerusalem. David captured Jerusalem in the year 1010 BCE, which is a historical fact. So they spent 200 years literally killing everything they came across, beginning in Jericho and finishing in Jerusalem.

Jesus reversed that process and said, "Here's who neighbor is: You begin in Jerusalem and you end in Jericho. And your neighbor is everybody you meet, everybody who's in need—that is your neighbor." So it's a total reversing of the notion of neighbor.

So when you think about who is your neighbor, you have to figure out whom am I not loving because I've excluded that person from being neighbor to me.

Through Christ consciousness is the ability to see that everybody is my neighbor, to see the divine in everybody else.

Question 4: What is My Mission?

The fourth question: What is my mission? I think there are various levels of mission:

1. The first level of any mission is to grow in love as an incarnated individual—on a personal basis, I have to learn how to become Christ-conscious in myself.
2. Secondly, to be part of a team which is attempting to awaken Christ consciousness at a planetary level.

So in some senses, there are two levels to the mission itself. I can't contribute meaningfully to the team unless I've done my own work first, unless I'm working at developing Christ consciousness. Otherwise, I'm not an asset to the team—I'm a drawback on the team's effort.

When you're on the journey of developing Christ consciousness at an individual level, then you need to find your tribe. You need to find your fellow light workers so that together you can put your shoulders to the wheel of human evolution.

We come down with various kinds of equipment for this mission in 3D reality, and basically, we have physicality, emotionality, and intellectuality. These are the three great pieces of equipment we come down with.

I believe I've got my own definition of personality in psychology. There's this ongoing debate about whether personality is an artifact of nature or nurture. I have a totally different theory. I think both nature and nurture are less important than the soul that's coming in. The main artifact of personality is not nature and not nurture—it's the soul who comes in with its previous incarnations.

Nature plays a part there, and nurture will play a part, but the biggest part of your personality is the soul who came in. For me, personality is the interface of essence with environment. When you put the same soul into a

different environment, a different personality will emerge because it's an interface between an external reality and an internal reality.

The question is, what kind of soul came in? Is it a young soul (not chronologically, but somebody who hasn't made a lot of progress in previous incarnations) or is it an old soul (again, not chronologically, but somebody who's made significant improvement in developing Christ consciousness)?

Our missions—we come in bearing two kinds of gifts:

1. The first kind is our talents
2. The second kind of gift is our problems

Talents do not belong to me. Whatever talents I have, it's a gift, which means I got it freely. I didn't earn it. So somebody gave me whatever gifts I have and said to me, "Go down and be of service to the human species."

I'm a mailman with a bag of letters. Even if the bag belongs to me, the letters in the bag do not belong to me. They belong to the people whose names are on the envelope. My job is to deliver the letters to the people whose names are on the envelopes. I'm entitled to make a living from my talents, but I am not entitled to make a killing from my talents.

The second level of gifts is the problems I come down with because I have growing to do. So I'm going to set myself particular issues I need to learn about. As the old man in Africa told me many years ago, "A problem is an invitation to self-transcendence."

Properly understood, problems are not really problems—they're invitations. They're something I set up. It was part of my karmic contract when I came in. I contracted to experience particular kinds of problems, whether family issues or cultural issues or personal issues, because I needed to transcend and learn stuff I hadn't previously learned in other incarnations.

But mostly we tend to hoard our talents and claim they belong to me: "What a great guy am I! Look what I'm doing in the world." And we tend to project our problems onto other people: "I'm not an angry person. It's Marie. Marie gets my goat. She's the problem. She's the reason I'm angry." The truth is, the reason I'm angry is that I'm angry.

I developed a five-stage model of problem-solving:

1. Faced with any kind of practical problem in my life, the first thing I remind myself is: I am a holographic fractal of source. That's who I am. I'm a bite-sized piece of God.
2. I volunteered for incarnation. I volunteered to be here now. I didn't make a mistake and take a left turn at Andromeda and find myself on planet Earth by mistake.
3. I begin to recount all of the blessings I've been given in my life, all of the things for which I'm grateful.
4. I want to harvest this present problem in order to continue my mission of self-evolution and the evolution of Christ consciousness.
5. Now, how can I tackle the practical problem? Having gone through these stages, I'm at a much higher perspective. I can see connections and possible solutions I couldn't see from a worm's-eye view.

For me, the real meaning of karma is that karma is this system I set up for myself before I came. Karma is not a system whereby I'm being punished in subsequent incarnations for mistakes I made in previous ones. That is not karma.

Karma was the life plan I set out before I came, together with the heavenly mentors. They took me aside and said, "Okay, what do you want to learn this time? What do you want to contribute this time? So let's pick a lifetime for you, let's pick a group for you, let's pick a time for you, let's pick an area for you that will maximize what you can learn and what you can contribute."

So we come in and we wake up in a body in a family, and most of us say, "Holy God, how the hell did I get here? Why did I choose this group?" And the reason is, this is exactly what you chose. So karma, when you realize where you've been born into, what system you've been born into, makes you say, "Yippee! I made it! It worked out exactly as we planned." Karma is not a punishment; karma is the realization this is what I planned, and this is what's happening right now. How do I live that out?

That creates problems. So destiny then is where you're meant to arrive if you play the cards well, if you accept the karma, you understand that you chose it, and you play it really well, and you make all loving choices. Destiny is what you experience at the end of that lifetime.

If you don't play the cards you meant to play, then you arrive at a fate instead of a destiny. Now, I'm just artificially redefining these words for myself to make the distinction between playing your karma well or playing it badly. If you play it well, you reap the reward of your destiny. If you play it badly, you reap the reward of your fate, which means you have to go back and say, "Bummer, dude. I screwed up again. Give me another chance at it. What can I do this time to unmake the mistakes I've made and do the learnings I need?" And that then determines your next incarnation and your next karma.

It's like a feedback loop. The two great parts of learning are repetition and feedback. Repetition is reincarnation, and feedback is karma. You're getting the feedback from previous things. That's how the learning process takes place.

Finally, realize that you're on a global mission as well. This is not just about you serving a small community. This is about you serving the human community itself. So that's about discovering your Buddha nature or discovering your Christ consciousness.

In Conclusion

If your personal cosmology is working for you—you're putting a lot of really great work into it—you'll find the following four things:

1. If you've reached a really good personal cosmology (not a final one), it will make your soul sing. You'll discover what your secret sacred name is, the one that was whispered to you by grandmother God when you said, "Send me." It'll make your soul sing.
2. It must explain all of your experiences. If there's anything you're experiencing that can't be explained by your personal cosmology, it is still incomplete.
3. It must stretch you continually out of your comfort zone. If your personal cosmology makes you comfortable and you want to sit on your oars, it's not an adequate cosmology. You constantly have to stretch. As mentioned this morning, in the agnostic gospel of Thomas: "Those who seek should not stop searching until they find. And when they find, they will be disturbed. And when they are disturbed, they will marvel. And when they marvel, they will rule. And when they're ruled, they will rest." So stage three is about stretching yourself out of your comfort zone.
4. It must be constantly updated. Every experience of every day is new data for creating a better version of your personal cosmology.

Q&A Session

Q (Leo): Carl Young spoke about the daimon and it's typically spelled in English as D-A-I-M-O-N. So it's not the demon. We're not talking about some kind of satanic influence. The daimon for Carl Jung is the muse. So it's who's kind of guiding you from the other side. How does that fit into the seven stages of the body?

A: In some senses, it is the distinction between atman and jiva. The soul kind of bifurcates, except that the vast bulk of the soul energy is always in the sight of God. Only a small percentage actually becomes jiva and incarnates, and they're constantly in dialogue with each other.

So every single one of us as a jiva has an atman who is a daimon for us, who's an inspiration for us, and we also have a team on the other side—angelic beings are those who prepared us for incarnation, and so they're constantly inspiring us as well.

Various great playwrights and musicians and artists speak about their own personal daimon, that there was some being, either an existing person or a fictitious person, who was the source of their inspiration.

In Irish mythology, for instance, we have the notion of a "spéir-bhean," and a spéir-bhean literally means a "sky-woman." The sky-woman is some kind of a muse figure in all of Irish mythology and Irish music. It depends upon the spéir-bhean, the sky woman.

In many different cultures, you have this notion that we're being fed inspiration from the outside. Part of it is the section of your own soul that's always at source, that never left source. That's part of the daimon. And part of it is your soul group who are egging you on, and also your angelic beings and the mentor figures who prepared you for this particular incarnation.

Q (Amy): It kind of ties in with your third point about when we're on the right track with our cosmology, it will push us out of our comfort zone. I've been on a spiritual journey, as we all have, for my entire life, and I've gone down different paths. They might turn out to be dead ends, or I pick things that work for me and then discover things that don't. How do we know if a setback is just a test of our perseverance or a push of our comfort zone, and how do we know when it's actually time to let go of something that's not working?

A: Ask your mother! Amy's question is, in the spiritual journey, when we have to be constantly taken out of our comfort zone, at what stage do you realize you're in a dead end, a cul-de-sac, and it's not a question of just pushing forward even more? It's realizing you took a wrong turn somewhere.

It's really important. When the Jesuits are training spiritual directors, a major part of the training is what's called the "discretio spiritum," which literally means discrimination among spirits. As a spiritual director, you have to figure out at what stage are you being led intentionally into a cul-de-sac by some kind of dark energies, and at what stage are they just testing your resilience? Are you going to stick with the program or give up at the first obstacle?

It's a lifelong process. Part of it is to be in constant contact with what Leo would call the daimon, to be in constant contact with your muse and your angel guardians. To be constantly asking yourself the question, "Am I knocking my head against a concrete wall because I'm stubborn and I don't want to give up, or is God saying to me, this is not the way to go?"

When am I choosing the road less traveled and therefore liable to meet more obstacles than the guy who stays on the tarmac (and therefore I'm on the right path), or am I just choosing to be an obstructionist? Am I selfish and not going to follow the herd?

It's about discrimination of spirits for yourself. Part of the realization is, am I frustrated by the fact that I'm not getting my way, or am I frustrated by the fact that I'm not getting God's way? That's a lot of discrimination.

Having people with whom you can speak on this side and the other side becomes very important, and then having practices like a meditation practice or working with your dreams, or in your case, Amy, spending time with Aiden. Kids between the ages of two and five are living in the imaginal realm, a place where the veil is really thin.

So there are lots of counter-checks. You must constantly go back to the definition of truth: something is true if it transforms you and aligns you with God, and something is ultimate truth if it transforms you radically and aligns you permanently with God.

So there are all these checks and balances, and that's what's called the spiritual journey, your spiritual discipline, your spiritual practice. Having a group of fellow seekers with whom you can bounce these ideas—that's why I said one of the most important things is to be a member of a community.

A community does two things for us: it should support us in our search for truth, and at the same time, it should challenge us in our personal cosmology right now. And you must do the same thing for your community. If you don't challenge your community, it becomes a cult.

We had a great discussion—a bunch of us at lunch today were talking about the notion of community. I believe statistically, sociologically speaking, that the ideal community is less than 150 members, because at less than 150 members, you can have a personal relationship with everybody. You can know their names. If it goes beyond 150 people, it's an institution, and at that stage, it becomes a cult, and an oligarchy takes command of it, and then you go into inquisitions and crusades.

So finding a community—it could be an online community, it can be a local community. You're doing great work with your mythology; you've got a women's group going in Tasmania. So having individual communities that work together, so that an individual community is like a circuit in the global brain. But an individual neuron can be a member of many circuits. And neurologically, that's true—an individual neuron in your brain is part of several different circuits, which allows them to cross-fertilize learning from one community to another.

So if you're a member of three different communities, you're taking learning from community A and teaching community B, and community C is teaching you, and you're going to bring that back to community A.

Some form of community which is manageable and which does not develop into a hierarchical system around a guru—creating a guru immediately creates a problem. There are no gurus. I keep saying that we have to commit four murders in order to be spiritual people. We have to become serial killers:

1. The first murder is I have to kill my ego. Not in the sense that I annihilate it, but in the sense I realize the ego is not my soul. The ego is a servant of my soul.
2. The second murder is I have to kill my father. By that, I don't mean my dad. I mean that I have to outgrow my culture of origin, not in the sense that I abandon it, but that I transcend it. And transcend means to incorporate and go beyond. So I honor it, but no cultural system can take me all the way.
3. The third murder is I have to kill my guru, which is not to dishonor the guru or my teacher, but no guru can take you all the way because you're having experiences that the guru didn't have, because you're an individual.
4. And then finally, I have to kill my god. "I pray daily to God to rid me of God," because every god has been created by theologians. And so I have to go beyond the god created by theologians.

So that's part of the journey of discernment at an individual level and on a community level.

Q (Andre): About languages, different kinds of languages. The language has been cataphatic, delicate—the language of theologians where you attempt rationally to make sense of God. Apophatic language is you back yourself into the experience of God but you can't articulate that experience even. And so then I talked about the different kinds of languages we've created for these gods.

A: Those languages have to do with how to express it—speaking about the gods, which is the language of theologians. And then the second language is speaking to the gods, which is the language of priests. And the third language is speaking on behalf of God, which is the language of prophets. And the fourth language is the language of the mystics, which is speaking as God—not on behalf of God, not to God, and not about God, but as God, because you realize there is only God. And so God is articulating yourself through you.

But then I talked about the non-dual mystics who don't talk at all, because ultimately, the mystic doesn't want to speak because everything you say is going to just be metaphorical. So the best way to express it, if you have to teach it, if you have to be a teacher, is to use parabolic language, metaphorical language.

Q (Ursula): [About the Rosary and dealing with difficulties]

A: Ursula is a German woman who was raised Protestant who rediscovered the rosary a few years ago and has been promoting it very actively in COJ, together with Amy and Dylan down in Tasmania. Ursula, we created a new version of the rosary. I gave homilies on the mysteries of the rosary, and then Amy created a booklet on the basis of that. Ursula has been leading rosaries every Thursday night for people who want to join.

The question she's asking is, when you're experiencing various difficulties in your life, and she talked about her son Yonathan who's having some health issues and experiencing some difficulties, and for Ursula herself, who had a lung transplant two and a half years ago, dealing with personal vicissitudes. For Ursula, this reformed Protestant who found Mary and is praying the rosary—that for her is the way of tamping down the pain and the agony.

For me, I would regard the rosary as a kind of Christian "tonglen," the notion of tonglen in Buddhism where you breathe in the pain of the world, and you transform it in your heart of love, and you breathe it back out as compassion.

Mary is Christa consciousness. If Jesus was Christ consciousness, if Jesus was the masculine articulation of the masculine face of the divine, then Mother Mary is the feminine articulation of the feminine face of God—of Sophia or Isis or Shakti, whatever term you want to give to it. The Christian version of that is Mary.

For me, Mary is kind of a Christian version of tonglen. By praying the rosary, taking in the pain of individual family members and world situations, transmuting it through the rosary, and breathing it out as prayer—that's a really powerful way of changing the world itself. It's not just dealing with your own personal anxiety, but you're creating a positive tulpa. You're creating an energy force which is being committed to by everybody. It literally is quantum information theory. It is an Akashic record which has been influenced by the thoughts and the words of this extraordinary prayer.

Q: What happens if a soul refuses to learn from its experiences? If karma is the life plan we've created for ourselves in the particular incarnation, and karma is our job—to work out what we've signed up to do—and destiny is what happens when we fulfill it, when we play the game well, and fate is what happens when we play it badly, what happens to souls then that refuse to play the game well? They're obviously not learning.

A: It is possible to regress in the course of a particular incarnation. You can't be at a standstill—you're either moving forward or you're moving backward. So that's what being awake really means. Any soul has the possibility of regressing in a particular incarnation.

Part of the reason could be this: when we're being prepared for incarnation, we make what I call pre-conception contracts with another group of souls to come in around the same time as grandparents, parents, children, whatever, and to be in a particular area of the world at a particular stage of human history.

But once we do that, then life is improv theater. We're not coming in with a script. We're not coming with a plot.

I had a client one time in my psychology practice who was a professional actor, and his forte was improv theater. He said there are two rules to improv theater:

1. The first one is you have to work with every line your partner throws you. You can't say, "That's a dumb thing to say. Give me a different line. I can't work with that." You have to work with every line that your partner gives you.
2. The second rule is you have to play to your partner's strengths. You have to give your partner a line you know he's going to be able to handle. And if he does the same for you, the play will take off. If you try to knock him down by giving a difficult line, the whole play is going to collapse, and you're going to collapse with it.

And so life is improv theater. There's no plot. There's no script. We come in here, we know the exact history of every soul we're coming in with, and we know the time of history we're parachuting into. We get a bird's-eye view of what's happening on planet Earth right now, how it's being played out right now. And you volunteer to come in here. But there is no plot and there's no script. You've got to hit the ground running. And then you've got to react to what's happening around you in your family of origin or in your culture.

There are some souls who will volunteer for a mission which is way beyond them. And the mentors will say, "I don't think you're up to that. I think you're biting off more than you can chew." And you're in heaven at this stage: "No, no, no. I can handle this. Send me down. I'm going to knock it out of the park here." And you accept the situation for which you're ill-prepared. They try to persuade you not to, but you have willpower and free will.

So you come in and you find out, either quickly or slowly, that you've really bitten off more than you can chew. At that stage, one of two things is going to happen: you're going to commit suicide, or you're going to regress, and you wind up at the end of the incarnation having lost ground instead of gained ground.

But God is not going to judge you. God is not going to wag his finger: "Bad boy, bad girl. You screwed up." God is saying, "Okay, what did you learn this time?" "Well, I learned I took on more than I was ready for." "Okay. So what kind of a mission are you prepared for at this stage? Where can you go? When can you go? With what kinds of difficulties? What kinds of problems?"

So there is regression possible in any incarnation.

Q (Bill): We know that God is not a person. What about souls? Are souls discrete entities? Are they persons in some senses?

A: Think about it—there's this great notion in mystical Judaism of the "netzutsim," and the netzutsim are the sparks of the divine.

Two years ago, unfortunately, I got COVID, and I had this really bad fever for about seven or eight days. Whenever I get a fever, I get visions. When I was living in Kenya, I had malaria at least once a year every year for 14 years. The upside was I had these extraordinary visionary experiences. So I said, "Bring on the mosquitoes."

I had this vision during my COVID episode two years ago in which I saw God, our source, calling what I call a pre-cosmic conference. So the first thing God did was self-fractured into these netzutsim, and netzutsim would be the Hebrew notion for holographic fractals of the self. Then God called all of those together—all of us included, we're all part of that first conference—and the first conference was, "Can we do something creative as a group?"

And the decision was yes, let's create a cosmos. And we created the cosmos, and we were witnesses to this cosmos, what Buddhism will call "turiya", the witnessing consciousness. And we were delighted with what we've co-created with God herself, and we're enjoying this for an eternal period of time.

And then God called a second conference and God said, "Okay, we're really enjoying being witnesses of this cosmos. Is there something else we can tweak? Can we do something else?" And the decision was made: "Yes, let's create avatars so that we can insert ourselves into the cosmos and experience it from the inside out."

This is what Buddhism will call "turiyatita," the ability to be both witness and participant. It's what cultural anthropology will call participant-observer. So when somebody with a notepad goes into a tribe in South America looking at what the natives are doing, immediately the natives knew two years before he came that he was coming because they're plugged into the Akashic records. They knew there was a stranger coming, and so they're not behaving the way they would normally behave because you're influencing. You are there. You think you're an observer, but you are a participant-observer. You're changing the dynamic.

And so the decision was, "Okay, let's be cultural anthropologists. Let's insert ourselves into this cosmos as avatars and see what it's like. What does it feel like from the inside out?" So that we now become "turiyatita"—that we can participate to the best way possible in this drama, which is improv theater, and at the same time not get identified with that. Don't get identified with the character you're playing or the avatar that you're playing. Realize that you're an eternal spark of the divine.

So now you're walking on two legs. You've got the witnessing consciousness and participant consciousness.

For me, the soul actually is simply a holographic fractal who decided to become an avatar at some stage, and at that stage, it appears to be a discrete, ontologically separate entity. So when we think of soul, we tend to think, "Oh, that's the guy that incarnated right now." But this was actually a game that the netzutsim invented with God in order to further enjoy their creation.

Q: Where in the Bible do you find that the journey goes from Jerusalem and ends in Jericho, where the Exodus experience when the Israelites are conquering the land of Israel?

A: They started the conquest in Jericho and then spent 200 years conquering the land, and finally, they conquered Jerusalem in the year 1010 BCE under David. That's the historical record. So this is in the book of Joshua and in the books of Judges. You'll find the historical record of that 200-year conquest beginning with the fall of Jericho in 1210 BCE and ending with the conquest of Jerusalem in 1010 BCE by King David.

The reverse of that journey, beginning in Jerusalem and going down to Jericho, is the story of the Good Samaritan. Jesus starts the story about somebody who starts in Jerusalem and goes down to Jericho, is

mugged on the way, is abandoned by his fellow tribesmen, and is rescued by a Samaritan and then winds up in Jericho.

But it's my interpretation of that story that I'm talking about. My interpretation is that what Jesus is really saying is there's a different kind of conquest. This is the conquest of the kingdom of God. This is the conquest of Christ consciousness. And the conquest of Christ consciousness is that you reverse the destruction.

Rather than regarding people as strangers—where you've got your fellow citizen whom you should love, your neighbor whom you should love, and the enemy whom you should hate—Christ is saying, "No, you've got it exactly wrong. You start in Jerusalem and you reverse the journey." So it's a conquest of love, not a conquest of military arms.

You'll find that story in Luke, chapter 15, somewhere around there.

Q (Bill): Why is this genocidal maniac that we find in Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy—why is this God that we continue to worship this God?

A: I treated this in my last book, which is "Setting God Free." It is very important for us to realize the history of our journey into spirituality. We can't just scrub all the old data and now present people with a brand new version. This was the thinking of the people of the time, all peoples of the time.

I come from a Celtic mythology in which we've got our own heroes like Cúchulainn or Fionn Mac Cumhaill, who wiped out armies, who killed giants. In Africa, I came across the same kinds of mythologies. Every people has a mythology of conquest where they're the good guys and everybody else is the bad guys.

These stories were actually created at a much later time. Moses allegedly lived about 1250 BCE. Moses is not a historical character. Moses is an invention that came 750 years after his putative existence.

In the year 722 BCE, you have the Assyrian Empire overthrowing the northern kingdom of Israel. The kingdom of Israel had bifurcated. When Solomon died in the year 930 BCE, there was a secession. There was a civil war, and 10 of the northern tribes seceded and they're known as the northern kingdom of Israel. And the two southern tribes, Judah and Benjamin, remained. But the northern tribes were wiped out in the year 722 BCE by the Assyrian Empire. They're gone. We never heard of them again.

The two southern kingdoms survived for another 130 years. Then in the year 597 BCE, the Babylonians overthrew the Assyrian Empire. Then they marched into Jerusalem and captured Jerusalem in 597 BCE. They installed a puppet regime and went back to Babylon. The puppet regime revolted, and they came back in 587 BCE. They took the existing king, the puppet they had created, and his sons, and they gouged out the eyes of the sons and killed them in front of the father. Then they killed the father and took the last two tribes of Israel into Babylon.

So now you have the last two tribes, and at this stage, it looks like this is the end of the road. So how do we retain a sense of self or a sense of nationhood? They create this extraordinary set of stories, a mythology.

Mythology should do three things for us:

1. It should explain some kind of a mythical past that created who we are right now.
2. It should allow us to be able to deal with present vicissitude.
3. It should give us a plan for the future.

So it's straddling the past, the present, and the future. All mythologies do that. Celtic mythology does it, African mythologies do it, African-Americans do it, native tribes in our country do the same thing. We all believe mythologies in which we're the good guys and they're the bad guys, and we are the great conquerors and we've had these great heroes.

So that's what Judaism did. But it was part of their effort to survive a real conquest, a real annihilation. There was a second genocide about to happen. The first genocide happened with the northern kingdom—10 tribes were wiped out. The next genocide was going to be Judah and Benjamin. To prevent that, they create this beautiful story. And this story has kept this tribe afloat for 2,500 years.

It is really important for us that we retain that, just like if I dip into Irish mythology and I say, "I don't want to hear any story before 1916 when Ireland got its independence. I don't want to know about the warriors of old and the kind of the crap we did and the fact that the Celts practiced slavery. I don't want to know any of that kind of stuff. I only want to know about modern Ireland, a democratic republic."

But it is very important for us to remember where we come from. If we don't have a sense of our past, then we don't have a sense of our future.

Let me end with this great Sufi story about a group of travelers who set out across the desert. They're trying to find a place I'm going to call "New Town." They're leaving "Old Town" and they want to go to "New Town." It's hundreds of miles across the desert.

They're in the desert, and after weeks and weeks of traveling, they are totally lost because they were told there's going to be a signpost. "If you keep going, you're going to see a signpost, and there's going to be four fingers on the signpost, and one of them will point to New Town and tell you how to get to your destination."

They're struggling in the desert for weeks and weeks, and there are sandstorms of various kinds, and they're about to give up. Finally one guy says, "Oh, I can see the signpost," and they start running for the signpost. Right then a whirlwind comes out and breaks the signpost and knocks it to the ground. Now they have no idea where New Town is. They're going to give up.

An old man says, "We're not lost yet. I want you to stand it upright. We know where we've come from. We know that one of the fingers was going to say 'Old Town, where we've come from.' Set it down and point that finger to Old Town." And then we know exactly where New Town lies.

By understanding your history, you understand your destination and your destiny, your karma. It becomes really important for us that we not lose the stories. This is why I keep saying to my friends in Africa, "Archive your mythology, just like Ireland did in the 1930s. We have to retain the stories that explain where we've come from."

So these are not just stories about genocidal divinities that we're meant to get rid of. They're evidence of the fact that we try to make sense of our history, we try to survive present vicissitude, we try to create a history and a future for ourselves where we can build upon a sense of self and a sense of being chosen in some way.

I don't ever want to see any of these stories gotten rid of. I need to see them reinterpreted. I need to see them understood from a mystical viewpoint, not a literalist mindset.

Q (Karen): Pursuant to your dream of the creation of souls, are there new souls and old souls?

A: The problem for us is that we're caught in a chronological dimension, a 3D dimension in which there's a past, a present, and a future. There is no time. Meister Eckhart will say that the greatest impediment to the experience of God is the invention of time.

The truth is that everything is present. So there's no such thing as an old soul or a new soul. The old and the new have to do with the level of development of an eternal being or eternal soul.

There's this crazy Christian and Catholic notion that there's no pre-existence of the soul. That a husband and wife make love, a zygote is formed, and God says, "Oh, a new zygote. Let's make a soul. Whoop! Bang! There we go." And God creates a brand new soul and infuses it into the zygote. But there was no pre-existence.

Hinduism is very different. Hinduism believes in a pre-existence of the soul, that the soul has always existed. And that's my viewpoint, that the soul is eternal. So God is not creating brand new souls every time a husband and wife get pregnant. We're eternal beings.

The idea of a new soul, an old soul, and a young soul has to do with the amount of progress that an individual soul has made in the course of developing Christ consciousness. So you have to take chronology out of the picture completely. Chronology screws up the picture. It's more about development.

Q (Karen): Where is the soul located?

A: I remember as a small child, I was five or six years of age, and I couldn't understand the difference between invisible and non-visible. I couldn't make the distinction. Non-visible means I can't currently see it. Like at 10:00 tonight, I won't be able to see the sun. So the sun would be non-visible, but the sun is not invisible. I'll see it again tomorrow morning.

When they talked about the soul being invisible, I was thinking they're looking in the wrong place, and I know where the soul was. I thought it wasn't just a little host for me; it was a plate, and it was right in here [gestures to chest], and it was white. And when you sinned, there was a big black mark down there.

I couldn't understand how adults couldn't figure out that the soul was actually right in here, and it was a plate, and when you sinned, you made a black mark in it.

This idea that the soul is located within the body, that the soul is trapped in the body—the opposite is true. We start off with the soul, and then the soul's devolutionary process surrounds itself with several levels of shells.

The first level of the shell is kind of the psychic body. And then the second level outside that is the mental body. And the next level outside that is the astral body. And the next level outside that is the etheric body. And the last version is the physical body. And so we got this physical shell, in some senses thinking that it's trapped the soul. But the soul has volunteered to shield itself in order to play hide-and-go-seek with God.

Basically, incarnation is a game of hide-and-go-seek with God where God disguises herself, blindfolds you, and now you're going to find out where God is hiding. And the interesting thing is, when you finally find God, you grab the shoulder and say, "Ah, I got you," you're going to find out you've grabbed your own shoulder. That's what the game is about—you've grabbed your own shoulder. So the hide-and-go-seek is about discovering the God within yourself.

So it's like peeling off these shields of ignorance or forgetting. It's not that the soul is trapped; it's that the soul is engaged in this game of hide-and-go-seek. You're grabbing your own shoulder.

I remember having a nightmare at one stage. I don't know if it's ever happened to you, but in my nightmare, there's this dark being at my throat, and with one hand, I catch it and I start forcing it away, and I wake up, and I've gripped my own hand—literally with my own hand. It was my demonic nature or whatever—I was trying to strangle myself in my nightmare, and I caught it.

The same thing is true of God. When you play hide-and-go-seek with God and you grab God's shoulder, you're grabbing your own shoulder.

Q: If there's an infinite number of souls, where's the room for them? Planet earth at the moment has 8 billion characters. If we're constantly recycling, how come, cumulatively speaking, statistically we've had about 111 billion souls live on planet earth?

A: Cumulatively speaking, from the beginning of homo sapiens sapiens way back, there have been about 111 billion souls who have been on planet earth. Now, many of those are recycled souls. So you're going to now change your numbers and find out how many actually different souls have been on the planet at different times.

If there are 8 billion souls on the planet right now, is it overcrowded? The realization is that there are souls coming to planet earth who haven't been on planet earth before. Every soul can jump off and incarnate in different dimensions. But souls are attracted to where the action is. When there's a significant shift in evolution happening in any particular part of the cosmos, souls tend to get attracted to that.

So there are souls on planet earth right now, and this is their first rodeo, literally their first rodeo on planet earth. But they have earned their spurs elsewhere. And some of them are very advanced souls, and they're coming in order to extricate the rest of us.

So the idea that this is a crowded planet right now—it's crowded because it's the most interesting game in the Milky Way galaxy possibly right now. It's the boot camp of the galaxy right now. And so great souls have been attracted to it. These souls have been in other places before.

Q: What about the nuclear family? Are you always going to incarnate in the same nuclear family?

A: I think we make contracts with a particular group of people until each person present has learned what this particular group can teach it, and then we change into different groups. We change up or we change sideways.

But as we're choosing for any one incarnation, we're choosing from two different groups. I call one the soul group or the soul pod, and the other one I call the shadow pod. So we're choosing people to incarnate with who are going to really test us.

I use this example: When I was in Kenya, I was working in very remote areas with nomadic pastoralists. These were people who had no agricultural background. They wandered around with their camels and their cattle and their goats.

When Kenya got its independence on the 12th of December in 1963, the government was forcibly settling nomadic communities, but they had no agricultural know-how. So part of my function was to teach them elementary agriculture. We lived in an area where we got rain only 3 months in the year, and the rest of the time it was like 120 degrees Fahrenheit.

So we decided to grow corn, what we call in Kenya "maize." I taught them how to plant maize. We'd go out with four people:

- The first guy would have just a pointed stick, and he'd dig a hole in the ground every 6 inches.
- The second guy would have a bag of maize kernels, and he'd drop two kernels of maize into each hole.
- The third person, if the family could afford it (and not all families could), would have a bag of artificial fertilizer, powdered fertilizer, and a spoon. They'd take a spoon of fertilizer and put it into each hole.
- And then the fourth person would come and just cover up the hole with his foot, and they'd just walk behind each other in the line.

After about four weeks, the young maize would be emerging, and they'd weed it. After about two months, the maize would be about this height [gestures], and they'd weed it again. And then after 3 months, they'd harvest it.

I would bring them in. I was their agricultural instructor and their priest. And so I would say to them, "If you had to make a choice between either weeding the maize or fertilizing the maize, and you want to optimize your harvest, which is the more important—the weeding or the fertilizing?"

Initially, they were just guessing. But after two or three years, they figured out very quickly: It is much more important to weed than to fertilize. If you're living on the equator with downpours for three months of the year and you put fertilizer down, everything is going to grow—weeds of various kinds, grasses of various kinds—and the maize is going to get lost in the middle. So if you had to make a choice, weeding is far more important.

I would say to them, "That's what Jesus meant when he said 'love your enemies,' because the enemies are the weeders in your life."

So we take weeders as part of our contract from the shadow pod, and fertilizers from our soul pod, and they're both important. If we didn't have fertilizers in our soul group, we'd all have very poor self-esteem. If we didn't have weeders in our group, we'd all become total narcissists.

It becomes really important then that in any incarnation, I bring people from my shadow group and from my soul group. But then within the kind of nuclear family system, whether it's as you say birthed into the family or adopted into the family, these are souls that have been together for many iterations. But then at some stage, they've taught each other and learned from each other what they can learn as a group, and now they're going to make different kinds of contracts with different souls.

Q (Victoria): If you take on a contract which is outside of your depth, in spite of the advice of mentor figures and angelic beings—you sign up for a contract that you can't fulfill; you think you can manage it, but you find out quickly or slowly that you can't manage it. Are the options even then that you regress or that you commit suicide and opt out? Is it possible that you're doing any good at all?

A: The answer is yes. You can still do good because you're still providing opportunities for other people. By witnessing what you are doing, they're also learning and they're having to respond to what you've done.

So you take the worst-case scenario: Suppose I decide to commit suicide because I'm not up to the task. I'm now leaving a whole family system totally distraught. How are they going to harvest that situation? Are they going to be able to grow from the fact that I committed suicide?

So, am I doing good? I didn't suicide in order to do good, but other souls had the ability to harvest my suicide for learning a lesson for themselves. And so yes, even a dastardly act or the inability to fulfill my contract is also an opportunity for other souls to harvest that situation and to grow as well.

Q (Emily): About the preconception contract and fulfilling your contract, how do you use epistemology and ontology and cosmology in order to create a system? If you're talking to people who are going to give you the wrong answers as you're interrogating people?

A: It's not that you're putting yourself on trial, that you're asking questions of yourself. I believe that there are many great practices which are very important. Off the top of my head, I would say that three very important ones would be:

1. Joining an intentional community, whether it's online or geographical. As I said, the community should do two things for you: It should support you in your search for truth, and it should challenge you in your current cosmology, and you should do the same thing for the community. It's a two-way street.
2. Developing a personal cosmology.
3. Creating some kind of a regular disciplined daily spiritual practice.

Just straight off the bat, these are three ways in which you can try to build and interrogate. But then you have to constantly outgrow your cosmology. You're having new experiences every day of your life.

So can I cram the experiences I'm having on March 24th into the cosmology you, Emily, came to the United States with a few days ago from Australia? Has anything happened in the last 24 hours that's allowing you to interrogate yourself and ask different questions? Of course—you've had experiences here that you haven't had before you came here because you're meeting a whole new bunch of people. So you have to continue interrogating yourself.

And the same thing with the community. You have to interrogate a community, asking what are their belief systems and how did they arrive at that situation?

And then there are lots of other practices like spending time with little children. You're going to learn a lot from your three-year-old son because your little son uses imagination in the way in which imagination is meant to be used—crossing the veil constantly. And his imaginary friends are not imaginary. They're real. He's having encounters at the other side of the veil.

So joining in the games of little children, not patronizingly tapping him on the head and saying, "Wow, that's a grand story," but really listening and joining and seeing if you can cross the veil with them. If they can take your hand psycho-spiritually and lead you through, you're going to learn from that.

Going into nature—nature is a great teacher. Nature has never met a situation that it hasn't been able to harvest for good. So I spend a lot of time just watching what nature does. There are two creeks that flow through my property. I spend a lot of time just wading in the creeks. During the winter time, these creeks are 15 feet high. And during the summertime, it's just a kind of a necklace of pools which are maybe 4 or 5 feet deep.

I trek up. It's sometimes waist-high, sometimes knee-high. I'm constantly amazed at what I encounter. A few years ago, I came across a situation—there are lots of wild pigs where I live, and there are coyotes and stuff like that. The trees are fishing stuff out of the creek. When the water rises up to 15 feet and there's stuff coming downstream, the branches are fishing stuff up. So when the water recedes, you get stuff hanging in the branches, which tells you exactly how high the water was.

I'm trekking upstream, and I come across a wild pig skull hanging, dangling on a branch about 12 feet over the water. And a bird has built a nest inside it. And there are two little babies peeping out through the eyes of the pig.

I'm thinking, nature never wastes an opportunity. So spending time in nature and watching how nature deals with what we throw at it, what happens to it.

So spending time in nature, spending time with little kids, joining a community—these are all the ways in which we kind of interrogate ourselves, our cosmologies, and our communities.

Q: Can you say more about becoming a serial killer, the four murders?

A: The first one is to kill the ego, to transcend the ego—to kind of incorporate and go beyond. So it's not that you're abandoning it, but that you're transcending in the sense of incorporation and then going beyond.

So the first thing is the ego. The second thing is the father or the culture you've come out of. The third one is your guru or your teacher, and the fourth one is your god.

Q: It feels like there is no landing place.

A: You're not meant to land. You're meant to fly. I'm serious. You're not meant to land. You're meant to fly. You're really meant to fly. And so you take off again and again and again. You elevate yourself continually until you give birth to God. So don't look for a landing pad.

Q: [Three questions about cosmic change, Jesus's enlightenment, and the bloodline of Jesus]

A: Very definitely, there are angelic beings—these what I call 64,442 light beings who are beaming loving energy at the planet for this period of transition, what I've called, using Stan Grof's model, the doulas and the midwives of the birthing process of the next stage of humanity. So yes, this is not a solitary project that we're trying to navigate. Just as homo sapiens sapiens, this has been orchestrated by, radiated by, lovingly directed by a lot of other forces.

The second question was about Jesus himself, about his enlightenment. Jesus, like any human being, had to be born, had to navigate through having a physical body, being confined in his physical body, and he had to grow as a human being and he made mistakes.

There's one story, for instance, in Matthew's gospel about chapter 15, where he decides to go on vacation with the disciples and they leave Israel and they go into Syrophenicia, and they're walking through a village and a Syrophenician woman recognizes him. She's been in Israel and she says, "Oh my God, this is the healer from Israel." And she starts running up the village street at him saying, "Son of David, have pity on me. My little daughter's at home and she's dying. Please help her."

And Christ ignored her. And they decided, people are coming to the houses, to their huts. They think we assaulted this woman. "Do something already." And Christ said a very strange thing. He said, "It is not fair. I was only sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." And he kept going.

And the woman ran after him and she went up in front of him and she bowed as she grabbed his feet. We have the same system in Swahili in Kenya, and we say "shikamu"—"I hold your feet." When you're honoring somebody, you kneel for them and you literally hold their feet. So she said, "Shikamu, I hold your feet. Please, my little daughter is dying. Please help her."

And Christ said a very strange thing. He said, "I can't take the food from the children and throw it to the dogs." It was a really terrible thing to say. And at that stage, the Father hit him a wallop upside the head and said, "Dude, firstly I did not send you just to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and this woman is not a dog."

Now, the woman was better than Christ here. The woman said to him, "You know what? Maybe we're dogs, but sometimes the little puppies run into the house and they take the food that the children dropped on the floor. That's all I want."

And then Christ finally realized, "Woman, I've never found this kind of faith in Israel. You've woken me up." So Christ realizes maybe it's the first time that his mission is not just to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and that outsiders are not—we have a very abusive phrase in Swahili for that. When you call somebody a "shenzi," a shenzi is a mongrel, a dog, a mongrel dog. So to call somebody a shenzi is the ultimate insult in Swahili.

So Christ needed to outgrow the last piece of his prejudices, and so he's still a work in progress, because he's in a human space suit, subject to all the indoctrination of being part of any group of people. And so Christ himself has a moment of elucidation when he finally wakes up totally to who he is.

The third part of your question had to do with Jesus's physical bloodline. If the Shroud of Turin has blood marks on it that have been analyzed, and if they are Druze, if it's a possibility it's an AB bloodline, and that is that Druze, is there a kind of lineage there? And so, for instance, did Jesus have children? Was Jesus married to Mary of Magdala? And did Mary carry the child of Jesus to France and give birth to the Merovingian royal lineage?

I think we have to differentiate between the genetical history of the space suit and the spiritual history of the soul, and not confuse them. Every one of us has to be born into a genetical lineage. So if Jesus were born of Druze origin, it means that his physical space suit that he took, being born in Bethlehem in 6 BCE, if that's of the Druze origin, that's fine.

Does that mean that Jesus is a Druze? Absolutely not. I believe that Jesus was a reincarnation of the Buddha. And so was Jesus of Indian origin? Is his genetic origin a Hindi origin? In that particular incarnation, that's the body he took.

If Jesus is on the planet right now, he's in some other configuration. If he's in a space suit, there's a genetic history to that space suit. So it becomes very important then not to mix up the genetic material of the space suit into which a soul incarnates with the history of the soul itself.

Q: Who are the Druze?

A: Druze is a community in modern-day Middle East, around Lebanon particularly, that area, who have a very distinct spiritual tradition. They've been vilified during the Lebanon war 20-30 years ago, and are being subjected to the current occupiers of Syria. Those who've overcome the Syrian regime are trying to wipe out the Druze right now. And so the Druze are looking for protection. It's a very beautiful spiritual system. It's not Judaism, it's not Christianity strictly speaking, and it's not Islam. It's a very different, beautiful spiritual system.

Q: What is the mystical understanding of the Holy Grail?

A: The literalist mindset is that Joseph of Arimathea, when Jesus was dying on the cross and the soldier pierced his side with a lance and blood and water came out, that Joseph of Arimathea was out there with a cup gathering the blood of Jesus in the cup, and that somehow they retained this cup, and that became the Holy Grail. So that's the literal interpretation—that it literally is a cup that contains the physical blood of Jesus.

If you're trying to unpack that myth symbolically, at that stage it means that somehow there was a container for the dying of Jesus, that those who witnessed it were witnessing an extraordinary event, and that was symbolized by stuff like the rending of the curtain in the temple, which allegedly happened at the moment that Jesus died. So that would be a symbolic representation.

What would be the mystical interpretation of the Holy Grail? The Holy Grail is that Mary was the Holy Grail. She was the one who contained the blood of Jesus, who gave birth to him. Mary of Magdala is the Holy Grail. You are the Holy Grail. Anybody who's aware of their Christ consciousness is a Holy Grail. You contain the essence of divinity in yourself. And the Holy Grail mystically speaking is not blood. It's not AB blood, and it's not even the symbolism of the rending of the veil of the temple. It's the realization that every single person who's awake to Christ consciousness or crystal consciousness is a Holy Grail. That's your job—to become a Holy Grail.

Q: How do I understand or make sense of the Second Coming of Christ?

A: I do not believe that the Second Coming of Christ is a physical being coming down from the heavens in a flesh suit and beating the crap out of the bad guys and taking us all into heaven. I believe that the Second Coming of Christ happens on an individual basis. Whenever you wake up to your inner divinity, the Second Coming has already happened.

I believe also that the most current incarnation of Christ is not an individual person. It is a movement. It's not that Christ is going to appear in another space suit and that we're all going to recognize him and say, "Oh, there's Jesus. He's back." It's that it's going to be a movement, the movement of Christ consciousness.

It's not going to be somebody riding on clouds and putting back down and saying, "I've arrived and I'm pissed." It's going to be the realization one by one, person by person, community by community, culture by culture, species by species that there is only God, there is only love. And that was the message of Christ. It is the birthing of God. That's the Second Coming—the birthing of God.

Q: I love the idea of Christ being actually reincarnated as a Buddha figure. What about the notion that Christ survived the crucifixion and spent time in the far east, visiting Zoroastrianism in Persia, Buddhism in Tibet, and Hinduism in India?

A: Did Christ survive crucifixion? There's a notion, for instance, that the Essenes had developed a technology of suspended animation, and that when Christ was on the cross, they had prepared a particular kind of drink. When you read the story, one of the first things Christ said was, "I am thirsty," and they took a sponge and they dipped it in hyssop and they put it on a spear and they stuck it up to his lips, and he sucked it because he's parched.

So one theory is that they had created some kind of a concoction that created suspended animation, and that Christ appeared to be dead, and that therefore he was taken down off the cross after 3 hours, put in the tomb, and then he was revived and then escaped and then spent time in the east visiting all the other great wisdom traditions.

Now personally, I don't subscribe to that notion. I think Christ literally died on the cross. Now resurrection for me then is a question of what body does Christ resurrect ?

It's very important to understand that there are very different levels of the understanding of body. In Egyptian understanding, there's what they call "ka" and "ba"—there's the physical body and then there's a spirit body. In Greek, there are three words for it: "sarx," "soma," and "pneuma."

"Sarx" is the flesh and blood, from which we get the word "sarcopenia," when the flesh gets wrinkled or the muscles dissolve. The first word they have for is "sarx," flesh and blood. The second one is "soma," which is the psychosomatic level of the body, and the third one is "pneuma" or spirit.

In Paul's letter to the Corinthians in chapter 11 and in chapter 15—in chapter 11, he's talking about Eucharist, and in chapter 15, he's talking about resurrection. And he says, "Sarx cannot inhabit the kingdom of heaven. Flesh and blood cannot inhabit the kingdom of heaven."

So Paul has three words available to him: sarx, soma, and pneuma. Which is the body that Paul is talking about in Eucharist and in resurrection? In Eucharist, for instance, when you receive a Eucharist, are you digging into Christ's kidney or his big toe? Is it Christ's physical body? Obviously not.

What's happening is that you're elevating your consciousness into a totally different state, and Christ is coming down several stages of this ladder, and you're meeting in a middle place, maybe at an archetypal reality, and you're having a real encounter. But reality is not a physiological phenomenon. Reality is a much higher phenomenon. So real presence has to do with the essential Christ that you're in dialogue with, in communion with, when you receive communion.

Now the same thing is true of resurrection. What body did Christ resurrect? When the Shroud of Turin is impregnated with this extraordinary radiation, there's not enough radiation power available on planet earth right now to do what happened to that shroud 2,000 years ago. Literally, there are not enough nuclear reactors to recreate that impression on a piece of linen today, 2,000 years later.

So what happened? Some kind of a deeper level of body, in some kind of a burst of energy, radiated this cloth. What happened at that stage for me? Jesus is inhabiting a different level of self, and therefore, in that level of self, he can visit all of these different locations and he can interact with ascended teachers in these locations. They don't have to encounter another physical being in order to encounter Jesus. They're encountering an ascended master as they themselves are ascended masters or have access to their realms.

So he may be having real encounters with real individuals who are following Zoroastrian teaching or Buddhist teaching or Hindu teaching, but those ascended beings are having real encounters with the reality of Jesus, but not necessarily his physiology.

Q (Damian): This battle, this recognition of evil—do I think that this is done on an individual basis, or is this more a cultural phenomenon, or presumably, is there influence from the outside along with this recognition?

A: Here's an answer for you, Damian. You know that I've been seeding my dreams for many years, and at one stage about three years ago, I asked for a definition. I wanted to differentiate between sin and evil.

The answer I got in my dream was that sin is the individual transgression of a culturally created precept. It's breaking a man-made law. Whereas evil is a cosmic conspiracy using human intermediaries to separate souls from source. So they're radically different.

All of the models of sin are basically breaking laws made up by human beings, because ultimately I believe there is only one sin. It is the refusal to wake up. And this is the sin against the Holy Spirit.

Christ says very enigmatically at one stage, "You can sin against the Son himself and it'll be forgiven. You can sin against the Father and that will be forgiven. But if you sin against the Holy Spirit, it can't be forgiven."

What did he mean by that? The sin against the Holy Spirit is the refusal to wake up. And if I refuse to wake up, I can't experience forgiveness. So it's not that I'm not being forgiven. It's that I've closed myself. I close my heart. I'm impermeable to the forgiveness and the love of God, which is still radiating down.

So it's not that God says, "No, no, no. You insulted the Spirit. I'm really upset with you. I'm not going to forgive you." It's not that. It is that I have closed my heart. And any heart that's closed to giving out love and forgiving other people is also closed to accepting love.

When I was working in Kenya, I would use this image: The women in the marketplaces in Kenya would use what was called a "debe." A debe was a recycled petrol tin. It was about 12 inches square on the base and about 18 inches high. They would sell grain in it, and they would sell potatoes in it.

When they were selling grain, they would fill up the container with grain and make a pyramid such that if you dropped another single grain, the whole thing would collapse. And that's how they sold it, a debe of grain.

But when they were selling a debe of potatoes, they would use what was called a "crushed debe." They'd punch in the sides and they'd punch up the bottom, and then they'd put the spuds in it. So if there was one big spud in the middle, and then they put spuds on top of it, half of the debe was empty, but you didn't know that. All you saw was the top of the debe with spuds in it.

I would say to them, "God is like a debe. If you bring a debe to God and ask God to forgive you, to fill your debe with forgiveness, and you're using an ordinary debe, God will fill it up for you. But if your sister comes to you and she asks for your forgiveness, and you measure out your forgiveness in a crushed debe, one that's punched in at the sides, don't go back to God again with an ordinary debe and ask for forgiveness, because you can only experience the level of forgiveness that you are able to give to another person."

So that's the notion. Forgiveness becomes a really important part of this dimension. Forgiveness is the realization that there is only one sin—the refusal to wake up.

Now, evil is a totally different phenomenon. Evil is a cosmic conspiracy using human intermediaries to separate souls from source. And the fact that you've got very advanced beings, much more technologically advanced or even more cognitively advanced than we are, does not mean that they're more spiritually or more morally advanced.

So there's this effort at a cosmic level, at an interdimensional level, to separate human beings from accessing source itself. And so evil is the attempt to separate souls from source. The human species has been dealing with that for over 70,000 years, but it's reached a crescendo at this stage.

Various teachers have come throughout human history—maybe like Zoroaster 1500 years ago, or Lao Tzu 2,500 years ago, or the Buddha 2,500 years ago, or Jesus Christ 2,000 years ago. And now in our times, Christ is saying, "You're meant to do things that I couldn't do because the timing wasn't right, but now the timing is right."

So it's the question of buckling up for the battle. And it's not a battle with swords or nuclear arsenals. It's a battle of love against hatred. It's a battle of forgiveness against holding on to hurt.

One of the things I learned in Kenya was when you learn to pray in many different languages, and then you translate from one language to the other, you get insights about various parts of the prayer.

I learned the Our Father in Gaelic as a child, and it says, "Forgive us our sins as we forgive those who sin against us." And that was the English translation, and I learned it in Swahili as well, and it's the same notion. In Swahili it says, "Tu samehe zetu kama nasi tu wasemehe wengine," which means, translated literally, "Forgive us our sins in exactly the same fashion that we forgive those who sin against us."

That's the first time I understood forgiveness. The little word "as" in English doesn't capture it. "Forgive me as I forgive you"—what does "as" actually mean? It means, "Forgive me in exactly the same fashion that I'm forgiving people that ask my forgiveness." And that's when I would talk to them about the debas.

So learning forgiveness is about letting go of the pain I'm holding because of the hurt I've experienced. I don't want to carry this stuff as my burden anymore.

Occasionally, in my psychology practice, if somebody came to me with a burden of anger against a family member or an ex or a neighbor of some kind, and they've been carrying this load of hatred on their back for years and years, I would say to them, "Is there any walking trail near where you live?" "Yes, there is." "I want you to get a knapsack, and I want you to pick up a big stone from your backyard, or several big rocks from your backyard. Put them in your knapsack and walk on that trail. And when you get out five or six miles, open it and get rid of the stones and come back with an empty backpack. Then come back next week and tell me what that was like."

And they'd do it. You get all these big rocks from the backyard, put it in a knapsack, put it on your back, and schlep it all the way out for five or six miles and then dump it and then come back. And I'd ask them, "What was the difference between the outward journey and the inward journey?" "The difference was I wasn't carrying all this crap on my back." I said, "Well, that's what you've been doing. How long do you want to carry this crap against your ex or your neighbor or whatever?"

The realization is that we're our own worst enemies. Forgiveness is not condoning what the other person has done or even excusing what the other person has done. It is understanding that they did it for their own reasons.

There's a proverb in French that says, "To understand everything is to forgive everything." Not that you condone it or pardon it, but you understand why they did what they did. So now that you understand that there was a reason that they did what they did—it's not to say it was my fault they did it, but that was their reasoning for what they did. So there's a reason they did what they did. And when you get that, you can understand, "Okay, now I can understand why they did what they did. I don't excuse it. I don't condone it. But I can understand it and now I can let go of the burden I've been carrying."

And that's true of the situation which we find ourselves in as a human species. We can look at the crap that we're dealing with, almost like it's cosmically created, and realize there are reasons that this is happening. There are reasons that these beings are acting in the way these beings are acting. It's not to condone it. It is not to excuse it, but it is to understand it and let go of the burden and not be filled with anger against the crap that's happening, but be filled with the vocation to become a doula of the next stage of human consciousness. Fill yourself with the assets and the abilities and the techniques of being a doula, and forget about being a guillotine operator.

Q (Damian): Is my definition of waking up that you can fully realize your Christ consciousness and then you can begin responding to life in that fashion?

A: That's exactly what I mean, Damian. You hit the nail on the head. Waking up is Christ consciousness. As I said at the very beginning, Christ consciousness is the permanent awareness of the inner divinity of all beings, including the enemies, including the dark forces of the heavens that Christ is talking about—understanding that they too, in some senses, are filled with divine being, but they've chosen selfishness and narcissism instead of love and service to others. And so they too have to be forgiven.

Being awake is waking up to the realization that everything that exists is a word of God made flesh.

Q (Amy): What about the Catholic notion of Eucharistic devotion?

A: In the Catholic churches, there's a kind of a tabernacle which contains the hosts, and sometimes there's a monstrance, which is a beautiful vessel with a window in it, and there's a host inside the window, and the Catholics will worship in front of it.

Now, does that mean that Catholics are worshiping in front of a piece of stale bread? Obviously not. What's happening is that you're going beyond the symbolic representation of a piece of bread in a monstrance, and you're raising your state of consciousness, and you're accessing an area where your advanced soul self is encountering the soul self of Jesus the Nazarene, and you're dialoguing at that level.

When you get a group of people coming together, each of whom is accessing that level of consciousness, you're creating literally a sea of light in the area.

I remember as a small child on Pentecost Sunday every year, all of the men of all of the churches in Cork City—and there were maybe 20 different churches in the city—Kim, you'll remember this really well. On the feast of the Holy Eucharist, the men would gather at their own churches, and they'd process in formation down to Daun Square, a big square in Cork City, and there was an altar set up. The bishop of Cork, a guy called Cornelius Lucey, would be there, and he'd be holding the monstrance aloft, and you'd have about 30,000 men who had made a pilgrimage from their home churches, gathered in Daun Square, each of them in an altered state of consciousness. And by God, was Christ present there! It was absolutely palpable.

You had 30,000 ordinary men, carpenters and mechanics, fathers and brothers, gathered together looking at this host in the distance being held by the bishop of Cork, elevating their consciousness, and everything was different. Everything was different.

So it's not a piece of stale bread behind a window.

Guys, let's break it down and go stretch your legs. Namaste, my brothers and sisters.