

VOLUME 33

THE BIBLE SERIES

A METAPHYSICAL
AND SYMBOLICAL
INTERPRETATION OF

The Bible

by

Mildred Mann

Author of

HOW TO FIND YOUR REAL SELF (textbook)

THIS I BELIEVE

LEARN TO LIVE

THE FAMILY OF ADAM and EVE

THE BIBLE – The Seven Days of Creation

BECOME WHAT YOU BELIEVE

WHAT IS PRAGMATIC MYSTICISM?

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Hebrews — Chapters 8-13 (Part Two)	3
James	16
I and II Peter	26
I, II and III John	39
Jude	44

Published By

The Society of Pragmatic Mysticism

116 Central Park South

New York, N.Y. 10019

HEBREWS — CHAPTERS 8-13

(Part Two)

CHAPTER 8. There is one thing which is unfortunate about the early and present day interpreters of the Bible and that is that most people do not realize that there are four levels on which it is written. They are the historical, psychological, inspirational and symbolic; and one level is not complete without the others. It is true that there is a certain amount of historical background, but beyond the history there is always a symbolism and that symbolism pertains to either the universal pattern or the individual development or both. We have seen this symbolism throughout the Old and New Testaments. And I am sure we have all noticed the striking similarity between the pattern of the symbolism of the subconscious and that which occurs in the Bible. This is true because, after all, you and I are the people who walk across its pages: it is our story. So once you begin to understand the symbolism of the Bible, and I think we have a fairly good comprehension by now, you can begin to apply it to your own experiences and interpret what happens to you. People very rarely discuss experiences or dreams of this nature but—and I am in a rather unique position to hear it as a teacher—you would be amazed to see how many dream experiences relate to Bible symbolism. As someone once said very beautifully, “We are all homesick for the land we very dimly remember,” and this is the memory which very often appears in our dreams.

This discussion has an intriguing connection with the present chapter. You could say that Paul is symbolically discussing the subconscious and the steps towards a greater understanding of God. To a certain degree this could be true, for the symbolism is there. But he is quoting Moses, Exodus 25:40 and Jeremiah 31:31 literally, word for word and we can see that he is not making the point we just mentioned, nor does he understand the implication of what is said by his opening statements. Despite his religious training, I doubt if Paul was even aware of the symbolism in the texts he quotes or else he would not use them in this context. Moses was a brilliant and thoroughly trained occultist who knew whereof he spoke: Paul was brilliant, but not particularly trained in occultism and had little esoteric knowledge and practically no esoteric experience.

It is fascinating to see that the person Paul most frequently quotes, other than his own interpretation of what Jesus said, is Moses. It is almost as though he felt that the best corroboration he could get for his own arguments was from the man whom he considered to be the most brilliant. And so he quotes Moses without actually understanding what he said. If you were to compare the two men, what they taught and what they did, you would be astonished to see how great a difference there was, despite the many similarities. Moses knew far more and showed far greater wisdom, even in the terms he used for the primitive people he was teaching, than Paul could even begin to realize. If you want to have an interesting experience, as well as a good metaphysical lesson, re-read the first five or six chapters of Exodus and Deuteronomy. You will find that this man gave more of the truth than anyone else in the Bible with the exception of Jesus.

There is another interesting difference in these men which arises here. In the quotation from Jeremiah which Paul uses, there is the very famous statement: "I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts" etc. There are two very great differences between Moses, Jesus and the man Paul. Both Moses and Jesus were very outgoing and had a great love of people. Paul was personally withdrawn, except where it came to his missionary zeal, and he did not have that love of people. Paul had a great love of Paul, which comes out repeatedly in all of his letters, such as his intense irritation that anyone should preach this doctrine but himself. His fury with Peter. The competition he carried on for followers was for the glory of Paul, even though he says it was for the glory of Jesus. His constant negation, stress on mortification and abstinence, and his unceasing reminders of our sinfulness, are far removed from a concept of a God of Love, and what Moses and Jesus taught and how they lived.

The other difference is equally striking and in its way reveals a great deal. Both Moses and Jesus had the knowledge of the Law that enabled them to use the power of decree, or what we call speaking the Word, for anything they wanted. Paul did not have the knowledge and ability to speak the Word, nor did he understand it, say, in relation to lack. While Jesus did not have money as we think of money today, he had the power of the Word to decree anything he wanted when he wanted it. He never lacked for anything. Moses never lacked anything and he too could decree what he needed. If you recall in the episode in the wilderness when they were without

water he smote the rock with his staff and water issued forth. Do you think that was an act of God or did he use the Law? Certainly the Law is a part of God, but Moses had enough knowledge of that Law to be able to use it as Jesus did when he fed the multitudes.

We get back to the same old question, do *you* believe they did these things? To Paul, if he accepted them, they would have been miracles of God, in the sense of the church's definition. There are many forms of healing, although the basic principle is the same, and Paul healed on a couple of occasions. However, I believe it was partly due to his tremendous guilt and obsession with sin, that he was unable to accept the idea that each individual has the power to decree the good they need in their lives, which is what the text from Jeremiah really means.

One of the things that intrigues me with metaphysical students is that we say we believe, and we make demonstrations when we have used the Law correctly. But why we think that the Law is limited, let us say, to a physical healing and is incapable of doing anything else, is beyond me. It is still the same Law. There is no difference in the Law, and its proper use will heal *any* condition, and change *any* situation. But many students do not believe this or utilize it.

If we could ever get ourselves to the point of overcoming our fears we would really begin to grow. I personally think that the only way we will ever reach that point is to realize that this is not a hit or miss proposition. We all know that mentally by now, but we have not accepted it subconsciously. We know very well that we have been created and endowed by God to do the things that we have to perform in our daily lives, to create the situations which are right for us, to overcome the things that are wrong for us. It is still the same Law that we use. The Law is not in the least bit interested whether the thing I am demanding of it is to heal a paper cut or to move a mountain. If we could only realize that, we would be far more advanced than we are now. We would be making wonderful demonstrations. We would not be—and this may sound strange to you—in a world of such turmoil as it is now. Because, you know, fear is the most infectious thing there is: it is far more infectious than any disease. For some reason or other, courage does not seem to be that infectious.

I have watched people go through many kinds of experiences. It is marvelous to see how beautifully some of them have fought their way to a feeling of confidence, and sometimes we have to

fight. When the situation concerns physical fear, I usually suggest to people that they use as the basis of meditation four lines: "I am not my body: I am not my emotions: I am not my mind: I AM I." You would be amazed to see how much that helps to overcome physical fear. Meditate on it. Who are you? Are you a physical body? You are not a body: you have a soul and the body is only the clothing for it. We are never as concerned about our personal clothing as we are about this clothing of skin we carry with us. This is our basic fear.

It is fascinating in watching students to see them make demonstrations over problems in the fields of personal relationships or finance very easily—but when they are in any degree of physical pain, the terror that they feel can devastate them. Until you get to the point where you can rise above it, it is practically impossible for you to help yourself. And I always suggest that in such a situation you should try to rise above it first, although I do not want to see anyone in physical pain. One of the best ways to practice it is in the dentist's chair. When the drilling starts, concentrate on relaxing. Put your mind on something else. The most usual reaction of course is to become tense, and the thing to do instead is to start relaxing toe by toe. Many students have done it very successfully.

This is all part of the fact which I am stressing, that there is one Law and it does not matter whether we use that Law to heal a pain or to walk on water. Let us hope to heaven that we never have to meet any painful situations such as this. But we should always remember that the only way you can increase your confidence and gain any ability to handle the Law is by using it constantly. It responds to faith and decree. It can be compared to building a mental and spiritual muscle. If you go to a gym, you do so to increase the muscular strength of the body. Then you see those muscles build up as you go back day after day. As you use the Law more and more frequently in your daily living: you speak the Word, direct the Law to bring to you that which you need, and you see it happen repeatedly, it becomes as great a certainty to you as that there is a sun in the heavens.

This is what we are supposed to do. We are supposed to learn to use the Law. We are told in Genesis that "God created man in His image after His likeness and gave him dominion over the works of His hands," but we have never taken the dominion. There are many people who are so enchained by what they see

that they do not believe that what they do not see can happen. And, despite his own disbelief, one of the great statements that Paul makes, which we will come to soon, tells the real truth about this: "Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen."

CHAPTER 9 refers back to Exodus 30:10. Do you recall what blood means? It is the symbol of the emotional nature. Now, in sprinkling the blood, do you think this was done as a symbol of a sacrifice of the emotional nature, or a symbol of the love for God? The act of sprinkling blood on the altars, or on anything else symbolized the act of giving of oneself. It is the symbol of giving of one's love. When Jesus said at the Last Supper "drink of my blood and eat of my flesh," what do you think he meant? To do this literally? He was telling them to partake of his spirit and his love, because blood is your emotional nature. For instance: you either get very flushed, or you get very pale, when the blood flushes the face, or leaves the face. Blood primarily represents the emotion, but it has always symbolized love as well. The color itself in its pure essence represents love, which is why the red rose has always symbolized love, both spiritual and physical.

Now Paul is interpreting it from the point of view of a total sacrifice. To him it represents the sacrifice of all negative things in the sense that you must "do yourself in," so to speak, before you can be acceptable to God. In verses 15 and 16, for instance, he speaks of the "new testament, that by means of death . . . they might receive," etc., and, "For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator" etc. Jesus said, "By their fruits ye shall know them," and he did not give a teaching of death, but of life. You might say that this was Paul's martyr complex coming out. However, I do not think it was that as much as the fact that he felt mankind was a rather sorry lot. He believed that. His whole teaching is based on the belief that, as we are, we are not good for much.

But while we are on the idea of sacrifice, how do you understand the word? Do you think sacrifice is necessary as Paul describes it? The only sacrifice we are ever called upon to make is the sacrifice of our self-pity, our resentment, our fears, our doubts, our worries, our stupidities. These are the sacrifices we make. And one of the things that should make us, as metaphysicians, a bit more mature than most people is that this is the kind of sacrifice that nobody sees but yourself. The "giving up" which accompa-

nies many religious holidays are not sacrifices, although people may think they are. We are to sacrifice the things closest to ourselves.

The concept of tithing as a sacrifice to God, for instance, was adopted and adapted by Moses and Aaron from a very ancient concept, in order to teach the people that there was one Source of all supply. This is still one of the great ways of making yourself realize that there is only one Source of all substance, which you acknowledge by giving part of your financial substance in this belief. On the other hand, if it becomes a sacrifice, in the usual sense of the word, then you are not doing it properly and it has no meaning for you. For this really means that you are giving back to God a small token of what He has given you.

Jesus believed in this too. And, from another point of view, he said "the servant is worthy of his hire," and he told his disciples that when people offered them clothing, money, or shelter, they were to accept it and bless them. Paul, on the other hand, said, "You cannot give me anything. I will not take anything from anybody. I am going to work for what I get." There was his martyr complex. He was going to "out Jesus" Jesus if he could. But the symbol of sacrifice was designed to impress the early Hebrews, who were quite primitive, that God was the Source of all supply, and therefore, they had to bring the best of their flock for tithing. This is the Law. But Paul disregards this part of the Law, as well as the fact that people had progressed to the point of being able to give in love to a certain degree, and he takes it completely from the point of a sacrificial stripping of oneself. You are to sacrifice everything that, in his mind, is wrong. So your very life was a sacrifice and it had to be stripped of all good, all beauty, all enjoyable things.

CHAPTER 10. As we have said before, I do not think Paul ever had a real experience with God. He was close to a real experience, but he never had it. If he had, he could not have said, as he does in verse 31, that "it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God." From another point of view, Paul goes further afield in trying to make people fear God than almost anyone in the Old Testament. Even in their most violent denunciation of the people, at least the prophets incorporated the concept of the forgiveness of God, and the renewal of good when you did repent and turn back to Him. But what Paul is teaching, particularly beginning with verse 26, is that if you sin now there is no forgive-

ness or redemption. Furthermore, according to Paul's list of sins, if you were to even sit with a sinner, you were eternally damned.

Then, on the other hand, he strangely enough quotes Habakkuk 2:4, in verse 38: "Now the just shall live by faith" which is one of the greatest statements of metaphysics. It means that the metaphysical life is a life based on faith and not on the intellect, or the outer processes of the physical world. Incidentally, the definition of faith in the Oxford Dictionary is quite wonderful: it is "a reliance on what is." If we translate the statement "the just shall live by faith" into our own terms, what would it mean?

Let us say you know that you have done everything you can to make a demonstration and nothing apparently has moved. You know you have no fear, and you are completely sure everything is in order: you know this and you *stand still*, and you will never be let down. This is the meaning of the seventh day of creation: "and the Lord rested." However, Paul inserts this quotation about faith in the midst of his analysis of what we must do to gain salvation, and the fearfulness of God. The idea of a God who is going to punish us continually: who is just interested in seeing how many times we fall on our faces—and heaven knows, we all do that enough—is not my concept of a God of Love. I rather suspect Paul fancied himself as wise as God, he so often puts himself in that position, as he does in verse 38. That his wisdom was above question was certainly true in his mind.

CHAPTER 11 is the very famous chapter on faith. Much of it is quite beautiful and, of course, the opening statement is one of the greatest statements of faith that has ever been made. The chapter is in the form of a review, however, so it requires little comment. Paul cites the instances where by faith, and only by faith, so-called miracles happen. Of course we know there are no miracles, there is only the working of the Law. The real point here is that if we do not have faith, nothing of a positive nature can happen. But let us remember one thing, that faith has a negative side too, and it is called fear. Faith is a belief in, and fear is a belief in: the one, faith, expects the good, and fear expects the bad. But they function in exactly the same way because they are implemented by the same emotion: belief. When we remember this, we will find interesting differences in the instances Paul cites here, many of which are not of what we would term a positive nature.

CHAPTER 12. Referring for a moment to that question I frequently ask, "What kind of a God do you have?" would you say

from this chapter that Paul knows the God we know? What is the difference? This is a God of vengeance: this is the early Judaic concept. Even the very famous text in verses 5 and 6: "whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth" is based upon the Old Testament: Job 5:17 and Psalm 94:12, almost verbatim. And, as I have said before, I think my version, "whom the Lord loveth He chaseth" is closer to the truth.

But let us look at this section from the metaphysical point of view. You and I know by now that God never punishes any of us, nor does He reward us. Anything that ever happens to us has already been given us and done in Spirit. If we do things wrong, we break the Law and then, consequently, we have to rectify it. Any time you or I make a misstep, it is not because God has impelled us to do it. That would be rather ridiculous. It is the result of some form of fear which we have. Sometimes we do things because we do not know any better, this is true, but always behind it is the basic pattern of fear.

You need no better proof of this than when you have broken a Law, and I am sure each of us has done so at one time or another since we have been in metaphysics. Let us take something very minor as an example. We find this happens constantly in the beginning of our metaphysical lives. We try to overcome our doubts, our fears, our envies, our resentments, and sometimes a particular feeling "sticks." Then we suddenly find that something goes wrong. We can very readily trace it back to the fact that, either we did not overcome the feeling, or we indulged in a very negative emotion. This has nothing whatsoever to do with God. It has only to do with you or me. God is not in the least bit interested in punishing us. God never punishes us. We punish ourselves. And we also make our own good.

When I say we make our own good, let me also say that we are not making something new. We are recreating that which has already been given us, which we have never used. Paul speaks of faith as being a gift of the spirit, as in Galatians 5:22. We have been speaking of changing the negative emotion of fear into the positive emotion of faith. Faith is not endowed upon us by God because we have accepted a particular doctrine, faith is always there as is the knowledge of what and who we are. Faith is always there in the same way that the heartbeat is always in the physical body. Faith is as much an ingredient of human nature as love or hate, or anything else positive or negative.

We are not given something new, like an injection, when we develop faith: this is a transmutation of emotion, or ridding yourself of the negative concept of fear so that faith can emerge. It is a change, a transmutation: it is still the same ingredient, emotion, but emotion is colored by the motivation. Every human being who has life has emotion. Even though some people do not show it and other people gush all over, we all have emotion. Now the direction that emotion takes is completely dependent on what else we have within us besides that. People who are by nature kind and good, and who have a great love of God will have faith. But people, even those who say they believe in God, who have been badly trained for a lifetime or two do not have a love of God but the fear of God. Consequently they fear life, for if you fear God, you fear life. This is the important point.

Now do you transmute fear into faith? Many of us have had the experience of having had to meet a great problem in our lives of which we were terrified. And, since we know something of metaphysics, we work to change our consciousness. That fear goes and in its place there is the knowing that everything is going to be all right. Even though it looks as black as ink outside, there is a feeling of peace. What has been done? You have transmuted fear into faith. You have taken the concept of fear, which is an emotion, and by raising your consciousness you have transformed it into faith. We can only do this consciously. And no one can do it for you, you can only do it for yourself. "Faith is the substance of things hoped for; the evidence of things not seen."

There is another important point which Paul brings out here with which I completely disagree. Paul, as well as practically every other rabbi, minister or priest, speaks of the necessity of renunciation. What do you think it is? In its real sense it is the outgrowing of things which we no longer want in our lives. That is the only way it can ever be accomplished.

I have for instance, had a number of people come to me for help with alcoholism, a few of whom have been members of Alcoholics Anonymous. I think A.A. does a very wonderful work, but I do not approve of their methods, because they make converts by fear. You *dare not* take that drink. So they are not overcoming the basic problem of alcoholism, but are making people live in fear of taking a drink. Certainly I would not wish to do away with A.A., but the result of this method — which is fascinating — is that they talk about it incessantly in their meetings. In-

stead of having an alcoholic jag, they have a jag of talking all about it. Now, is this overcoming? I have found it far wiser and more effective to show the person the basic problem behind their drinking, which usually is some form of escapism. And then to tell them, "If you are in a mood and you take a drink, it is like drinking poison for you. You can take a drink when you are not in a mood, and you can take two drinks in an evening, but if you take more than that you are creating trouble." I have seen person after person master this and, what is more, they are no longer afraid of it.

Renunciation as Paul means it is merely a sublimation of the thing you are trying to overcome. Sublimation means that sooner or later there is going to be an explosion within you. You cannot do it that way. You must grow out of it. You grow out of it in the same way as you grew out of the great love you had for toys as a child. There came a time when the toys no longer interested you. If you will look back on your life you will see there were a number of things that you were very interested in and indulged in, and then suddenly found that they no longer appealed to you, and you had turned to something else which was usually on a higher level. But you did not renounce the first interest: you did not amputate it.

If you amputate a thing physically, that does not mean you have removed it subconsciously. Unless you clear out the roots, its chances of coming back are extremely strong. As a rule, if you grow out of it, in the real sense of renunciation, you always put something in its place. There is never a vacuum as long as you replace it. And there is an old statement which we use in metaphysics that "*nature abhors a vacuum.*" Sudden renunciations create a vacuum, and then troubles will begin again. This is what Jesus referred to in his parable of the unclean spirit who returned with "seven other spirits more wicked than himself." So the idea of renunciation, which the church endorses very strongly, is one of the most dangerous things we can ever do to ourselves until we are ready to grow out of it.

This is another aspect too of the subject of repentance. What do you do when you repent? You give up the sense of wrong doing, put the truth in its place, and you grow out of the negative concept. In the orthodox religious teaching it seems that you are never finished with repenting. Metaphysically what do we do? There is no one who has not made mistakes and, as long as we

are human I have a suspicion we will keep on making them. But what do we do? If we have included anyone else in the difficulty in which we find ourselves, we try to make it right. We forgive ourselves and we ask God to forgive us, and then we forget about it and try to do the right thing. The worst thing we can ever do is to keep thinking, "Woe is me." That will never help you in any way. It will merely implant a wrong pattern which will link up with the other wrong patterns and then you will really have things to overcome.

CHAPTER 13 is a closing reminder of what he has said before, so we will not discuss it in detail other than to refer to verse 12. Paul did not have the knowledge, and he did not have the understanding, and so he took a very literal interpretation which has resulted in the views the churches teach today. He was wrestling throughout his life with the idea that Jesus was God and that he shed his blood so that we could all be absolved of sin. If that was the reason for the crucifixion of Jesus, I would say it was not successful, looking around at the world we have known since then. There certainly has been a lot of sin—a word, as you know, I hate to use. Paul's teaching is completely based on his emotional reaction to his one experience and a very scanty knowledge of what Jesus taught. He could only bring to that teaching that which he had learned as a Jew. This is the reason why we have so many Judaic practices in Catholicism. It was not Jesus who was the founder of the church, it was Paul. What would have happened if Paul had had the knowledge, I do not know.

One of the questions which I am sure is in everyone's mind, and is in mine too, is, "Why Paul?" Why did Jesus choose Paul? The only answer I can think of is that the people were only ready to accept what Paul brought them at that time. All of the disciples had small groups around them, but Paul was the only one who traveled from point to point. Jesus taught that there was no need of ritual of any sort. Jesus taught that God is in you and God is Love, and that you are responsible for yourself, God is not. The doctrines, rituals and theology were added afterwards and had nothing to do with his teaching, but were based on Paul and then on Augustine.

Bringing this up to the twentieth century, the largest audiences or congregations I have ever know were those of Emmet Fox in this city. I well remember the Manhattan Opera House, particularly on holidays. The auditorium downstairs seated about 5,000

people; the ballroom seated another 2,500 and even then people were standing in the streets listening to the loudspeakers. We have had some very able and wonderful ministers in this city, but there have never been audiences like that. And he gave a teaching that was completely contrary to orthodox teachings.

The orthodox field is beginning to accept some of these principles little by little, and their concepts are enlarging somewhat. There is, for example, an Episcopalian Bishop in a middle-Atlantic state who had been a follower of metaphysics for years and quietly imparted it in his own way to his congregation. After all, metaphysics deals in the basic essentials of the human being. No matter who you are or what you are, you have in your life degrees of love, of hate, of fear, of faith. Everyone is interested in their health, in their substance, in the people closest to them, and these are the basic problems that will always exist until we get to the point where we know how to handle them. When people are given answers in their own terms, they will accept it. If they are led into more confusion and are unable to think it through, then they are directed to a particular creed or church that does the thinking for them. This is our great problem. But I do think Paul could have done a better job, or it could have been a better man than Paul. It may be that he was very much needed for that time, and I am sure he was or Jesus never would have chosen him. But he certainly made life very complex for the last two thousand years.

But again, "when the student is ready, the teacher appears," and the race was not ready for more. That is the only answer that can be given. A world teacher will come at the point of the world's greatest need and vulnerability. We have had one of these points now since the Second World War, or a little before that. The world was very vulnerable, and at that time we began to see a renaissance of religion and a greater development of metaphysical thought than ever before, and the metaphysical field has grown tremendously since then. It may well be that this time people are ready to outgrow their old concepts and the Pauline tradition, and begin to accept the original teaching of Jesus and put their own individual contact with God in place of them. Then we will begin to see the dawn of the "second coming of Christ"—not in the form of one person, but in humanity itself.

Paul is by far more Hebrew than Christian in this book. His concepts of fear, sin and sacrifice come directly from his early background, which he tries to fit into what he believed Jesus taught. And, unfortunately, it is the teaching of Paul, rather than that of Jesus, which has been given to the Christian world since then.

What a different world we would have if the reverse were true! Paul taught separation, because of his belief; Jesus taught brotherhood, despite beliefs. Paul taught negation of self; Jesus taught we are all the sons of God. Paul taught austerity; Jesus taught we were all entitled to the abundance of God, here and now.

There were moments when the Truth came through for Paul, but the "moments" were few and far between.

H. H.

JAMES

The question of the identity of James has never been definitely answered. *The Interpreter's Bible* has a great deal to say on the subject and their research, as always, is intensive. There is little information given in the letter itself, and the writer's references to himself and his relationship to his readers are extremely vague. Most scholars do not feel that it could have been written by the brother of Jesus, primarily because of its literary form and strongly Hellenistic influence. However, if you remember, in the introduction to the gospels we discussed the fact that Jerusalem at that time was a metropolis and the center of Roman, Greek and Jewish thought and culture. It was an extremely cosmopolitan city and was permeated by these three important cultures: the religion of Judaism; the philosophy of Greece; and the law of Rome.

We have no written record that any of Jesus' brothers accompanied him when he began his ministry. Actually, I have never found any evidence that any members of his family, with the exception of his mother, had a real or prolonged contact with him. I have always, nevertheless, had a very strong feeling that the James of this epistle was the brother of Jesus. I believe too that he must have accompanied Jesus in his travels. And, as is the case with anyone who is interested in a particular subject, you become very much aware of all aspects of it and you more or less absorb those things which relate to it from your environment. Moreover, Paul certainly had a good knowledge of Greek, and although we know nothing of the academic background of James, there is no reason to believe that he had not also been trained to some degree. Anyone who was associated with Jesus would be vitally interested in everything that pertained to the teaching and the effect it would have on people. One of the very great points in spreading the teaching was to familiarize yourself with other people's points of view so you could teach them in their own terms.

It is not necessary for James to have had a Greek education in order to have written this letter, for it is mainly a question of metaphor and style. He certainly had access to the books of

Greek philosophers. And from my own experience, for instance, I found that once I began to understand metaphysics, I would adapt it and speak fluently about it not only metaphysically, but in terms of psychology and philosophy (to say nothing of putting it into terms of good, old-fashioned common sense!) without having had an intensive academic background in these fields. Be that as it may, I feel quite sure that this is written by James, the brother of Jesus. Since it is open to question, you might see what clues you can pick up for yourself as you read.

CHAPTER 1. This is a delightfully common sense approach, which is quite refreshing after our siege with Paul. It is a bit reminiscent of II Isaiah. In verse 4 we have a phrase which is another cornerstone of metaphysics: "Let patience have her perfect work." Paul, as we have seen, used it primarily in the sense of being long suffering. When that is the approach then that, unfortunately, is the usual result: we prolong suffering. However, in the real sense, it means to forbear from activity until the time is right. When we speak the Word with belief in the perfect outcome, we then "stand still" or, to use the phrase from the Psalms "Rest in the Lord, and wait patiently for him," and this patience must always have "her perfect work."

Verse 5 is extremely true and is a very beautiful way of expressing this truth. We all could use much more intelligence, and I have often suggested that you treat for it at least once a week. It is interesting that James states this in the midst of a section, beginning with the concept of patience in verse 4 and ending with verse 8, in which he develops the idea of a steadfast and unwavering faith. Verse 8 is one of the most famous texts in the entire Bible: "A double-minded man is unstable in all his ways." What do you think it means? We say we trust God, and then we do just the opposite.

Let us take a statement which is utterly simple, even though we will never plumb its depths: "God is the only Presence; God is the only Power." Do you believe it? We believe it intellectually, but not emotionally, not subconsciously. Do you know how you know if you believe it? By expressing it in everything you think and say. By doing it! If you believe that God is the only Presence, and God is in you, then you live according to that belief. How do you do that? Does it mean that we live on another plane as Paul seems to think? You live right here in the physical world. God is in every plane He has created. If you

really believe that the Presence of God is in you, then every action of every day is done in the way that the Presence of God in you would do it. That is your measurement. It is utterly simple.

We can all look back at each day, and find small indications of what we actually believe. Today, for instance, when you awakened this morning, what was your first thought? Did you feel depressed if you saw rain? And as you started your job, your study, or whatever it may have been, did you act as God would act about it, or did you find yourself grouchy, irritable or bored? If you really believe that the Presence of God is in you, then this is the attitude you carry through your day. This does not mean that there may not be a problem or two waiting for you. There may be a new problem, or an old problem; that is completely beside the point: how would God treat it? Would He fuss and fume and worry, and tear Himself apart and feel a bit sorry for Himself? Do you think God does that? To act as He would act, is what it means to really believe what we say. You know, we pay mostly lip service to our beliefs, and I think the time has come when we should stop it. By now we should believe that God is the only Presence and the only Power, and we should begin to act in accordance with our belief.

When things take you by surprise you certainly do have to make the effort to remind yourself of what you believe. That is why we are trained to realize that the first thirty seconds are golden. We should be trained by now to remind ourselves of what we believe within the first thirty seconds after something happens to us, for it takes the subconscious that long to absorb and react to the situation. Paul used the phrase "none of these things move me." It is this inner attention and awareness that keeps us untouched by what happens without, and so we are able to control it. If you are studying metaphysics you cannot vacillate. You must stick unwaveringly to that one point. Otherwise, you are on a spiritual treadmill, taking the steps but never moving. It is completely true that "a double-minded man is unstable in all his ways."

In relation to what we have been discussing, what do you believe about verse 13? In the meditation we use so often, the Presence card of Dr. Fox, we say "God never sends sickness, trouble, accident, temptation, nor death itself; nor does He authorize these things. We bring them upon ourselves by our wrong thinking." Do you believe this? If God is perfect good, and He is, then He

can cause only perfect good. This is the truth which James is emphasizing here and he states it most beautifully in verse 17. The usual question is, if Good is the only Power, how is it that there is so much evil in the world? But that is only the result of our own unruly little selves.

CHAPTER 2 is entirely based on the statement in verse 17 that "faith without works is dead." You might ask, if you have faith, how can you not have "works?" The point is that this kind of faith is not an active faith. There are three kinds of faith: there is the faith that professes belief; there is the faith that is accompanied by activity; and then there is the faith of desperation that is usually aroused by the need of a particular moment. I do not know that we can really call the first type faith. You know it was Emerson who said so beautifully, "What you are shouts so loudly, I cannot hear a word you say." If we say we believe one thing and we are another, it is always extremely obvious. If you really believe in a certain concept, you demonstrate that concept. If you do not believe it, you do not demonstrate it. It is as simple as that.

James is perfectly right when he says that faith is dead without works. You can profess all the faith in the universe, and make all the prayers in the world, but unless it really means something to you and shows in your outer life, these are simply words. This does not mean that everyone is going to reach the top of the ladder of faith overnight: it is a growing thing. But, on the other hand, as you begin to build in the real concept of faith, you begin to show it in your outer life. It must be so. This is the Law and nothing can change it. Whatever we believe in, we demonstrate: what ever we really believe in, we do: not what we say we believe in.

I have heard person after person tell me how much they believe in this, that and the other thing, and then do exactly the opposite. When I first started counselling, I thought this was done to impress other people, but I soon realized that they were completely fooling themselves. You know, there is not one of us who has not been faced with a pressing situation. We have all been through them, but by now we know we have one of two ways of approaching them. We have the way of metaphysics, which is to treat about it until we rise in consciousness—until we are aware that we have no fear of it—and then proceed to do whatever we know is the right thing to do. The other way is to meet it in terms of the world. We each have this choice in every situation

we have to meet. But we have to make the choice. Too often we fool ourselves by saying, "I am treating about it: I'm waiting for the result." But you are not handling it properly if the situation remains. This is the Law and we cannot change the Law: it is the one thing we can never change.

This is why Jesus said, "By their fruits ye shall know them." When we come to a decision about a situation, and we have decided to use a metaphysical attitude towards it, then we know that we believe. We can only really know for ourselves that we believe what we profess to believe in when we see the results in the outer picture. Throughout this chapter James is talking about faith and trying to impress on us that God is the one Source, and there is only one Source. There is only one Presence and one Power. However, we all forget this completely from time to time. If we are in the proper frame of consciousness where we realize that this is so, we can manifest or demonstrate anything in the given space of a second. Anything.

For example, the most difficult thing to do is to heal yourself. You can heal others much more easily, because it is more difficult to rise above the pain when it is in your own body. Since it is your own body the situation may be accompanied by a little fear, and you must rid yourself of it before you can do much. But I have seen it done time and again by people who have then been able to overcome really serious illnesses in the twinkling of an eye. Now if you can reach that peak of consciousness that quickly over a question of health, you can certainly reach it in any other situation, provided—provided, you believe it not only consciously but subconsciously. But the subconscious has been used to having its own way, and it is filled with many, many negative concepts which we have accepted. It depends on the training of the conscious mind as to how great our subconscious belief will be. The Superconscious, the Presence of God in us, will do nothing for us until we have cleared the way. We blocked the door ourselves, and it is up to us to open it by retraining ourselves.

CHAPTER 3. Have you ever thought about how important the power of speech is? You realize that we use the medium of thought and speech when we claim the power of the Word. It is the thought which governs the speech—but we choose to say what we please. And of course James is quite right in what he says about this phase of our life. I doubt if there is one person in the world who has not been guilty of abusing speech at some time or

other. But if we realized the power of our own word and how important it is to keep that word as well as our thought completely positive, we would pay much more attention to it than we do.

What James is stressing behind the power of the Word is that this is a matter of self-discipline. And it is a discipline that no one can give you, no one can force on you, no one can make you do but yourself. Actually the whole secret of metaphysical growth is self-discipline. If you do not know how to discipline yourself, or if you are too weak to make the attempt, or if you are too "double-minded" to stick to it, you had better do something about it. Because, until you begin to discipline yourself, nothing can change positively in your life. This is a matter of will—not the will of God, but your will—and if you want to find the growth and knowledge and ability to change your life, this is the only way in which it can be done.

Do you realize, for instance, that every time you abuse your word by speaking negatively or condemning other people, or curse, you are weakening your own power to speak the Word effectively? Now, I do not think, living in the kind of world we do in this age, that any of us is completely free from cursing in one mild form or another. It is not too bad in its minor forms, but there are certain words which we should most definitely not use. When we use one of the names of God it is very much blasphemy, and it hurts us far more than we know. We should not use "God-damn" or Jesus Christ." The Ten Commandments say "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain, for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain." It is not that God is going to punish us—we punish ourselves. As we know, the name means the nature of a thing, and in doing this we are damning our own nature.

So you find that the words we use are extremely important. Unfortunately, some metaphysical students carry this almost to the point of superstition. There is hardly a day in the week when I do not get a letter saying, "Will you please tell me exactly what to say when I treat?" In this case, the words are unimportant, as long as they are positive ones. The words I would use for myself may not be satisfactory for you: and yours may not be satisfactory for me. But as long as our words express our own thoughts clearly and positively, there is no necessity for verbatim affirmations, nor is there any "magic" in them. The magic lies in the directed faith behind them.

This is one reason why I am very much against the idea of affirmations. I think they are wonderful for beginners, but we are not beginners. I do not think that every time we feel we need something to hang our spiritual hats on we have to run from one book of statements to another to find the way our need is exactly worded so that we will not offend God. Actually, this is the reason why people do this, and it is a concept we should get over. Or, people often think that a metaphysical teacher has a certain type of Word which must be more powerful than that of anyone else. Well, if I said "abracadabra" it might be powerful, if I believed in it. This approach is carrying it to the other extreme.

But the thing to remember is that the words you use are important to you. If you are in the habit of speaking negatively you should learn to change it. If you find that people have reacted in ways you do not like, do not be eager to rush to everyone else and tell them about it. First of all, you are not going to hurt the other fellow, you are only going to hurt yourself. This is an abuse of the power of the Word. Let us go a step further. Suppose someone you know has hurt you, has done something very unkind. What kind of a reaction do you have? What is your first reaction? How many of us ever react by immediately forgiving the other person? You know, Jesus said, "whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." Matthew 5:39.

Many people in thinking about the phrase "the meek shall inherit the earth," feel that it is asking the impossible in this day and age, for if you have that reaction you will usually be stepped on. But you have to understand the word meek. We are meek before God, not before man. I can assure you, I do not think anyone will smack me on the cheek. They may want to, but I do not think they would dare. You are meek before God, but you have self-respect before man: and there is a great difference. You will be amazed to see the change that takes place if you approach situations with people in this way.

You know, when people come in to see me with personal controversies, I have suggested that it takes two to make a fight. Their usual reaction is, "Well! You don't think I am going to let them get away with that, do you? I've got my pride!" Well, your pride is not going to get you far. Metaphysics teaches us that not only the people with whom we are constantly in contact, but those

we meet only occasionally as well, are those we have brought into our own lives. They are there for a purpose. They came in to your life because, subconsciously somewhere along the line, this is what you invoked, and they are there for you to learn something. That may be simply to curb your temper, or it may be to learn to evaluate what pride is. Pride is a fool's dream: self-respect is a very different matter.

It is very strange that when you do have self-respect, everyone respects you. No one respects any person who does not respect himself. This is another approach to "love thy neighbor as thyself." Unless you love yourself in the same way that you would love your fellowman; unless you respect yourself in the same way that you should respect your fellowman: you are going to get the identical treatment from your fellowman. This is all part of the power of the Word. As you refine your word, as you discipline yourself to this, your power of the Word grows. That is what is so important, and this chapter, while it seems to be mainly concerned with speech, is really on self-discipline.

CHAPTER 4 once again raises the question of the editorial hand. Was this altered almost beyond recognition, or was it inserted apparently at random? Up to this point the writing was particularly beautiful and the concepts were extremely broad; this is almost as full of hell and brimstone as Paul's letters were, and, as a matter of fact, there is quite a similarity in the point of view. I do have the feeling that this was inserted, perhaps because the later editors felt that the first few chapters were a bit too tame.

I am particularly interested in this question because there are countless books which are now bringing to light the facts about the extent and the nature of the editorial handwork to which our Bible has been subjected. This was a fairly closed subject until fairly recently. There is one scholastic author, Charles Guignebert, who says that the true message of Christianity was never taught after the time of Jesus. It is perhaps an exaggeration in overall terms, but not in terms of theology and the doctrine of the churches. As we have seen, it has been greatly altered and much has been removed from the New Testament. Actually from as early as the first century there have been deletions and changes with each century adding its own peculiar viewpoints.

To return to James, you will notice that in verse 7 the writer says to "resist the devil" and you will recall that Jesus said we

should "resist *not* evil. Whether or not James wrote this chapter, no one associated with Jesus would have stated such an obvious contradiction in conception. This is another indication that this was written by a later writer, plus the fact that the approach in the first three chapters is that life is really something to be lived because the Spirit of God in you is the spirit of joy: and here we suddenly return to blood and thunder.

CHAPTER 5 does not sound as though it were written by the same person who wrote the first three chapters, does it? The difference is extremely noticeable in the language and the style. For instance, re-read verses 6-12 in chapter 3 and then verses 4-6 of chapter 5. Do you think the same man could have written both chapters? This is one of the things that is really amazing about the way the Bible has been put together and edited. If you remember in Isaiah you could hardly tell the difference between the Second and Third Isaiahs. Unless we were given the information, we would have no idea that it was not written by the same man. We do know now that it was the work of a disciple of the Second Isaiah, whose flow and choice of words were identical. But here not only is the thought completely different, but the choice of words also differs.

Incidentally, there is one line in verse 11 that we have encountered time and time again. I will never understand why it is expressed in this way, because it is so contrary to what actually happened. I wish that someone would explain to me why anyone ever thought Job was a patient man. If you remember the book of Job, he did nothing but scream and yell about his misfortune. And do you remember his indignation when God would not meet him face to face and tell him why this was happening to him? Who was God to do this to him? Really, what was so patient about Job? The phrase may have originated because it was felt that he quietly endured his sufferings, but actually he had no choice. However, although we do not know the origin of the phrase "the patience of Job" in one sense it starts here with "we count them happy which endure . . ." affliction. It is, in the writer's view, the positive aspect of the "patience" of Job, and it is quite contrary to what Jesus taught. Returning to James, I think the editors could have omitted the last two chapters, because I do not think they belong in the epistle.

"Faith without works is dead," said James, and he was right. Too often we pay lip service to something we admire and desire, and we think that this is sufficient. We say we have faith if we follow the outer forms - and of course, this will get us nowhere.

Faith is an inner quality and a growing quality. It is backing your idea, - your thought - with the conviction of your heart and soul, and living your belief to the best of your ability.

It is a growing thing because the more you live by it, the more you prove it; the more you prove it, the stronger it becomes.

Faith is the witness to the Truth.

M. M.

I PETER

Since CHAPTER 1 is primarily in the form of an introduction the latter section of which joins with CHAPTER 2, we will discuss the general portion of the material as a unit. From what we know of Peter, do you think he wrote this? It sounds more like Paul, although it is not so bombastic, in the learning which it exhibits. At the end of the letter it is mentioned that Silvanus transcribed it. It is thought that Silvanus is the same Silas who accompanied Paul on many of his journeys. He was a well-educated man, both in Greek and in the Hebrew tradition, which would account for the style and phraseology which we certainly would not expect from Peter. It is also possible that it was written by Luke who, as you know, was with Peter for many years. In either case, the writer probably listened to what Peter had to say and then put down what he thought he should have said. Actually it is not even known if Peter could read and write: he was a very simple and uneducated fisherman.

An interesting aspect arises here. We have gone through Paul, James and the beginning of Peter and there are few remaining epistles in the New Testament. Whether or not Luke wrote this, it was presumably written during the period when they had first hand reports from the disciples. They all seem to be dealing with one major subject — in terms of man's understanding God, or man's relationship to suffering—that we are to submit ourselves to suffering and have the "patience of Job" in enduring it. Paul stressed this to an almost fanatic extent, but it was also due to the nature of the times, for the early centuries of Christianity were times of persecution, as we all know. The fact that it continued, however, and the reason for the reaction to it was due partly to Paul's influence, partly to the misunderstanding of the new ideas which were being spread throughout the world at that time, and partly to the misunderstanding and emphasis placed upon what they considered to be the suffering of Jesus and his crucifixion.

Interestingly enough, no matter who wrote this letter, the aspect of patience is approached somewhat differently here. In chapter 2 Peter is concentrating on the quality in which he was most lack-

ing, and that was patience. You will recall that Peter was a most impatient man, and his impatience always got him into trouble. Peter acted before he thought, and it climaxed when, because of his fear, he denied knowing Jesus. This comes under the heading of impatience and impetuosity, and Peter has by this time learned his lesson. In this entire section we find that the most important thing to Peter is to be patient. Paul, on the other hand, did not stress this or any other quality because he felt that he could improve in that area, as he did not feel himself to be lacking in any quality, but because he was sure that everyone else was. It comes through quite clearly in his letters that Paul felt that he was quite the person. There was no one, not even the disciples, who could hold a candle to Paul in knowledge or anything else. He believed completely that he was the living example of what Jesus meant, and if he had been a sinner at one time, he had since been made perfect. Peter is not approaching it from that point of view: Peter is stressing the quality in which he felt he was lacking.

It is interesting and quite true that anyone who lectures in the fields of religion, psychology, or metaphysics, cannot possibly avoid bringing into their talk the thing which to them is their own weak point. They will stress the concepts they particularly believe in, and they will never mention the aspects with which they have little or no contact. As I have said before, I rarely talk about worry, or about sin, and very little about fear, unless I am trying to make a point for you, because I do not worry, and I do not believe in sin, so I never talk about it. Now, in the same way, Peter is stressing his weak point here. Needless to say, he had an agonizing experience when he denied knowing Jesus. Do not think that he did not suffer the tortures of the damned after it, even though he knew Jesus completely forgave him. I am perfectly sure if nothing else left a mark on him this did. He realized that all of the things he had done which were wrong, and he did quite a few, came because of his inability to curb his emotions, to control them. So for him patience is a most important quality: patience is uppermost in his mind.

We know that all the disciples greatly misunderstood what Jesus taught. And again let me remind you, for we have discussed it repeatedly, that just because these men were chosen by Jesus does not mean that they had a great degree of knowledge or that they had that much spiritual experience. They were chosen

because they had certain qualities which he knew would develop and enable them to do the thing he wanted to see done. It was not a matter of their proficiency, or brilliance, or spiritual development—that was to come later. Not only do few of us in metaphysics realize this, but few of the rest of the world do. Most people consider the disciples, next to Jesus, to be the greatest human beings in the world. They were not: they were ordinary, good, kind men.

Let us go back to Paul for a moment. Do not think that Paul did not have some very wonderful qualities. Although they were not so close to the surface as to be easily seen, he did have many. He had a tremendous integrity. He had tremendous courage. But this was balanced by a tremendous ego, which made him feel that he had a right to tell everybody else how to live, and that nobody else knew anything about it. But he was still a very fine person. He was not spiritually developed to any great degree, but he was a fighter and a worker. Certainly this man could take more punishment and come through it than anyone else I have ever come across.

We have discussed the fact that the First Isaiah was very similar to Paul in some ways. He was a wealthy, aristocratic, elder of the court who was terribly proud, very snobbish, and had a frightful temper. This comes out in his writings in spite of the fact that the same man said, "Unto us a child is born . . .". Just because they happened to have been prophets or disciples does not mean that they were so spiritually developed and advanced that they had full understanding. They did not. I think this is probably one of the most difficult things to understand. If you read this part of the Bible objectively and see the points of disagreement among the disciples on what is right, then you realize how little they knew.

Now, getting down to the point at hand, we might ask what are the points of agreement aside from patience. Here Peter speaks of Jesus' suffering, and says he died for our sins. As for the latter point, we can be fairly sure that was inserted because Peter certainly knew better than that. But throughout the chapter he speaks of Christ and of Christ's suffering for us. Now whether these are insertions or not, where do you go in the Bible to find the real truth, the real teaching, if you cannot turn to someone like Peter, who spent time with Jesus?

It is because of this question that I have so frequently stressed

the need to develop your own ability to distinguish the spurious from the real and to rely on your own intuition. There are certain points where it comes through. In I Corinthians, for instance, Paul gave us the chapter on love, and then one on faith in Hebrews; other than that we find a few isolated texts and that is all. There are a few texts in James, and a few here in Peter's epistles, but actually the New Testament could be confined to the four gospels, the letters of John and Revelation.

One of the reasons why people have become to a great degree anti-religious, in terms of orthodoxy, is that when they look at the Bible they do not regard it as an inspired book that cannot possibly be wrong. We have been far too materialistically educated, and in one sense it is a good thing, to take these writings simply on a fundamental interpretation. Just because it is in the Bible does not mean that every word is literally, physically true. And in this section, which is also the most severely altered in the entire Bible, you find that some of the ideas of the disciples did not show a very clear conception of what Jesus had done. They were not educated to it, they could not understand it, and in the short time of three years, he did not have the time to really make them aware, because a good part of his time was spent in public teaching and traveling. He did not have the time to give them a thorough instruction in the inner teaching, and I am also sure that he felt they could not take as much as he would have liked to give. In fact, at one point he tells them that he cannot tell them more because they could not bear it. He realized this.

These people then groped desperately for understanding after he left them. Until Pentecost they did not really know what he was talking about in terms of the kingdom of God within them—how much less did they understand his own experience? We should not forget too that the crucifixion was an experience of great horror for them. Whether or not they personally witnessed it, they had seen crucifixions in Jerusalem before, and John must have given them a description of what happened. Certainly this must have left a mark of suffering. But they missed the point, they do not know the point, they were not ready for the point of what happened and why. Therefore they revert to what they feel Jesus was teaching, and they are a far way from what he taught.

Let us approach this concept of suffering from a different point of view. It is quite certain that everybody at that time believed in reincarnation. Now if Peter really believed in reincarnation, do

you think he could voice these things? That you could build in patience as you grew, yes, but certainly not that until you did, you would find no favor with God. This was not the teaching of that time. That Peter would stress patience because of his own experience, or lack of experience, is one thing, but the hell and damnation which we find here I do not think came from Peter who really knew more than that. John's main stress is on Love, both in the gospel, quoting the words of Jesus, and in his own words in his letters. This may have been due to his own deep understanding and experience of that aspect, but this concept of God as Love came from Jesus. Peter who, with John, was closest to Jesus would have been so imbued with this concept that he would never have said, as we find in chapter 1 verse 17, "pass the time of your sojourning here in fear," to cite one example.

Let us relate this again to the concept of reincarnation. I would say to you now, and to myself as well, that when we find negative qualities in ourselves, we should overcome them because I am sure we do not want to come back here with these qualities and have their resulting problems all over again. But I do not believe that I am going to be damned and flung into outer space because of them. I am going to have to learn to overcome them, for I will continue to have them until I do, bringing them all with me the next time I appear on the earth plane. We are not punished for our negative qualities or for anything else. We reap the result of our beliefs and actions—and we reap the good as well as the evil. The evil goes when we change our negative qualities into positive ones.

On the other hand, to some extent Peter believed in the idea of suffering as a part of life, aside from the concept of punishment. Many people, even those who believe in reincarnation, believe in suffering. The idea of having to suffer, unfortunately, is not relieved by the idea of reincarnation. And certainly, as I said before, anyone who had been through the experience of the crucifixion could not help but be tremendously and deeply impressed with suffering. But then we get back to the question of how much did Jesus suffer? Did he suffer physically? Or did he suffer emotionally when he saw what happened? However, essentially it all comes back to an old statement that "there are two ways of growth: the way of suffering and the way of intelligence," and there are few, so very few, who have ever chosen the way of intelligence.

I do not think we can blame Peter or, to some extent, Paul for everything that we find in their letters or for the concepts of the church. The theology of the church began at the end of the second century. One reason for the theological or editorial alterations in these letters is that from ancient times men have believed that the way to control people is to hold them through fear, and it is in the history of religion as well. Religiously it has always been a question of fear of God or the fear of the church and its doctrines.

One point that is very interesting is that the Old Testament does not stress fear in the same way as it is approached in the New Testament. Again, let us go back to Moses. Certainly he held a tremendous power over his people and, because of their background and primitiveness he gave them a concept of a God of wrath, but he always told them the choice was theirs. Prophet after prophet pulled them up out of their troubles, but they themselves chose to go back to their former ways. The prophets did not push them back and say "You are damned for this or that": they damned themselves by their choice. And each time, as we saw, no matter how many times they were told they were going to be cast into outer darkness God, at the end of the "chapter," always came to the rescue and held out His hand and said, "If you will walk in my way, I shall be unto you a God and you shall be my people."

We frequently hear the expression: "he is such a God-fearing man." It is a terrible expression. Why is it that we do not say "He is a God-loving man?" The concept of fearing God, in the sense that is meant in that phrase, is very definitely from the New Testament. The teaching in the Old Testament is far healthier in concept than that of Paul and the last two chapters of James and Peter. Yet in his letter to Timothy, Paul makes one of the greatest statements he ever made: "God never gave us the spirit of fear, but of love, of power and a sound mind." But then he gets drowned in his preoccupation with sin, which to those who believe in it, results only in fear and suffering.

Now the subtle point in all this is one of motivation. Take verse 14 of chapter 1, Peter uses the word lust, but substitute for it the word desire. If I revert to desires I have outgrown, it will diminish me. But why do I abstain from them? You can say that it is out of fear, or you can think of it as disciplining yourself for yourself to produce a greater good. But this aspect is not brought

out here. Whatever I happen to do in the way of self-discipline, I do it for myself. I do not do it because I fear not to do it, but I do it because I think it is the step toward the goal I want to achieve. I want to do it even though it may cost me a little difficulty in achieving it. It is the step I must take for me. It will enable me to express myself more freely and fully by overcoming a negative quality in myself. I free my subconscious, and consequently increase the use of my God-given power. But this is not the approach we find here. In the New Testament, and particularly in the letters, you are not taught what Jesus taught. He taught that you are a child of God and the kingdom of God is within you. You are not told that Jesus said "all the things that I do shall you do, and even greater ones, because I go unto my Father," and your Father. This aspect of his teaching is never brought out.

CHAPTER 3. Do you think this chapter was really written by Peter? It really does sound like Paul. You will not find much that is revealing in any criticism that has been given to date, but it simply could not have been written by Peter. It is literally impossible for any of the disciples who had been with Jesus not to have had some of the inner teaching, and the core of inner teaching is the meaning of sex. Anyone who has had that teaching would never say this. Let us for the moment return to the beginning principles of Life. Everything in our world manifests in this way: there must be a positive principle and a negative principle. There must be masculine and there must be feminine; and it is from the union of these two that manifestation occurs.

This is the basic principle and no other principle is possible. On the lowest form, which is the physical, or earth plane, you find the masculine, who is considered to be the positive principle because he is the active participant, and the feminine principle, the negative, is the female who is the passive, receptive participant. The man can start nothing unless he can give, and the woman can do nothing unless she can receive. The one can do nothing in the way of reproduction without the other. Their place in life is identically the same, but each has a particular role to play. It is only through their union that we have, in terms of the physical being, a child.

In the terms of any other function of life — take it in the form of your own manifestation of a demonstration, the same principle applies. Let us say there is a problem: what happens? You think about it: that is the masculine principle. You impose that idea

of your thought on the passive principle which is the subconscious, or the feminine, and it is the combination of these two, the union of these two — and only this — that produces a demonstration.

If sex is ever properly understood — and we are a long, long way from that, it will be in that sense. God has never given us anything which we were not to use. But on the other hand, we are not to abuse it either. When we realize this, we will really begin to grow. What is actually meant by the fall of man is that he fell into sensation. There is nothing wrong with sensation, but it is not a god, and too many people have made a god of it. Consequently the whole world has suffered, because most of the world has done this. We have all done this in one life or another, and some of us still do it in this life, but this is the most unimportant aspect of it, because it is primarily a creative fuction. But basically the masculine cannot create without the feminine and the feminine cannot create without the masculine. So there is no question of the inequality of the sexes.

On another level, within our bodies in the glandular system we have the pineal which is, in miniature, a reproduction of the male genital, and the pituitary gland which is, in miniature, a reproduction of the womb. I am sure you recall the term the "mystic marriage" which takes place in development at the point of the Third Initiation, at which time there is a union between these two glands. But again, it must be the union between the positive and the negative, or the active and the passive, before it can take place. And what is their child? Wisdom and power. We can carry this principle to every scale of life and we will see that it functions in exactly the same way. So when I see that Peter is supposed to have written something like this, it would not matter whether the theologians or scholars thought he did or did not, he simply could not have done so.

In CHAPTERS 4 and 5 there is a dominant stress on suffering. And again, even the framework of the ideas does not sound like Peter. Not even the effect of the experience of the crucifixion could account for this. Peter was with Jesus too long not to know that what is spoken of here is not true. This is what you deal with in reading your Bible. It is very difficult, unless you actually become a student of the Bible for you to see, to learn to understand where the tampering begins. It is a constant miracle that this book which has been so altered by so many hands, still retains the power it has. They have not been able to destroy the inspiration

of the people who walk through its pages, because they were really touched by God, but the pity of it is that the people who followed were not.

I am very much in favor of people becoming good Bible students and tracking these alterations down. It is a very fascinating study. First of all, you have to remember who Peter was when you read this. It could sound very much like Paul, and much more like Luke, who was secretary for both Peter and Paul. Luke never had the benefit of knowing Jesus. Luke merely wrote down what Peter told him and put it in very good prose. But one thing Peter did learn from Jesus was that Jesus was not here to suffer, nor was this the way of life he taught. The idea of having to suffer in order to gain "salvation" is purely a matter of stupidity, to refer to the old saying I quoted before. And I still think we can be intelligent enough not to suffer. I have not seen anyone do it yet in all areas, including me, but I will say one thing, if I do "come a cropper," and I have, there is one thing I make up my mind about and that is I will never repeat it. And I do not think we have to. If you find you are on a treadmill, then get yourself off. There is no secret about how to do it. The only thing it takes is perseverance. You climb out of that pattern and make your demonstration. And when you really make your demonstration you never have to meet that problem again.

II PETER

CHAPTER 1. This chapter is written by Peter, and I think you will agree. It does not take a very great scholar to see how it differs from the previous letter. There is, however, little material in it which we have not covered before in some form or another, so I will simply comment on verse 14. At the time of this writing, Peter was fairly near the end of his life and he knew it. We do reach a certain point of development when we know when that time comes and we have records of many people who have known the day and almost the hour of their deaths. It is a subconscious knowledge that comes to the surface. Peter knew, and this was something he wanted.

One of the subjects we could spend hours on is the reaction of people to the incident known as death. But, you know, there is no death. It is just a question of not seeing someone for a while.

That happens in our normal living when people who have been very close to us have to move to a different part of the world. We may never see them again in our lifetime, but we have a strange reaction, because we know they are on this plane, even though we do not see them, it is all right. It is only the three words "on this plane" that gives us a feeling of comfort, even though we may miss them. We certainly do not miss them any more than if they had gone on to another plane, but we have accepted, because of the misunderstanding that has ensued through the centuries, a sense of finality associated with death. Even though we say we really do not believe this, there are very few for whom this is completely true. Actually, I think it is one of the things that we should think about every so often, not from the point of view of gloom, but in overcoming our own misconceptions and fears.

There is not one person in the entire world who can guarantee that they will awaken on this plane tomorrow morning. Not one. How many people have walked out of doctor's offices having been told that they were in perfect physical condition, and then dropped dead. Do you realize that in every moment of life we are in the midst of death, and that it is nothing more than the shedding of a garment? You and I do not die: we live, but we do not quite believe it. We want to believe it. But we all have — thanks to the ideas imprinted in the race mind — very peculiar ideas about the change called death. We are not only afraid of death, we are afraid of people who have died. These are the bugaboos of the soul. I would like to have a dollar for every hallucination that was supposed to have been a visitation from a discarnate entity. Actually, contact is not that easy, not because it is so difficult for the discarnate entity, but because we are too insensitive. If we have a little sensitivity and a little imagination, anything can happen. If you have any fears in this area, you should go to work and get yourself over them.

CHAPTER 2. Peter does get very moral at times. There is little here to discuss, however, in verse 7 of the previous chapter he used the word godliness, and we might discuss that in the light of this chapter. What do you think it means to be godly? For many people it means little more than to practice the Golden Rule, but it means more than that. It means that in everything you do you act as you think God would act. Augustine said the same thing in another way: "Love God, and do as you please." Because if you really love God, you could never do anything but the right thing,

you could not think anything but the right thing.

Speaking in terms of love, let me put it in another way. You love your father: do you love God the same way? Activity, or what you do, is merely the manifestation, for behind the activity there is the motivation, and behind the motivation there is that which is reflected. Now if you love God as you love your father, then your love of God is very much lacking. You love your father with a certain emotional depth, as every child does. Whether they realize it or not, even the coldest of people do have an emotional reaction to their physical parent. However, you cannot love God in that way until you have had union with Him: a conscious union. If you have had conscious union, then love, or its corresponding activity, is not an occasional thing, point one. Point two, to love God in the beginning is a very impersonal feeling. We think of love in terms of a physical and emotional reaction, but it is much more than that.

What is spiritual love composed of? Wisdom and understanding, or wisdom and intelligence. I cannot say that I have seen too many parents and children, no matter how much they love — and they do love — exhibit too much wisdom and intelligence. Theirs is an emotional love, it is a tie: it is the feeling that “this is my flesh.” But spiritual love is a detached giving. It is not at all emotional in the sense that we know emotion connected with human beings. It is completely detached and it never expects a return. It is not possessive. It does what it wants to do because it feels it wants to do it, and it has no interest in it after it has done it: it expects nothing back. Actually, it is not really love when it is only on the emotional and physical plane: it is much more a feeling of attachment, pride, possession, or sensation. But I am talking now about the spiritual plane, and you cannot love God in the same way that you love your parents, or your wife, or husband, or your friends. You do after a while when you have had the personal experience, but not in the beginning.

CHAPTER 3. This is Peter and, as you see, it is a completely different tone from chapter 2. In verse 4 when he says that the “fathers fell asleep,” he is referring to the patriarchs who had died. They were considered to be the elders of the race, and they gave the law. And, as we saw, the people did not listen to them too well and continued on in their own way.

The concluding section is reminiscent of Matthew 24 and 25, but it is approached from the point of view of the day of Judg-

ment, which Jesus did not teach. This may well have been the result of Peter's Judaic training. I have seen this to be true of many students who were rather deeply involved in their own religions before they reached metaphysics. It resulted in some confusion at first in trying to sort what was new from what they had been accustomed to. People who have been reared in a certain tradition and have really lived in this tradition and taken it seriously do not find it easy to change. What they hear and will accept consciously is not necessarily accepted by the subconscious.

You need no further proof of this than your own metaphysical experience. Did you ever watch yourself during the day? Take a very simple example, how many people have been in metaphysics for years and are perfectly sure that they are divine spiritual beings, that nothing but good can touch them, but will be afraid to go out in the rain? They still believe that if they get wet they will catch a cold. One of the things that amuses me about people is to see some of the ridiculous ideas with which we all grew up still so deeply rooted in the subconscious that they are completely unconscious of them.

We say one thing and we do another, and this is just as true of Peter as it is of us. Another example of this was Paul. Paul was so completely Jewish that no matter how much he wanted to be part of the new idea, as he believed he was, he could only give the theology of Judaism. Peter was not as orthodox, and not as well versed in Judaism as Paul, but he was a traditional Jew. And, needless to say, many of the old ideas were still imbedded in his subconscious. I would love to have had the opportunity to ask Peter if he still fasted on the day of Atonement. I will make you a bet that he did.

I think that probably the most difficult thing for all of us to realize is that these men who were chosen by Jesus personally, who were with him—with the exception of Paul—for three years, probably had less knowledge of what Jesus taught when they started teaching than we do. I do not think they learned too much in the three years that they were with him. He chose them because he knew that they were good people, they were sincere and would carry on, and that it was their karma. Of the whole group, the only one who really knew what Jesus taught was John, which is why his gospel differs so completely from the other three. The real preservation of what Jesus taught is in the gospel, and letters of John, and the book of Revelation.

As we have said, it is very doubtful that much of these two epistles were from the mouth of Peter. Peter had faith - but he had even greater impatience and rashness. It was not until the Resurrection that Peter began to overcome them.

Because of his impatience, he had always acted before he thought - and he had to train himself to be still - think - and THEN act.

This is something on which we could all improve. If we only take the time to catch our mental breath before we speak or act, we will save ourselves from much difficulty. Always remember the greatest Wisdom in the universe is within you - waiting to be asked.

M. M.

I JOHN

CHAPTER 1. This is one of the most severely doctored documents in the entire Bible. The most startling proof of this is seen when you read this first chapter and then go back to the first chapter of the Gospel of John and read verses 1-14 and see the difference. "In the beginning was the Word:" you can see the similarity of the underlying ideas, and you can also see the enormous changes that have been made in direction and meaning. It is rather striking evidence of the extent of the alterations in our Bible.

The gospel was written about twenty years after the Resurrection, on the Island of Patmos where John had a group of students. The first fourteen verses of the first chapter are about as complete a summary of what we are, why we are, how we are, that you will find anywhere: it tells the whole story. Unfortunately, people have interpreted the Word and the Light to refer to Jesus alone. But that is not the case: they refer to the Presence of God in Jesus and in every other human being. This is the great and major quarrel between metaphysics and orthodox religions, and you can clearly see the orthodox viewpoint which has been inserted here.

CHAPTER 2. Do you think that if John had understood what Jesus came to do and what he taught, that he really could have written this? Certainly very little of it. He wrote a very beautiful epistle, and there are certain parts of it which are his, but the editors retained what suited them and deleted or changed what did not. In the next chapter we will see a section which is most obviously his, but they did not leave very much intact. By this time the news had been spread that John was the favorite disciple: he was the beloved and the closest to Jesus, so his works, wherever possible, were twisted to conform to the current ideas of the newly forming priesthood because he, supposedly, had the greatest influence. In the first few centuries before the church really became highly organized John, because of his relationship to Jesus, was the most important disciple to the church fathers. But Paul provided them with such a marvelous theology, which John did not, that eventually they dropped John and took Paul.

One very obvious indication that this letter has been altered to conform to later ideas is the stress which is placed on sin. This would certainly not come from one who understood what Jesus taught and was himself known as the apostle of Love.

CHAPTER 3. First of all, the first nine verses—with very little exception—is John. It has been slightly altered, but not much. One phrase which was left, in verses 8 and 9, “for his seed remaineth in him” became the authority which the church quoted to uphold its stand concerning marriage. The misunderstanding of the seed is the reason for the doctrine of celibacy for the priesthood and nuns, and the Catholic belief that sex is only to be used for procreative purposes. The text, taken in the sense that the church has interpreted it to mean follows very much on Paul’s ideas: to keep your seed within yourself means that you must be celibate. This has absolutely nothing to do with physical life or celibacy: it only pertains to the spiritual birth of the Presence of God within you within your own consciousness. It is one of the most misunderstood texts in the Bible, and millions of people have gone through all kinds of hell because of the misunderstanding.

The basic meaning of that phrase is similar to that of the Light spoken of in the first chapter of the Gospel of John. And, as people misinterpreted the meaning of the Light by applying it to the person of Jesus, so they have also misinterpreted the meaning of the seed which conveys the same idea. We have discussed the meaning of the seed before, and seen that it is another term for the Presence of God in each and every human being. And John, who had a fair knowledge of esotericism, is saying that the seed must be protected.

Now, in this context, the seed corresponds symbolically to the experience known as the Immaculate Concept and the Virgin Birth, or the First Major Initiation. What happens at that time is that the individual achieves the conscious realization—the conscious emotional and mental experience—that the Presence is within him. It is not really a question of protecting the Presence, it is a question of protecting your own recognition of this, for in the beginning it is a very weak awareness, despite the tremendous impact of the experience. And so it is very often compared to the seed which will produce a child. Isaiah describes the same thing in the section beginning with “For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given,” for that phrase represents the beginning of the seed.

That seed in the spiritual reference must be protected. And how do you protect it? By your daily meditation and by living the life. The moment you do not take care of this, your ability to sustain it begins to evaporate. You have made what can very well be called a "spiritual abortion" which is what the text refers to. When that happens, you do not lose the Presence of God within you, but you lose your contact with Him and you lose your ability to grow at that point. This can happen until the Third Major Initiation is passed. You lose your ability to grow because you have really aborted yourself for a time by misuse and neglect, and you have done a great spiritual damage to yourself.

You cannot lose anything you have the consciousness for up to the level of initiation, but then your misuse is willful: it is a matter of conscious awareness. Let us say, for the sake of argument, a person has had this experience and has developed tremendously and become very interested in the fact that he has acquired certain power which does come with the initiation, and he begins to misuse it. That can end it, and end it not for just one lifetime, but for several lifetimes. That does not mean that he will be denied the privilege and power to grow forever, but it certainly will not be immediately possible for him. It is equally true that the more highly developed you are, the higher your state of consciousness, the greater your responsibility, not only in matters of this type, but in every other area.

CHAPTER 4 was far less tampered with than the others. This is John as he really was. Verse 18: "there is no fear in love, but perfect love casteth out fear:" and verse 19, "We love Him, because He first loved us" are particularly beautiful examples. It is quite self-explanatory, however, and I do not think we need to discuss it in detail.

CHAPTER 5. I think in contrast with the preceding chapter, you can see that this was one of the chapters which has been greatly altered and twisted in meaning. Incidentally, when in verse 16 he says "there is a sin unto death," he is referring to the one sin we can commit, which is that of spiritual pride.

However, the one who really understood the teaching far beyond the other disciples, was John. You see it throughout his gospel, in his description and interpretation. John gives very little of the history of the life of Jesus. He was only interested in recording the teaching. So when you read a letter such as this, except for certain parts of each chapter, you can see that the

rest was altered, additions were made, and parts were omitted.

It would be the most wonderful thing in the world if they would find some of the New Testament writings in their original form. They should be in existence somewhere, for I do not think they have all been destroyed. Or, perhaps someday we will come to the point where we have developed a machine so delicate that it can photograph the Akashic record and bring back the text that is imprinted upon it. As I have mentioned before, the Akashic record is a fine band of etheric substance which surrounds our universe, and everything that has ever been done, thought or said is imprinted, or recorded, upon it, and is never erased. We would certainly see some startling religious changes if that day ever comes.

II JOHN

CHAPTER 1. This is supposed to have been written by the apostle, but it sounds very unlike him. Again, remember we are in that section of the Bible where a great deal of editorial work has been done. At this point, one of the best proofs that we have of the authorship of these letters is in the style of writing. The style here differs completely from that of the gospel, or I John and the underlying ideas also differ although there is, you might say, a deliberate choice of similar words.

There are many people who doubt that the author of the Fourth Gospel is John. However, I can tell you one thing on which I would stake my life, and that is that the Fourth Gospel and parts of the first epistle, and the book of Revelation were written by John the apostle. The rest of it I believe to be spurious. However, you must determine your own opinions on this for yourselves. As we have seen, the Fourth Gospel is the one that conveys most fully the teachings of Jesus. The others give more or less of an historical background and his sayings, but the explanation of the sayings, the pith of meaning, is found in the Gospel of John. It also totally differs from the others in that it is completely Gnostic in its interpretation, approach and ideas. There is no doubt of the fact that Jesus was entirely familiar with Gnosticism (and remember we are speaking of the ancient gnosis, not that so designated by the church fathers)—was himself a Gnostic—and also studied with the Essenes who coupled a good deal of the

Gnostic philosophy with much orthodox ritual. The Gnostic element in John's gospel came mainly from his contact with Jesus, and not through any greater educational background than the other disciples and writers. But he was more sensitive and more intuitive. He understood far more than the others, and real mysticism is always dependent on the degree of understanding. Education has nothing to do with it. Education helps you to interpret what you know, but it does not in the least bit help you to absorb what you know, and of course absorption is the most important aspect. And it is the lack of understanding which is noticeable here even in those instances where he speaks of Jesus, which makes the changes by later editors so obvious.

III JOHN

CHAPTER 1. There is nothing in this letter that is either esoteric or requires discussion. It is just good, commonsense advice: walk in the way and do good. He does make the one point that those who do not do just that will be taken care of on his arrival. That Pauline note indicates quite clearly that this was not written by John.

With the next letter we come to the end of the epistles of the disciples, and by now we should have a fair idea of what the three leading ones—Peter, John and Paul—were like. Even with the distortions we find here, and there are many, you cannot help but get a feeling of the personality of the men themselves. As I have mentioned before, no matter who the person is, no matter how much of the truth they know, what they teach will always be colored by their own personality. We see many differences in the metaphysical field, and we should always follow the one to which we most closely respond. There are many, many wonderful teachers in this field, and there are many who could be improved upon. But the one that will hold your interest and stimulate a response in you is the one you should follow.

In our own case, for instance, we give a very hard metaphysics. It affords no compromise. It tells you there is a path, a straight line: walk it. If you fall, do not yell about it, but realize you did something wrong, pick yourself up, dust yourself off and keep walking—in the right direction. Now there are other branches of metaphysics which allow far more leeway. We will all get to the

same end, of that there is no doubt, but I think we may get there a little sooner. Many of them have the attitude that to a great extent we are to depend on God, and we do not. We believe that God has already given us everything we could ever use, and if we have not opened our consciousness to accept it, the fault is ours, not God's. Some other branches of metaphysics will say "Well, dear, God doesn't think you should have this." That is not so. It is never so. It is true that we can make a wrong choice, but if the thing we are trying to demonstrate is not for us we will be shown in countless ways that it is wrong; and we are very foolhardy if we do not accept that guidance. If we want to continue battering our head against a stone wall, that is our privilege: not even God is going to stop us. This is a hard metaphysics.

But you will find there is a very wide leeway in the teaching, and it is completely influenced by the individual who teaches it. So here we have found a man like Paul who consciously believed that he was teaching what Jesus taught, but subconsciously was promulgating his own concept of Paul and Paul's ideas, which then became the doctrine of the church. Then you find John, particularly through the gospel and the first epistle, who reveals himself as one of the few, if not the only one, who really understood. Then you find the others at various stages of understanding trying to explain their viewpoints. This happens in every phase of religion; and is as true of the orthodox religions of today as well. This is why it is particularly important to get as clear a picture as is possible of the personality and characteristics of the disciples from the material available, in order to understand the whys and wherefores of the differences in their teachings.

JUDE

I think, once again, we can touch briefly on this letter. It was assuredly not written by Jude. It is a mixture of ideas that were incorporated after the first or second century, or even later. It ends with words which are so directly opposed to what Jesus taught as to leave little doubt of this. In verse 22 it says "and of some have compassion, making a difference." We are to have compassion on some people and not on others. Yet how often did Jesus say we should forgive? Seventy times seven. Nor did he limit it—he meant everyone.

Now that we have come to the end of this part of the New Testament, we have seen that there has been such a mixture of interpretation and interpolation that the only way you can really know what is true is when what you are reading strikes you personally as being true. When we started the Bible I said that there were a number of levels on which it can be read: the historic, the symbolic or Cabalistic, and there is the real inner truth. It can be read as we have just read it, but it should also be read intuitively. As your intuition develops you will find that there are certain points where you automatically find yourself saying "This is not so." Then you know. Unfortunately, most people feel that because it is in the Bible, or because it has a name of authority attached to it, it must be so. Never let that influence you. If your intuition is strong enough for you to get that feeling, then you know what is the truth. This is the real guide to the Bible.

As I have so often said, I think the greatest demonstration of all is that this book is still the most powerful book in the whole world despite its alterations. No matter how many people have tried to alter it, they have been unable to strip that certain ability that it has to communicate the truth. That, to me, is the greatest thing about it. That it provides us with magnificent stories, that there were fantastic people who walked across these pages, there is no doubt. But too often their lives have been twisted to conform to what later people thought they should be, particularly in the case of Jesus. At that time, even the people who were fairly well-educated did not have access to the breadth of knowledge we have today, and few of them realized that the concept of the virgin birth was a part of all of the ancient religions, and that it had been adopted as a physical occurrence to enhance the figure of Jesus and make him appear to be supernatural. And so they accepted the ancient religious myths and the divinity of Jesus unquestioningly. He is divine—and so are we.

Or, on the other hand, we found books which the editors found incomprehensible and so they left them alone. One of these is the Song of Songs, another is the book of Job. Few realized that Job was the one mystery play—the mystery of the soul—in the Bible. Most people today have heard of the ancient Egyptian and Greek mystery rites where people were initiated into the higher consciousness. But few, even today, realize that Job is one of the mystery plays which was performed before neophytes to determine if their understanding was sufficient to know what Job's sin

was. If they did not know, they did not pass to the higher level. So we have a picture of Job as a poor man whom God "had it in for," and so He was going to cause him great trouble and make him suffer. But this is not at all the case.

The other book that is untouched is the book of Revelation. They had no answer at all for that. It is a mystery, and it is a miracle, that the book of Revelation is still untouched, and that it is still in the Bible, and I think you will agree as we go on.

Not even the words of John escaped later editors, but his basic understanding, which we find in the Gospel of John still come through. However, it certainly was not understood by those who followed.

Jude also has been made to conform to the ideas of the later editors, to its disadvantage.

With this we come to the end of the Bible, with the exception of the Book of Revelation. This book - Revelation - might well be called the Epilogue of the Bible, as Genesis I could be called the Prologue. With due respect to all the arguments as to its authorship, I am quite certain that the author was John, the beloved Disciple

M. M.

Thank you, and God bless
you.

Mildred Haun

Seven Steps in Demonstration

Desire: Get a strong enthusiasm for that which you want in your life, a real longing for something which is not there now.

Decision: Know definitely what it is that you want, what it is that you want to do, or have, and be willing to pay in spiritual values.

Ask: [When sure and enthusiastic] ask for it in simple, concise language...

Believe: in the accomplishment with strong faith, consciously and subconsciously].

Work at it ... a few minutes daily in seeing yourself in the finished picture. Never outline details, but rather see yourself enjoying the particular thing ...

Feel gratitude. Always remember to say, "Thank you God," and begin to feel the gratitude in your heart. The most powerful prayer we can ever make are those three words, provided we really feel it.

Feel expectancy. Train yourself to live in a state of happy expectancy ... Act it until it becomes part of you, as it must and will.

These are the seven steps. Follow them and they will bring you whatever it is that you need.

*FORMULA FOR DEMONSTRATION

(A demonstration is answered prayer..
the manifestation of the Presence,
Power and Love of God.)

" **A**sk And Ye Shall Receive,

Seek And Ye Shall Find,

Knock And It Shall Be

Opened unto you"

- *JESUS*

(*The formula is ASK Mildred Mann)

VOLUME 33

THE BIBLE SERIES

A METAPHYSICAL
AND SYMBOLICAL
INTERPRETATION OF

The Bible

by
Mildred Mann

