

# ALTAR OF PEACE

COPYRIGHT©2011TIAGO BONACHO

NOTE: THE TEXT HAS BEEN WRITTEN IN ENGLISH AND REVISED BY THE AUTHOR, TO WHOM, NONETHELESS, REMAINS STILL NOT BEING THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE. AS OF THAT, DISCRETION IS ADVISED WHEN IT COMES TO GRAMMAR.

## I

– Kant stated that everything that is perceived and made conscious is only phenomenon, manifestation of something that is ungraspable in its true being. That is, information, so to become something in consciousness, inevitably appears pre-determined by what cognitively enables us to consciously know whatever it may be, hence the things in-themselves and unconditional understanding, so to say, the unconditioned knowledge is thus impossible to us, given the preconditions that every experience is invariably invested with so we can even know at all. God, then, understood as in being of transcendental Nature, that is, in theory, not only deemed unavailable in the world of phenomena (the only one where we obtain experience and knowledge from), but also without correspondence in the abilities of our intellectual grasp, God is then an issue on which reason might dwell on, but on grounds

where its unable to grasp or at least affirm anything that could be settled for universally valid, since we don't seem to have appropriate cognitive instruments, alike the ones that make mathematic and geometry possible, that would enable us to produce affirmations about God as we do for the latter issues (that don't need exterior proof so to be reckon as evidential truth, but already hold as evidence by intuitive logic and conceptual demonstration alone). Under this scenario, theology is therefore understood to be an area on which reason can dwell on, but only to deliberate about it in antinomies, as in, reason can assent to the existence of God as well as to its opposite, because both the existence of God as well as His inexistence are things that can't be proved, neither by objective, exterior perception (because we condition everything we experience, and God is subjectively understood as objectively unconditioned) neither by self-evident conceptual reasoning (because we don't understand ourselves as in possessing similar cognitive instruments as to those that make mathematics and geometry possible, so to turn the existence of God self-evident by logical demonstration alone).

»Let's say that there are two kinds of evidences or ways to obtain proof: the ones that require proof by practical demonstration, by

experience, and the ones that don't need exterior demonstration, but can make themselves evident solely by logical reasoning. Kant seems to say that human understanding inevitably imposes conditions on what is experienced, adding or changing already what is experienced, as it inevitably contextualizes it into a sum of conditions just to make the act of knowing even possible. Dogma is thus impossible and all that might be said about God is only speculation, because we are already unable to prove His existence, for two reasons: 1. Objectively, exteriorly speaking, because God is understood as in being of unconditioned Nature (and since we inevitably condition whatever we experience so to know, the unconditioned, like God, is impossible to experience, to point Him out in nature, so to speak, which we wouldn't be able to do even if we saw Him, as in, in the world of phenomena, God seems to be unrecognizable ); and 2. as far as proving His existence by logic alone, we don't seem to have an inherent cognitive ability, alike the ones that we have that make mathematics and geometry possible, that would somehow make the existence of God irrefutable by idiosyncrasies' comparison alone, so to speak.

»Consciousness seems to be related to God understood immediately as an infinite beginning. A self-evident Conscious Origin. Self-

evident because the concept of consciousness (and thus our fundamental sense of self) is impossible, if taken in any way deriving from unconsciousness. If denying that premise, that is, if denying consciousness or awareness as not being accidental but expression of Origen, one seems to be denying all consciousness beyond and prior to oneself; we'd be saying that consciousness is exclusive of whomsoever claims that attribute for himself – needless to say, bound to believe in that claim solely when affirmed in our regard – unless we realize now that in fact we are not alive, but dead, and, although writing or reading these words, we are actually unaware or unconscious of ourselves thinking that we are – not by mistake but by illusion – which seems to make death less of an end, but a door out of a paradoxical dream.

## II

– That's how it starts.

»Someone talking. We all arrived in the middle of something, anyway. What's the point? Is consciousness just a shadow, a synchronized dance? Not a reflection, but origin of movement, thus errorless and omnipresent illusion of self?, alike the insight beyond the forgery of laws, trying to pass in rags for yesterdays or just now. Eternity, without you, there is no meaning.

»Unmerciful originality of the present – knowledge, what are you? Memory's divinity? What's the mystery of life? Will our souls blend with fate? Will we cry the rains or smile the sun?, wink the night and sigh the moon?, sow with stars and talk with Angels? Are we not the conscious ones, or are we the reflection of someone else, bounded in someone else's consciousness? Not the person but the shadow, not projector but reflection, not beholder but

beheld, not a subject but an object, like trying to say something amidst a hard hushed panic, believed as a child would a puppet. Eternity, you are the cradle of my mind. What are these invisible walls? They echo like a church.

»Are you still there?

Anubis barked.

– Come here, boy – said the Witness, petting Anubis. – The Christian disposition to discuss Christ in philosophical terms wasn't and isn't deemed inappropriate because it is held as at least unoffending to God's Majesty. But it is not being discussed a philosophical God, conjectured sole out of reason's foreseen necessities for the existence or not of a supreme supernatural entity. We didn't reason ourselves onto Christ. God, in Christianity, is a Revelation.

»It feels like the dialogue between philosophy and Christian Doctrine, throughout the centuries, gradually arrived at a point where God was no longer thought upon as a God that is believed true not fundamentally because of what our reason may assure us about Him out of our perceptive abilities or logical reasoning, but mostly because of being believed as a God that revealed Himself throughout History; a God most of all reckoned as such more out of testimonies of power rather than of reason's



speculations about divinity, needless to say, a God you have to believe in, a God that seeks faith.

»Both the ones that believe in God as well as the ones that don't, say that we should all get along and live in peace. But the ones that don't believe in God announce that out of fear and the ones that do believe in God out of hope. Because the inexistence of God justifies violence and all sorts of evil, which is then a very relative thing, that's why the ones that don't believe in God, despite denying His existence, still say that we should live in peace, but out of fear or ignorance from the natural outcome of that disbelief.

»People, in general communication, don't seem to express themselves through paths, but destinations. That's why we seem to disagree. Mathematic is just a form of knowledge, nor better nor worse than others, just different in nature and use. If mathematical knowledge is the only thing certain we can know for sure, what are we, then? An echo of a zero in space and its relation to existence? A talking number, looking for a name? A conscious number is then a question: who do I serve? Which seems to lead again to theology. Which, as Christians, leads us to where we presently are.

– Theology led us to the north of Spain? – asked Vanessa.



### III

– Time is very important in Christianity – continued the Witness. – Hence this place. This place is like the continuation of the apparitions of Fatima. Are you familiar with them?

– Yes – answered Vanessa.

– In this place, Our Lady and Saint Michael the Archangel appeared to say, well, overall, to say what Our Lady has been saying throughout the years: remember God in your lives. Convert. Be good.

– Anything specific?

– Yes. We have to apprehend the state of the world in comparison to God's plan for humanity. It has already been said and noted that the world is in a current state similar to that of Sodom, godless, perverted and depraved. The image of an alcoholic elderly woman, in the

night, with too much makeup on and overdressed for her lonesome, listening to old records or something, always seems to come to mind when thinking about the state of western civilization. Do you see what I mean?

– I think I do. That’s a funny comparison  
– giggled Vanessa.

– But it’s no laughing matter, I assure you. Our Lady said that God would leave a visible supernatural sign that would remain here until the end of the world.

– Is that what this is about? The end of the world?

– I can’t answer that question, but I think not, but rather the end of times, of an epoch, if you like. Our Lady said that before that miracle comes, a warning sign would be sent to all humanity, that will, it is assumed, light up the light of God in us, so we can see ourselves through His eyes, realizing all the real good and evil that we’ve done. I should underscore real, because people might have a wrong idea about themselves out of what they might consider as in living a «normal life». But if God has no part in that «normal life», you seem to be dead. The suffering and devastation that was brought about by World War II wasn’t the only harm done. Another harm that that war produced was

very low standards, as in, if I don't do what that guy did, well, I guess it's safe to say that I'm home free. But good as well as evil are related to something, related to the Truth.

– I Am the Way, the Truth and Life – said Vanessa.

– No one comes to the Father except by Me – completed the Witness.

– John 14:6.

– That's what Jesus said of Himself. But good and evil, on their own, seem to be but subjective concepts. They are what they are in the light of the Truth, compared with something. Because, on their own, it's like forcing you to choose between two things without context, as in, a car or a parachute? Well, a parachute, because I rather walk to the store wearing a parachute backpack than drive out of an airplane. But good and evil, while related to the Truth, seem to send that question for what happens after death. So the question is who are you going to believe about that subject? The question is credibility.

– So how can we distinguish?

– Saint Agustin wrote that one of the things that still amused him in other philosophies, before he converted to Christ, was

the package rather than the substance, some sort of eloquence, if you like. He commented, however, something like, it is not the eloquence that makes it true nor does the truth, so to be recognized as such, has to be conveyed in a poor manner.

– Sure.

– But concerning credibility – continued the Witness –, it looks like God, maybe not always, but many times, chooses people that are not very scholar type persons concerning religion or whatever subject. You have, for example, prophet Amos, in the Old Testament, saying that he was only a shepherd and/or a farmer. And you have Jesus that had fishermen among His Apostles. Many times they argued with God that they thought they were unable to do what God was asking of them. But God, I imagine, answered them that it was precisely because of that, or one of the reasons, He had chosen them, so it would be recognized that it was Him, God, that was at work there. Again, this is not to be taken as a law or defining characteristic. There were other prophets that were priests, so obviously more schooled in religion than the average person.

»For me, Saint Paul, regarding this matter, seems to be the best example. An ultra-zealous Pharisee, that went from city to city

persecuting Christians, what does he say: I was on my way to Damascus, so to bring in chains Christians that were there, when suddenly, boom!: white light everywhere, and a voice: Saul, why are you persecuting Me? Saint Paul was an educated man, naturally well schooled in Scripture. When he defends Jesus as in being the Messiah and the Son of God, more than trying to deliver an interpretation of Scripture to justify his faith in Jesus, he just simply tells what happen to him when he was on his way to Damascus, as in, why such a radical change occurred with him? Naturally something extraordinary had to have happened to him. Credibility, as in bearing in mind what he was and what he became. Do you see what I mean?

– Yes, I do. And the supernatural sign will be left here?

– Yes, down there, on the pine grove. And the ones that are here when it happens, if unbelievers, they will convert, and the sick will be cured.





## IV

– Some sort of low mystique.

– That’s an interesting opinion about writing – answered Vanessa, as she continued following the Witness down the mountain.

– A writer or, best said, a poet, attempts what mystiques do when endowed in God’s grace.

– What do you mean?

Anubis barked.

And rushed down into the Village.

– Never mind – answered the Witness.

Both kept descending in silence for a while.

– So this is the place – said Vanessa, when reaching the Pine Grove.

– This is it. Look at it – said the Witness, contemplating the mountain around them. – Looks like a natural amphitheatre for it, doesn't it?

– Yes. An enormous one. Does it have a name?

– Mount Elias.

– Like the prophet?

– Just like the prophet. Do you know what primarily is, or was, related with the word prophet?

– I think it has to do with exaltation or ecstasy.

– Yes, exalted, ecstatic, to be out of oneself.

– The high mystique...?

– If you like – smiled the Witness.

– Could you tell me more about the apparitions that took place here? – asked Vanessa, putting down her backpack.

– First, Saint Michael appeared, so to prepare the seers. Then Our Lady.

– Sounds like the apparitions of Fatima, with the Angel appearing first and everything.

– Yes, like I’ve mentioned before. These apparitions are like the continuation of the apparitions of Fatima. In Her message here, Our Lady told that God will send a sign so to prepare the world for the great Miracle, the one that will leave a visible supernatural sign here, in this pine grove. When the Miracle happens, the ones here, if unbelievers, will convert, and the sick will be cured. Our Lady also told that if the world doesn’t change, if the world doesn’t turn to God after that Miracle, then a great chastisement will befall on the Earth, which could be interpreted pretty much as the end of the world.

– I thought you’ve said that this is not about that.

– Do you know one of my favorite things said about God? Is that God is alive. I didn’t make much of it when I first heard it, but gradually it became a very powerful expression for me. Tell me, what is one of your favorite answers of Jesus in the Gospel?

– It’s...

– Let me guess? Give to Caesar what is Caesar's and to God what is God's, right?

– One of the best.

– Also one of mines. But concerning this issue (of the expression God is alive), one of my favorites is the one that Jesus gave the Sadducees, when they questioned Him about the resurrection (that the Sadducees didn't believe in).

– Why was that?

– I guess that party or sect dwelt mostly on the Torah, the first five books of the Bible. And since they didn't see there any proof or explicit mention to the resurrection...

– Okay.

– But the question they presented to Jesus revolved around a law that the Jews had concerning marriage and family duties. If, for example, a man died and left no descendants, the man's brother would have had to take in marriage his late brother's widow so to provide offspring. So they went to Jesus, just to try to embarrass Him about the resurrection, with a story about a man who had so many brothers, who married and died without leaving descendants, and so one of the brothers took his brother's wife, just like Moses instructed. That

brother also died without providing descendants, and so on and so forth regarding all the brothers, as in, all died one after the other, ending in all of them taking in marriage the first brother's wife. So the question that the Sadducees presented to Jesus was: in the resurrection, of all the brothers, to whom is she going to be wife, given that she married all of them? Jesus answered them that she will be the wife of none of the brothers, because, in Eternal Life, neither men will marry nor women will be given away in marriage, because everyone will be like Angels. And about the resurrection and Eternal Life, Jesus reminded them what God told of Himself to Moses: I Am the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. As in saying, God is not the God of the dead, but of the living, despite that, obviously, nor Abraham nor Isaac nor Jacob being around in the time of Moses, let alone in the time of Jesus, but, nevertheless, God, as in, an immortal Being, still identified Himself to Moses as in being the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. What can be understood of this is that those Sadducees, that went to Jesus with that question, after Jesus' reply, must have realized that their faith in God really didn't exist, as in really believing in an everlasting and supernatural Being and, as a natural follow up, a supernatural life, that, come to think of it, they didn't believe in God at all. Not that they might have not acted piously, in

truth or not, in some or many occasions, or with right intentions, but because they had yet failed to understand God properly when it came to His Revelation, in Scripture, that is; and grasping Him as a really Living and Supernatural Eternal Being. So, again, back to what we were addressing, this episode seems to ignite the expression God is alive. And by saying that God is alive, I'm saying that although I've said that this didn't seem to be about the end of the world, God is alive...

– And...?

– And who is alive can always change his mind.

– ...

– You shouldn't lose sight about the state of the world that I've mentioned before – continued the Witness, as if reading Vanessa's thoughts. – That is, the comparison of the state of the world to the one of God's intention. What may seem normal to us, in this day and age, can be outrageous to God. And you always have to remember that God is Saint. Not that you might feel mistrust about Him or anything like that, but just remember where you are. And when I say where you are, I don't mean while in church or something, but right here and right now,

alive, that is. Life is God's Place and consciousness is His Card.

Vanessa smiled.

– You look better now. Not so anxious anymore, are we?

– Sure, a talk about the end of the world always seems to pep me up. But I guess I am – sighed Vanessa, sitting on the ground, leaning against one of the pines. – I don't have to tell you what I've been through to get here. Not geographically speaking, but in my life, where I'm at as a person.

– Are you familiar with the Letter to the Hebrews in the New Testament?

– Yes – answered Vanessa.

– Good. There's this particular chapter I want you to read and meditate on for a while.

Vanessa took out her Bible from her backpack.

– Great timing, boy – exclaimed the Witness to Anubis.

That suddenly appeared.

– So, I'm going to leave you here with this fellow...

Anubis barked.

– ... (Yes, that's you, boy...) and you're going to read chapter 11 of the Letter to the Hebrews, and then come meet me.

– How will I find you?

– Follow the dog.

– Where will you be?

– San Sebastian de Garabandal. Where else?



V

– Benben, not Bena-Bena. What's Bena-Bena, anyway?

– It's an ethnic group of New Caledonia. Did you know that the wives in that ethnic group should keep the skulls of their late husbands?

– The what should do where?

– New Caledonia, an island in the Pacific, east of Australia. James Cook made port there in the middle or late eighteenth century. Saint Pierre Marie Chanel was the first one there to announce the Truth, in the nineteenth century.

– ... Anyway, it's benben.

– You mean like it could have been bar, for «son of», in the Jewish sense, being, then, barbar...?

– No... And I don't think ben is or was solely used when in reference to the son, but some sort of opposite to 'ab, father, given that they didn't have a whole lot of vocabulary for all sort of different things, such as kinship degrees. For instance, Abraham calls Lot his brother, or son – I'm not sure right now –, but anyway, whatever he did call him, Lot wasn't neither his brother nor his son, but his nephew or cousin or something. As for 'ab, father, it was also used in reference to the older generations and not only when in reference to someone's father in the strict sense of the word.

– And it's rooted in the Acadian, where the kings referred to the god's as *abbu validum* and *abbu murabbishu*, father according to the flesh and foster father.

– I think it's the other way around, *abbu validum* meaning adoptive father, and *abbu murabbishu*, the one according to the flesh. And I don't think that the word has its root in the Acadian. I think it's in the Sumerian.

– No. I think I'm right about this one, as the god's in overall Mesopotamia were also called *abbu*, father, or *abi*, my father. And, it could be said, the term wasn't solely used to designate a family member or some other kinship likeness, but also as a form of compliment or honorary title, as the Pharaoh

ended up designated Joseph, son of Jacob/Israel; and Axtarxerxes also designated Haman as δεύτερος πατήρ<sup>1</sup>, second father, nevertheless the latter case being more recent than the former, anyway.

– Whatever it may be, and despite of the metaphorical-like examples for the semantics of the term, the most probable is that the word isn't rooted in the Sumerian or the Acadian nor in any other language, but in the perceived onomatopoeia of a child, like, for the Greek, πάπλα<sup>2</sup>, or the Latin *papa*, *pappus*, as it might also be the case for *em*, mother.

– But why did it end up being called benben or what does it signify? – continued, while pointing to the aforementioned.

– There are different versions. Some of them related to creation myths others as outcome of events. Well, not only about why it ended up being called the way it did, but also about the significance around the pinnacle stone of the pyramid. There's one version where the same stone is regarded as a celebration of the first appearance of land after the Flood.

– That makes sense.

---

<sup>1</sup> Deuterios pater.

<sup>2</sup> Papa.

The Guardian Angels that were listening to the conversation, sitting near the top of the pyramid, bowed gently their heads to another Angel that had descended from the heavens, taking place across from them, sitting on the head of the sphinx.

– To what concerns creation myths, it's associated with the god Atum, being held, then, as the original hill where this personified god of the sun performed something sexual in nature, so that the rest of the universe might come to be.

– Of course.

– What did you expect? If humans don't know, they speculate about it. And it's no surprise that some creation myths, across different cultures, have some sexual related elements in them, being, as it is, something so centrally linked with conception, as in bringing forth existence.

– Sure, as it could be understood for rivers, such as the Nile, here, or the Ganges or Ganga, in India.

– What do you mean?

– As in related to life and water for survival and crop irrigation and so on.

– But I’m talking about creation, bringing forth existence.

– Okay. I thought that the sun-god in Egypt was Ra, not the other name you said... what was it?

– Atum. Theology or mythology or whatever you may wish to designate it, but, in Egypt, it combined different elements as the times and circumstances shifted. Regarding the sun, a conjugation of different views and personified deities about it ended up in different denominations so to designate the sun in different aspects or circumstances, such as Aton, meaning the solar disk; you also have Kephri for the sun-rise, symbolized by a beetle, for being noted that this particular bug pushes around a dung ball, where its eggs are laid, but it was then used as a symbol for the sun, as if its sphere was being pushed onto the surface of the earth so to become the rising sun; you have Ra, as you’ve said, for the sun in its peak, and Atum for the sun-down.

»The sun, in this particular system, was understood as a vessel that sailed across the sky in the day-time, so to enter the underworld at sun-down, where it would emerge again from it at sun-rise. In some of their creation myths, the Egyptians also understood the moment before creation as of being constituted by chaotic

waters. So, from out of those waters, and concerning this personified deity of the sun in this specific creation myth, and out of context from this system, but from out of those chaotic waters arose an original hill, benben, understood as in being pyramid-like shaped, where Atum, the sun-god, was, bringing, then, light and order to that chaotic darkness that existed before he emerged. Therefore, benben, as the pinnacle stone symbolizing that original hill, is also understood as the inspiration and reason not only for the pyramids but also for obelisks, which are usually said to be stylized sculptures of sun rays or the erected phallus of some other god, depending on the tradition.

»I still can't get over this, however. Why waste so much time and energy with such things? Why did this people, with understandings to make structures such as the pyramids, why would they still invest so much time and energy with things such as these?

– You mean the Sphinx?

– Yes.

– What do you think the Sphinx is?

– Sculpture supersurrealism of the time? A megalomaniac Maecenas influencing the Pharaoh of the epoch? Who knows...? There's this story that she was completely buried in the

sand, and that a prince, while taking a nap near her, had a dream where she appeared to him and told him if he unburied her, she would grant him greatness. Something like this.

– The Sphinx is a living monument to factual genetic experiences in the past. Look at it: human head with body of an animal.

– Do you mean that this, and similar creatures such as this, really existed?

– That’s exactly what I mean. In several creation myths, across different cultures, what do you have? Allusions to visitors from above, from the sky, nevertheless such allusion being made in novel-like literature or in a religious poetic way, but still. In Greek myths, for instance, what do we have? Before the Titans were created, we have Gaia, the earth, and Uranus, the sky, as in alluding to where the Titans came from, the sky. Forget about the narrative plot and just think about these elements. Also in the Bible we find a small allusion to that, in Genesis, chapter 6, right in the beginning, where it says that the sons of God, meaning some angels, came down from the heavens or the sky, from above, anyway.

– But how do you go from there – which, I’ll admit it, is an interesting observation –, but how do you go from there, that is, from angels

coming down from the sky, to the Sphinx being a living monument to the outcome of genetic experiences in the past, as in a real creature that existed?

– Empirical sciences, for the angels, pose no mystery.

– And the Flood wiped out completely all traces of that, except, for instance, in novel-like literature and what we are looking at right now?

– It's how I understand it, anyway.

Both stood quite for a while, looking at the Sphinx, glowing in the full moonlight.



## VI

– When evil stops to make sense. Not that evil, in itself, makes sense, but in what comes to Scripture being fulfilled, in what comes to the Truth.

– As in?

– As in God doesn't cheat.

– Please expand.

– When Jesus resurrected, that was it, game over. Angels might have start to appear all over the place and beginning to announce the Gospel, the Son of God, Who He was and what He had done and the effect on Reality of what He had done, or they might have just started to take the good to Heaven and the bad to Hell. I mean there was nothing more that could be done. But no, nothing of the sort happened,

globally, at least, given that, when Jesus died, a number of saints resurrected and appeared to some. But instead of a global event of the kind, some sort of silence instead. The Son of God, having done what He had done and, apparently, to the world, to what mankind is concerned, nothing happened and all remained the same. Just some manifestations of that event, the resurrection of Jesus, to a hand full of people. Well, occasionally, it was more than to a hand full, when it says in the Bible that Jesus appeared to more than five hundred brothers, but being the Son of God, you know what I mean by just being for a hand full. So, instead of that decisive event on Reality having an immediate and global (or at least humanly visible) consequence on the world, no: that same event travels the world in a human manner, from person to person, taking or seeking human effort as a partner, like being told about the sun in the night. Thus the Truth travelling by human means, securing the Truth on that regard, could as it could, and without spoiling the integrity of its Nature in Reality, that is, could as it could, after the resurrection of Jesus, just make a global like manifestation, it still chose to travel throughout time, throughout the generations to all corners of the earth by human means. It's in that sense I say that God doesn't cheat.

– I understand. What led us here, anyway?

– Rivers.

– And patterns.

– Sure. But water, as it is source for survival, while enabling thirst quenching and crop irrigation. Right there you have water and food.

– And bathing and washing of clothes, one of the jobs you'd want to stay away from in Ancient Egypt.

– Why's that?

– Well, you wouldn't want to be washing some lady's clothes on the river bank of the Nile while she might be in that time of the month...

– The what not?

– The blood on the clothes...? And the crocodiles in the river...? As in dinner is served...?

– ... Okay.

– But the rivers, like the sun, also ended up being divinized or perceived as a god or held as in being a manifestation of what was understood to be in fact a personal deity, as,

somehow, could also be envisioned of crops, while its blooming appearance was transferred into how Osiris was portrayed as, with green skin, that is. Ancient Egyptians also referred to the Nile as the Great Green or the Very Green – well, they used that expression mostly for the Mediterranean or the Red sea, but I think they also referred to the Nile as such. But, again, to what comes to Osiris being portrayed with green skin, it must have had to do mostly with crop blooming.

– As almost every deity having to do with crops or agriculture in religions other than the Egyptian.

– Sure. Nevertheless Osiris also being associated with resurrection, not because of any event in the past that would lead to understand him as such in a literal manner, but, here it is, because of crop cycles, which disappeared, as in, «died» after being harvested, so to reappear, as in, «resurrecting» in the following year, thus painting the landscape green with its blossoming. A complex theological system gradually developed around Osiris afterwards, as we can witness, for instance, in the description of the after-world in the enchantment-like writings in the Pyramid and Sarcophagus texts or the what came to be known as the Book of the Dead.

– And Plutarch.

– Sure. But, anyway, to what comes to Osiris, having now literally to do with the resurrection and life after death contexts, and nothing to do with crops anymore, literally or metaphorically.

– Isn't Athena also depicted with green skin? Why would that be? Isn't she the goddess of wisdom and war? What does she have to do with crops?

– You know, intercultural relationships affected religions as well, thus ending up trading different elements among them, taking attributes from different deities or of other religious features in general, implementing them in their own gods or theology, which could become, after some time, sects of a preexisting religion or new religions altogether, and also resulting in new gods even. I mean, it's like it could be understood, broadly, for a branch of ancient literature, where you have, for instance, Homer's *Iliad*; and then you have Virgil that picked up from there and wrote the *Enid*; onto Dante that used Virgil as a character in his *Divine Comedy*; broadly, onto Luís de Camões, for example, that used mythological imagery in his *Lusíadas*, etc., etc. Egyptian deities and theologies were brought from Egypt into Greece, and the other way around, suffering

transformations and settling with a new name. You have, for instance, Ptha, a creator god in Egypt, who was also associated with metallurgical works, so, when intercultural events took place in between those two civilizations, that deity was either the inspiration for a similar god or blended with the already existing Greek god Hephaestus, also associated with metallurgical work. That god or idea of deity associated with that social task, when assimilated, afterwards, by the Romans, was, then, again, or inspiration or reason for enrichment for the roman god Vulcan.

– That’s why he ended up being identified with the devil, for living in cave-like places or volcano sites, smell of sulfur, having a limp, something like that?

– That’s a different. But it’s understandable of being associated with that sort of figure, as in, prison-like underworld places, as Hell is associated with, being conceived as in having a limp due to the crash after the fall from the heavens, that sort of thing. But, again, in Christianity, intercultural exchange should be envisioned differently. Not that it didn’t happen, but it happen on different levels, that is, not so much on levels, as it occurred with other religions, where specific and general understandings or doctrinal beliefs about this or that god could be understood as in

being flexible when far from their land of origin, so to adapt to this or that particular culture, as in trying to establish that deity regardless of any doctrinal purity scrupulous, but in what Christianity is concerned, such elements, such as the Divinity of Christ and His Resurrection, couldn't ever be compromised so that His Name could be accepted by this or that culture or population. Certain elements, as far as concept translation to the native language might be concerned, when a new word wasn't made up so to designate a new reality, sometimes it was used the closest synonym available, then explained as in being like what that word signified, but not exactly, such as, for instance, for the word angel. Etymologically, the word has its origin in the Greek word ἄγγελος<sup>3</sup>, which translates the Hebrew term מַלְאָךְ<sup>4</sup>, which means messenger, envoy. The Latin authors, instead of translating ἄγγελος with *nuntio*, they invented a neologism, transliterating the «Greek angel» into Latin, so to safe keep in its semantics a special feature when of the use of this new synonym of *nuntio*, namely the intrinsically understood supernatural characteristic of that special messenger or envoy, being transliterate, then, as *angelos*, that is, a supernatural *nuntio*, of God.

---

<sup>3</sup> Ἄγγελος.

<sup>4</sup> Ma'lak.

– But the image of the Virgin holding the Child Jesus could very well be understood as in being inspired or at least similar to Isis holding young Horus, couldn't it?

– A mother with her child is always a mother with her child. I know that this sentence appears or is in fact redundant and could be simply understood as in meaning nothing. But what do you want me to say? You have two female figures, both comprehended as in being queens and her sons as in being gods. So, is it all that surprising and unexpected that a similar imagery could have emerged with depictionary likeness? I don't mean you exactly, but those sort of arguments usually come from those that, regarding ancient figures, whomever they might be, accept whatever it might be said about them as in having done or said without any difficulty whatsoever, but when it comes to Christ, far more close to us, as time proximity is concerned, everything is questioned, from words to deeds to existence even. Like I've said, and I know I don't have to tell you this, just for myself being a Christian, that is, but that sort of understanding of intercultural exchange, ancient religion wise, is inapplicable to Christianity, or at least the same should be understood appropriately, because that strange subtle but also overwhelming force emanating not only from Christ but from His early followers as well, such



as His Apostles and the first generations of their disciples and communities, not to mention Saint Paul, but that tremendous Light, although overshadowed by indescribable modesty – that, one should admit, not only enhances the implicates but providentially and/or consequently also ends up putting off the proud and stuck-up ones –, but that paradoxically outshining Light cannot be compared to any text or story about whatever it might be the conception about god or divinity in general made until the appearance of Christ. It's not just the what could be considered as the appealing nature of a suffering God, thus identifying not only with the misfortunate ones but with the human condition altogether, as in being overall permeable to the effects of evil, whatever their context might be in this world, but because in Christ unarguably sounded a Voice and shone a Light that, in the honest eyes of our lonesome miserable selves, instructed and educated as one may be, seems that, in the end, by comparison, He can and should always be described as of just being Someone entirely different. It's like, by comparison, sometimes is said that this doctrinal faith in Him as such wonderful things about it... What does that mean? What is that, wonderful things about faith in Jesus Christ? Here we're addressing and take interest in the Truth alone, not an illusion, no matter how beautiful it could be presented; and we do what

we do and believe in Whom we believe not to please or displease anyone. Again, it's about the Truth. Because the Truth is not only, as it is, anyway, the source of all beauty, but because of indeed being the Light that is leading us out of darkness and showing us the only way home, not by a beautiful fabrication or other seduction, but by Revelation of Truth.

– I thought that Osiris was portrayed with a green skin because of the color that human corpses come to be after some time, being him a god associated with the dead and everything.

– It makes sense.

## VII

– There's this one aspect that seems that it has always been attached with theology, or just how people interpreted God's feelings about them or something else in general in any given situation, what we call luck, or providence, intertwined with fate, not as far as an invariable determinism is concerned, but just how things end up turning out.

– Do you believe in it?

– In what? Fate?

– Yes.

– Sure.

– But doesn't that contradict free-will and thus accountability?

– It depends on how you look at it. I don't think that every single little thing is determined about whatever you might do with your day tomorrow, as in how you're going to do whatever it is that you're going to: what you're going to have for breakfast, the small variations it will occur concerning the way you're going to prepare it, despite of usually having the same thing for some time, what clothes are you going to wear, how will you put them on, how are you going to drive your car, whatever it is that you might be thinking about when you're doing any of those things. To a certain extent, I do believe in fate, but because I see it as a consequence of choice, of having gone down that road instead of this one, as in, whichever road you choose to travel on, it will invariably lead to a certain destination. It's in this sense I say that I believe in fate or destiny.

»And a Christian understanding on this matter can also be seen as in saying that things will turn out to be as they're already understood as in going to turn out to be. God knows all things, and so He knows how they will end up. We'll invariably reach an ending stage, that's inevitable, but we can choose how to get there and, most of all, we undoubtedly have a decisive role on what will become of us individually on the light of our choices. Therefore, yes, we are free and certain events in the future can indeed

be changed – and, here, I’m not talking about because of shifting choices or ways of life or something, as in choosing to go down this road instead of that one, but really changing things through prayer, by asking God’s intercession –, but, on the other hand, there was this one initial place, if you like, in the beginning, and there will be only one also in the end, so, in that sense, it is predetermined and unchangeable. Not to mention Holy Scripture, as in, it is being fulfilled and, as Jesus said, it is easier for heaven and earth to pass than the smallest element in Scripture be left unfulfilled. Therefore, you might say it’s something of a paradox: the Bible can’t be changed and will inevitably be fulfilled, but God is a Living God, and you can relate with Him on a personal level, thus some interference with Reality, or the way Scripture is fulfilled, appropriately understood, can be taken as acceptable.

– But it seems that, as it is, we can’t consider ourselves truly free, but only have ourselves as such due to an illusion.

– There’s this argument in philosophical anthropology where it’s said that human beings, or the human spirit or soul, due for being constituted with a desire for an eternal life and an infinite good, the human spirit is indeed free and undetermined in the choices that he makes in this world, because all the forms of good that

this world has to offer are contingent and finite, thus being the same goodness' of this world pursued or chosen not because of the unavoidable coerciveness or inescapable effect they have over ourselves, but by choice and assent of a free willed being.

»God's will or opinion about ourselves, individually or as a community, has been very much linked with fortune associated with the moments, days or epochs. For instance, if the Nile didn't flooded conveniently one year, it was generally assumed, then, that the community or the Pharaoh had done something wrong, thus penalized by God by means of that inconvenient behavior of the Nile, which would damage the fruitfulness of the land, which would make the crops not so abundant. On the other hand, if the Nile flooded consistently throughout a number of years, it was assumed, then, that the Pharaoh or the community in general were behaving appropriately on the eyes of God, thus being rewarded with convenient flooding, which would make the land fertile, which would provide good crops. And by mentioning the Nile, I mean any other river in any other part of the world.

- Or for the outcome of wars.
- That's a good example as well.

– God’s pleasure was always with the victors. Military victory seems that was always understood as for reasons of moral and theological superiority.

– Christ also said something about that matter, given that in Israel, in general, misfortune was associated with a sinful state, individually and as a community. If things went wrong, it was because a sin was made on the eyes of God, thus a consequent punishment. At the community level, you have, for instance, the exile in Babylon, which was understood as in having occurred as a consequence of a sinful behavior on part of the community throughout the years, such as religious apostasy. On the individual level, you have the infertile state of women, that hadn’t bore child yet. These women were generally understood to be sinners, thus punished by God with their sterility.

– And what did Christ say?

– Jesus said that bad things didn’t necessarily happen because of sinful behavior. He didn’t dismiss it altogether, though, but not linked good or bad events due to immediate punishment nor reward. When Jesus mentioned the fact of the Siloam tower having collapsed and killed a number of people in Jerusalem, He commented that the ones that died in that collapse didn’t suffer that because they were the

most sinful persons in the city. But He also recommended, however, after having healed a blind man or a leper, for him not to sin again, so that a worst thing wouldn't befall on him. So just because something isn't going the way you desire it to go, doesn't mean that God is necessarily discontent about you or something, and vice versa. What should be concluded of this is the effort for keeping in mind that this world is temporary. And after having known not only that God exists, and He is what we can already see and understand in Jesus Christ, by this fact alone, and if you truly believe in Him, it should be understood, then, as in having already gained all the luck in the world, that is, by already knowing the Truth about Reality and what that Truth was translated into on the indescribable greatness of God in the Light of His Son and the promises linked with His Person, thus nothing, whatever it may be, can ever take that away, so resulting in us being or already should be, by faith in His Promise, lifted above all of the circumstances of the days through the wings of a pledge for an Eternal Life where all the variances of fortune and evil aren't and can be no more.

– Why do you think that God doesn't just bestows the gift of faith to everyone?

– That sort of question comes from an inappropriate or forgetful knowledge about



essential premises about God, or God's Being or Nature, namely the fact of Him being Absolute, as we can read Jesus pointing out also about Himself in the Gospels. Not wanting to speculate too much about it, there is, at least, this one thing we can know for sure about what that condition implies: God doesn't need anything. He doesn't need souls, He doesn't need Angels, He doesn't need the world. Him alone is absolutely sufficient. And it has nothing to do with morality nor personality nor anything that could ever be deemed as some kind of flaw – quite on the contrary, because He's Absolute – , but just because of being a direct consequence of His Divine Nature. But what could be even more disturbing about this is the fact that despite that absoluteness, that requires nor needs nothing for absolute happiness, God still created – therefore, right from the start, by this fact alone, He is indeed Pure Love, or Mercy in advance, by forgiving all creatures not being God like Him and existing like Him already without an act of His will –, and not only He created but He's still Someone you can related to on a personal level, hence prayer. That is to say, an answering your question, maybe oversimplifying it, but if no one reminds God to convert people, or pray with that intention anyway, for Him, it's the same, because He Is Absolute already.

– But it seems that, at some level, He must have created because He needed to.

– Not because He needed, but because He could. Necessity doesn't seem to apply here, because it contradicts the concept of absoluteness, as if something was missing, and if something is missing, whatever it is that we are talking about can no longer be considered absolute.

– I see.

– Anyway, what was said, here, about praying for conversion, might be considered a way of thinking about this. But we're addressing the Creator of Heaven and Earth, and a Love so great, out of an absolute unnecessary creation, so... what can we really say...? And if you add to that what God has done through Jesus, as in how far He has gone so to make us understand the Truth, it seems that there is even less that could be said.

»What are we, as creatures, suppose to do or feel, when contemplating Eternal Life? Is that Reality already sunk in the way it should? Shouldn't that reality be prioritized so to really put things in perspective? Won't, whatever it may derive from that appropriate acceptance, naturally set, then, all the rest in its proper place? Won't that acceptance really deliver us

from the weight of any eagerness about earthly things or already from just any general anxiety or hopelessness we might feel and would try to elude ourselves from with deemed honorable worries and pleasures that this world could ever offer us, thus truthfully setting or at least sending the soul down a true path of peace and tranquility? I am going to live forever. Do you really believe that? As in really, and not just «sure I do, because I'm a Christian»? What is the constant of the creature? Saint Paul seemed to have alluded to this in chapter thirteen of his first Letter to the Corinthians: even if it is done whatever it might be positively done, if one does not have love, we are nothing and all is in vain. And Saint Paul goes to describe, then, what love is, but only, it seems, while it reflects here, in this world, so beginning to describe it as patience. But what is that constant in Eternity? Thankfulness and praise of God? Overwhelmed in the Light of God stimuli, where wrongfulness can be no more? Peace at last, from haughtiness and envy now all have been delivered! Now our talent no longer threatens, now our light no longer bothers, now Our Lord no longer hides, for our talent was not our talent, and our light was not our light, because appear as we do of movement, as we do of speech and deeds, we're just a night and a riverbed, where waters flow and stars ignite.



## VIII

Do you know the one about the illegal alien? Illegal?! What do you mean, illegal? I left my papers in the spaceship...

Maybe not today.

Professor Alexander King sometimes started class with a joke. Or what he considered to be a joke, anyway. That wasn't to be the case today, despite of having already smiled to the thought of the aforementioned.

Alex had been a Professor of Theology for some time now, in Japan, but he still taught his classes in English, given that his Japanese was still so and so. And Professor King avoided speaking in a language he felt he didn't quite mastered. The last attempt, in Japanese, was still fresh in his mind, those attempts usually taking place after the forgetfulness of the

previous attempt had taken over combined with a bottle too many of sake, one of the few alcoholic beverages the Professor drank. Not that the Professor would get drunk or inappropriate or anything of the sort, but, well, looser in what comes to social conventions, more relaxed, if you will.

But the last time he had tried to speak something in Japanese, the interlocutor stood looking at him with suspicion, to say the least, something that puzzled him at the time, given what he said, or thought he said. That look, however, being understood after having confronted one of his colleagues with what he said on the previous day: wanting to pay a compliment, reviewing the words, or with the phonetic proximity he remembered, it appears he ended up telling his listener to go, well, something that a Professor really shouldn't tell to go to the Dean's wife amidst a faculty dinner.

Thank God I didn't say it out loud for everyone to hear, as I first imagined, thought the Professor whenever that episode came to mind.

– The first thing to understand about the Bible – continued the Professor in his class – is that it consists of a sum of Texts (or the sum of Texts, if you're a Catholic, as I am) of a post apocalyptic world. And what apocalyptic

event am I talking about? Anyone...? Book of Genesis...? Noah...?

– The Flood – answered one of the students.

– Precisely. The Flood or the Deluge. Everything that was, met its end in the waters that covered all the land, thus waters being not only the context of that end, but also the one of the new beginning, that is, the beginning of the world that emerged from the Flood. Let's see, now, how creation and the context of existence are described in Genesis: «In the beginning, God created heaven and earth. The earth was empty and vague/deserted/shapeless, and darkness covered the abyss, and the Spirit/breath of God agitated the surface of the waters.»

»Waters. Shapeless, formless, dark waters. Looks like a post flood description to me, wouldn't you say? This is not just what could be considered as an interesting observation, but an essential premise to keep in mind so to understand in a global perspective the nature or policy of God while communicating with human beings, as in, this world, or, better said, this time, being the grand finale in the finality or purpose of creation, the glorification of the Son of God, victory of good

over evil, Light over darkness, Love over hatred, poetry commanding mathematics.

The note that Professor Alexander received the previous night still dwelled in his mind omnipresently. And he had been trying to confer with his Guardian Angel since the start of that day. But Professor Alexander's Guardian Angel was like most Guardian Angels: invisible and silent.

Well, not completely silent. Or invisible, for that matter. Alexander King had what could be described as an easy soul, the kind that believes without too much complications. Simply put, a soul that trusts in God. Alex was the kind of person that sometimes, while waking up, opened his eyes, looked around, and think something like, Guardian Angel's invisibility: check. Showing green across the board.

– And this concludes the class for today.

Was it done already?, resounded the Professor's final words in his thoughts while the students exited the classroom, donating their voices and presence to the classical recess clamor halls. A tight mash up of roaring whispers, like an invisible cloud in between the ceiling and the heads of its commuters. I'll write a poem later, he dismissed it.

Phase One.



That's what the note said.

Nothing left to do but to take the considerations, that that note would naturally trigger, as it already had, to a sushi dinner he already imagined: the usual place, or something else that might appear during the day – one should try to keep an open mind about routines –, with this fish and that fish and the usual. Sushi and sashimi, dipped in soy sauce with a generous pinch of wasabi. Yes. Japanese food was one of the reasons why the Professor sought to work in Japan. Another reason was the people. The respectful and modest ways of the Japanese were also appealing to him.

– More coffee?

– Yes, please – replied the Professor to the interruption of his thoughts made by the airline stewardess – being the reason for being in that flight what had been with him all week, and that took over his thoughts immediately after having accepted more coffee:

Phase One.

That meant that the others already received a similar notification. Spain and Egypt. Now Greece, where he was headed.



IX

– Spaced out? What were you thinking about? – said Natalie, returning to the table.

– I was thinking about... Where were we, anyway?

– The Trumpet.

– Before that.

– *Shema, Israel!*<sup>5</sup>

– Right. And one of the things to understand about Christianity, throughout the generations, is that it is not some sort of tape recorder playing, but a live feed, in Portuguese, *Deus é sempre em directo – nunca em diferido*. Directamente do futuro. Well, from Eternity would be better said. *Dieu est toujours en direct*

---

<sup>5</sup> Listen, O Israel!

– jamais en différé. God is always live – never on tivo. Something like that.

»Anyway, one of the episodes that we can dwell on so to contemplate one of the problems of God with humanity might be the one we find in the Gospel of Mathew, and parallels, in the beginning of chapter 9. One of the things that I note that happened around the cure that Jesus performed there is the answer that He gave to the thoughts that some of the present were entertaining in their hearts, after Jesus had said to the man, your sins are forgiven: what's easier? To say your sins are forgiven or get up and walk?

»This seems to allude to some sort of centrality to what concerns human consciousness, free will and the, if you like, creativity of God before the premise of not interfering directly with the mechanisms responsible for such things, as in providing a specific grace so that people would believe in Him, as if rewiring something in the soul or minds of men so that the hints of God's existence and the Supreme Lordship of His Son Jesus Christ would become clear or self evident. Healing people, raising the dead, walking on water, for God, that's easy. Touching people's hearts or just reasoning with them so to try to make them realize the Truth, not so easy. Again, the fact that God doesn't interfere with those

«mechanisms», that make human beings conscious beings and not just animals, is not due to an impossibility from His part, but because of the truth, as in, by doing it so, that is, by interfering with those mechanisms directly, instead of a real, truthfully conscious and free willed being, you get a puppet, that says he believes in you and that loves you, but you're really the one making that happen by direct intervention, and if so, consciousness, free will, love, truth ultimately, about this issue, can be no more.

### The Trumpet.

It comes from shofar, a ram's horn used for trumpeting in many valences throughout Israel's History – gathering the people, signaling in battles, etc. In the New Testament, the symbol of the trumpet was also used. This time as a sign that God will give so to announce the Second Coming of Jesus.

It's a mysterious subject, the one of the Second Coming and the elements around and about it, thought Samuel. Take, for instance, this one, of the Trumpet. Samuel sometimes thought of the one responsible for giving this sign might feel like that maestro or band leader in The Dirty Dozen, who would start up the band every time the base commander appeared – not

now...! Not now!, you [a lot of censorship]...!  
Now!, Now!

– But returning to our first subject – continued Samuel. – Sanctity, so to be an objective thing, seems that has to be related with something, or Someone, better said, because, otherwise, on its own, that is, it would be just a concept result of an arbitrary, as in, depending on the perspective of the evaluator, without universal premises, thus being submitted to variation of opinion depending on whomever might make a consideration on the theme, thus being, then, just something that doesn't really exist, as in, for instance, just a demonstrational standpoint, a compliment or a manner of speaking. For some, sanctity would be this, for others, something else, varying in range from detail to substance.

»The first concept of sanctity in Judeo-Christianity seems to be of separation. God's People should be separate from others, primarily and in sum, theologically wise, since that alone implies comprehensions on everything else. God's People, thus separated from others, shouldn't, then, evaluate with the criteria of other peoples nor learn from their understandings on whatever it might be, in case those comprehensions and lifestyles conflict with God's Teachings. There is only One God, Origin of Life, Creator of Heaven and Earth,

Beginning and End of Reality, and it's from Him and Him alone that all should be understood.

»Another understanding of sanctity is related with purity. Being purity, simply put, the unmixed state of something, withheld of other elements that are unnatural to its inborn condition. Purity, in what concerns the human being, seems to be related with truth and/or honesty, towards what God has revealed about Himself or, unacquainted with God's revelation, towards what is usually designated as good conscience or the innate sense of justice, at least of not harming others.

»Understanding sanctity as faithfulness to an innate sense of justice, that is, the ability, in oneself, to morally distinguish right from wrong and undergo a virtuous behavior towards the others and life in general, despite of unacquainted with God's Teachings, seems to lead to a previously to be made understanding of what the human being might be and, in consequence to the conclusion one may arrive at, what one's basically meant to do with his life in this world and how one should then behave. In the lives of the human beings, one of the major question marks could be the question of life after death.

– In a way, and without wanting to sound presumptuous, that seems to be the meaning of

life: to try to understand the circumstances of life beyond death. If you want to be philosophically serious, it seems that you have to have some sort of a detective-like mind set, while understanding yourself, the world and the circumstances of History. But, please, continue.

– Interesting comparison. Continuing: In consequence to the more or less defined answer or conclusion one may arrive at, out of a personal view or by shared belief of a religious doctrine, one, then, out of that view, understands oneself this or that way, and, then, based on that understanding, (in theory, anyway) behaves accordingly. Needless to say that one may also find appropriate to disregard that inevitability, meaning death, or just live as if it didn't exist, dismissing, then, any attempt to reasonably understand what could it mean or might signify to his conscious and rational nature.

»Will everything that one has done in this life be absolutely inconsequent after death?, or will the ideas, words and behaviors that one carried out throughout his life have to be accounted for, according to some criterion, as if reflected on the Mirror of Life and Love and Truth? Is death just a senseless eternal void, like a dreamless eternal sleep?, or is there a coherent continuity with this life? Questions similar to these seem to arise spontaneously about life



after death, so some sort of an answer to them seems to be something important to do, consciously or not, so to settle some sort of general personal philosophy and system of values, even if just vaguely. Again, one may choose to disregard them and improvise with whatever one may find appropriate to do when the situations arrive, regardless of any understanding and conclusions made to the previous questions.

»There are and have been many theories about the human being, what he's understood to be and thus how he should behave, from a religious standpoint, to a philosophical one, having or not into account life after death and the existence of God or divinity in general. Despite of adhering to this or that understanding, the human being could be accepted as in consisting, in broad strokes, of an organism passable of being submitted to the most abominable passions and the most selfless ideas, behaving according to either, radically or in the various degrees of its spectrums. We're addressing this in abstract, so to say that in a case-by-case evaluation, naturally that the degrees of both instances may differ. Ultimately, on opposite sides of the spectrums, either you end up with a sociopath or with a «saint». I say saint in quotation marks because of not being referred as such in a catholic perspective, just to

give an idea of what's being tried to say. As in, summed up in other words, either a total disregard for others in order to achieve one's own self interest or satisfaction, on the sociopath side, or the opposite, with the «saint», a total disregard of one's own self interest or wellbeing on behalf of others.

»So, what is being tried to say with this? Basically that the human being, nevertheless being subjected to various kinds of ideas and/or impulses or whatever you may wish to designate them as, cannot be inevitably and absolutely determined to think or behave in this or that manner, precisely for being a bearer of reason, thus conscious/aware, as in spiritually free, if you like, and not just an animal that is inevitably determined or ruled by the primacy of its instincts or impulses or specific animalistic drive. Because of the nature of reason, the human being seems to be enabled to be or to dwell in what could be called a state of neutrality, as in the ability to free himself of any determinations other than the ones of his own rational resolve. Naturally that can be factors that could create a disposition to think and/or behave in this or that manner, or what is usually designated as the question of nurture versus nature, but, despite of the preponderance that either might induce on the individual, in a continuum fashion or in an exacerbated way in

some points in one's life, again, the nature of reason seems to provide to the human being some sort of neutrality, as it enables the individual to achieve what could be called a distance towards not only exterior factors but inner ones as well, while rising him above or enabling him to play a third party role, if you will, being, then, nurture or nature, in the end, just excuses, as anyway everybody already knows that they are. If not so, Jesus wouldn't have said, in truth, in truth I say to you: who isn't born again, cannot see the Kingdom of Heaven.



X

– Grazie – answered Alex, impersonating Brando in the Godfather.

– Prego. Now – already addressing everyone there –, why do you worry so much about what the dead think? They're blind leading the blind. Maybe you should keep in mind what Saint Francis of Assisi said about the true value of human beings: they're only worth what they're worth in the eyes of God.

»You know?, if I had to sum things up, in a bottom line sense, I'd say that there are only two kinds of people in this world: Catholics and zombies. You shouldn't become so attached with whatever might have to do with the latter, as you should also keep in mind that most people in this world live under different illusions about what Reality truly is, not only philosophically wise, or theologically, but what comes to other

things as well, such as the notion of property, for example, one of the greatest illusions there is, as in, nobody truly owns anything. We're nothing more than administrators of whatever it may be, not only because, in truth, everything belongs to God, but also because no one lives forever in this world, so everything that one might have had in this world is bound to pass on to someone else's tenure.

»Remember always what could be considered a fundamental premise that you should constantly keep in mind: Catholics do not mistake Eternal Life with life in this world. Our hope is totally in the life that awaits us after death. And maybe you shouldn't refer to or think about that passing as such, as death, because, given cultural conventions or something, it has a feel of some eternal ending, and not what it truly is. Remember how Jesus referred to that passing, as in, entering Life. Anyway, as Saint Paul put it: if our hopes were only for this life and this world, we'd be the most miserable of men, given that in a world where evil exists, one, so to stay on course in the path of goodness, has, at least, to be patient. And God didn't make the human being for suffering. On the contrary. Not that patience is a negative thing, as in, it can be practiced only in result of a bad thing, but you know what I mean. I understand that you're still in the world, so

some degree of socializing seems to be inevitable. But still. In simple terms, the glories that this world has to offer are for, well, for lack of a better word, for suckers. True life is on the other side, if you will. We're nothing more than seeds here. Seeds of what we'll become in Eternity. And as seeds must do so to become a tree, so must we have to die, literally and metaphorically. The literal part needs nothing so to happen, unless you're Enoch or Elias, but the metaphorical part depends on us, depends on what the seed is willing to do so to become what it's supposed to become. So we're something of a paradox, kind of like conscious seeds, aware that we are as such. And if we are as such, maybe we should behave as such. Like Jesus said: he that loses his life in this world, shall find it. And he who holds on to it, as in, preventing that metaphorical death to happen, shall lose it. Because, one might understand, as such, one is preventing the natural course of the seed to happen, so to become what it's supposed to.

»Maybe it should be said that these words of Jesus appear to be more both for the early days of Christendom, when Jesus' Name was starting to be announced, and for those that, in these days, don't believe in Him, given that, in the Christian Tradition, well, if one is raised as a Christian, in principle, that is, if staying on course, one doesn't need to undergo that

metaphorical death or be reborn of the Spirit, as Jesus said, for having already been raised in the Light of The Truth.

Anubis howled.

Staring at the moon.

– Just give me a minute – interrupted Giacomo Sinsanpe Roconmuxosolès his speech to the ones that were there with him. «Longitude and latitude, check?»

«On the bottom right of your screen, there's this showing of a percentage element, which, by handling it, is where you can diminish or enhance the size of the things you have on display in front of you. So, when reading a blog, for instance, if you enhance the size percentage to something over 100%, it should make the reading more comfortable.»

Sinsanpe Roconmuxosolès. That was his name. His surnames, anyway. Sinsanpe Roconmuxosolès was a mix of Uruguayan or Chilean and Japanese ascent. He was a true man of the Church. Yes. Giacomo of the Church. He always thought of the Pope for whatever reason that expression came to mind. But Giacomo did things like that. Of course to the ones not so used to similar events, the first time they would be like, well, at least, in expectation.



That being the case with Vanessa and the others at the moment, witnessing whatever it was that Giacomo was doing, in a quite Crete, just before the day would start to light up the night with its known smoothness.

– Holy... Trinity! I see you already – said Giacomo out loud amidst a smile, as if speaking to himself, and still looking through the telescope.

It wasn't the first time that Giacomo's Guardian Angel was appearing to him in what could be held as an unusual place, but on the moon was the first. Giacomo's Guardian Angel belonged to a type of Angels that could be compared to a certain Gaullist village in Caesar's time. They were the kind of Angels you could find occasionally in some armed forces drills. They would be like, according to angelical possibilities, they would tie something to a cannon bullet, and off they went, as if being pulled by, well, something really fast, so to land near another Angel, or a group of Angels, blowing them all sky high amidst laughter. They were of spiritual nature, of course, so, needless to say, no harm done. You could also see them sitting outside and around a rocket going to space, as you could also find them in those psychic consultations, you know, where people go so to «communicate» with the dead. I'll leave to your imagination the type of things they

would whisper to the psychic. Giacomo's Guardian Angel was of that tribe, if you like, Saint Michael's Angels. They were like God, beyond good and evil. When someone says they were like God, people may start to think of power or authority like God. None of that. Instead, more in the nature of what Saint Paul wrote about making an effort so to develop Christ's feel about things. In that sense. Anyway, this occasion would be extra special, given that a certain Lady would also appear, just how it's written in Revelations 12, he thought. But tonight would be more like that part of the Bible where King David entered Jerusalem with the Ark of the Covenant.

– Ok, then. Louder, please – said Giacomo to Natalie.

– Done – she answered.

– Thank you very much – replied Giacomo, impersonating Elvis.

## XI

Alex didn't feel like God, while he was wondering if the pigeons might be feeling like the Israelis in the desert, throwing pieces of bread to them, as he was, from a window, some floors up in the hotel in Spain he was staying in, making time to go to the seaport, so to get on a ship for England. Alex preferred ships to planes. And so that was the way he travelled whenever he could. He felt, however, that Catholic spirituality, on the level of the soul, and metaphorically speaking, was something like moving into a seaport or an airport, waiting to go home. As he felt that, as a catholic, while still living in this world, he was sort of like a tourist in a third world country. You know, somewhere you might go to, but you don't really want to live there.

– Dreams rarely have a literal meaning. The elements and story of a dream are or can be

fused or amalgamated, as they might be in reference to some significant thing that might happen in the course of your day, not necessarily the day after you had the dream. For instance, if you dreamt of a friend of yours playing guitar, wearing a postman outfit, being that friend of yours not a postman nor someone that plays the guitar, you have already there three elements that should be considered separately, them being your friend, the guitar and the postman. The elements of dreams sometimes don't have to do with the elements itself, as in pursuing the or a literal sense of whatever might be related with them, but sometimes something that is happening on the side when you might be thinking or talking or meeting someone that is or could be significant to you. As in, for instance, someone is telling you something and, at that particular time, a postman caught your attention for whatever reason; or someone playing or carrying a guitar; or your friend appearing or someone that has the same name has him or her, etc. After having such a dream, you don't call your friend and say, hey, you're going to be a postman and learn how to play the guitar, you know? Dreams and/or their meaning can be a language dependent of the individual's personal development on the matter, not wanting to exclude, with this, what could be designated as the existence of a system of archetypical signs.

Just Alex reminiscing on one of the topics of the night in Crete – or was it Rhodes? –, still in his room, throwing pieces of bread out of his window to the pigeons, while making time to go to the seaport. He had been to Santiago de Compostela, to the Cathedral where the Apostle rested, being this a Xacobeo Year and all.

– Certain elements of dreams can also present themselves in a certain way, but meaning its opposite, as in, if in a dream someone is stepping outside a church, in the, let's call it, awake mode, that could mean that that person is in fact entering a church.

»In the manner that the dream unfolds, again, it can be the opposite as to what might happen to you when awake, as in, the last part of the dream, in its «story», could be the starting point of something, related to that dream, in the awake mode. For instance, if someone dreams that he was cooking dinner and then was watching television and then was listening to music in his headphones – a great invention, I might add –, but, in the awake status, it will unfold the other way around, as in, that person will first listen to music, then watch TV and then cook dinner. But dreams can also have a literal meaning, despite of, so it seems, being rare. But, again, it's a personal thing, and dependent on the individual. So, when are you going to know if

its meaning might be literal or not? My answer would be, practice.

The night in Greece had been a night to remember. The conversation, at some point, was about music. Alex liked mostly rock, but he didn't think of musical genres as some sort of teams in whatever sport. You know?, go, rock!, or go, jazz!, or go, pop! He liked whatever it was that he liked. But Alex was mostly a rock person. And Rocket Skates from the Deftones was something he thought as some sort of an ultimate rock song. Just as a manner of speaking, given that he didn't believe to be any ultimate song, given Life being Eternal and such, so the pursuit of songs being also eternal. Or not.

Alex thought of Eternal Life mostly as in consisting of artistic pursuit. But, hey, if you want to plant potatoes or something, I guess it's alright. Anyway, Jesus is there, so, who cares? But that song... really. For Alex was something else. Not that it, in appearance, in regard of what made it up, as in, guitars in overdrive and so on, was what made him feel what he did about that song. Just how it was put together, you know?, as in, greatly written, and the little details here and there. I know there's this expression that the devil is in the detail. Well, in some parts of the world is said that God is in the detail. Whatever. French cuisine is in the detail,

the detail is in the detail... All sorts of things are in the detail.

But back to Rocket Skates: the guitar riffs were just great, the drums arrangements were just something else, that whoo made by Chino, really, just gave an extra special something that permeated the entire song, really, like a subliminal omnipresent oh, yeah! That bridge, where the keyboards are with that sustained siren-like sound, and the drummer adds those two strikes in the tom-toms in between the – what's its name? – the high pitched tom-tom, which isn't really a tom-tom, the one where you put the snare or something, the one that, in a way, is setting the rhythm, the thing in between the drummer's legs. There. In Portuguese, a tarola. But the two strikes on the tom-toms in between the one on that thing, combined with that guitar riff and the sustained siren-like sound, well, again, put together, what a swing. Really.

The unity of the Church or of Christians was also something that crossed Alex's mind while interacting with the pigeons. A subject he thought that didn't need many arguments so to happen. For instance, the Church is designated, among other things, as Christ's bride. And any Christian that understood that it was alright for existing all sort of different churches or Christian communities, nevertheless not having

anything to do with one another, that sort of understanding appeared to give the idea of understanding Christ, when of the time of wedding His bride, as in being in favor of polygamy... being so many different and unrelated Christian communities, that is.

Maybe I shouldn't think about this subject in these terms, thought Alex. Anyway, maybe there's a mental institution in Heaven, he wondered, for his peace of mind. But why am I thinking about this?

Maybe because of where he was going to.

The alarm sounded.

Alex threw a few more pieces of bread out the window, grabbed his suitcase and headed for the door while thinking: off to see the heretics, then. Or was it the apostates?

Jolly good, old chap – singled out amidst a conversation going on between a group of people waiting by the elevator down the hall of the hotel corridor, right after he opened the door.



## XII

Phase Two.

All systems check – ready for takeoff.

Queue the music.

The dentist's chair reclined all the way back and that suction tube in his mouth always made Charles think of astronauts in liftoff position and *Live On A Prayer*. Charles was already set to meet Alex in England or Scotland, nevertheless him still being in Denmark, where he had been attending some meeting with the Danish Customs Officials counterparts, which he also was, a Custom Official, that is; but, now, spaced out amidst the stare at the dentist light and her questions – why do they do that, anyway?, being, well, difficult to answer, given the circumstances –, but already thinking about his latest meeting with Alex.

– Another subject that usually is misinterpreted, is the episode of Abraham, where is said, in the Bible, that God asked him to sacrifice his son, Isaac. To my understanding, God doesn't need that sort of thing so to know whatever it may be about a soul, as in, that episode happened, not because of God, for Him to know something about Abraham, but so that Abraham would gain self knowledge about himself.

Charles was very passionate about evangelizing, that being the reason for his nickname, Mr. Renfield, you know?, got to find lives for the Master...

– Jesus, when addressing certain subjects, apparently didn't raise completely the veil over their mystery, when mentioning Elias, for instance, after His Transfiguration on Mount Tabor, when He became brighter than the sun, and Moses and Elias appeared to Him, and a cloud descended or formed over Him and the Apostles that were there with Him, and the Voice of God came from the cloud, saying, this is my beloved Son, with whom I am well pleased; listen to him. But, after the Transfiguration, when coming down the Mount, after Jesus having said to the Apostles not to tell anyone about what they had seen and Who He was, that is, the Son of God, until after He resurrected, to what the Apostles asked Jesus, then, why were

the scholars saying that first, that is, before the Messiah, Elias would come first, because of what it's written in the Book of Prophet Malachi, Jesus seems to have responded with something of a paradox, concerning that mystery, when saying, yes, Elias will come first. But I say to you, Elias has already come, and he wasn't recognized. Understanding the Apostles that Jesus was referring to John The Baptist. So, how is this a paradox? Well, because Jesus is saying that Elias had already come, with John The Baptist, but He also apparently agrees with the idea of Elias coming again. At first sight, this could be confusing, and no one should know what to think about it. But you have to keep in mind the, let's call it, dynamics of the Messiah, of Jesus, as in, well, The Messiah has already come, with Jesus Incarnation, but He will come again in His Glory. So, maybe, and this is just maybe, and speculating, before Jesus returns in His Glory, maybe Elias will come first, or the Angel of God, as is also written in the Book of Prophet Malachi, alike the first time, with John The Baptist, that is, so to prepare the people for His Return. Again, this is just speculation.

Charles thought of Alex as in being, metaphorically speaking, in a «spiritual place» similar to that elderly American Indian on that movie – what's its name? run to the stronghold, you know?, Thunderheart, I think –, watching

cartoons and stuff. He thought of God as a return to simplicity, so he took pleasure in the simple things in life.

– There's this comparison that Jesus makes of the generation He was among, when He Incarnated, as of being like children defying themselves, in playing different types of music, and getting no response, as in, we played up beat tunes, and you didn't dance, we played songs of lamentations, and you didn't cry, then explaining: John The Baptist didn't eat nor drank, and you said that he was possessed by evil spirits; The Son of Man, meaning Jesus, ate and drank, and you said, here's someone that eats, drinks and that dwells with sinners. That is to say, do whatever it might be done, nothing goes through those hardened hearts.

»Saint Pio of Pietrelcina, Padre Pio, once said something interesting that is more or less related with this subject: some people are always questioning everything, why?, why?, why? It was because of that type of behavior that the world is in the state is currently in. As in, going down that road, at some point, the sky is too blue..., and the honey is too sweet..., etc., etc. It has nothing to do with a healthy thirst for knowledge, but when questioning everything, well, the human being has free will, so, it's not impossible to set yourself to nothing will never be good enough.

Alex was someone that didn't mind silence and being alone from time to time. Although that «silence» and being «alone» having to be well understood. That is to say, at some point, if he was to say what was going on in his soul, you would think that he was listening to Heavenly Jerusalem FM – hey, everybody, I'm glad to know that our signal is finally getting to the Pilgrim Church. For our first guest, we have a real treat for you. No, it's not the Lord nor the Holy Spirit nor God The Father. Despite of broadcasting to you from Eternal Life, there's no reason why not to keep up with tradition, that is, an Angel usually appeared first than Our God. So, our first guest is a Seraph. That's right. Despite of, well, all of you might be guessing what he's going to say. They always say the same thing! – So, hmm... how's being a Seraph working out for you? Answer: Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus. What time is it? Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus. I'm not kidding. It's in the Bible. Book of Prophet Isaiah, I think. You can check it out for yourselves.

»I'm just playing. We love all Seraphs, as we do all of Our Lord's friends. And, so you know that this is also an educational radio, for all of you that don't know or might have forgotten, the word Seraph is related with fire or blaze, as in the fiery love that they have for God. God bless them for that! And thank You, Lord,

for making such beautiful friends! That was also the way that San Francis of Assisi was called by his brethren, their seraphic father, given his flaming love for God.

– You can spit now – said the dentist.

### XIII

Master of Gravity – on a wave

– Lo there, do I see my father; Lo there do I see my mother and my sisters and my brothers; Lo there do I see the line of my people, back to the beginning; Lo they do call to me, they bid me to take my place among them, in the hallowed halls of Valhalla, where the brave may live forever!

»That's what I feel about Jesus Christ.

– That's a Viking funeral prayer.

– I know. And now I do solemnly declare that, as of this moment, I make it to be Our Lord's.

– ...

– Our Lord reaps where He hasn't sowed, you know. And behold I come as a thief. Words of Jesus.

– Yes, but I think Jesus, when He said He would come as a thief, was talking about His Second Coming, as in, no one will know when that will be, unexpected, or when least expected, as said.

– Ah!, a learning experience. Everyday. I thank You, O Lord, for Thou art the Eternal Master. And due to the experience of Thy Eternal Nature of Thy Eternal Mastery, as in saying, bubbled inside of Thy Eternal Mercy – that echoes through eternal space – you never hear about it, completely, of course, if there were to be palms of eternal telescopes – a continuing praise of a brand new now, out of sense and good nature, in law, as it is, could this sentence be part of the palm of the hand, involving forever.

A praising machine

Not a washing machine

His Irish friends: well, if you're coming this way, drop by and give us a hug. Being a hog something not very handy to travel with, he took some prosciutto for them instead.

Another



### Phase 3

You can make videos, clicking the remote whenever the drummer hits the snare-drum, the bass-tom or wherever the wave may take you – all hands on deck! This is what we know so far.

We'll be back right after this:

– Most people in this world live under illusions. Do I have to keep telling you the same thing over and over? Most people think they're going to live here forever. I know that when you ask them if they feel that way, they say no, but it's an automatic response, given that, a few seconds later, they're back to their delusional selves.

»Again: Christians do not mistake this life with Eternal Life. I mean, what do you want me to say? As written in the Letter to the Hebrews: Christ is the same yesterday, today and forever. And so is God's will. So, in a way, whatever it could be said, as far as what God expects from us, turns out to be redundant – and reintroducing, God's Will! Now with scrambled eggs com ovo a cavalo<sup>6</sup>...

We are still in the solemn moment

---

<sup>6</sup> Literally it reads, with [an] egg on [a] horse[back], which is a Portuguese expression so to designate a fried egg on top of another food item, usually a steak.

In the solemn hour

Within possession of new lands

Just now

– This girl sat across from me, facing me, and started reading a book. So I asked her: can I ask you two questions? She said, sure. So I asked: what are you reading? And she told me the name of the book. Then I asked: do you know what evangelizing means? She said no. So I told her to look it up and took out this business-like size card of the Guardian Angel, with a prayer on the other side, and gave it to her. And that was it.

For God made the sky and the earth around them

Turning that person who had that Angel for a Guardian to be to the world both a blessing or not, as in someone you might not want to upset or have the misfortune of treating bad if she happened to cross your way. That Guardian Angel shouldn't be portrayed as in turning into a hit-man or something, but just to give an idea, but it would really turn him into something else, by comparison, making Sin City's Marv look like Saint Francis of Assisi.

Lord, make me an instrument of Your peace. Where there is hatred, let me sow love;

where there is injury, pardon; where there is doubt, faith; where there is despair, hope; where there is darkness, light; where there is sadness, joy.

O, Divine Master, grant that I may not so much seek to be consoled as to console; to be understood as to understand; to be loved as to love; For it is in giving that we receive; it is in pardoning that we are pardoned; it is in dying that we are born again to eternal life.

In abstract – continued the Narrator. – It is not being tried to say something indirectly about whatever movie it might be mentioned, or giving it an overall approval stamp, but only this or that particular thing that's mentioned. Such as, for instance, the reason why Alex, not having finished completely his degree in Theology, still was allowed to teach in a Catholic University by special permission of the Pope, being the explanation of the Holy Father for that in the nature of Bowfinger's explanation on why movies in fact don't cost millions of dollars to make, but eleven hundred dollars or something instead.

And then...

– Lo there, do I see my father; Lo there do I see my mother and my sisters and my brothers; Lo there do I see the line of my people,

back to the beginning; Lo they do call to me, they bid me to take my place among them, in the hallowed halls of Valhalla, where the brave may live forever!

»That's what I feel about Jesus Christ.

– That's a Viking funeral prayer.

– I know. I adapted it. Our Lord reaps where He hasn't sowed; and behold I come as a thief. Don't you remember those words of Jesus?

– Yes, but I think Jesus, when He said He would come as a thief, was talking about His Second Coming, as in, no one will know when that will be, unexpected, or when least expected, as He put it.

– Yes, I know. But I said that not while making a serious theological comment, but in broad sense. You're interpretation is the right one, of course.

– The other day, the Priest, in his homily in Mass, was commentating about the words of Jesus, when He said: make an effort to enter through the narrow door. For wide is the gate that leads to damnation. He said one thing about those words of Jesus that put the whole passage in perspective: he said that the narrow door is the service door, as in living this life, not

posing yourself as in someone that thinks that the others are there to serve you, but making yourself servant of others. Now, here, service does not mean subservience. As in, if you like, in parallel for humility, it is not subservience, but to be true, and assertive, if you will, as in, the middle ground in between being bossy and a pushover.

»He also said the other day, in his homily, commentating the Parable of the rich man and of the indigent man – who the rich man took no note of – and he singled out this very interesting detail about that Parable. It goes something like this: there was this rich man, and there was this poor man, named Lazarus, as in, there was this rich man – whatever his name is – and there was this poor man, named Lazarus. Do you see the difference? The rich man that takes no notice on his fellow man starving and freezing to death, this one God doesn't know. But the poor man, however, God knows his name. Needless to say that this isn't the way the world works.

– But why doesn't God stop their suffering and feed and clothe all those that are in need of such things?

– That question seems to come from someone that isn't familiarized, or inappropriately, with Jesus' Revelation. You

know?, I could go on about the poor being here so to give you a chance to do good and so on, but I'm not even going to go there. I could also say, in a way in parallel to the question that Saint Faustina asked Jesus, as in, why don't You punish the wicked?, to what Jesus replied, for that, I have all Eternity, so to say that despite the hardships you might had to endure during this life, this I guarantee to you: after death, if going to Heaven directly, all the misery you might have had to endure in this life will seem nothing more than a faint dream, because you have no idea what the gift of Heaven is. Saint Paul was lifted in spirit once to Heaven, and he said that there aren't words to describe it; and Saint Thomas Aquinas, one of the most preeminent Christian philosophers and theologians, after a vision, said that all he had written was nothing but straw, as in nothing at all. And you have to keep in mind that Jesus appeared to him and said, you have written well about Me. But I'm not going to go there either, because, again, if you were just remotely familiarized with Jesus' Message, you'd be put in context immediately, when such questions popped in your mind, with expressions such as the mystery of beatitude and the mystery of iniquity. Now, when contemplating those questions, you have to include another element, that being the truth. I want to say by this that, in sum, I think that one of the reasons why God is

Someone you have to believe in, while in this world, is because this world, as it is, where God is invisible, seems to be a response or a demonstration of why things are as they are in Eternal Life, as in, while everybody is rich and pretty, and you see God right over there, it's easy to be good. But when that is not the case, then one sees who is really good. Hence the element of truth I mentioned and why, in a way, by revealing yourself, as you currently are amidst the circumstances of this world, it is you that is being revealed, both to you and to others, who you truly are and why you'll be what you'll be in Eternal Life. That is one of the reasons why the Commandments are light, as in, don't lie, don't kill, don't steal, because everything you do will have to be accounted for after you die. Nevertheless, the truth already makes its effect here on this world, and is indeed liberating, as Jesus said – going to bed at night with a clear conscience, for starters. And it's liberating also because by believing in Jesus you are believing in the One that is completely free, as in, beyond any concept of right and wrong. Right and wrong are concepts that don't apply to God. He Himself is the Law.

»Human laws of this world do not come from an honest philosophical reasoning, but rather as a way, in some cases, to prevent conflicts, as in somehow trying to prevent that

the understood reasons that are believed for being the cause for this or that conflict won't happen again. It has nothing to do with something like: here is the world, or our circumstances, and here is History, so let's try and see what the truth is. I know that it is said that the truth is a relative thing, but, again, such statement is only put forward not because it is indeed true, but because it seeks to avoid conflict on the hand of those that have different takes on the world or on how or what humans and the world are. But of course the truth it's not a relative or a subjective thing, but an objective one. As in, for instance, very basically, this is the planet we live in temporarily, there is the sun and there is the moon and, I mean, there's nothing subjective about that. They're there and they're objective parts of your circumstances, despite you have them for truth or not. So you see that recent laws, that are sought to put forward, are nothing more than remedies or preventive measures for past problems, not because they are true and so brought forth from philosophical honesty. For instance, you had in the past conflicts between religions. So this current age says that all religions are the same or of the same value. Naturally that isn't true, but it said in such a way so to seek prevention from future conflicts because of religious differences.



»I Am the Light of the world, said Jesus. Believing in Jesus Christ is to be truly conscious, awake and aware to the Truth about Reality, because, on the other hand, that is, if having Reality for something other than what Jesus said about it, is to be mistaken and walking in darkness, despite of the crowds that might think like you do. Have you noticed that liars always have the need, consciously or not, to find others or convince others to think like them, as in, trying to spread their comfort zone, if you like? Have you ever noticed that? And they're always very desperate about it, always trying to push and justify their ideas onto the world, trying to change the name of things and so on, or trying to lift onto laws of men whatever it might be so it won't sound and/or look like a lie anymore. People have the illusion that when something turns into a law, then that something is automatically granted a status of truth. I don't care how many times you call or how many people you get along with you to call crap chocolate, in the end... Well, do I need to say more? On the other hand, who's in sync with the truth or, to put it another way, if you witnessed something, thus knowing it to be the truth, it's irrelevant to you how many will believe it or not, since you already know what the truth is. Ultimately, and objectively speaking, the Truth stood alone on the cross.

»Have you noticed that the Book of Revelation sometimes mentions Our Lord as the Witness?

»Since mankind has turned farther away from the Church, from Jesus and from God, in the last centuries, the number of people that become shocked with their first glimpse after they die has increased dramatically, because they've been had by the philosophies that have been pushed onto the general societies in the last centuries – and still are – to what concerns what life and the world truly are. So when they die, they're confronted with what Jesus said about Himself and about Reality. So, again, when they die, if not believing in Jesus, they become shocked, because of being something they weren't expecting. Don't you understand that whoever doesn't believe in Jesus is turning Him into someone that didn't tell the truth? Having Jesus' life in this world in mind, does that add up? I mean, at all? What happens after death. In the end, that's what it all comes down to, right? As in, if knowing what happens after death, then one conducts his life according to that reality. Now, in all of History, who gives you the most credibility about that subject? Like Saint Paul wrote: who believes in Jesus Christ, will not be confounded. I think that Saint Paul had not only the Second Coming of Christ in

mind when he wrote that, but also what happens after death.

It's interesting the things one can end up with while waiting on a wave

Master of Gravity

Lo there do I see my father

Lo there do I see my mother and my sisters and my brothers. Lo there do I see the line of my people, back to the beginning. Lo, they do call to me. They bid me to take my place among them, in the halls of Heavenly Jerusalem, where the brave may live forever!

So

If

After this

Jesus is already Someone you love and believe in

Have a nice day

If not<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Go fuck yourself

CONTACT:

[tiagocontact@gmail.com](mailto:tiagocontact@gmail.com)

WEBSITE:

<https://sites.google.com/site/officialtiago>

ALTAR OF PEACE©2011TIAGO BONACHO

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED