

THE LAW OF LOVE

The Spiritual Laws II



Vicent Guillem

WU

THE LAW OF LOVE

The Spiritual Laws II

Vicent Guillem

Title: The Law of Love.

Original Title in Spanish: La Ley del Amor.

Subtitle: The Spiritual Laws II

Author: Vicent Guillem Primo

Translated by: Dale Taylor and Nuria Merino

Front Page Author: Josep Guillem Primo

First edition, February 2012

Intellectual Property Registration No. V-289-12 (Valencia, Spain).

The total or partial reproduction of this work is permitted by all currently available means, with the condition that this is not done for lucrative aims or its content is modified.

Official web page of the book:

<http://lasleyesespirituales.blogspot.com>

Email: lasleyes.espirituales@gmail.com

INDEX	Page
PROLOGUE	4
INTRODUCTION	5
THE LAW OF LOVE	13
RELATIONSHIPS OF COUPLES IN THE LIGHT OF THE LAW OF LOVE	21
INFIDELITY IN COUPLES' RELATIONSHIPS THROUGH THE LIGHT OF THE LAW OF LOVE	59
THE EGOFEELINGS IN THE RELATIONSHIPS OF COUPLES	63
THE RELATIONSHIPS WITH CHILDHOOD IN THE LIGHT OF THE LAW OF LOVE	81
LOVE TOWARDS OTHERS IN THE LIGHT OF THE LAW OF LOVE	92
THE TEN COMMANDMENTS IN THE LIGHT OF THE LAW OF LOVE	113
THE MISSION OF JESUS ON EARTH II	166
THE FAREWELL	182
FINAL CONSIDERATIONS FROM THE AUTHORS	191

PROLOGUE

Dear reader. If you are reading these lines surely you have read before the book *The Spiritual Laws*. So you will understand my preference to call you brother or sister. We started the prologue of *The Spiritual Laws* saying that the content of the book was a message of love for all humankind. The content of the book which you are going to start reading continues being a message of love, as in reality it is the continuation of the previous book, where we will deepen even more if possible on one of those spiritual laws, maybe the most important one: The Law of Love. In this second part we will continue asking our friend Isaiah all those doubts remaining for asking about the sense of life and about feelings. Many of the questions which you will find formulated hereafter are your questions, the ones that you have been sending me through email, or you have formulated in meetings or in person. We have selected those ones which were of a bigger interest for all of us and which were related with the topic for treatment: love.

I wish this book to be useful for you to better know your feelings, allowing you to differentiate feelings of true love from the forms of egoism that imitate love but they are not like this, so you can look to feed the first ones and to eliminate the second ones, then that's the only one way to achieve happiness.

I hope you are able to lose the fear to love, for your life to be a reflection of what you feel. I hope that after reading this book you can be clear that you are having a fundamental right so as you must not permit anybody to infringe on it, and this is the right to the freedom of feeling.

With all my love, for you.

INTRODUCTION

Are you happy? No, don't answer yet. Because I don't believe this is a question to answer joyfully. Also, I would like this to be a sincere answer, so that you don't simply answer for giving a good image of thinking about what answer I would want to hear. You don't believe that I ask you in sincerity for me. Surely you could delude me and nothing would happen. I am asking you to be sincere with yourself, not trying to self-deceive, because from the answer to this question depends all the rest of your life. Why do I think it is so important? Because I believe that all human desire is to become truly happy. Or perhaps you don't wish to be happy? I watch people and I don't see the majority of them being happy. They don't release happiness. Why? Maybe is because we don't know how to be happy. Is it possible to achieve to be happy and how? I think that all of us have made ourselves this question at any time, I mean, how can we arrive to be happy? Intuitively we relate to be happy with the fact of knowing love. I refer it to the love of couples. So, many times we have dreamt of finding that love which is making us happy. There are persons who would say not. That's not true. Love is not giving us happiness because I have loved a lot and that love has made me suffer. There are persons who associate love with suffering, and for not suffering they prefer to not love. But, what is love, what are feelings? Do we really know what love is? We are going to set aside this question to the air. We have to think a lot about it throughout the book. Now I want to talk about another topic.

After my first contacts with the spiritual world, and my first experiences with astral travels, it aroused in me a strong feeling of nostalgia for that world, and at the same time a lack of interest about the life of this one. My vision about the world and about life had changed radically. Whether before I didn't understand what happened, now, after my first out of body experiences, I had the sensation of this world being like a kind of theatre where humans spend their lifetime playing a role, like if they were actors who, through the passing of so much time representing the same work,

they end tucked deep into this character so that they believe their personality is the same one belonging to the character players whom they play, and that there's no other reality than that of the production in which they are acting. I gazed at people with the sensation that we were all robots acting mechanically, unconscious of the real truth, entertained in banal and irrelevant things, the ones which we gave them a lot of importance. I refer to the importance that we give to obtain success in life, I mean, to have recognition, fame, prestige, money or power. Most of the persons use all their strength for getting these objectives, as if their happiness depended on it. My sensation was that all that which people give so much importance was totally irrelevant for me, because in none of those did I find a reason to make myself happy, as happy as I have felt when I was in the spiritual plane. At the same time another worry was causing me restlessness, and this was the power to remember completely all the details of the lived experiences in the spiritual plane, because although I wrote all that I could remember, I had the sensation of it being impossible to remember everything completely and to expose it like I had lived it. And that's why, when I tried to relax myself for being able to detach myself from the body, I couldn't achieve it. Disordered thoughts came to my mind blocking me the complete relaxation which I needed. My consciousness was not sufficiently relaxed and quiet so that the experience could come again. This was generating me even more nervousness and inability.

One of so many times that I was trying to relax, lying on my couch, locked in the room, in almost total darkness, in solitude and complete silence, between disordered thoughts coming to my mind, I listened very clearly: DON'T BE WORRIED. This startled me enormously, like when someone is waking you up all of a sudden when you are sleeping. My first reaction was opening the eyes and looking around me. It was dark. Feeling around I turned on the light. There was nobody. Everything was quiet. I didn't hear at any moment any opening or closing of doors neither any other noise. At that moment I even thought, Is it my imagination? I turned off the light again and leaned once again on the couch,

endeavouring to return to relax doing deep breathing exercises. But after a while I went back to listen very clearly: DON'T BE WORRIED. This second time the shock was smaller, and instead of getting up, I remained totally immobile and expectant. I was conscious that in reality that voice did not sound in my ears. It was rather a voice talking inside of my mind, like a very clear thought, but not proceeding from myself.

-Who are you?- I asked mentally, just trying something, without the expectation to find any answer to that question. There was no immediate answer. Some minutes were passing and nothing happened, so I was relaxing myself again.

-MAN OF LITTLE FAITH. WITH ALL THAT YOU HAVE LIVED AND DO YOU STILL HAVE DOUBTS? WHO DO YOU THINK I AM?

-Are you Isaiah?- I asked.

-YOU CAN TELL ME, DON'T ASK IT TO ME- he answered.

-I recognize "the voice of your thoughts". But I don't see you. That's why I doubt.

-YOU CAN FEEL AND NOT ONLY THINK, AND YOUR DOUBTS WILL DISAPPEAR. YOU DON'T SEE ME BECAUSE YOU ARE TIED TO YOUR BODY. BUT YOU CAN HEAR ME CLEARLY AND THAT IS ENOUGH FOR WHAT YOU WANT.

-And what is it that I want? I don't know what you refer to- I told him.

-YOU ARE WORRIED ABOUT SOMETHING AND I TOLD YOU NOT TO WORRY.

-Oh, yes? And why am I worried?- I said to him.

-YOU CAN TELL ME. OR IS IT THAT YOU WANT TO PLAY RIDDLES? I AM SURE THAT I WOULD WIN AGAINST YOU. HAVE INTO ACCOUNT

THAT I CAN READ MINDS. ALTHOUGHT I PREFER WE TO LEAVE IT FOR ANOTHER TIME, BECAUSE I DON'T LIKE TO PLAY WITH AN ADVANTAGE.

-Well, there are some issues worrying me. On the one hand what worries me is seeing how people are, to see how they suffer.

-BEFORE THEY WERE SUFFERING AS WELL AND YOU WEREN'T SO WORRIED.

-It's because I wasn't aware before. I mean, I wasn't as aware as I am now –I said.

-SURE, BECAUSE YOUR SENSIBILITY NOW HAS AWAKENED AND YOU DON'T SEE IT, IT'S THAT YOU FEEL IT AND YOU LIVE IT. THEY WERE ALREADY SUFFERING BEFORE BUT BECAUSE YOU WERE NOT AWARE OF IT THEN YOU WERE NOT AFFECTED. NOW THAT YOU ARE CONSCIOUS OF IT, THIS IS AFFECTING YOU. IT IS VERY NORMAL. HOWEVER WITH YOUR SUFFERING YOU ARE NOT GOING TO GET THEM TO STOP SUFFERING.

-I would like to do something for them, but I feel myself powerless. I know that we were talking about this issue when we were with Vesta and Juno. I mean to inform people about the reality of how the world works, about spirituality and that human beings need to develop their capacity to love in order to be able to evolve and be happy. But I don't know where to start.

-THEN YOU CAN START AT THE BEGINNING. ¡HA, HA!

I felt a bit annoyed because I had the sensation that Isaiah was turning into a joke something that for me was very serious. And of course, he noticed it right away.

-DON'T BE ANGRY, MAN. DON'T THINK THAT FOR ME THIS IS NOT AN IMPORTANT ISSUE, THAT'S WHY I AM HERE. I ONLY WANTED YOU TO LAUGH A LITTLE FOR YOU TO BE RELAXED. DON'T YOU KNOW

THAT HUMOR AND LOVE ARE RELATED? LAUGHTER IS A REFLEXION OF THE INNER WELLBEING, OF HAPPINESS, JUST LIKE LOVE IS.

-Sorry, I am very susceptible.

-IT DOESN'T MATTER. I SAID THAT I AM HERE TO HELP YOU.

-It may seem silly, but is that I don't know how to make known this message, and I am also worried of not remembering what I have lived. Furthermore I feel that I don't know enough as for being able to convey all that people need. I don't see myself ready, and even myself I am having many questions. How am I going to be able to clarify the doubts of others if myself I don't see it clearly?

-YOU WILL, BECAUSE I AM GOING TO HELP YOU.

-I think that you don't understand me. Even with your help, I am afraid of not remembering later what you have told me, when I return to the body.

-I UNDERSTAND YOU, BUT YOU DON'T UNDERSTAND ME BECAUSE YOU ARE BLOCKED. I HAVE TOLD YOU BEFORE TO NOT BE WORRIED ABOUT THIS ISSUE. EVERYTHING HAS A SOLUTION AND EVEN MORE AT THIS TIME. CAN YOU TALK?

-What? I don't understand you. Why do you ask me if I can talk now? Aren't we already talking?- I said to him.

-YOU HAVEN'T UNDERSTOOD ME. NOT WITH MIND. NOW WE ARE IN COMMUNICATION WITH THOUGHTS. I MEAN IF YOU CAN SPEAK WITH YOUR VOICE, TO MAKE SOUNDS. BE AWARE THAT YOU CONTINUE TIED TO YOUR BODY.

- I don't know. I haven't tried- I was answering him.

-TRY IT, ALTHOUGH TRY NOT TO LOSE CONCENTRATION.

I tried to do what Isaiah was requiring me. It was then when I realized of what Isaiah had told me. I continued in my body, although I had forgotten it. I mean that I hadn't paid attention. Now that Isaiah was asking me to talk is when I started to notice it, however it didn't seem to respond to my orders and I almost didn't feel it. I felt like if I were paralytic, stiff. I tried to move my mouth to speak, but I couldn't. I was in my body but I could not move it.

-I can't – I said mentally.

-WAIT A MOMENT, I'M GOING TO HELP YOU A LITTLE.

After a while I started to notice like a tingle at the zone of my head, going inside through the top, very pleasant and smooth. The tingle lowered progressively inside of my head until the neck area. It was like if I were suffering an electrical shock, but at a very low intensity and which it was not annoying, but rather very nice. The tingle had like current pulses of greater and lesser intensity and it circulated from the top part of the head to the neck like if it were a stream. This made me stop the stiff feeling at the head area, however the rest of the body remained in complete paralysis.

-TRY NOW- he said to me.

I was finding it even more difficult to move my mouth, but now I could do it a little, although I was not able to speak a single word. I could just barely swallow some saliva.

-It is very difficult –I thought.

-KEEP TRYING

I was moving my mouth and tongue for around five minutes without any change happening, until when finally I could issue a little whisper, which seemed more like a guttural snore.

-ARE YOU STILL LISTENING TO ME?

-Yes –I answered mentally.

-IT'S ENOUGH FOR TODAY. WE'LL GO ON PRACTICING THIS EXERCISE IN OTHER OCCASIONS.

-And what's the point of this exercise?

-FOR YOU TO BE ABLE TO SPEAK WHILE YOU ARE LISTENING TO ME MENTALLY.

-What for?

-FOR YOU TO RECORD WHAT I TELL YOU.

-Record?

-YEAH, MAN. AREN'T YOU HAVING MACHINES FOR REGISTERING VOICE? USE THEM. SO YOU WILL BE ABLE TO REGISTER WITH DETAIL EVERYTHING WE SPOKE ABOUT WITHOUT YOU NEEDING TO REMEMBER IT. YOU ARE HAVING YOUR PROBLEM ALREADY SOLVED.

-And what do I do with that?

-DO YOU ALSO WANT ME TO TELL YOU WHAT YOU HAVE TO DO WITH IT? USE YOUR IMAGINATION. WHAT IS DONE IN YOUR WORLD WHEN SOMEONE HAS SOMETHING TO TELL AND WANTS TO RELEASE IT?

-Writing a book?

-FOR EXAMPLE. DIDN'T YOU WANT TO HELP PEOPLE? DIDN'T YOU WANT PEOPLE TO KNOW THE REALITY OF HOW THE WORLD WORKS AND HELPING PEOPLE TO DEVELOP THEIR CAPACITY TO LOVE FOR REACHING HAPPINESS? SO I WANT IT TOO. I AM GOING TO HELP YOU TO TRANSMIT TO PEOPLE THE KNOWLEDGE THEY NEED FOR

BEING ABLE TO AWAKEN THEIR INTERIOR AND FOR THEM TO REMEMBER THE REASON WHY THEY CAME TO THIS WORLD, WHICH IS NO OTHER THAN DEVELOPING THEIR CAPACITY TO LOVE AND SO THEY CAN START TO BE A LITTLE HAPPIER. ALTHOUGH ONLY ONE BOOK IS NOT GOING TO BE ENOUGH. A FEW VOLUMES WILL BE NEEDED. BUT EACH THING IN ITS DUE TIME. IF YOU WANT WE CAN START JUST TODAY WITH THE TITLE. LET'S SEE IF YOU ARE ABLE TO REMEMBER IT. THE TITLE IS "THE SPIRITUAL LAWS".

-¡Ah! But what are "The Spiritual Laws"?

-LET'S WAIT SO THAT YOU CAN RECORD WHAT WE SPEAK ABOUT SO THAT YOU DON'T FORGET IT LATER. I DON'T WANT TO CAUSE YOU ANY TRAUMA. HA, HA!

-Very funny.

-WELL I AM GOING TO FORWARD YOU SOMETHING. DO YOU KNOW THAT ONE OF THESE SPIRITUAL LAWS IS THE LAW OF LOVE? IT IS THE MOST IMPORTANT ONE, SO THAT EVERYTHING IN THE UNIVERSE TURNS AROUND LOVE. AND WE HAVE A LOT TO TALK ABOUT THAT. SO IT IS NEEDED TO WRITE MORE THAN ONE BOOK FOR TALKING ABOUT THE LAW OF LOVE.

THE LAW OF LOVE

- The destiny of the spirit is to reach happiness through experiencing unconditional love, by free decision of will.
- Without love there's no evolution. Without love there's no wisdom. Without love there's no happiness.
- Love is the revitalizing and harmonizing force from the spiritual universe.

What is, according to your criteria, the most important aspiration of human beings?

To achieve true and long lasting happiness.

What's the secret to achieve happiness?

Love, but it is not any secret. Each spirit, I mean, each human being knows, senses that they need love to be happy. All its evolutionary process turns towards that objective, developing the capacity of love for becoming happy.

What is the way to follow? I mean, if we want to progress in love, whereabouts do we start?

The way starts by oneself and it continues with others. I mean, we have to love ourselves for being able to love others.

And if every human being intuits that way, why haven't we been able to reach it yet? My impression is that there are very few people in the world who can say that they are happy.

Don't think that this is an easy or short path. In the process of love to oneself and love toward others there are different stages that we need to walk for reaching the ultimate goal, which it would be to love unconditionally to anybody like to oneself. Jesus summarized the same in a very simple and profound message when he said: "love others like you love yourself". This way involves living many experiences through incarnating countless times. The work is double. By one side we have the development of feelings and by the other the elimination of selfishness. Earlier we talked about the different levels of selfishness from the spiritual point of view, of the stages of vanity, of pride and arrogance, and how egoism is manifested in each of these stages. Now I would like us to go further in the development of feelings, of how these ones are developing gradually from self to others, starting with those closest up to those who have no special link to us. We will talk about love in couples, about love within families

(between parents and children) and in human and social relationships. We will also analyse how egoism infiltrates between feelings and it adulterates them, wreaking havoc, confusing humans and setting them apart from the way of love and happiness. Egoism is the biggest enemy in the development of love and it has many ramifications. If we don't know them we can twist our evolution to the point that we can come to believe that we love, when in reality we are getting carried away by selfishness disguised in forms of love like a covered wolf in sheep's clothing.

But what is to love oneself?

Acting with freedom of feeling, I mean, to recognize our own affective needs and feelings and move on to develop to be the engine of life, so that the important decisions of life are taken in accordance to those feelings.

What is to love others?

To feel others like to one self. When one feels another person like him or herself, one feels another's happiness as well as his or her own and perceives the suffering of others as if it were his/her own. When one person loves others he/she wishes happiness for the others as much as if it were his or her own and strives to help them to achieve that happiness so that their actions do not harm them or generate suffering.

And where is this suffering coming from?

Suffering can come as a consequence of the egoistic actions made by others, or as a consequence of their own selfishness. I mean, sometimes we suffer because we are victims of the egoistic acts of others, while other times our own egoistic attitude is making us judge wrongly the act of others, blaming them for our suffering, when in reality we suffer because others do not act as we expect or demand of them. Also the suffering comes when one person suppresses his or her feelings and does not live

according to them, but against them. This latter one is the cause of a more intense suffering.

How can we know if we are suffering as a consequence of the acts of others or if it is a consequence of our own attitudes?

Being sincere with ourselves. Without honesty there can be no progress, since it will happen that instead of recognizing reality such and as it is, and changing our way of acting according to that recognition, we deform it to justify our egoistic acts, to justify others' selfish acts, or for justifying the repression of our feelings.

How can we know if others suffer as a consequence of our acts or not? Can it not happen that one person generates suffering to others even not having the intention to hurt? What has to be done in these cases?

It has to be distinguished where the suffering is coming from, before deciding whether it is a consequence of our selfish acts or it is from our repressive attitude with our feelings, or if it is a consequence of others' selfishness.

There are certain sufferings that we cannot avoid to loved ones; those are the ones appearing in their life as a consequence of their own selfishness, because they face the painful consequences of their selfish acts of the past. In these cases the best we can do for them is to give them the best advice possible for them to be aware that suffering can result from their own selfish attitudes, and so they can take good notes of the experience that they are living to not generate this suffering in others. There are sufferings that they appear when facing any hard trial that they chose before incarnating, and this test is part of their process of spiritual learning. In these cases you can comfort the person who is living that time and giving encouragement and hope for him/her to feel with strength to pass that test, pointing out that this test has a meaning and once it is exceeded, the spiritual advancement will go on.

Let's give the situation that another person has made us know that we are making him/her suffer. How should we deal with this situation?

With sincerity and realism. Let's analyze first our attitude toward that person, whether we recognize egoism from our side or not. If we recognize a selfish attitude on our part that causes injury or suffering to the other, it is up to us to change our selfish attitude. Awareness of our selfish attitudes is part of spiritual learning, so in many occasions we act selfishly unaware of selfishness that causes damage to others. That's why we need to live the consequences of our acts to raise awareness of the suffering we have created.

It may also be the case that the other person suffers because there is in us a repression of our feelings of love towards him or her, because the repression of feelings is not only damaging to oneself, but also to others. I mean, they suffer because there is a deprivation of love.

We should also analyze the possibility that the suffering of that person is not caused by our selfishness but by their own, I mean, that it could be a false perception of reality by the part of the other person. In this case, their own selfish attitude is making them to perceive unfairly our action as selfish, because they have not been satisfied in expectations or because we have not performed as was expected or demanded of us.

In this last case, should we please the other person's demands? I mean, should we give to the other what is expected from us to avoid the suffering?

Use common sense and evaluate if what is asked of you is fair and honest and is in your hand or in your will to realize it or not. In any case it cannot be enforced, because the requirement itself is already an act of selfishness. At best it has to be formulated as a petition in which there is the possibility to say no without having any type of retaliation, otherwise it would be a violation of free will.

In any case one is not bound to do good things without feelings just for pleasing others. If we renounce the will or personal

freedom, the only thing we get is to suffer needlessly, because we don't advance and neither does it help the other to advance. We only satisfy his or her egoism. For instance, it would be an effort as useless as the one who is carrying on the back the other person who pretends to be lame and can walk perfectly. In this case the other is pleased on the basis of an unnecessary exertion done, because what we do for him/her, can be done by themselves.

But there are persons who say that if you love someone you have to make sacrifices for him or her, I mean, they give precedent to the happiness of the person who they love than to their own happiness. What do you think of this?

It is a mistake to think this way. Happiness of one person cannot be sustained in the suffering of another. It would be unfair on the part of the spiritual world to ask anyone to give up their right to happiness. All spiritual beings are entitled to be happy, without this implying a reduction in the rights of others. That's why it is not fair to renounce one's own happiness for the one of others, nor is it fair to require renunciation or sacrifices to others for the benefit of oneself. What depletes the right to be happy is selfishness and not love. What happens is that you are having a mistaken conception of what love is, because your way of love is mostly impregnated of selfishness and that's why you think that for others to achieve happiness you have to make sacrifices on your own right to be happy, or you think that you are having the right to demand others do resignations in order to be happy. Therefore it is important to analyse very well our way to love, to go separating what feelings of true love toward others are from what selfish manifestations are. Thus you will not be confused by performing or asking unnecessary sacrifices and resignations.

But isn't it true that sometimes is necessary to renounce to certain things for the benefit of our loved ones?

It depends on what you may know about renouncing. To renounce selfishness for love is something good. What is not having sense is to renounce love for love.

I don't understand what you mean exactly. Any example to clarify it?

Imagine the situation of a materialistic couple who are considering having children. The fact of having the children can be lived as a waiver of their material whims, because now they must cope with supporting the children, or they may live it like a waiver of leisure time, since now also part of this time must be dedicated to their children. If they live it like a renunciation it is because selfishness prevails over love, because they value a lot material possession and comfort but they value feelings just a little. If for the love of their kids they strive to be less capricious it will be good for them, because what they lose is selfishness and what they gain is won by feelings. Another very different situation is the one of the woman who for having a child in common with a man she obligates herself to live with him not being in love with him, while she loves another man, although she considers this is the best for her child, condemning herself to a life of suffering. This is the person who wrongfully renounces love for love, because she is renouncing her freedom of feeling with the mistaken believe that this is going to promote the happiness of her child.

This given example makes me to reflect about the quantity of different situations that can occur and how difficult it is to analyse them all clearly and know what to do in each one of them without confusing feelings with selfishness. You've discussed the topic of relationships in a couple and relationships with children. I believe that analysing these situations that occur within personal relationships in an exhaustive way would be very useful to all of us, to me firstly, because I think almost everyone relates to this and I think many people suffer as a result of not knowing how to

confront them with clarity of spiritual awareness. A book could be written just about that.

Well. We are here to try to clarify all that. It is true that most of the emotional human suffering has to do with personal relationships, starting with relationships in a couple and family relationships (between parents and children, siblings, etc). So that's why it is good to deal with this in an exhaustive way. Where do you want me to start?

If I can choose, I would start with relationships in a couple.

Go ahead. Make the question, I am all ears.

RELATIONSHIPS OF COUPLES IN THE LIGHT OF THE LAW OF LOVE

I note that one of the major causes of human unhappiness has to do with the theme of couples' relationships. Some suffer because they do not find a partner and others suffer because they are unhappy in their couple relationship. Why are so many people not happy in their relationship as a couple?

Because there is not a true feeling of love for each other in the couple, or because the flaws are imposed onto feelings, or both things at the same time.

What makes two people to be happy in the relationship of a couple?

Complete happiness in the relationship is only possible when there is a complete inner affinity and a real feeling of mutual love, reciprocated and free. But this is very rarely done in your world.

Why?

Because when selfishness and necessity prevail in choosing a mate, and adding to this is linked a lack of enough development in the capacity of love for the majority of people that can allow them to have clarity to recognize the person with affinity to them, to wake up and recognize the feelings towards him/her and having the courage to fight for them.

When you talk of recognising the affinity being, do you mean to recognize the twin soul?

Yes. Although a more exact term instead of twin souls would be then affinity souls.

Why?

Because you identify the word twin with identical and believe that soulmates must be identical, the same in everything. But it is not like this. Related or twin souls are those who proceed from the same act of creation, from the same "spiritual birth" by giving a definition. They are spirits complementing each other one

hundred per cent, created at the same moment for being together in love. But this doesn't mean that they are equal.

And why aren't they equal if they are created equal?

Because being in affinity does not mean they have only one will. Each one is having their own personality, as a result of their personal evolutionary process, that never is identical, because each one decides by him or herself. This marks some differences at all levels.

You mean they do not have the same evolutionary level?

It is usually similar, but identical is not possible, because each one has an independent free will and has lived different experiences. Although the differences are not usually very big, it may happen that one of the two advances faster than the other, or that one advances more in some aspects and the other more in other aspects, and this marks a difference in their spiritual personality and in their evolutionary level. But although being different, they continue having affinity.

Then, if two persons who become united in a couple are twin souls, does it mean that they will reach the perfect happiness in their relationship as a couple?

They will achieve perfect happiness when they will have evolved enough for the feelings between them to be stronger than their shortcomings. Although they have affinity it doesn't mean that they are perfect. While their capacity to love is poorly developed, the egoism of each one predominates and this generates obstacles for affinity and feelings to be manifested, and this prevents them from being completely happy.

And can it happen that your soulmate is not found incarnated simultaneously with you in one life?

Yes.

Then I don't really understand what sense something like this would have. I mean, if they don't incarnate simultaneously, isn't it

denied to these spirits the possibility to be happy experiencing the union of a couple?

You say that because you are seeing only the part of life in which one is incarnated. I remind you that the separation is only temporarily, because the physical life is only an instant in the real life. It is only one part of the lifetime of the spirit when it remains incarnated, which is shorter in the more advanced spirits, because these ones space out sufficiently their incarnations.

But why is a circumstance like this chosen, I mean, not to embody simultaneously?

These are elections taken by the spirits, in this case the soulmates or souls with affinity, depending on the test or mission that they want to carry out. It doesn't mean that they are completely separated, because during the sleep the incarnate spirit returns to the spirit world and meets temporarily with the beloved beings whom have remained at the spiritual level, and not only with the kindred soul, but with other loved ones who have not incarnated simultaneously. Actually both collaborate in this mission, each from a different plane.

But does the person who is incarnated remember this contact during sleep?

Consciously, most do not.

Then what is the use if you cannot remember the moments of encounter with the disembodied soulmate?

Although it is not consciously remembered, inside is comforted by the experience.

But isn't it a frustration, at least for the embodied one, living in this way?

It is a difficult test, similar to that one of the person who after living together with the beloved person, sees him or her dying and stays on the physical plane without this one. In the situation that we were exhibiting, in not being fully aware that their soul mate is on the other plane prevents them a higher suffering.

And is there anyone who comes to realize?

Yes, there is. If one is sensitive, it is possible to contact consciously.

Then the suffering is much bigger, isn't it?

This depends on their developmental level, on how much one is prepared to fit this situation. Note that even though they embodying simultaneously, it is very difficult for kindred souls to be permanently attached. It may take a relatively long time for them to meet. Even many times, although they meet, they don't fight to be together, either for lack of firmness in feelings, lack of courage to fight for them, or because selfishness still prevails inside them. It also happens that the disembodiment of one or the other can happen at differently spaced moments in time, so that one of them is on the physical plane, while the other returns to the spiritual plane. If during that period of separation each one of them achieves the aim proposed by him/herself, the reunion will be wonderful.

And what happens if when you return to the spiritual plane your soulmate has already become incarnated?

Note that incarnations do not occur immediately. There is a rather long time spent in the astral plane before to incarnate again. Usually it allows time to occur the reunion of kindred souls and so that they can live in the spiritual plane before returning to the physical plane.

Would the realization that your soulmate is on the other plane, prevent you having a partner in the material world?

No. The same happens when the widowed person can take a new partner, without this transgressing any spiritual law in this way. The incarnated one can do whatever he/she considers appropriate for his or her life, having a partner or not, since it is his or her free will to decide.

Isn't the soul that remains on the other plane, going to be jealous that their soulmate has another earthly partner?

No, because the perspective that he/she has from the spiritual world is wider than the one on Earth. The soulmate understands the situation and will wish for the partner to make the decisions that bring him or her to be happier. Although wishing the reunion, of course.

But will this one be happy in that partner relationship?

This is going to depend on the affinity existing between them. If there is affinity, there can be achieved a certain degree of happiness. But it is true that there will always be a gap on the inside that cannot be filled. Complete happiness in the couple relationship will never be lived, because the complete affinity is with the one who is in the other plane.

And how can you combine both feelings? I mean, how to combine the feelings for the spiritual partner and for the earthly partner? Isn't it a dilemma without a possible solution?

The solution is to comprehend the situation. In any case wanting to forget the feelings for the spiritual partner who is current, or that one who passed away to the spiritual plane before oneself for not suffering, is a terrible mistake, because then the suffering is higher for wanting to cancel the feelings. It is also a mistake to force yourself to feel for your earthly partner the same as for your kindred soul, or feeling yourself guilty for not feeling the same for the second than for the first one, because the feeling emerges from the complete affinity, and if this is not existing, then it is not possible, without it being anyone's fault. But it is true that highly advanced souls who have known and lived the feeling with their soulmate, they don't usually engage with another partner, so that they prefer to wait for the reunion because they know that no other partner relationship is going to fulfil them. In addition, their capacity and sensibility allows them to maintain contact despite the fact that each one of them is on a different plane of existence.

When two twin souls incarnate simultaneously, do they incarnate always for being in a couple?

To incarnate is not always done with the purpose of being able to join together as partners, although this is the most common.

Must twin souls have the same earthly age or can they even have 30 years of difference between them?

Everything is possible. They can have a large difference in years, or just a few. The moment for the incarnation and the circumstances that will occur are chosen before birth and everything has a reason.

And isn't the difference of age an obstacle for these spirits to become a couple?

It will only be while one of them is a child and the other is an adult. When both of them will be adults then it will be not.

Can the twin souls incarnate in a situation that prevents them to become a couple, for example, incarnating as a mother and son or being siblings?

Yes. There may be many situations, parenting and children, siblings, etc.

And is this situation making impossible for them to look for another partner?

Of course not. But it is certain that they will always have more affinity towards their cognate soul, embodied as family, than towards the partner chosen in life.

And can two twin souls incarnate having the same sex, simultaneously?

Although it is not the most common, it can happen.

It occurs to me to think that homosexuality may be due to the fact that twin souls incarnate in the same sex.

No, it is not for this reason. Like the fact of the incarnation as a mother and child, father or brother and sister is not encouraging incest.

Then if this is not the reason, what is the reason for the homosexual condition from a spiritual point of view?

It is complicated to give a general answer applicable to all the cases, because each case is unique. But what is certain is that the homosexual condition of that one who is born being homosexual has to do with what the spirit lived in other previous lives. The spirit devoid of material shell does not have a sex. In embodying is when it acquires the sexual condition, and although having preferences usually by one gender when it incarnates, in general, the same spirit can incarnate into a life as a man and in the next one as a woman, or vice versa, as determined by their developmental needs. It happens sometimes that the spirit going to incarnate in the opposite sex to the one chosen in the previous incarnation, is not completely detached from the personality (including sexual condition) from the past life, and this affects the perception of sexuality in the current life. Depending on the degree of identification with the sexual condition of past life, we will find different situations, from the transsexual, who directly is identified with the opposite sex in everything, and wants to acquire the physiognomy with which he/she is identified, the homosexual who, not identified with the opposite sex feels the same sexual orientations like in the previous life in which was incarnated in the opposite sex of the current one, or the bisexual, in whom are given sexual inclinations owned by his/her current condition and from the previous life.

What are the reasons for this lack of detachment of the personality from the previous life?

The causes of this lack of detachment can be many in number and varied, but in general are due to selfish attitudes deeply rooted in the spirit, that they have used and they were using their sexual condition to manifest, and have led to the violation of the free will of others, including the freedom of feeling.

Any example?

A spirit incarnating as a man who was extremely sexist, and he abused women. For example, it could be the case of forcing a woman who was not in love with a man to become his wife, and therefore forcing her to have sexual relations by force, or abused and humiliated her all her life, and in general he had that same attitude of contempt for all women. In this life he embodies having the same sexual condition that he despised, but retains the personality of the previous life, with similar tendencies, because by not exceeding the trends they are strongly impregnated in his spirit. Or one spirit who after incarnating as a woman she used her good looks and her seductive power to dominate and subjugate men. In this life she incarnates having the same sexual condition of those who were abused, but retaining the personality of the previous life because she is very deeply rooted to it, and therefore she retains all or part of the same sexual orientation.

And what should be learnt from that circumstance?

The spirit chooses to incarnate in the same sex of those of who it abused for learning to respect the gender condition. That is, if a man abused women, he embodies a woman to learn to respect women, because now he is one too. Or if like a woman she abused men now she embodies as a man to learn to respect men, because now she is one too. The condition of trans-sexuality or homosexuality is generated by the person in those circumstances because is keeping the personality of his/her former life, including sexual inclination, totally or partially, because it is deeply rooted inside him/her.

Many religions, including the Catholic, have the notion that the homosexual condition is something negative and that the homosexual must renounce his or her condition, as it is considered deviant. It even recommends that they look for a heterosexual relationship. What is your opinion?

It is not having sense that a gay person is forced to be heterosexual when he/she is not, just to keep up appearances.

That is, to not admit or repress their homosexuality does not lead to anything good. This would be a cause of unhappiness for the person and for the partner who was chosen, because it is not possible to force what does not occur spontaneously. The homosexual person, like any other, has to be himself or herself, to accept himself/herself as he/she is and search for happiness accordingly. The homosexual condition itself is not negative. Just the opposite. To this spirit it is a condition that can help to advance in appreciating how valuable is the free will and freedom of feeling, because when you are forced to be as you are not or you are forced to live as you don't want then the suffering is a lot. This is a test. Striving to be himself/herself despite the incomprehension and rejection. When someone has difficulty being himself/herself he/she puts high value on respecting free will and starts to realize that he/she must not force the one of others in any way, because it is a big cause of suffering. I will only add that homosexuality and trans-sexuality are very related with vanity, and while vanity is not exceeded, these kinds of circumstances will continue being given.

Let's return to the topic of soulmates. If you are telling me that happiness in a couple comes from the union of soulmates, Isn't it a contradiction to choose those circumstances where they are not able to be together as a couple in this life, like for example, having a tie of consanguinity?

Sometimes the ties of consanguinity are chosen because it is a way to make sure that the person with highest affinity will always be near you. When there is not a blood bond usually there are more material difficulties for those two affinity beings to achieve to be together, so that, although the union is desired, in most cases this does not occur. In this case the bet is certain; however it is not the most desirable situation.

Do you mean that most of the persons who are having a couple, they are not linked with their soulmate?

Yes, we have already said it. The number of earthly couples who they are the union of soul mates can be counted with the

fingertips. Although, of course, hardly anyone will admit that this is their case, i.e., that their union is not that one of kindred souls.

Yeah, but there might be persons who are uncertain of who can be their soulmates. I mean, how can you recognize your soulmate? I understand that it might not be easy.

It would be easier if you would act according to your feelings and there would be more freedom in your world at the time to love. But as this doesn't happen, what was possible becomes complicated.

What are those difficulties preventing two twin souls to be united as a couple when they are embodied?

We have already said it. Because the human being on your planet is still very impregnated with egoism and is having less developed the ability to love, at the time to choose a partner it is more in account with other factors than with the feelings of love. Although before to incarnate the kindred souls made the purpose to join as a couple; once they embody the most common is that they end up joining other persons.

And which are those factors? I mean, why can be produced a loveless union?

There are different reasons. It may be because there is a physical attraction, for material or emotional convenience, for mental affinity, for the need to be loved or for the need to love.

Can you talk to me more in depth about each of these reasons, so that it is clear to me what they consist in?

Of course. Let's start if you want with the number one reason in your world: physical attraction or sexual instinct.

When the spirit is still underdeveloped in its capacity to love, its will is enormously influenced by instincts, and at the concrete case of the election of a couple, sexual instinct prevails over feelings. Therefore it usually chooses according to what activates its sexual instinct, which is looking at the exterior and not at the interior. For this reason, people who are physically attractive have facility to find a partner, while those who are less attractive seem

to be condemned to not find it. This behaviour is predominant in your world because, in general, most of the beings have underdeveloped their capacity to love, and it is more pronounced in the adolescence, as this is a stage where sexual instinct arises coinciding with the immaturity typical of youth, which makes that even in the most advanced spirits predominates the desire to satisfy one's sexual instinct over the awakening of feelings.

I think that in a couple's relationship has to exist necessarily a mutual sexual attraction. If sexual desire does not arise between them, then what sense would have their union as a couple?

Of course, it is a necessary condition, but not sufficient.

But do not confuse the sexual instinct with the sexual desire. And that's because there is a hint of difference. It is true that sexual desire can be activated by the biological sexual instinct, but not only by the instinct. It can be also activated by feelings. Biological sexual instinct is fundamentally activated by physical attractiveness and novelty. It is a biological programming, which drives the individual toward promiscuity, because from the biological point of view this promotes genetic exchange and proliferation of species.

When two persons are joined by physical attraction, without any feeling between them, once they are sexually satisfied, usually there occurs a decrease in sexual desire between them, so that for the sexual instinct now this relationship is not novel and it is not activated like at the beginning.

The consequence is that, if that relationship is prolonged, there is usually a loss of sexual appetite, because between them the sexual desire was depending completely by the instinct. Sexual relationships become scarce and tedious. The interest toward this partner is lost, because it is no longer novel, and it is activated the interest for other candidates, by the fact of being novels. If these relationships are extended, they are a constant source of unhappiness, since then comes to light the lack of affinity and feeling, which at the beginning were eclipsed because the sexual instinct was covering them. And this is reflected with an increase of disputes and reproaches. It is used to talk then that

love has finished in the couple, that there is no passion, when in reality there never was love, only attraction by instinct. When there is an affinity of feeling, the sexual desire arises and never turns off, because it is not nourished by the instinct, but from feeling.

Let's talk now of unions made by material convenience.

There's not much to clarify about this one. It is the union by material interests. It is done when one of the two, or both spouses, consider that they are going to get some sort of material advantage in life which before they did not have, like material comfort, social status, success, fame, wealth or power. This reason for the union is even poorer than before, because there is not even sexual attraction, and it is more evident that there does not exist any type of feeling, although there is usually a pretense of feeling, i.e., one is making to believe the other spouse that the reason for the union is the feeling of love.

This means that the reason for the union of two persons can be different, because if in both of them there would exist a material interest then there would not be the need of pretense.

Exactly. It usually happens that for each of the spouses the reason for the union is different. In one case it may be the material interest and in the other the physical attractiveness. For example, the union that occurs between a millionaire who is not attractive, but he is attracted to beautiful women, and a beautiful woman but without money who aspires to have it. In none of these two cases there are feelings, only an expectation of satisfying a desire, but surely both will pretend that there is a feeling to hide their intentions. It will be a relationship where neither of them will be happy, although initially may there be a satisfaction related to see accomplished their expectations.

And in what does it consist the union by emotional convenience?

It occurs when one of the two persons considers that the psychological profile of the other may give him/her some advantage at the moment to manifest certain characteristics of his/her personality which he/she knows are selfish but he/she

doesn't wish to change them. For example, a dominant and authoritative person may find suitable as a partner someone submissive and docile, a capricious person may want to be with someone pleasant, a fearful person with someone decisive or a lazy person with someone active.

But I understand that it does not have to be negative having psychological traits seemingly opposed, but it may rather be an opportunity to help. For example, the decisive person can help to overcome the fear of the fearful partner.

Understand that the problem is not in that there are differences of personality, but that the couple has been chosen by emotional convenience, and not because there is a feeling towards the partner. If a person needs to overcome fear can seek psychological help to overcome it, even within the couple, but the partner should not be for that reason. In these cases what usually occurs is that the relationship given between the members of the couple is under dominion or psychological dependence. One will feel him/herself enslaved in the relationship, because he/she only receives orders and not feelings from the other, while this other one, let's call him/her dominator or psychological dependency creator, is suffering too, because although his/her selfishness is pleased, the absence of feelings on his/her side makes him/her to feel empty inside and dissatisfied in the relationship.

Talk to me now about the union by mental affinity.

It is the union that occurs between two persons who share the same likes, same hobbies or same interests. For example, people who have the same social status, the same kind of job, similar intellectual level, the same professional or material expectations, or they have fun with the same hobbies, for example playing sports or going to parties.

But is there anything bad in sharing likes or hobbies? I think that it is something natural and desirable in a couple.

There's nothing wrong with sharing hobbies or interests. What we expose here is that the decision to choose a partner cannot be

taken on the basis of mental affinity, because this is only bonding them at a mental level, but not at the level of feelings.

So many people are convinced that the fact of having similar likes and interests has a lot to do with compatibility as a couple and so, as a reason for that compatibility, the feelings can arise. For example, marriage agencies prepare compatibility tests for trying to find the ideal partner for their customers based on their likes, interests and aspirations, with the idea of increasing the probability that there can be affinity between them.

It will be just a mental affinity, never sentimental. Feelings neither understand about probabilities nor can they be planned. They have to arise spontaneously, even when they do not fit into the mental schemes that someone has about "the ideal partner", which they use to be stereotypes, like the tall guy, handsome, and romantic for women, or the sexy girl, blond and hot for men. These are only mental fantasies that feed the imagination and that have little to do with feelings. If feelings would function by probability there could never be united the souls with affinity between them, because the probability that this union is produced at random is very small. These unions by mental affinity use to have a period of apparent good progress, but they generate a sensation of emptiness inside whose origin is difficult to identify, because to outside eyes, which play a lot on the mind, it seems that one has everything needed in life for being happy. However there is the lack of the unique thing needed to be happy, which are feelings.

Let's talk now about the persons who are united for the need to be loved.

This is a quite common reason. Generally it corresponds to people who have felt poorly loved in life or with longing for a love not known in this life, but their inner senses intuit to have lived that (in their past previous to the current life). They have a necessity to be loved so big that when someone is interested in them as a couple they feel so grateful that they accept this relationship without having in count their own feelings. They tend to be persons with a low self-esteem. They feel themselves unattractive

and believe that nobody is going to love them. They don't think they have the right to be able to be happy.

Many of these persons have had a difficult childhood, with huge affective deprivations, neglect or situations of physical or psychological abuse. If that person has not released him/herself yet from the oppressive family environment then can use the relationship like an outlet to get rid of that insufferable family relationship.

But perhaps is there anything wrong in feeling the need to be loved? I think it is natural and inherent to every human being and I think that there isn't anybody who does not want it.

There is nothing wrong with wishing to be loved. Indeed, it is something natural in every spirit and a sign that there is already a certain level of evolution, since one is now aware that the key to happiness has to do with love. The problem is that if this need to be loved is very compelling it may result in despair and emotional blindness, anxiety to quickly find someone to fill that void, which makes the person to rush at the time to choose a mate, as surely will accept as a partner to any person who is presented at that moment, and not to the one who awakes his or her feelings. The affective void causes the emotional blindness, which prevents to see the partner such and how he/she is. Rather it is idealizing him/her according to his or her expectations for being able to fall in love.

These people also tend to live relationships of domination or dependence. Many of these people are those who have reached this relationship by fleeing from a suffocating family relationship. When they find someone authoritarian and dominant they tend to be submissive and allow the other to dominate them and humiliate them. Emotional blindness, lack of clarity and desire to escape, have made them choose the unknown with the belief that it could not be worse than what they lived previously. And the result of it has been that the unknown was the same or worse than what they tried to leave behind. The lack of something better makes them even accept

this situation as normal and they end up adopting the same role of submission that they had in their family, so in their life with a partner they reproduce the same situations of suffering than they had in their family life.

Sometimes they do choose with a certain knowledge of cause, looking for the opposite of what they have had, i.e., seeking caring persons, pacific, tolerant and with a good heart, who they know they will be treated well by them. In these cases there is a relationship more of a type paternal/filial or maternal/filial, since they seek receiving from the partner the love that they did not have from their parents, and that is why the spouse acts more like a protector than like a partner. The person who was rescued from the family relationship of suffering feels thankful and indebted to the protector who rescued him/her from the suffering situation and tries to compensate it in any way possible, even up to the point of reaching to be self convinced that this feeling of thankfulness is love in the couple. Then it is generated a dependent relationship between one another.

In this latter case I note that at least there is a happy ending.

There is less suffering, but there is still no happiness, because there is not a correspondence of feelings, since at least by one part there is only gratitude and this makes that neither of the two persons to be happy, one because does not love and the other because is not loved.

This latest example of the protective relationship then resembles to the one of emotional convenience, right?

It is similar because one seeks a partner with a certain psychological profile, with the nuance that in the emotional convenience it does not exist the need to be loved, while in this case the need to be loved is the one promoting the search of a particular psychological profile in the couple.

I think there are many people who pair up with others for fear of loneliness. The person who is looking for a relationship just for fear

to be lonely can be considered like someone who is having the need to be loved, or is it because of emotional convenience?

Sometimes is for one thing and sometimes for another. There are people who have fear to loneliness and it is not for the need to be loved, but for convenience, because they need someone who indulges them in their desires, who makes their life easier or more comfortable, especially when they get older, because they fear old age and illness and they don't want to stay stranded at the end of their life. But it is true that in some cases the fear of loneliness is a manifestation of the need to be loved.

Tell me now about the union that is sustained by the need to love.

Alright. This type of relationship is done when one of the members, or both have already enough developed an ability to love and they need to manifest it to be fulfilled and feel happy. They are usually persons who feel nostalgic of having loved intensely in a relationship that they have not known in this life, but in their inner they sense that they have lived (in another life). When this need to love and to find the beloved becomes very urgent, it may happen that, like in the case of those who need to be loved, the need to feel prevails over the own feelings, and the couple is chosen not in function of the feeling arising from him or her, but by the own need to love.

But is there perhaps something wrong with having the need to love? I say that if there is no need to love you cannot have feelings, because if there would not exist that need then never would there be a search for a partner. It seems a contradiction with the message of developing feelings, isn't it?

As I said when we talk about people who need to be loved, there is nothing wrong with feeling the need to love. Like you well say, the need to love is linked to the ability to love. People who have a big capacity to love can love many persons, but this does not mean that they fall in love with any of them, because the feeling of romantic love in a couple does not awaken with all people. The problem comes when for the need to feel, oneself is forced to feel what does not feel, I mean, is forcing the feelings, and in the love relationships the feelings cannot be forced, but

they must occur spontaneously. Forcing the feelings is different to developing feelings and what we are saying here is that forcing feelings is not good, simply because it generates suffering instead of happiness. The person who is dominated by the need to love also suffers an emotional blindness preventing him or her to distinguish love from the need to love. I.e., he or she is self convinced of being in love, when in reality is striving to feel that love. Also usually is not looking whether it is reciprocated or not about the supposed feelings of love. Simply self convinced of being in love, or if it is not at that moment, then he or she will be reciprocated if submits totally to the other person, that is, that the other person will not be able to resist the flow of feelings and will end up falling in love.

But I had understood that love is to give without expecting anything in return. But it seems that romantic love in a couple is an exception, because it has to have something in return, and it is that the other reciprocates.

And it continues being true that the one who truly loves really does it without expecting anything in return, because it cannot be demanded to be reciprocated in feelings by the person who loves, or in the situation of being reciprocated, one cannot force the other to recognize the feelings or to agree to form a couple if he or she does not have this will. I.e., it must be respected the will and freedom of others and be willing to take a no as an answer, even despite to have given one's heart. But it is true that in the situation of a couple's relationship, for becoming happy is necessary to have a reciprocated, mutual love. To love without it being reciprocated does not allow to be happy either of the two persons.

You've exposed here different motivations, different to feelings, which can lead to the union of a couple. You've talked about physical attraction, material convenience, emotional, mental affinity, the need to be loved, and the need to love. Do these motivations exist in an independent way or can they go together? I mean that if one person can feel physically attracted

to another at the same time of feeling the need to be loved, for example.

Yes, of course. In fact almost always uses to be a mixture of motivations. Physical attraction is usually combined with almost all the others, because the biological sexual instinct is in every human being, although sometimes is also absent. In reality, depending on the spirit's capacity to love are predominant some types of motivations or others. In less advanced spirits, who they still know and appreciate love just a little, are most commonly given usually any combination of these first four: physical attraction, material convenience, emotional and mental affinity. In more advanced spirits are given more usually combinations of physical attraction, with the need to be loved and the need to love. And in an intermediate stage may be given combinations like physical attraction, emotional convenience, mental affinity, and the need to be loved. It also sometimes happens that these motivations do not occur simultaneously, but appear at different times of the relationship. For example, a relationship can be initiated by physical attraction and when this one turns off, it comes to light other reasons to prolong it, such as they can be material or emotional convenience.

So this still complicates things even more. I think that it must not be easy, at the time to analyze what one feels, to know how to distinguish the feelings from everything else. For example, when there is a mixture of sexual attraction, need to love and need to be loved I understand it has to be hard to know what love is and to separate it in what needs and desires are.

In your world it is difficult for the vast majority, because you still do not have clarity and firmness in feelings. But that is the process of evolution, to learn from living and to know the difference of what it is or what it is not.

But I also understand that not everyone loves the same. I say this because there are people who they say to have much affection for their partner, who they get along very well with, but they don't feel the need to have sexual relationships with him or her. What is happening in these cases?

This person feels a fraternal love towards the spouse, as the one that might be felt for a brother or a friend, but is not in love with him or her. It is not romantic love of a couple. It confuses some feelings with others.

And how can be known if love that one feels is or is not of a couple?

The one who feels that something is missing in the relationship to be fulfilled completely, even when there are no disputes or conflicts, knows that has not found true love. When one is not attached to the kindred soul there is not a complete affinity in the couple. Lack of affinity is manifested at all levels, in sentimental, in mental and in sexuality, and this causes a vacuum inside that is not filled. Anyone who has experienced in this life the love of a kindred soul will know how to distinguish it very well, since only remember the loved one that makes him or her vibrate inside, and feel fulfilled. The one who has yet to experience in this life the feeling that awakens when recognizing the kindred soul may have more doubts. He/she will have to rely on what spiritually he/she intuits, because although he or she has not lived it in this life, feelings between soulmates are never destroyed and they persist in the spirit forever leaving an indelible mark, although after a new incarnation the memory of remembering the past is lost temporarily. This sentimental intuition is the one allowing you to distinguish what truly love is and what is not.

Sorry to insist but how can one person distinguish between a fraternal love and a love for a soulmate? Perhaps cannot it be filled when one loves siblings or children?

The one who sees the partner like a sibling and not as a spouse, already knows that it is not romantic love of a couple. I mean if one has love for the partner, like the one felt for a son or a brother, and is not feeling sexual desire for him or her, or when having sexual relationships with the partner he/she experiences a void inside or does not feel like to be submitted in that relationship but can dispense of it, the love felt is of a fraternal type.

And what happens if one discovers that the love towards the partner is of a fraternal type and not like that of a couple? Should he/she continue in the relationship or not?

If one wants to be happy should be sincere with himself/herself and with his/her spouse about what are and are not his/her feelings and act accordingly. It does not have sense to prolong a relationship in a couple when one of the two knows that he/she is not in love, because he/she is neither happy nor can make happy the other. For example, maintaining sexual relationships without desiring it will be a source of suffering for one and dissatisfaction for the other. And if for avoiding that bitter swill they no longer have them, what difference is this to them from a sibling relationship? I mean, that person loves his/her spouse like a brother and lives the relationship like it would be lived with a brother. It makes no sense to continue the relationship as a couple, because he/she is neither living with his/her brother in a couple's relationship.

There will be people who say that loving their spouse like a brother they are already happy and this is better than nothing. I mean that they conform to what they have. Are they acting correctly or not?

To speak here about right or wrong does not have any sense. It is better to talk about being or not being truly happy. There are persons who are resigned to this situation and convince themselves of being happy thereby. But this is a delusion for them, because it is not true.

There are people who struggle to take the step to separate because they have mixed feelings, because even recognizing that they are not in love with their spouse, they continue having a great affection and they don't want to lose the affective bond. What would you say to them?

Recognizing that we are not feeling romantic love toward the spouse does not mean necessarily that we have to dislike them or to totally remove them from our lives. There simply has to be recognized the type of feeling that we have for someone and to act for adjusting our life to the type of feeling we have. If there is

a feeling of friendship, that friendship can continue without it to force to continue the couple's relationship. If we do not admit this reality we will come to feel rejection towards that person, for the fact that we force ourselves to live a relationship which is not in consonance with our feeling toward him or her.

Many people recognize to be not in love. They say that if it were by their choice, they would give the step to separate. But because they don't want to hurt the other, they prefer to continue the relationship. What do you have to tell me about this?

They just do the damage by prolonging the relationship, because if they do not love they cannot make the other happy. If they prolong the relationship they prevent the other to find a partner who corresponds to them in feelings, besides that they are cheating them, because they make them believe that they love them as a couple when in reality it is not true. The extension of the relationship under those circumstances is more harmful than the break, as there is no affective bonding. It will be a fictitious union, facing to the gallery, a forced relationship that will generate suffering in both.

There are people who, if their partner does not agree to leave the relationship, they believe that they should continue it because they consider that because as this is a couple's matter, they must both agree to the decision that they have to take. Are they right?

No. If one of the partners does not want to continue the relationship then it is enough to leave it. No matter if the spouse does not agree with that decision. No one, not the spouse, has the right to force him or her to continue, because that would be an infringement of their personal free will. Often this argument is nothing more than an excuse that reflects the lack of courage needed for leaving the relationship, and it is expected from the other to give the steps that one does not dare to give.

But does it not often happen that when one person reveals to his/her partner to not be in love and wants to leave the relationship, it is the other partner who takes it very badly and insists on continuing the relationship after all?

It is true, because they refuse to admit the reality. They are accommodated, accustomed to that relationship and they fear the changes which are going to occur in their life. They prefer something bad known that the good to be known. In that influences a lot the education they have received, which if it is of the traditional type it considers that family breakups, especially if there is a marriage contract between them, are something dishonourable to the reputations of a person. It also influences the attachment or possessive love, that ego feeling which simulates love, makes the person who has it to have the tendency to consider the couple as his/her property and takes it very badly to lose that property. Although not being happy, maybe he/she has seen pleased all his/her aspirations and is not willing to give up what he/she was used to and believes it belongs to him/her. Unfortunately, because of the attachment there are very few people willing to admit a change of sentimental status. I mean, they do not accept to go from being a couple to becoming friends and they interpret the change of status like a rejection or a disregard. As they do not respect the will of the other, sometimes they try to force the continuity of the relationship using as weapons victimhood, persuasion, blackmail and even aggression, causing to his/her now ex partner a big emotional and/or physical suffering which reflects the few love they felt for him/her. The ex partner many times has to force himself/herself to avoid any kind of contact for not being psychically or physically attacked, until the point that they wish to never have met the one who was once his/her partner.

What you say brings up another very common situation, the one of the person who does not dare to leave the relationship for fear of the violent reaction from his/her partner. There are even people who come to fear for their lives if they leave the relationship.

Yes. Unfortunately in your world there is little respect to the freedom of feeling and that makes many relationships to not be about love, but domination and submission, because couples live together as executioner and victim. In these cases what the victim of domination feels toward his/her supposed partner is fear

but not love. That fear paralyzes him/her at the moment to decide to leave the relationship, because he/she knows that when the step will be done then he/she will be relentlessly persecuted. Also, many times the perpetrator psychologically manipulates his/her victim into making him/her to believe that he/she is still in love, therefore some women feel guilty if they leave the relationship.

The increasing number of cases of domestic violence, does it have anything to do with increased aggressiveness in people, in this case men, towards women, in the relationship of a couple?

No. Before, violence and aggressiveness existed the same or even more than now, but as the husband felt more supported by the law and social norms to dominate the woman, she did not dare to break the chains of submission. Now there are more cases of domestic violence because there are more courageous women who dare to break free from their abuses, especially in countries where there exists a legislation that protects them and a greater social awareness that abuse and bad treatment are intolerable. The abuser, unable to continue dominating his victim, resorts to more drastic actions to retain her, even coming to murder.

I understand that there are women who, for fear to be murdered by their husband or partner, take the decision to not leave the relationship. What should they do in this situation?

If they continue that relationship they are already dead in life, because for the inner to live like this way is worse than death. It is better to fight to be free for being happy, although life could be lost in the attempt, than losing a whole life submitted to the tyranny of an abuser.

Everyone has the right to be free and happy and no one is entitled more than one self to decide on his/her own life and feelings.

Spiritually what can be learnt from that situation of abuse?

These types of tests, although very painful, help the spirits to acquire firmness and courage in their willingness to fight for their

freedom of feelings, and to take awareness that no one must be deprived of their right to freedom of feeling, because that is one of the causes which generates bigger suffering and unhappiness to the human being.

Some people discuss that although they are not in love they do not separate because their partner has never given them any reason, as they have a cordial relationship, they never had arguments and they were not receiving mistreatment. What would you say to them?

Sometimes it is believed that there must be an unpleasant reason to justify leaving a relationship of a couple, for example that there are physical or emotional abuse, or one of the spouses has any kind of addiction (drugs, alcohol, gambling) that buries a normal coexistence. People who have this opinion, i.e., who they think if abuse is not given they have no justification to leave the relationship, they use to be the ones who have received a traditional religious education, since it seems that abuse is the only one case where it is relatively tolerated a spousal separation, and they feel compelled for that relationship to last a whole lifetime without considering if there are feelings of couple or not between them. However it is not like this. The only thing needed to leave a relationship is to not have a mutual feeling of a couple.

I think this statement may surprise to some people, who believe that breaking the marriage contravenes some divine law. Is it not true that most monotheistic religions, and this includes the Catholic, are contrary to divorce?

Many religions are opposed to divorce, but I say that forcing a person to continue a relationship against their will violates a spiritual law itself, which is the Law of Free Will. We feel very sad to see how many people are empty and lacking of love, but simultaneously they undertake to be in marriage relationships without feeling, either by fear or for convenience, or because they believe that if they divorce, they violate the religious law of indissolubility of marriage, committing an offense to the eyes of God. A lot of people have been led to believe that it is God the

one who asks to the human being that their marriage is for a lifetime, so that the person believes that with the suffering generated by the relationship without love is “winning the sky”. However this is not true. There is not any spiritual advancement in the person who gives up living according to their feelings, because it is not God who forces him or her, but is the personal self or the social or religious norms professed the ones forcing him/her. It should be clear that it is neither God nor a higher spirituality the ones requiring it, but the laws of men impregnated by selfishness, who trade with everything, even with feelings.

So, if it is not from God, where from is coming the idea of indissolubility of marriage?

In your selfish and mercantilist mentality you put a price to everything and you establish property titles to all that exists, the ones you give them even more value than to your own life, because you do not mind to kill or to die for them. You assume that everything is susceptible to be bought and sold, and that if it were not because it escapes your control, you would empower even the air that you breathe or even the rays of sunlight to sell them for the price of gold to those who have less power or ambition to say “this is mine”. Similarly you believe that people, their will, their feelings, can be bought. You think that with the contract you sign in what you call marriage you are making any whatever business transaction, in which some believe to buy the will and feelings of a person, and others are convinced that they are bound by contract to yield their will to the spouse, their capacity of decision, their freedom and their feelings. At the height of selfish delusions you have been led to believe that the notary of that contract is God, and you are convinced by yourself that the contact has to be fulfilled at all costs, passing over one’s own happiness or that of others, otherwise it shall dispossess all the “goods” of the afterlife, as the one who is seized of his properties when cannot repay a bank loan. Then know that this is all a big lie invented by human selfishness. God has given you complete freedom regarding your person, to your feelings and your thoughts, and it is not transgressing any divine law when you fight for your freedom to feel and think. No one can deprive

you of the right to be free, to decide regarding your own life and your feelings in any way and under any circumstances, and even less in the name of God.

Someone could take all this as an encouragement to the breakdown of marriages.

Although you do not want to admit it, a union of a couple which is not based in the mutual feeling does not exist in reality. Although you can maintain signed contracts during all a lifetime, and even facing to others you want to give an image of union, it will be an apparent union, a facade, as everyone inside knows what is the reality and, though the person tries to display to the face of others, that one will be a miserable person since he/she will live the bitterness, the emptiness and sadness of being trapped in his/her own life. If he/she also imposes the objective of that nobody finds it out, he/she will live that suffering alone, which makes it even more painful.

It seems that you give enough importance to the topic to emphasize that people have the right to separate or divorce, if so they wish it without this supposing an offense to God.

Because it is a big cause of deep unhappiness in many human beings and this must start to change, for each person to know that they have the right to be happy and that there is no divine law that prevents it. On the contrary, the spiritual world wants happiness of every being in existence and must do everything possible to help them to discover the way of happiness. It wants to help remove the obstacles found in the way, and the laws of your world are like a giant stone standing in the way of happiness. In addition, you have been led to believe that the stone has been thrown by God and this cannot be tolerated for a longer time.

You mean then we should not get married to regularize relationships of a couple?

From the spiritual point of view only the mutual love between two persons is what defines a true binding partnership, without this having any relevance on whether or not a marriage contract is

signed. In your material world many times it is necessary to sign contracts to protect the spouse or descendants of the family, for example, if one spouse dies, the other person may have a pension or for other family members not to dispossess the property to the spouse of the deceased, and this is understandable. But know that this only has a material validity and you don't try to give it more value than it has. That is, you should not use the binding of marriage as a basis for restricting the freedom of a person, or ultimately to retain or blackmail him/her if they decide to leave the relationship, since this is considered from the spiritual point of view like an act against the law of free will.

Let's return to the theme of the reasons that make a couple continue their relationship despite not to be in love. There are persons who fear for material helplessness if they leave their partner, and they continue with him/her because this guarantees them a house and a livelihood. What do you have to say about these cases?

They are a reflection of that in reality it is a union where material convenience predominates. If at the beginning it was not the main reason for the union, it is now the extent of it. These people will have to decide what they value more, whether their freedom of feeling or their safety and comfort. If they choose to continue the relationship for those reasons, surely they will lack nothing materially, but they will lack everything emotionally, because they live without love. If they are materialistic people who value feelings just a little they will choose to continue the relationship. If they are the kind of people who above all want to be happy they will overcome their fears and even having to start from zero materially speaking, they will do it happily because they will have recovered their freedom of feeling.

Another of the arguments of many people who have children as a fruit of that relationship is that they do not separate for protecting their children. They say they prefer holding themselves in the relationship at least until the children arrive to adulthood. They consider to act correctly, for the love toward their children,

since they give precedence to their children's happiness before their own. They consider that a breach of the couple or marriage can cause a strong emotional trauma to the children and they prefer to avoid it. Are they right?

No, it is not true. They arrive to this wrong conclusion because when one person is divorcing is not divorcing from the children but from the partner. If both parents love their children they are going to continue feeling love for them even not being together. This argument "holding for the children" is very common among people who have received a traditional religious education, so the family unity is taking precedence over their personal happiness.

More commonly it occurs just the opposite, that the extent of this relationship generates more suffering to the children, because when two persons are not in love and they force themselves to live together they generate an emotionally negative environment for the children, so that the unhappiness in which they live is radiating around them. Many times children witness fights, arguments between parents, perceiving their discomfort and suffering and this causes them an emotional suffering. There are children who grow up with the feeling of being guilty about their parent's unhappiness, because some parents tell them that if it were not because of them then they would have already had divorce. That is to say, they blame their children for their own cowardice.

But for the child the break in the relationship of parents is a radical change in his/her life. Isn't it true that many children live their parents' separation in a traumatic way?

When the child is small the rupture itself does not cause any kind of emotional trauma, since the child does not have enough knowledge for the constraints of education to have permeated in him or her.

The changes that will occur in his/her life, if the contact continues existing with both parents and they continue manifesting the love they feel for him/her, even being apart, he/she will live them as a game.

What most causes suffering to small children is the fact of being used like a throwing weapon in the arguments of the couple for reasons of the separation and the fact of witnessing fights, arguments and blackmail between spouses. Therefore if this is avoided by the parents, they will be able to avoid a trauma to the children for the fact of the separation.

And what happens with the children who are grown up? Many of them are already having knowledge of the facts and they fit badly those changes in their lives.

Many times the separation is produced after being endured for years. Consciously or unconsciously, the message transmitted to children along that time was that family unity is above personal happiness. Therefore children tend to interpret what is happening from that vision. So they perceive the break as something negative, because they see it in opposition to what until then they had believed was right and good. For them to be able to fit what they are seeing it is necessary to deprogram them of the education given to them and make them understand now that freedom of feelings and personal happiness are above all and no one should renounce them under any concept.

I think it is difficult for a boy almost adolescent to fit all that overnight when he has lived an entire childhood educated with other standards, also instilled by his own parents. Surely he will think that his father or his mother has gone mad.

That depends of how much evolved is that son. There are sons who are more understanding than others. Sometimes the sons are the ones who give advice and help the parents to do this step, because they are more aware of the reality than their parents. The more advanced he is the more comprehension he will take and the better he will fit it, because on top of the education that he had received will remain his developmental level to make him understand that situation. But even though it costs him to fit it in this moment, he will appreciate it in the future when he will be older if he sees himself in a similar situation. I mean that if he comes to have a partner relationship and he is aware that he is not in love and must decide whether to continue or leave the

relationship, he will have it clear that for nothing in the world must he obligate himself to continue it. He will have an example in his own parents that there is nothing bad in being free. He will have more certainty and courage and he will feel himself less guilty at the time to leave a relationship in which he is not happy. However, if he would have had the opposite example, I mean that his parents obligated themselves to continue living together against their feelings, he himself too can take this bad example and repeat the same miserable life that his parents had.

Summing up everything we have discussed up to now, I get the feeling that the message transmitted of love in a couple is a love of greater importance than the fraternal or filial one. Isn't it selfish to make a distinction between love of partners and fraternal or filial love? Isn't this distinction contradicting the concept of unconditional love?

What is your basis to say that?

I suppose like in the example given by Jesus. He was not doing special references about the love of partners, was he?

You cannot know that, because you are basing it on the information of the canon gospels that reflect very little of what he said. But I tell you that he also spoke of the love of couples, above all to those closest, who had more ability to understand. He already left them the teaching that only mutual love and perfect affinity is the bond that unites couples, and that the decision of the union and the separation of a couple should be taken by each one of them in total freedom. This that I tell you now does not seem anything unusual, because it is reasonable for any moderately sane mindset. But at that time the mentality of the human being was poorer in understanding and the respect for freedom of feeling was practically nil. Polygamy was frequent and the majority of unions were without love, arranged marriages in which either one of the partners or both was obligated to get married without having in mind their will.

I think many people nowadays are aware that arranged marriages are an abuse and they are in opposition to this practice.

It can seem obvious in Western societies, with a more advanced legislation, which collects and protects some of the individual rights and freedoms. But still today this practice is common in many countries, where laws, many times encouraged and introduced by leaders and regimes of "religious" character, allow "in the name of God" even children at a young age to be married with adults, giving legal cover to sexual abuses, moral and physical exploitation of girls and women. It makes them believe that if they do not submit to these abusive practices, they are dirty people, impure and disobeying God's designs. And when, after all, trying to break free of their inhuman condition, they are treated as if they were criminals, sometimes they are tortured and cruelly killed.

Know that the arranged marriage is a form of institutionalized prostitution, because it is forcing a person to live and maintain sexual relationship with someone she did not choose, under the guise of "honesty" and this is a very serious violation of her free will, specifically of her freedom of feeling.

Well, I think that actually most of people already know they are free, at least in Western countries, and that the law protects individual liberty, contemplating the right to divorce and punishing those who prevent its exercise. Is that not right?

It is right. And this represents an enormous spiritual advance that has been achieved with great sacrifices and struggles, which unfortunately have not counted with more than religious opposition, who once again, instead of contributing to the spiritual progress of humanity, have done all the possible things to hinder and obstruct it. And the most unfortunate is that they have done it using the name of God. But the customs and religious norms are very deeply rooted in societies and sometimes, although they have no power to ban, they have it for influencing psychologically.

Know that still in your time and in your society, though few arranged marriages occur, there are still going many unions without love. And it happens that when a person realizes this and wants to undo this union he/she has many difficulties due to these religious norms, as we have mentioned before.

Let's return to the subject in which we were before, about if romantic love is selfish and contradicts to achieve unconditional love. If it is not a teaching of Jesus, at least the church has interpreted it this way. I think it is based on a quote of the Gospel (Luke 14:26) in which Jesus supposedly said: "If anyone comes to me and does not reject his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brothers, and sisters, and even also his own life, he/she cannot be my disciple" I think the interpretation that the church makes about this text is that for loving unconditionally to others you cannot make distinctions between partner, family and the rest, because this makes you to remain trapped by the love of a partner and love to the children, and it prevents you from a deeper dedication to the others. I think that the Catholic Church requires to the priests the vow of chastity and celibacy for this reason. Am I wrong?

This text that you mention is a nefarious translation of what Jesus really said. Change the word reject for detach and you will understand what he wanted to say. He means that for achieving unconditional love (following him) it is necessary to overcome clinging, the possessive love, very common inside of families, because often this selfish way of love restricts human beings' freedom and greatly limits him a lot at the time of giving himself to a mission of unconditional love to others. Therefore, the interpretation made of what Jesus said is totally opposite to reality. I tell you that the one who has not experienced love of a partner cannot experience unconditional love to others. Feelings of romantic love, when one fights for them, are the strongest that exist. Those feelings are the ones helping to continue forward in life. To undertake a mission of dedication to others like the one performed by Jesus, he needed an inner strength. This inner strength he had it because he was sure of what he loved, to who

he loved and why he loved. I tell you that all the true envoys from the spiritual world have felt and lived the love of their kindred soul, and from that love they have been fed to perform the work they have done. If one denies these feelings what happens is that one feels totally empty and lacking courage and strength, and in the front of adversity implied by a mission of this kind, he falls down.

I thought that these beings were fed by the love of God and this was enough for them.

Their faith in God gives them strength, but being in the human state of evolution needs the love of an equal to himself, and this being is the kindred soul. Why to deny something that brings happiness and fulfils the human being in all aspects? Where is the problem? I tell you that renouncing the love of a partner, far from making him evolve, seals the spirit in its process of evolution. The prejudices that you have in this respect, I mean, to think that renouncing love of a partner makes you more evolved and with greater ability to love others, is an invention of the Church to subjugate the will of the human being and it is contrary to the Spiritual Laws, because they hinder the freedom of feeling and prevent the human being to achieve happiness.

But is it not true that sometimes the partner can be an obstacle in an intense work of help to others?

It is not the fact of having a partner itself which hinders this work but when, because of the addiction, one side of the couple believes he/she has the right to restrict the freedom of the other side and retains him/her because he/she believes to own him/her as property and sees the others as adversaries who steal his/her attention. This occurs frequently when someone is united to a partner who he/she is not in affinity with. From the lack of affinity arises the misunderstanding and the divergence of motivations in life.

Also it can be done within a couple composed by kindred souls if ego feelings get in the way, principally the attachment, but also others like fear. Generally, it is about the fear of the suffering of

the loved one, or the fear to lose him/her if he/she undertakes a mission that puts him/her in danger.

When the couple is having affinity and they have overcome all the fears and other manifestations of selfishness, there is no obstacle. Quite the contrary. If they match in incarnating together, they are both implied in a mission with the same intensity. That makes the mission to be much deeper, because the mutual love strengthens them, reassures them and sweetens for them all the bitterness of the way in which they have chosen to live.

But as it seems Jesus did not have any partner in life and this did not prevent him to love others and perform his mission, did it?

We have already talked about this before. Jesus is like everyone. He also has his kindred soul but he did not incarnate simultaneously with that one, which does not mean that he was not having contact with this one. For the beings at the same evolved level as Jesus, the fact that the beloved is not incarnated with him simultaneously does not mean an insurmountable obstacle, because due to their ability and sensibility they have relative ease to detach from the material plane and this way they can contact with their affinity beings in the spiritual plane.

Then is it not selfish to love some persons more than others?

You call selfishness what are simply differences of affinity. It is always easier to love someone you are in affinity to rather than someone you are not. Only when the spirit is very advanced is it able to love with the same intensity towards beings with which it has differences in affinity. I tell you that to experience love to the others in an unconditional way you need to firstly have lived love for the kindred soul, since this love is the strength that feeds you to love others. Therefore, the one who unconditionally wants to love others but reproaches or cancels the love of partner will never be able to achieve a true love to others, because in lacking the source which is feeding the inside he/she will be quickly empty in giving him/herself to others when the first signs of ingratitude start to be given. For achieving the tenth degree, it

has to start by the first one, and pass through the intermediate degrees. But it seems that you believe that you have already achieved the tenth without having clear which is the first, I mean, that if you still deny love to those who are in affinity to you, as it happens with the love of the twin soul, how do you want to love those who are not?

But it is not so easy to succeed and get true love at the first time.

With a greater reason, because it is not easy to succeed, you should allow yourself to be able to step back once you are aware that you are not in love. What is really sad is not that loveless unions occur, but that you strive so much to prolong them forcefully, establishing earthly chains which prevent you to be free of them once you are aware that there is no love.

I think that the youth are more clear that they are free to decide who they want or don't want to be with and they don't have so many doubts to leave a relationship if they do not want to continue it.

Yes, it is true. Youth have more freedom now, above all in the western countries, because they have not lived a so repressive education. Above all, they enjoy greater freedom in sexuality and they know that the fact of maintaining sexual relations with a person does not obligate them to be with him/her for a whole life. And that is something good. The problem of youth is not so much to leave the relationships when they wish, rather knowing how to find true love, because mostly they are united by reasons different to love. Despite having more freedom in life, they are not taking advantage of it to develop feelings.

And for what reasons are they linked?

What predominate are the unions by physical attraction, mostly in adolescence, or by similarity of mental interests. It is valued above all the physical attractiveness and also being important. So that is why the persons with sexual attractiveness, fame, money, are very desirable as a partner. The young people physically attractive are feeling satisfied because their graceful physique guarantees them to have contenders waiting and they

usually choose also according to the physical attractiveness. The couple relationships tend to be transient because once it has satisfied the sexual instinct, the interest is lost and another more novel relationship is searched for. But sexuality, practiced without love takes its toll, because in those persons more sensitive it generates emptiness inside and it is the reason why many young people sink into deep depressions, as they try to fill with sex what only can be filled with feelings. On the other hand, that one who is less attractive, wishing the same, feels frustrated in his/her intentions, as he/she is having more difficulties to get what he/she desires, because what is more valued is the physical attractiveness that he/she does not have. He/she lives ashamed for his/her physical aspect and feels undervalued and having less possibilities to find a partner. The shames and the repressions as a result of the physical aspect, bring as a consequence depressions and severe disorders like anorexia and bulimia, for the desire to be thinner and to increase the attractiveness to be liked more.

Why does this happen to youths, if they have lived in an age of greater freedom?

Now there is greater sexual freedom, but there is no freedom of feeling yet, because it still remains to overcome the sentimental repression.

Your way to educate children is still very materialist and barely spiritual. The children are not yet educated sufficiently in feelings. They are not taught in life to search for happiness through developing feelings, they have not been taught to value love or to have a perspective of life of the spiritual kind. By one side they are much more developed in mind, in intelligence and they are taught with knowledge that is going to serve them for having a profession in life. This is the academic formation in the schools. Out of school what they live in families and what is transmitted to them through communication media and social relationships is that happiness is reached through the satisfaction of vanity. It means, they are taught to evaluate external qualities that make one highlight over the others, like physical attractiveness, intelligence, having success, fame, power and money.

Many young people have taken refuge in the satisfaction of whim and pleasure, entertainment, in sex without feeling, in drugs, as a way to escape from the emptiness and dissatisfaction that they feel in life. They try to fill with pleasure and entertainment what corresponds to be filled with feeling and in front of the lack of feeling, their inner is depressed.

A big part of youth suffers because it is trapped by the desire to satisfy their vanity and because their sensibility towards feelings is repressed or cancelled. They lack to find a sense to life.

The youths of this age need to comprehend that life does have a sense beyond having fun with the satisfaction of the whim and pleasure. That for being truly fulfilled they need to develop and live the feelings in complete freedom, and also the spirituality. Only by this way they will reach to be happy.

Some people have the notion that the reason why youth is inclined to consumerism, banality and sexual promiscuity is that they have lost the moral values of the past, that they have had decline in the spiritual. Are they right?

No. We have already said it, they take refuge in material things for escaping from the inner emptiness. Things were never better in the past. If the youth of the past did not reflect the same attitudes it was not because their values were better than the actual ones, rather because they were more repressed and went through more economic hardship. The religious Puritanism suffocated the free development of sexuality and condemned it to the clandestine. The youth were not free either in feelings or in sexuality and they lived repressed and scared, since in front of the eyes of religious Puritanism everything was a sin. Before sexuality was repressed almost completely and only was consented in the basis of marriages. And as in many marriages there was not love, but that they were an imposition, the sexual experiences for many persons were horrible and traumatic. Many people had a double life, the one facing to the exterior for keeping social appearances and the other hidden, where many found an escape valve to a life full of taboos and repressions. This way to act, the one of a moral double, still lasts in current times,

above all in older people who have lived a repressive education, used to having two faces for the fear to what others will say.

INFIDELITY IN COUPLES' RELATIONSHIPS THROUGH THE LIGHT OF THE LAW OF LOVE

What do you think of fidelity and infidelity within the couple?

It is that you can be loyal to an obligation or be loyal to a feeling. Spiritually it only has value the loyalty to the feelings.

What do you mean exactly with those words?

I mean that when in a partner relationship there is no mutual feeling and affinity, the loyalty is kept by obligation, as a duty to be accomplished that is done with effort, not felt. When there is a true feeling, the loyalty arises spontaneously, without needing to do any effort to maintain it. You give much value to the contract signed in front of the priest or the judge, which you call marriage and just a few to the fact of if there is love between the partners. That is why you condemn all extramarital sexual relationships, even when there is not love between the spouses, though it can happen that in the extramarital relationship is given the true love. You speak of an infidelity in marriage when you should know that the only infidelity that spiritually exists is the infidelity to feelings. There are people who have been their whole life in a marriage without love, even being in love with another person and that they have renounced to this feeling convincing themselves or being convinced that this was the good thing to do, the right and that it was in harmony with the divine law. They are people deeply unhappy whom others consider saints, with a splurge of virtue and faultless morality, because they have sacrificed to accomplish a promise that the priest solemnly sentenced the day of their wedding: "What God has joined man must not separate". However, from the spiritual point of view, the things are seen in a different way because only fidelity to feelings has spiritual value. These persons, of faultless image to the eyes of the rules and

customs of their community, are people who are being unfaithful to their feelings and by that they have stopped in their own spiritual evolution. When they will go back to the spiritual world they will be aware that they have performed a useless sacrifice and they will have to go back in the next incarnation to perform what they did not dare to do in this one, fighting for the feelings. By the other side, those who were the executioners of feelings of other people, those persons who are not seeking to fight for feelings but rather they are pleased in persecuting those who fight for being happy loving in freedom, and they are satisfied when they achieve that someone can be miserable trapped by the bonds of forced marriage, they expose themselves in the next lives to be themselves the victims of the repressive attitudes with their feelings of other beings similar to themselves in egoism.

On the other side, that person who for fighting for his/her feelings, for being next to the person who he/she loves, and suffering misunderstandings, humiliation, blackmail and physical and/or psychical abuse, and who is considered by society, community or by family an adulterous person, disloyal or immoral is that one who is truly advancing in feelings. He/she is the one who is truly in harmony with the spiritual law of love and is the one who will enjoy in the spiritual world the true happiness so laboriously conquered in the physical world, because he/she will find that there already he/she will not have any obstacle to the free expression of feelings.

I continue not understanding it. I think that if you me give an example I would have it more clear.

Ok. Imagine that a woman is married to a man whom she is not in love with, but she loves another one whom she would desire to be in a relationship with and who matches her in feelings. Both men, let's call them husband and lover, they want to have a sexual relationship with this woman. According to your concept of loyalty in your world, if she maintains relations with the lover she is acting wrong, because she is being disloyal to the husband. But I tell you that if she takes the opposite decision, I mean if she maintains relations with the husband but not with the lover, she

would be disloyal to her feelings, because she loves the lover and not them husband.

I don't understand anything. Then is it all right to have extramarital relationships?

You understand more than you seem. But I will clarify it, for not leaving any doubt. Spiritually the earthly contracts do not have more validity than the one you want to give to them. I mean, nobody is bound to love anybody, nor to keep loyalty for the obligation of a marriage contract, nor for any other cause. What is really wrong is to trick the other person making him/her believe that there are some feelings which in reality do not exist. What is fair is to be honest with what one feels and to act in consequence. In the previous example, since the woman recognizes not to love her husband, the right thing is that she reveals it to him and that, consequently with it, finishes the loveless relationship for being able to live the relationship of feelings with the loved person without the need to hide.

There are people who know they are not in love with that one who they signed the marriage contract with, or the commitment to be a couple, and maintain the link for convenience, for necessity, for feeling of guilt or for fear of the reaction of others. We have already talked enough about it. On the other side, there are people who know who they love to, but for fear or comfort, they don't fight to join with the beloved being, instead of that they prefer to repress or nullify their feelings to not suffer, and they get used to comfortable earthly relationships however they are not fulfilled with them, because they lack the essential, the mutual and corresponded affinity love. They live a life of appearance facing to the outside, and of emptiness and repressed suffering facing to the inside. Be honest with your feelings and make your life to be a reflection of your feelings. That's how you can avoid unnecessary sufferings. Have the courage to fight for your feelings, because that is the only thing worth fighting for.

But can it not happen that even one wants to fight for feelings it seems impossible to achieve his/her objective because of

circumstances? Following with the previous example, what happens if the husband does not accept to leave the relationship and obligates the wife to continue it? In fact there are women who are murdered by their ex husband or ex partner because they don't admit the breakdown of the relationship. Or what happens when the legislation of a country refuses divorce and even condemns to death the woman who leaves her husband? What option is left to that woman?

It is true that she can find herself with many difficulties, because regretfully in your world there is very little respect for freedom of feeling, especially for the most vulnerable ones. However, respect for freedom of feeling has increased compared to past ages and is taken as a right in the laws of many countries. In Western countries the laws contemplate divorce as a right, and there are laws that protect against gender violence, although it is certain that in others the situation is intolerable and there remains a lot to improve. But although having everybody against you, I tell you that it will be worth it, because there is no better reason than the one of fighting for feelings, because it is the basis of spiritual evolution and happiness. The one who chooses to fight for feelings will have the biggest of rewards, which is the happiness that is felt when meeting again with the affinity love being, for being able to feel and live feelings in fullness. Even that it may be possible to lose the physical life in the attempt, because of the constraints of human egoism, and therefore not reach it in the material plane, be assured that what was sowed in physical life will be reaped as a reward in the spiritual plane.

By contrast, the one not fighting for feelings, who represses and nullifies them, and at the same time obliges and strives in conserving a relationship without feelings, is already suffering the consequences of his or her lack of courage and will have to return in later lives to overcome what in this life remained unresolved.

THE EGOFEELINGS IN THE RELATIONSHIPS OF COUPLES

Can it happen that one person who has met with his/her twin soul regardless does not appreciate him/her and wishes to have a sexual relationship with other people, and even to be disloyal to him/her?

Yes. When there is no firmness in the feelings, when there is no striving for caring about them and developing them and it is permitted that selfish feelings get in the way, it usually happens. In the spirits little sensible to feelings, the biological sexual instinct predominates over the poorly developed feeling and this makes to search more for the satisfaction of the body than the happiness of the spirit. The sexual desire at this stage is awoken fundamentally by physical attractiveness and novelty. When there is a satisfaction of the body the interest for that relationship is lost and new relationships are sought. In this moment there is not a special preference for anybody in particular. As the spirit progresses in the development of feelings it gets bored of the purely sexual relationship, because once the desire is satisfied he/she feels emptiness inside, and searches for something more in the relationship, i.e., to love and to be loved. And here is where the affinity feeling comes into play, because if this one does not exist, it cannot be reached the inner fullness. Then starts the fight for feelings, for finding happiness in the relationship of the couple. In this path the spirit will live countless experiences of personal relationships, where it will experience everything, instincts, feelings and egofeelings, and in function of the degree of happiness and of unhappiness that it has experienced will go little by little perfecting its sensibility and ability to love. It will go discarding the egofeelings and will go developing the feelings of love. It will have every time more clearly which are its feelings and also will be firmer at the time of living accordingly with what is felt. It also will go gradually showing more respect for the freedom of feelings of others.

Which are the egofeelings most important which interfere in the feelings of a couple?

They can be different. The principal one is attachment and from this one derives other egofeelings like absorbance and victimhood, jealousy, resentment and spite, sentimental obsession, guiltiness in love, fear to love and sentimental confusion.

Can you explain to me in what consists each one of these egofeelings?

Yes, sure. Let's begin by attachment. Although we already talked about it before, now we will do it with greater depth. Attachment is what more commonly is known as "possessive love". The person who suffers attachment assumes that when it is created a link of partnership, it obligates the spouses to give part of their will and freedom in favour of the other and, at the same time, that some rights are acquired over the will and freedom of the spouse. We can differentiate two facets of attachment, the active attachment and the passive attachment.

The active attachment is done in the person who considers that the beloved is belonging to him/her in property and because of that has certain rights over him/her. It is manifested as the desire to possess the will of the other person and the eagerness to control his/her life for the other to do what one wishes. I mean, people with active attachment think they have the right to impose their will over the will of their partner. They want to have someone who satisfies their desires, who pleases them, and they believe they have the right to require it from the other because they consider this forms part of the obligations of the partner relationship.

Passive attachment is what corresponds to the person who allows that the spouse infringes his/her freedom and will because he/she believes that the link of couples obligates him/her to do that. The person who suffers the passive attachment has a tendency to give oneself in the satisfaction and complacency of the partner, renouncing his/her own freedom and will.

The traditional male chauvinist education promotes the attachment in both variants, because it approves active attachment for men and educates women to be accustomed to live with passive attachment. In a partner relationship of male chauvinist type, the husband would act with active attachment, because to him is attributed the right to dominate the wife, imposing his will and restricting her freedom, while that the wife would act with passive attachment since she obligates herself to cede to the husband part of her will and freedom.

Do you mean that, in general, the man tends to act with active attachment and the woman with passive attachment?

No. There are many cases that are the reverse. It also can be given the active and passive attachment in the same spouse or both at the same time. That there exists active or passive attachment has to do with the evolutionary level of each spirit. The active attachment is done with greater preponderance at the stage of vanity, where love is less known and one desires and needs more than what he/she loves. It is searched in the relationship of the couple that the other satisfies the desires and needs of oneself. If that spirit at the stage of vanity incarnates as a man he will take advantage of the male chauvinist education to justify his attitude of dominance and if it is a woman she will seek to dominate with other weapons.

The passive attachment is done usually more in the proud person due to the necessity that he or she has to be loved and by his/her greater ability to love. He/she believes that forcing him/herself to please the other, he/she is going to achieve to be loved back and as he/she has a great capacity to love, she delivers herself a lot in the relationship, even to the extreme of renouncing her personal freedom and will.

How can attachment be overcome?

Active attachment is overcome when one becomes aware that one thing is to love and another thing is to want to possess. So if you love someone truly you have to start by respecting their will

and their freedom in all the facets of their life, just as you like to be respected your own freedom and will.

Passive attachment is overcome when one becomes aware that to love someone does not imply renouncing your freedom nor your will, and that it does not have sense to submit to them for wanting to achieve that they love you, because if the person loves you truly he/she will not ask you for that submission as a condition to love you. The person who requires of you a sacrifice to love you in reality does not love you now nor will love you later, because true feelings arise spontaneously, they are not conditioned by you doing some specific thing.

Absorbency and victimisation.

We call absorbency the desire to attract the attention of others so that they satisfy or please the desires and necessities of one self. The person dominated by absorbency usually thinks only about oneself and demands and obligates others to lend attention. In the couple relationship they usually demand of the spouse an almost exclusive attention, therefore they frequently violate their freedom and their will, to convince this other that this attention corresponds to a right, because of the emotional link that there is between them. If they don't get the attention to a good degree, they usually use victimisation to achieve it.

Victimisation is an egoistic feeling that characterises to the person who seeks to attract the attention of others towards him or herself seeking to awaken the feeling of pity, for others to commiserate of him/her, with the purpose to submit others to his/her will and to get advantage of them. This is much related with absorbency, because the victimizer uses to be absorbent, because he/she requires the attention of others without respecting their free will. Also he/she is a coward, because he/she doesn't fight for going forward, but instead for getting that others replace them in their proofs and responsibilities. It is a very subtle way of manipulation, because many times the manipulated person is absorbed without being aware. The victimiser uses to play with the feeling of guilt, I mean, he/she tries

to make the victim to feel guilty if he/she is not agreeing to please or satisfy the demands.

For example, he/she can use personal sickness to trap others. They invent ailments or exaggerate the ones they have for avoiding responsibilities or to force others to assume the ones for them. Another argument they tend to use to make them feel pity and justify the absorbency is to say that their discomfort is inflicted because in their childhood they were not loved, when it is not true this to be the principle cause of their discomfort. In the relationships of couples, they use to seek pleasant persons as spouses, so that they agree always to their requirements. They make themselves voluntarily dependent on the spouse by their way to behave, since they simulate to always feel bad, physically or psychologically, to receive a constant attention and for the other to carry on with everything. This behaviour finishes up choking and exhausting the spouse, because practically he/she doesn't have his/her own life, instead of that his/her life revolves around satisfying and pleasing the victimizer even in the most minimum details, as this one convinces him/her to not be able to fend for him/herself. They themselves feed their discomfort and they don't want to go better, because they use it as a weapon to trap.

How to overcome absorbency and victimisation?

Renouncing to control the life of others and respecting their free will. This means that one has to be aware of not having the right to demand or impose nothing to nobody and even less under the pretext to have any emotional link to the person. At the same time it is necessary to conquer cowardice, laziness and comfort to confront the problems for one self, instead of always to look for someone external who resolves them.

Jealousy.

We could define jealousy as an anxiety that a person suffers for the fear to lose someone who he/she considers is of his/her property. Jealousy in the couple relationship is characteristic of the person with an active attachment, possessive and absorbent, because he/she considers the partner of his/her property and

requires of him/her an exclusive attention. For this they get angry when the partner demonstrates any attention or affection towards other persons.

Jealousy is usually manifested as a permanent distrust towards the partner and a recurrent obsession with the idea that the partner can be disloyal. This obsession brings him/her to exercise an exhaustive control over the other person's life under the pretext to avoid any possibilities of disloyalty, and makes him/her to have ill will towards those persons who are related to his/her spouse, above all toward those who he/she considers as possible competitors as a partner. Jealousy can feed other egofeelings, which are used to exert a control over the spouse's life, like aggressiveness, absorbency, victimisation or spite. The jealous person during the relationship uses to be the spited one when it is broken. The jealous person reflects poorness and weakness of feelings. First, because he/she is not paying attention to the happiness of the other. He/she only thinks in satisfying his/her desire of domination without thinking in the great damage caused to the partner. Second, because he/she doesn't trust that the link of feelings is enough to maintain the union of the partnership. That is why he/she resorts to coercion and intimidation. When there is true love one trusts in feelings and there is no fear of interferences of third persons. If a third person appears in the relationship, it is a symptom that the feelings existing before were poor or they did not exist.

How to overcome jealousy?

Jealousy is a symptom that there are no feelings, only active attachment. Jealousy is overcome recognizing this lack of feeling and recognizing the own active attachment. For overcoming it one has to renounce the desire of possessing the other and respecting the freedom of feeling. One has to be aware that true love is free and cannot be forced, it arises spontaneously and it is on that basis of the free and mutual spontaneous feeling where the union will be produced, without the need to exist any obligation or an effort to maintain it.

Resentment and spite.

Resentment is an ego feeling characterised for the ill will toward someone who we consider he/she has injured us. One is feeling harmed in his/her own love, or in his/her feelings and he/she feels justified to harm the one who made the injury, because he/she waits for a satisfaction of that damage. There exists a desire of compensation or revenge. When the person acts by resentment, has tendency to harm not only to those who made him/her damage, but in general to everybody, because when resentment is owning the will of the person, it makes him/her believe that all the acts of others towards oneself have the hidden intention that has as an objective to harm him/her. The resentful person becomes distrustful in extreme.

A variant of resentment is spite. In this case is the ill will toward the partner because that one decides to break the relationship.

The spited person feels harmed in his/her feelings because he/she considers to have lost something owned and fits bad that loss. He/she desires the suffering for his/her ex partner and usually acts to damage him/her. The person feels him/herself a victim and with the right to make damage to the other, who he/she considers the person causing his/her ailment. His/her motto is: "Because you have made me suffer I am going to make you suffer".

The spiteful person uses all that he/she considers a weapon to repay, victimisation, defamation, manipulation, blackmail, threatening, coercion or aggression.

He/she believes him/herself justified to undertake actions to harm the ex partner, through aggressions, threats, false accusations of bad treatment, desire to dispossess the other of material goods that there has been in common, etc. If there are children in common they are used like a thrown weapon, trying to prevent his/her relationship with the children or giving a bad image of the ex partner to the children for there to be disharmony between them. If the ex partner has a new relationship, also the new partner can be an objective of attack of the spited one, above all if he/she considers that his/her separation has to do with that new relationship.

But isn't it normal to feel bad when someone is abandoned by his/her partner?

It can be felt sadness, deception, frustration, loneliness or nostalgia as a consequence of the break. But one thing is to feel sadness and another very different thing is to desire the suffering for the other and to act for making him/her suffer. The spiteful person also reflects poorness and weakness of feelings, because who truly loves never acts for damaging the beloved being, neither even when this one takes a decision that the other one does not understand. And this occurs because there is not yet a respect of the freedom of feeling, that it gives to each person the right to decide who he/she wants or doesn't want to maintain a relationship with. If there will be a respect of the freedom of feeling one will suffer less when a break of couple is produced and one will make to suffer less to others.

How to overcome spite?

Everything revolves around the same thing, I mean, overcoming attachment and respect to the freedom of feeling. As we said in the case of active attachment and jealousy, we have to be aware that nobody belongs to nobody. It doesn't exist the right of property over the spouse, and so there is no right to decide for him/her and even less to require continuity of the relationship if it is not his/her will. Therefore, there is no justification to act against him/her.

The emotional obsession or fascination.

The obsession in personal relationships makes references to the unsatisfied desire of getting or possessing a person who one has set as a goal. If the desire is easily achieved, once is got the interest is lost. But if it is costly, it becomes a challenge. The desire increases and, on not being satisfied, it becomes an obsession. Many times this does not reflect a true feeling, but only a dissatisfaction and a need, which can be sexual and/or emotional. Therefore, the obsession makes to lose the sense of reality. The obsession is characteristic of capricious persons, who have lived a lot of time focused on satisfying their whims and

when these whims are not accomplished they obfuscate in themselves. Also the repressed persons, who have difficulties to express their feelings, are an object of emotional obsession. They usually get fascinated for the person object of their desire and create a fantasy around him/her which does not correspond with the reality, but it feeds that desire and also the hope that if it is gotten one can come to be happy.

Such as you expose, it reminds me to what the character of Don Quixote ends up feeling for Dulcinea of Toboso.

It is a good example of what fascination and emotional obsession mean.

In obsession, the mind works a lot and the feelings just a little, until the point that one can come to believe that what one thinks is what one feels. The lack of attention to feelings makes them not even worry for if they are corresponded or not. They use to be people who do not act with sincerity, because they use to be afraid of rejection and they are not willing to admit it. Their purpose is to get to the desired person at any price, even passing over his/her will if it is needed. That's why they don't express openly their intentions, instead of it they act with craftiness to get what they want without giving the opportunity to the other to say no. If they are physically beautiful they believe they can bend the will and the feeling of the other person through seduction. If they are intelligent they study the weaknesses of the other person and they use this knowledge to be able to conquer him/her through persuasion, flattery and the satisfaction of the needs and whims of the other person. If they are spirits not much sensible, in case of not getting it for these ways, they will use other methods that violate even more the free will, like blackmail, intimidation, coercion and violence.

What would happen if they will get to achieve the person who they desire? Would they be happy?

No. For some time they feel the satisfaction to have got what they desired. But when they observe that reality is not at the height of their expectations, they suffer big deceptions and this makes them to disenchant quickly of the relationship. In their eyes, their current partner, the one who they saw before like a god or a goddess, he/she passes to be now someone normal and ordinary to them, which makes them to progressively lose interest for him/her. They use to blame the other that the relationship does not work, when in reality their dissatisfaction comes from the lack of feeling hidden behind fascination. However, they can become possessive if they perceive other persons are interested for his/her partner, because they consider him/her a trophy that has costed them a lot to get and so it is belonging to them in property. And then they don't live, neither they let live, because they are not already happy in the relationship and they don't allow to the other person to get free of him/her and to seek happiness in another place. It is like the capricious child who stomps when the parents don't agree to buy him/her a toy that he/she desires and, when he/she gets it, he/she plays for a little while and after that he/she is tired of it. But if another kid is interested for the toy, they go back to take interest for it, not because it returns to be attractive, but because they don't want to hand over what they consider their property.

How to overcome emotional obsession?

Active attachment should be overcome, that is, the conception of love with right to property. If the person is not corresponded in his/her feelings, has to accept this reality without trying to force a change, since that feelings are free and neither can be nor should be forced, because the only thing that would be achieved is to suffer and make suffer. If the obsession is done in a repressed person it is overcome through conquering shyness and repression, having the courage to express what is felt at each moment with sincerity, without hiding his/her intention for fear of rejection. By this way, he/she will achieve his/her relationships to be real and to not generate fantasies nor obsessions around the

person who is liked, then if he/she is corresponded, will be able to have a natural relationship with him/her, without the need of deceits nor manipulations and, if it is not, he/she will be able to turn the page with a peaceful mind, without clinging to the thought of what could have been and was not for not to have tried.

Emotional guiltiness in the couple relationship.

It is the feeling of guilt which is displayed when a person tries to force his/her own freedom of feeling, either because he/she obligates him/herself to feel what is not felt, or rather because he/she obligates him/herself to repress the feelings. It shows up with frequency in persons who suffer from passive attachment.

One of the situations where emotional guiltiness is clear is when in a couple relationship one person is aware that he/she is not in love, but believes that for having created the bond of couple and having passed time together this bounds him/her to be in love and to continue the relationship. I mean, he/she strives to feel partner's love towards the spouse because he/she believes it is an obligation. This effort includes giving to the other what it is supposed corresponds him/her for being a partner, like pleasing sexually, attending and dedicating him/her time. And he/she does all this because of feeling guilty for not loving him/her because of the belief he/she must compensate him/her in any way for the lack of love by his/her side. Another situation where emotional guiltiness is evidenced is when a person falls in love with another but at the same time judges that this love is incorrect according to his/her code of moral conduct. For example the case of a person who falls in love with someone who already has a partner, or oneself already has a partner. In this case the person feels guilty to love someone "inappropriate" to whom he/she supposedly should not love, obligating him/herself to repress or renounce that love judged immoral or forbidden. So he/she condemns him/herself to be miserable.

And what is supposed a person must do if this occurs, I mean if one falls in love with someone when already has a partner?

That one can do whatever he/she wants. But if he/she wants to be happy must fight for feelings.

Does it mean that he/she should break the previous relationship for joining with the person who he/she loves?

A relationship without love is already broken for the mere fact of the lack of love. It only needs to recognize it and to act in consequence. We have already talked about this before. If that one doesn't love the spouse he/she should be sincere and have the courage to expose it, and following on to give as formally ended the couple relationship. This is independent of if he/she is in love with another person or not. If he/she also loves another person, he/she has to admit the reality of feelings and then express them to the beloved person, to know if it exists a correspondence of feeling or not, and later to accept the decision of the other person, be what it were. If there is a correspondence of feelings and will to be together as a couple, nothing and nobody can nor should prevent it and even less the feeling of guilt, because spiritually it doesn't have any foundation.

But I understand that a situation like the previous one usually awakens feelings of guilt. How does one overcome that emotional guiltiness?

It awakens the feelings of guilt because you have a wrong conception of what love in couples is, of the "possessive" or attachment kind, and because you have created around it some equally wrong moral rules, like marriage with right of property and the indissolubility of it. To overcome the guiltiness it is necessary to be aware that the feelings are free and spontaneous, that they cannot nor should be forced, and that they don't obey to any conventionalism. Each one has the right to love freely to who he/she wants and nor can one obligate oneself to feel what one does not feel, nor to stop feeling what one feels, without this to be the blame of anybody. Newly we come to stop at the same point, the respect to the freedom of feeling. In this case it deals with respecting the freedom of feeling of oneself and of not unfairly punishing oneself for a supposed crime that does not

exist. Nobody should feel guilty of feeling true love, even being through transforming his/her life from beginning to end, because the feeling of guilt, if it is not overcome, is an obstacle that prevents one to fully feel and live these feelings and prevents to enjoy the happiness which emanates from them.

What is the fear to love?

Like its own name indicates, it is the fear that someone can have to feel love because he/she feels that this will be a cause of suffering.

It uses to occur habitually in persons who have lived traumatic experiences in the past, as well because their ex partner made them suffer or rather because third persons acted to destroy an existing sentimental relationship, and they achieved their objective. It also occurs in persons who have received an education with the feelings repressed since childhood that has limited their freedom of feeling. They have fear to feel freely because they fear some kind of reprisal against them.

Also it usually conditions them to feel remorse if their feeling is not correct from the point of view of the rules of conduct that they have learned.

The persons who have fear to love usually are distrustful at the time to relate with others, because they fear that those ones use what they know about them for making them damage. That is why they use to be reserved and they difficultly give to know them themselves such as they are. They fear incomprehension, rejection, blackmail, threats, manipulation, slander, aggression and they believe that if they don't give themselves to know, that if they hide or repress their feelings, they will prefer that anybody acts against them. So they have tendency to emotional isolation, because they believe this is the best way to avoid anyone to harm them.

Then emotional isolation is a good weapon to avoid anyone damaging you, isn't it?

No. The fear to emotional suffering makes the person to be covered under an armour which apparently protects him/her of

the emotional aggressions from others, but at the same time it prevents him to be happy, because that armour also prevents him/her to express the love felt toward others and perceive the love that other persons can feel towards him/her. In this case the damage is not caused by others but rather by him or herself, but not because of this does it stop to be a very intense suffering.

Can you show any example to serve to clarify how isolation generates suffering?

Yes. Imagine that one person emotionally isolated knows to his/her affinity soul and this one approaches him/her with the intention to express his/her feelings. In normal conditions both could express their own feelings and feel love from the other one, and this would make them happy. But the person who is isolated for the fear and the distrust, does not perceive the love which is done and the same time represses his/her own feelings of love. And this is what makes him/her suffer. At the same time he/she makes suffer to his/her affinity soul because he/she prevents him/her to transfer his/her love and because this one neither feels loved. Surely the affinity soul will feel frustrated and confused because he/she does not understand what is happening. Even he/she can come to feel guilty of his/her suffering, to take fear to express his/her feelings and even to question if he/she is corresponded, so he/she can stop trying to start a partner relationship with him/her. And in this way, because of the emotional isolation, which derives from the fear and the distrust towards love, two affinity souls who could have been happy together, they end up separating their paths and continue without experiencing happiness.

But isn't it true there are people who never had bad experiences in life regarding relations of love and even like this they have fear to love or fall in love? From what is due that fear in these cases?

The emotional trauma can come from a previous life. Although circumstances of the past are not preserved in the memory, if one has not overcome his/her trauma, this remains impregnated in his/her spirit and that is why it is preserved in the next life, and it is manifested in the way of fear. People with fear to love don't

have illusion for life, because they have the belief that happiness cannot exist for them and they do not trust nobody is going to truly love them. They feel like the wandering dog that has been caned for a long time by a mistreating owner from whom it achieved to escape. One day that dog is found with some sensitive persons who commiserate of it and they decide to collect it for taking care with a lot of affection. When one of them approaches to caress it, the fear of mistreatment makes the dog believe that the hand raised to caress it is a hand raised to mistreat it and flees in terror from the persons who could have provided it a better life. Thus this occurs to many people, that due to fear, they lose the opportunity to be happy in life.

How to overcome isolation and fear to love?

First recognising that one has fear and so because of the fear oneself is isolated. You can overcome fear and conquer isolation allowing the free expression of your own feelings, having the courage to fight for living according with them, trusting in them at the time to decide in life without thinking of the opinion of others. For very difficult that the circumstances seem one must never deny the feelings, nor repress them, because it is the only one way to become happy. It is necessary to regain the faith and the hope in love.

But there are persons who despite fighting courageously for the feelings they don't get their objective to live beside the person who they love, or they don't get to free themselves from forced relationships because other people prevent it. We have already talked before of gender violence and of the women murdered for defending their right to freedom of feeling. Have they failed in their fight?

There is no failure when fighting for feelings. If because of incomprehension and human egoism, that person does not arrive to taste the happiness of love in the physical plane, then he/she has for sure that he/she will achieve the reward in the spiritual plane. And the courage demonstrated in his/her fight for living according to what was felt will be a developmental achievement that will endure forever in his/her spirit. He/she will

have clarity and courage in feelings, spiritual qualities very valuable earned with strength in tests he/she experienced in his/her incarnations. They will be qualities which he/she will manifest since then and forever, and this will help him/her to be happy and will avoid falling into the traps that made him/her to be miserable.

Sentimental confusion.

Sentimental confusion is an emotional state which originates when a person obligates him/herself to feel what is not felt or to repress what is truly felt, or both things at the same time. If it persists during a long time in this attitude, it arrives one moment in which is not distinguished well between what is truly felt and what is obligated to feel. And this is the confusion that these persons have, they confuse feeling with "must-feel" and substitute feeling for obligation. The person who obligates him/herself to feel what is not felt, suffers because that obligation of feeling exhausts him/her and generates in him/her emptiness, so that the feelings cannot be forced, they are given spontaneously or they are not given. Also he/she can suffer for the repression of a true feeling, because he/she believes he/she must not or doesn't have the right to feel it. However, the self-deceit motivated by the sentimental confusion makes him/her believe that he/she suffers for the remorse to have awakened an improper feeling, that this is the cause of his/her unhappiness and that is why he/she must fight to eliminate it.

Sentimental confusion usually is given in persons who have denied their freedom of feeling. One of the motives for denying their freedom of feeling may be to have been educated following a repressive moral code with the feelings that they have assimilated as their own. In this case their sensibility is strongly conditioned by the moral rules of that code. Also can be due to have passed any painful circumstance in their life related to the feelings in which they say themselves forced to resign to them.

I find it difficult to understand what sentimental confusion consists in and how it is manifested. Could you give me any example to clarify it better?

Alright. Let's give the case of a person who is married by the Church and has been in marriage for some years. During that time he/she has realized that in reality he/she is not in love and neither is happy in that relationship. If that person would feel with freedom of feeling he/she would be quickly aware that he/she doesn't feel love for his/her partner, would make him/her know and would ask for divorce.

But if that person has been educated in a religious formation, which considers that marriage must be for all life and it cannot be broken, his/her sense of duty and the fear to a negative reaction from others will make the obligation to continue the relationship. He/she can take the decision to obligate him/herself to love his/her spouse because he/she believes that it is also a moral obligation the one of "love for ever the person who you have joined in marriage". He/she will make the effort to please him/her in all aspects for the partner not to be aware that he/she is not in love and will self-convince that he/she does all these sacrifices for love. The fact of it supposing a sacrifice and to live it as an obligation reflects in reality that there is no love, because the one who feels true love does not live the submission to the other as a sacrifice instead as an act done freely and that generates him/her happiness.

Another option to which he/she can resort is the one to justify the breaking by a bad attitude of the spouse, by this way the responsibility of the breaking is made to fall on this one, so that the person him/herself is exempted of having failed in his/her duty. That means, "I love him but I cannot continue living with him because I feel that he does not love me, he does not pay me attention or he has done this to me and I cannot forgive him".

Another of the options that he/she can take is to make life impossible to the spouse for that one to be who takes the decision to leave the relationship. By this way the one who

officially fails the sense of must-feel is the other and the person remains exempted from his/her responsibility in regard to the breaking of the marriage. To the eyes of others he/she will make them believe that the first one is the victim and the spouse is the guilty one when it is totally the opposite.

Thus a situation of emotional conflict which had a clear origin "I don't love my partner", and a very easy solution "I leave the relationship", because of sentimental confusion it is transformed into a monumental tangle which causes suffering to oneself and to others. I mean, the reality has been falsified by the refusal to recognize his/her lack of feelings and the cowardice to contravene the religious moral code.

How can sentimental confusion be conquered?

Deepening in oneself with a total sincerity for knowing how to distinguish what are true feelings and what are acquired obligations because of a repressive education. And once one has clear one's own feelings, one has to have the courage to live according to what one feels, without being influenced by the opinions of others, disassociating from others the repressions and prejudice of received education, because if they violate the right to freedom of feeling they are the wrong rules and precepts from the spiritual point of view and don't deserve to be held in consideration.

THE RELATIONSHIPS WITH CHILDHOOD IN THE LIGHT OF THE LAW OF LOVE

Is there any measure that could be applied at a social level that would allow humanity to more quickly advance spiritually?

Yes. Love the children and seek to not do them harm, neither physically nor emotionally. Never humiliate them. I do warn you now that from the spiritual point of view one of the most severe crimes existing is the mistreatment in childhood. Allow the children to be free, to express their feelings, to play and to learn playing. If you raise a generation of children with love your world will change rapidly, because love changes the world. You won't change the world, but they will do it thanks to the love that they have known.

Any advice that can serve us for knowing how to treat children better?

Perhaps you have never been children? Put yourself in their place. Remember when you were children, the good and the bad. Remind yourself of the bad done toward you for not to repeat it and of the good to take it as an example. And here we don't only speak about physical mistreatment, but also of emotional mistreatment, because there are many people in your world who emotionally mistreat children, starting by their own children, although very few people will admit it. They are so bogged down in their own problems that they don't have a minimum of sensibility to realize the damage that they are doing to the children. They think that the child, for the fact of being it, doesn't understand things like an adult and for that is less sensible, so they don't have any consideration at the time of treating them, and they discharge all their frustrations on them. However, it occurs all to the contrary: children are more vulnerable and sensitive to physical and emotional damage than adults, therefore there has to be put greater emphasis on treating them the most respectfully and lovingly as possible. Accept them and love them such and as they are.

Don't put any condition to love them. There are persons who don't love their children, they only use them to give themselves importance, to presume of them for being intelligent, because they have some quality that makes them to be better facing to others, and if they don't have these qualities they underestimate them, and this greatly affects their self esteem. Who truly loves his/her children, loves them such and as they are, being more or less beautiful, more or less intelligent, more or less determined.

There are people who say that it is necessary to do physical punishment to educate children. What is your opinion of this?

Then there will also be supporters that their boss gives them a smack occasionally if this one considers that they haven't done well their job.

Then I don't think it would do them a lot of fun, in truth. I think that the normal would be that they denounce the boss for worker mistreatment.

Of course it would not do them any fun, because nobody likes to be hit. If you consider that hitting an adult is a criminal and deplorable act, why don't you have that same criterion when an adult hits a child, who also is weaker and cannot defend him/herself? What you don't desire for yourself, don't do it to others, and even less to the ones who are weaker and defenceless, who are the children. How sad it is to observe how some parents, when their children hit other children, they punish them by doing the same as they just banned, I mean, hitting them. What can the child learn seeing the adult doing the same as was forbidden to the child his/herself, apart from that the strongest is the one who imposes his/her law through violence? Absolutely never even think to hit a child and much less using the excuse that it is for his/her own good, to educate and to teach him/her discipline. Who makes uses of physical punishment does not educate, only puts of manifest his incapacity to educate, his/her lack of tact, patience, tenderness and delicateness towards children. If one fights against mistreatment and gender violence, the same or more emphasis should be put in fighting against mistreatment of children.

Well, I believe that nowadays in many countries the mistreatment of a child is a crime penalized by the law and punishes the adult if it is demonstrated that the child has received bad treatment.

Yes, above all in the West and this is a rather important advance. The problem is that many times it is difficult to demonstrate that the child receives mistreatment, because the proofs of mistreatment are not evident. An adult who has been mistreated has the ability to defend him/herself and to make a complaint if he/she has been assaulted, but children need an adult to defend themselves, and if also the mistreatment occurs in the family environment, then who is going to defend the victim if those who are there to protect him/her are the perpetrators? Furthermore, your society is still excessively tolerant toward minor physical punishment, as many persons consider acceptable the smack, the slap or whack on the bottom, although surely if it were done to them it would do them no amusement. Thus each one thinks to him/herself how it would feel being the object of the treatment given to children. This will help each adult to be more sensible towards the children.

There are people who discuss that the best would be not using physical punishment and they agree to limit its use, but there are children who are rebellious and do not listen to reasons, so in such cases one must be “tough”, ie to implement stronger measures. What’s your opinion about it?

Whoever believes that educating his/her children, or children in general, it is to impose on them and submitting them to his/her will uses verbal or physical aggression with the objective to scare them so that, for fear, they end up obeying, it reflects his/her own helplessness and spiritual immaturity. When there is love, sensibility and understanding there is always another way to do things but if not, any excuse is good to bring out the bad attitudes from inside.

But isn't it true that many of the adults who mistreat children were themselves mistreated as a child? I mean that they haven't had a good example to follow.

In these cases they should remember what they felt when they were mistreated and how painful it was to be treated with contempt and without sensibility, for they to seek not to repeat with their children nor with any other child that which they didn't like for themselves. There are many people who have received mistreatment, physical or psychological ones when they were children in larger or smaller measure, because in your world the egoism still predominates in all aspects. Those who have taken good note of lived experience and they remember the suffering that they experienced, will seek to try to avoid it to their children and in general to all the infants, the suffering that they have lived.

Which are the alternatives to educate without resorting to the heavy hand?

Through the game is the way in which the child learns in a natural way without the need to obligate him/her. Through the game values can be taught, and also knowledge of all kinds. If they have acted negatively, the first step is to have dialogue with them so that they become aware of the negative act that they committed. There is a very simple question that can help them to reflect: How will you feel if anyone will have done to you the same that you have done? For example if they have hit another child, a good argument to lead them to reflection is to ask them "do you like anyone to hit you?" You have to promote dialogue and reflection into the resolution of the conflicts, to help the child to be aware, to understand where the problem is in his/her action and offer him/her a possibility to repair the damage realized. In reality there are educational currents in your world acting agreeing with this philosophy. But for this to happen it is necessary for the child to receive more attention than what he/she generally receives.

There are people who give the opinion that education of nowadays has worsened in respect to previous ages. So now children learn less because these new educational methods are too soft and the only thing achieved is that the children cheat the teachers and pay less attention in class. What is your opinion of this?

They are wrong from start to end. It is true that some people, above all the ones who have a rigid and severe way to be, seem to be nostalgic of the education of the past. They are the ones who usually agree with the proverb "learning goes in with blood". In past ages the religious schools were highly valued by some parents because they had fame to educate with "discipline", as God commands. In reality what they called "to educate with discipline" consisted in forcing the obedience of pupils through fear, threats and physical punishment embittering the life of those pupils, who more than children were small scared recruits of whom had disappeared from their face all inkling of the proper spontaneity, sensibility and joy of childhood. And also all that was done using the name of God.

But this education, although it is possible that it achieved children more submissive and obedient, it didn't achieve children any more intelligent nor happier, nor freer. These children who have grown with the fear in the body when they are adults, they have many shortcomings. If they haven't overpassed the trauma of the childhood they usually have difficulties to express feelings, a low self esteem and are susceptible to emotional problems, although maybe they still remember by heart the list of Gothic kings, because their life was going on it.

It is also questionable that the pupils from the past were more intelligent and better trained than those of today, because before much emphasis was done on memorizing the contents and little on logical reasoning. The suitability of the educational contents was also questionable, the resources which were destined to education were minor and the time of obligatory schooling was less too. The current education intends that children have greater capacity of reflection and rationality, to memorize less and rationalize more. On the other part, the countries which show better rates of academic performance and less school failure are not those which opt for educational models based in discipline, but to the contrary, those that apply progressive educational models. The difference is that they invest more human and material resources in education than other

countries. Finland, the country that has the best educational model in the world, is a clear example of what I say to you.

And why are there parents who say that they prefer an education with more discipline, if it is not true that it is more effective?

Look, what occurs is that many times the problem is not from the children but from their own parents, because many parents don't know their children's feelings, nor their emotional needs. They suffer from emotional ignorance. They believe that just feeding the children, taking them to the doctor when they are sick, providing them with what they need at a material level and enabling them to study in a good school for them to have a good education, they have everything done as parents. Something fundamental is still missing and it is to pay attention to the emotional care of their children. It is sad to observe how many parents are annoyed by their own children and that is why they don't dedicate time to share with them nor express affection to them nor understanding. Rather they are exhausted when they are with them, everything they do is irritating and they don't lend them attention. Also there is a very common tendency in some parents to assess the children depending on their academic merits. Some parents only worry about the children if they have bad reports or if they are sick.

That makes the children feel less loved and they try to call the attention of their parents. They can use as a tactic the lowering of their academic performance because they know that in this way the parents will give them attention. Or it simply occurs that the children feel so bad emotionally that they lose interest in everything, even in their studies. Because of the ignorance and lack of attention toward the children the parents believe the problem with their children is that they are lazy in their studies and they should need to go to a school where more discipline is imposed, with more authoritarian teachers that obligate them to study more. And the problem is not in the school but rather in the lack of attention from the parents.

But is there something bad in wishing that the children study, so that when they are older they have a means with which to earn themselves a living?

There is nothing wrong in wishing that the children study. But this must not be used as an argument for showing them more or less love.

If they are only valued whether they are intelligent and good students, children can have problems with their self esteem and also feel excessively pressured with the studies. You have to love the children unconditionally such and as they are and pay emotional attention to them, for they to be able to be happy.

Sometimes it also occurs that the adult intends the child to shape to some absurd rules, thus they limit enormously his/her freedom and spontaneity and then the child rebels against these standards considered unjust. It is absurd to ask the child not to play or to be permanently quiet. Because they are unjust it is impossible to hold them through reasoning, so some parents resort to imposition and coercion.

Then do we have to allow children to do everything they want, even if what they want is maleficent for themselves or for others?

Not everything. Use the common sense. Each thing has to be done at its due time. The freedom and responsibility of the child must go increasing in measure as he goes getting older and goes acquiring higher capacities. When the child is small isn't conscious of many dangers, he/she cannot be left alone in the street without supervision, because he can commit mistakes like crossing the street without looking. We have to go teaching him/her progressively what is dangerous for him/her and what it is for others. We have to teach him/her to respect other children, to not hit, to not swear, to assume responsibilities owned by his/her age, like doing homework, picking up their toys when playtime is finished, etc. No more or less than what a child can assume according to his/her age, always trying to be with him/her respectful, comprehensive, caring and patient, and respecting his/her freedom and sensibility.

But where is the limit? For example if children don't want to go to school or do homework, do we have to obligate them or let them be?

Use your common sense. Instead of trying to obligate them by force to do things, talk with them, speak to them about the importance that learning has, encourage them, share with them the moment to do homework, make it fun for them and entertaining and you will see that the child answers much better than if this is imposed by force.

And how can we do for a child to learn that which is necessary but at the same time is boring or tedious?

Make it fun and share this moment with him, for him to feel attended to and supported in what he is doing, because this stimulates him to continue. We have already said that children have fun playing, and through the game they can be taught of many things without being tedious, and so he himself will be the one who wishes to learn because the learning will be fun.

How must be the education at home, in the family?

Dedicate time to be with your children, to hang out with them, to dialogue about their things, about their problems and worries. Be always open to answer to their questions. Think that they are discovering the world and that for learning they need to ask everything, although for you it can seem obvious, for them it is not and if they observe that you mock them, they will feel repressed. Have a lot of patience with them. Allow them games as much as you can because for the child playing is his life and if you block him playing you will do him a lot of harm. Show them continuously your feelings in an expressive way, with words, kisses, caresses and hugs. Allow them to develop their personality with freedom don't impose on them what you would like them to have. Love them such and as they are and help them so that they go gradually polishing their egoism and to develop their sensibility and affectivity without hindrance. Don't allow that your problems and adult worries, which have nothing to do with them, interfere in their life.

But aren't there times that if you are too benevolent with the child this one is becoming too exigent and whimsical and uses foot stomping and tantrums for getting what he wants? What can be done in these cases?

It is true that there are parents who allow their children to do even that which is dangerous for them and agree to all their whims, for laziness, for weakness of character or for not listening more to the complaints of the child, and this makes that the child becomes exigent and whimsical and that he can use his cunning to bend the will of the parents. In those cases you have to act with firmness, don't yield to the blackmail that the child is trying to do but do not respond ever with violence nor aggression. When he acts in a despot way is when less attention you have to pay to him. If he observes when he is acting in this way he is ignored and he is not getting what he is demanding he will be tired with time passing. Help him to be aware of his own egoist attitudes through dialogue and reflection.

Any recommendation to future parents?

Yes, to try to conceive their children with love, for them to come to the world with the security that they are going to be loved, attended in all the aspects of their life, above all in the emotional one. I assure you that if children who come to the world were conceived with love the suffering of the world would decrease enormously.

I think that things have improved in current times respecting to previous ages. I refer that current parents are more aware of the needs of children. Am I wrong?

It is true that there has been a certain level of advance. In previous ages, children came to the world mostly by ignorance and unconsciousness of the parents. They were children brought to the world without an explicit desire of the parents. They came accidentally, because the parents maintained sexual relations without any kind of contraception, because there were neither the mediums nor the information that currently exists.

That is why they brought to the world so many children as biologically was possible to them, and this brought as a consequence that the children would come to the world many times in circumstances materially very difficult. The only worry most parents posed regarding their children was to seek their survival, while the emotional care was scarce or null. They were not the best conditions for coming to the world, but because it is necessary to the spirits to incarnate in the material world to learn and evolve, to take advantage of any opportunity that is provided to them. The sensibility of those spirits was less developed than now, both in parents as in children, and although the children received little emotional and sentimental attention, their suffering was softened also by the scarce sensibility.

In current times, in many countries, above all Western, things have changed. The percentage of children who come to the world accidentally, without the will of the parents, has decreased. Many are now conceived with the will and consciousness of the parents wanting to have them. Because there exists a greater economic wellbeing in the West and not dealing with numerous offspring, the survival and the material attentions of the children are guaranteed by the parents. They will be children who will neither starve, nor thirst, nor be cold, nor have sicknesses caused by malnutrition and lack of hygiene. But it continues lacking something fundamental, which is conceiving children by love and with love. Still mostly children are conceived by reasons different to love.

Which are those reasons different to love that push parents to have children?

Many times it is done because there is a kind of obligation to continue the family lineage, or for the convenience that the children care for the parents when they will be older. There are couples who arrive to a certain age and they continue not wishing to have children because that implies to them to make some changes in their life to which they are not very willing. But

they have them anyway because biologically their possibilities to conceive decrease with the age. How is vulgarly said “the person is getting past it” (like when rice is getting to be overdone). There are times when children conceived as a way to trap the partner and obligate him to continue the relationship when there is fear of the breaking up of the relationship, or like a desperate attempt to save a relationship that isn’t working.

What are the consequences for those children conceived without love?

Many of these children who come to the world conceived without love will suffer the lack of love of their parents, in the way of mistreatment, incomprehension, inattention, coldness and all this will make them suffer in a large manner, because the children who come to the world in the current time are more advanced and sensible spirits than in past ages, fruit of the learning acquired in many incarnations. Therefore their level of suffering in front of the lack of emotional attentions, in front of psychological discomfort, is greater than in previous ages. And this is the cause of most of the suffering of the children in the West, that they are not loved by the parents, although the parents make the effort to believe that the child always has the problem because he has a bad attitude. Many of those children who suffer end up developing emotional traumas or physical sicknesses because of this suffering due to lack of love, without most of the parents being aware of it. It is necessary therefore that the parents take greater awareness and sensibility for the emotional wellbeing of the children and by this way they will avoid many of the sufferings that now whip on them.

LOVE TOWARDS OTHERS IN THE LIGHT OF THE LAW OF LOVE

We have been very focused on personal relationships, above all relationships in couples and with the children but I understand that unconditional love goes farther beyond personal relationships.

Of course. There are no limits to love. The more capacity one spirit has to love to a greater number of persons is able to love without it being important whether there is a bond of consanguinity or not. The goal is to reach unconditional love, which embraces all the beings of creations without any kind of distinction. Jesus already talked to you of it when he said about "love your neighbour as yourself", and when he said "love your enemy".

And why is it so difficult for us to evolve? I mean, isn't there any way to reach more quickly to that evolutionary level that allows us to love unconditionally, as Jesus said?

All that we are talking about revolves around this. For evolving to the levels of Jesus there has to be a lot of emphasis on eliminating egoism and developing feelings. And this is not at all easy. It is not a job of only one life. It's hundreds of thousands of years of evolution, thousands of incarnations. Also, although all the spirits incarnate with this aim, once they are incarnated, they don't arrive to be aware of what they did it for.

In most people the awareness only covers until where physical life lasts, and while material fortune smiles on them, they dedicate their life to the satisfaction of material desires.

They take any existential reflection as waffle without sense, a loss of time. They don't want to do any change because they are not interested in leaving the whimsical life that they take.

Some avoid themselves from their inner concerns developing the intelligence under the scientific materialistic education, and they mock or consider useless any kind of existential inquiry.

There are others who confuse spirituality and religion, and they let religion to take them for it being an easy way, because they believe that following some rituals they have enough for achieving a privileged place in "heaven" and they replace the spiritual work with themselves for religious fervour, under the deceit that this last one is pleasant to God.

There are people who indeed awaken in their inner existential concerns. Many times that awakening is the consequence of to have lived circumstances in life with a lot of suffering to which they don't resign and they want to find an explanation. They don't conform to slanted or incomplete explanations delivered by religion or by materialistic science about the meaning of life. But they get desperate in not finding satisfactory answers to their questions.

The conclusion to all of it is that, by disinterest, by ignorance, by incredulity, by fanaticism or by desperation, most people don't arrive to find the true meaning to life, whereupon they live without understanding life nor learning from it, since they don't take advantage of it for evolving, ie, they hardly do efforts to detach from egoism and for developing feelings.

As I have understood, in Buddhism it is said that the cause of the bad in a human being is due to the existence in him of the desire, and that the extinguishment of desire will bring him the inner peace and the spiritual advance. What opinion do you have in regard to this?

Thus there is to differentiate where from comes the desire. It is not the same a selfish desire than a yearning motivated by feelings. Some people confuse the elimination of selfish desire with the extinguishment of all desires and then they arrive to the conclusion that they must annul their will to develop spiritually and this is an enormous mistake that many people take advantage of for manipulating others. The one who you call Buddha knew that the cause of the bad in the human being was the egoism and that it was necessary to eliminate the egoism for spiritual progress to occur, and he referred to selfish desire as that impulse which the human being must try to eliminate from the inside to be able to achieve

happiness. But as always, with the passing of time the words and the teachings are misinterpreted, and the being which spiritually isn't evolved enough has difficulty at the time to distinguish the truth from the adulterated, and gives as good an adulterated teaching only because it is surrounded by the appearance of spirituality.

Any example?

The attitude regarding sex. There are people who believe, because by this way many religions have made them believe, that sexual desire, for being desire, must be removed if they want to progress, and they put all their effort into repressing their sexual desires in any circumstance. This is a great mistake, thus also sexual desire can be awakened as a manifestation of the love of a couple that contributes them happiness and from which they are wrongly depriving themselves. Who well understands this will be aware that it is the sexual desire the one coming from lust or lechery, it is to say, the selfish sexual desire, against which one must fight to go conquering it. In this case the progress is in achieving that the desire of sexuality be in consonance with the feeling and not being a manifestation of a vice. Don't confuse therefore the elimination of lust or lechery, I mean the manifestation of egoistic sexuality, with the Puritanism, which observes as something pernicious all manifestation of sexuality. We have already said that also it is a manifestation of feeling, a reflection of the love of a couple. The Puritanism is not sanctity but rather prejudice and repression, and the one who more is shocked of the others is the one who almost always is hiding more of himself, in prejudices and repressions.

You have said before that there are people who confuse spirituality with religion. What difference is there between spirituality and religion? Some people believe that it is the same.

It is not the same. Spirituality is one quality and individual capacity of the spirit which propels to evolve each time more. Evolving implies developing freely the capacity of love and by this way to achieve progressively greater bounds of feeling, sensibility, awareness, comprehension, wisdom and happiness, to know among other things, which is the meaning of his existence and the one who is around him, the development of his link with the rest of beings of creation and his Creator and how works the universe in which he belongs, including the laws governing it.

Religions are human organisations of hierarchic structure that are agglutinated around a series of dogmatic beliefs more or less certain that don't admit discussion, that function according to the criteria of authority, it is to say, the one who has more authority inside the hierarchical structure is the one who has the power to decide which are the true and appropriate beliefs in which the others must believe.

How is it possible that, if loving others is the basis of the majority of monotheistic religions, and with so many people in the world believing in God at the same time, there is so much selfishness and lack of love in the world?

We have spoken of this previously. In many religions love is only like a dead word used like a hook for trapping, but it is not lived nor revealed with the example. Also remains eclipsed by other rules and beliefs towards the ones which are given greater relevance, many of them in contradiction with the proper ones of love and the rest of spiritual laws. For example, to obligate faithful persons to believe without discussion in a series of dogmas, violates the law of free will, because it prevents freedom of belief. The religions are a phenomenon bound to the egoism of the human being, since they manipulate individual spirituality to the convenience of the egoism of a few. In past ages the authorities of the dominant religions imposed their creed by force and the

one who did not submit was annihilated. They had such a power that there was not possibility for dissent without risking your life. In current times, although with less strength, still in some countries religion continues being a yoke that drowns the freedom of the human being.

Do you mean that religions are an obstacle for the evolution of the human being toward love?

What I mean is that human egoism is an obstacle for the evolution in love, since it is so skilful that infiltrates in spirituality of the human being to adulterate and manipulate it, and the result of that mixture between spirituality and egoism is what originates religions. We have already commented that many religions have their starting point in the missions of more evolved beings who transmitted true spiritual messages which managed to penetrate in people's hearts, but with the time passing these messages were adulterated and changed shape by spirits less evolved with a desire for prominence and ambition with the purpose of satisfying their cravings of power and wealth. Under the influence of these beings moved by the egoism, the truly spiritual laws are substituted by the laws of egoism which they are recovered of apparent spirituality with the adornments of rituals and ceremonies.

Any example of how the truly spiritual laws are substituted by the laws of egoism?

Yes. In your world, you have substituted the law of spiritual justice for the egoistic "law of the funnel", it means the wider part for you and the narrower for the others. Each one sees fair what advantages him and unfair what advantages others. Even being the same thing, you see it different in function of if it is you who does it or if others do it. You justify your selfish actions and you criticise those of the others with enthusiasm, despite being the same thing. And the one who feels with more power of action is the one who ends up imposing his law over the others. For example, those who flaunt the power usually enjoy of privileges

not possessed by others, such as disproportionate salaries, abusive pensions and exemptions from paying taxes, while they make to the rest of the citizens to accomplish some rules much more strict.

You have substituted the law of love for the selfish law of satisfaction of wealth and success, that's why you understand that to do the good is to act for getting the satisfaction of your interests and material longings, like success, fame, a comfortable life with abundance of whims and comforts, although being at the expense of the suffering of your equals, and you understand the bad when you experience the least deprivation of the same ones. But it is not like this. To do the good, understood correctly, is to act in harmony with the law of love, and to do the bad reflects the contrary acts to the law of love, generally selfish acts which generate suffering and unhappiness.

The law of free will you have substituted it for the law of the strongest. It means, the stronger obligates the weaker to do what he pleases.

Thus in your world is seen a lot who says things, his position, his title, his rank and not if what he says is true or not. The humble one is not listened although he tells the truth, while that the powerful, the one who has the fame, the success, the one who praises himself with ranks and invented titles by the human being, can say what he pleases because anything he says will be taken in consideration. Many of these celebrities transmit false messages that serve to manipulate and to make people fanatical, and even so they are considered above the others. This domain of the "law of the strongest" and the little respect for the law of free will highlights in respect to the religious authorities. How is possible that persons who they consider themselves spiritually advanced are the most intolerant, uncomprehending, stiff, who only put effort in following scrupulously the rules and the rites and in criticising the ones not following them, that they easily condemn to the others in their acts and conducts and that so little emphasis they do in correcting themselves in their bad selfish habits?

Is it not possible perhaps that tolerance and understanding of the ideas of others is a spiritual virtue? Where is that virtue in them?

But I understand that at least nowadays there are many people who recognize these selfish behaviours, who recognize the manipulation that has been produced from the spirituality within religions and who are undertaking a search for the authentic spiritual knowledge.

This is something positive, but it is not enough with the knowledge. It is necessary to recognize what is true and separate it from the false, because even if it takes a supposed seal of spiritual knowledge not everything that shines is gold. The most important thing is to put in practice in oneself what one goes learning in respect to feelings and to egoism, or otherwise progress is not made. I mean to not confuse spiritual progress with the fact of knowing certain spiritual knowledge. If the knowledge learned, that should serve for a progress in the development of feelings, is used to give easy rein to egoism, subtly enclosed with an appearance of spirituality, one falls into the same trap into which have fallen the religious hierarchies.

What do you mean?

I mean that there are many people who put great effort into knowing and studying the spiritual knowledge from different sources. But if later they use the acquired knowledge with profit or like a way to acquire fame, admirers, leadership, believing themselves better than others, what they are doing, instead of developing the feelings, is to give free rein to their vanity. And this is even more serious not only when one loses him/herself, but also when one contributes to confuse and divert the spiritual path of others, because with his/her example confuses to the ones following him/her. This is exactly what Jesus denounced in his time when he called the Jewish priests "blind guides of blinds". Therefore it is very important to look first at oneself before jumping to "preach" to others, because who doesn't observe him/herself and doesn't recognize his/her own selfishness and attempts to

remove it, he/she is unable to give an example to others in altruistic behaviour.

It would be good an example to clarify this point.

I'll tell you a story as an example of what I am talking about.

In a classroom of a spiritual school there was a teacher with his group of a hundred pupils. They had been knowing all the different stages of selfishness within the process of evolution (vanity, pride and haughtiness) and how selfishness was manifested in each one of these stages. Like a final resume of the whole lesson he told them: "The main feature of vanity is the desire for prominence, wanting to be more than others. The main feature of pride is fear to be known just as you are. The main feature of haughtiness is that, although they are the most humble of all, they still need to be completely humble".

After the explanation, he asked each student that, according to the learning, to place him/herself in one of these three levels and then each one to anonymously note it on a piece of paper. After he asked them to place the paper inside an urn for the purpose to realize a recount to collectively analyse the developmental level of the class. The teacher, after counting the ballots and analyse the results, said to the students: "80 of you are in the stage of vanity, 19 are in the stage of pride, and only one of you is at the stage of haughtiness". In the light of the results, the students, surprised and upset, they begin to murmur among themselves. They ask each other what has been the assessment about themselves. Agreeing they choose a spokesperson, who turns to the teacher to manifest his disagreement respecting the results.

"Teacher, we have asked each other what we had written on the paper and they don't match with the results that you have indicated, as at least ten persons have recognized themselves as haughty while you have only counted one".

The teacher tells them: "If you disagree, you perform the recount yourselves".

The pupils take the box with the ballots and perform the recount, resulting that 80 pupils defined themselves at the stage of haughtiness, 19 voted blank and one of them defined himself in the stage of vanity.

In light of the results, the spokesman of the students takes control and says: "Have you seen, teacher? We were right, as the majority has been placed in haughtiness, as we had told you.

The teacher answers them: "Certainly you have given the result of the recount, but you haven't given it with the true result".

"We don't understand what you mean"-said the one acting as the spokesman.

To which the teacher replied happily "Now I'll explain it. The 80 who voted haughtiness, are actually at the stage of vanity, stage characterized by the desire for leadership and for wanting to be more than others. Knowing that haughtiness was the most advanced stage, they did not want to be the last, but rather the first in everything, and they identified themselves in the upper stage. The 19 who voted blank actually are those who are in the stage of pride, characterized by the fear to come forward. That's why they voted blank, for the fear to show themselves. And the only one who voted vanity is actually the one who is in the stage of haughtiness, because he is the most humble of all, so that's why in front of the doubt he placed himself at the lowest rung of all."

Then the lack of humility is it a feature of haughtiness or not?

The lack of humility is at all the stages, in the one of vanity, in the one of pride and in the one of haughtiness, and it is more highlighted in the one of vanity rather than in the other two, for this one being a less advanced stage. What happens is that it costs a lot to become truly humble, and not even spirits in the stage of haughtiness have achieved to totally detach themselves

from it. When we have said that haughtiness is characterized by lacking humility we do it because it has already overcome other flaws and this one is still remaining as the principal flaw to overcome, while that the vain or the proud have other flaws to overcome before to face up to overcoming of the lack of humility. Some people believe that because of the fact to recognize their lack of humility they've already reached up to haughtiness. Actually they identify themselves with this stage not because they like to recognize their lack of humility, but because it is a more advanced stage than pride and vanity and they like to see themselves in the highest echelon of the spiritual advance, above all the others. And this is one feature of vanity itself, wanting to be more than others and not wanting to be less than anybody.

It would go well for me that you clarify what is exactly the moral of the previous story because I don't have it clear.

What I wanted to demonstrate with this story is that you have a great difficulty in admitting your own selfishness. So you strive more to dissemble it, for it not to be seen, rather than trying to truly improve it, and this makes you to irremediably stagnate, because the one who doesn't want to admit his/her selfishness cannot overcome it. That's why you take very badly the advice of people who want to help you and who indicate to you which are the manifestations of selfishness within you. You only want your ears to be gifted with flatteries but you don't want to hear the truth. You glorify the ones who praise you while you criticize those who tell you the truth with the purpose that you advance. Thus it is very difficult to move forward.

But isn't it true that we are living in an age of spiritual awakening and there are many people wishing to do something for the others?

There are many people nowadays who say they want to wake up to spirituality and they want to do something for the others. And that's all right. But before helping the others you must look

well at yourself and to know whether you want to do it for helping the others or is to get admiration and recognition from the others. If it is the second option then it is better to do nothing. It is good to look first to ourselves and see how far our capabilities reach. Helping people is not easy and requires a lot of preparation. If we are not skilled enough we can get tired at the first trouble met or we can confuse others instead of helping them.

I understand by your words that each person has a capacity to love and not everybody can do the same for the others. But what is the first step that one can do if one truly wants to love the others?

The first step must always be to recognize the own selfishness and to put much emphasis on avoiding to act selfishly toward others. If this step is not taken then it is not possible to move on to more advanced stages. Typically, almost nobody wants to do that job of delving inside and recognizing the selfish part. So he/she stagnates in the beginning of the road and cannot go even one step further.

There are people who start the journey of helping others correctly receiving the necessary spiritual help to exercise it. But it often happens that people are not satisfied with what they get, but rather they would wish to receive more and to have greater capacity than they have because they feel good in that situation. But inner capacity is not increased overnight, rather with a great effort, with a long time of evolution, it requires many lifetimes of constancy in eliminating selfishness and the development of feelings. But there are many people who want to obviate that personal work. They would like that magically a wand would touch them and turn them into magicians capable of performing the greatest wonders. They would like to be filled not only with love, but also with praise and admiration from the others and this ambition drives them to believe that what they wish is a reality. Then is when their own flaw makes them believe that the thoughts suggested by their own selfishness are a message from the spiritual guides, and what now it's done with

the intention to become prominent is a selfless help to others. It is not searched to advance spiritually but only to feign it. Some people are more aware than others of this, because selfishness has very subtle and suggestive ways to convince us. If the person does not realize of it, then will believe that he/she is advancing spiritually when in reality the only thing he/she will be doing is to increase his/her selfishness. There are some forms of selfishness that especially interfere in the development of love to others and if they are not fought, people come to replace the intention to love others by the intention to take advantage of others.

What are these forms of egoism interfering with the development of love for others?

They are perfidy, envy, greed and hypocrisy, desire for leadership and arrogance.

Can we deal with them now?

Yes

Speak to me about perfidy.

Yes. Perfidy or malevolence is the egoistic feeling which defines that one who acts with the will and the intention to harm on purpose, who is aware of it and who finds certain satisfaction or joy when he/she is able to cause suffering in others. The perfidy person often uses his/her intelligence looking for the way of how to do the greatest possible damage not being discovered and by this way he/she is also developing hypocrisy. Perfidy is fed on other egoistic feelings, like envy or ambition, so that the perfidious one usually is at the same time envious and ambitious.

Tell me about envy.

Envy is the egoistic feeling manifested like aversion or rejection toward those who have something that one wants to get. That something can be a material possession or a physical, mental or spiritual quality. I mean, you can envy someone for their wealth (material possession), for their beauty (physical quality), for their

intelligence (mental quality), for their kindness or for their capacity to love (spiritual qualities).

Envy is very pronounced in vanity, as it is born from the desire to be more than others, which makes you constantly compare yourself with others with the intention of being more than others. The person trapped by envy is able to concoct any plan to humiliate, undermine or criticize those who he/she envies. The envious one is glad with the misfortunes of others and he/she grieves with their joys.

Is envy manifested in the same way in all the different levels of spiritual advance, or are there any nuances?

There are nuances. Envy by material issues usually is characteristic from the stage of primitive vanity up to the advanced one, while that the envy aroused by spiritual qualities is given from the advanced vanity and pride, and even in haughtiness. The vain advanced person can envy the material as much as the spiritual. The proud one envies above all the spiritual and the sentimental.

How is exactly manifested envy in the vain person?

The vain person envies those who have assets or qualities that he/she doesn't have. The vain envious person has a tendency to humiliate those who he/she envies, defame and criticize them in front of others for creating a bad image of them. That is, he/she transforms reality to make others believe that he/she is being harmed by the envied person or for justifying or covering up his/her aggressions towards the person who he/she envies. They will try to achieve their aims to discredit people who they envy through suggestion, manipulation, victimhood, falsehood and deceit. If they don't get it by this way, they may turn to more direct measures, such as verbal aggression, intimidation, blackmail, coercion and even physical violence. They convince themselves that they are right and that their hatreds and animosities are justified. On top of all that is the satisfaction of their desire and they do not consider the damage that may be causing in others.

How is envy manifested in the proud and what is envy exactly?

The proud, unlike the vain, usually doesn't envy people for what they have materially, but rather for issues related with feelings. The major cause of envy from the proud person is related to feelings. If he/she hasn't found love yet and he/she is not happy, may be envious of the feelings of love existing between other persons.

Let's give an example. The proud envious one falls in love with a person. If this person is not corresponding him/her because is in love with another person, then the envious will envy the receptor of that love, by considering that the other has got what he/she wishes for him/herself. I mean, it will arouse an animadversion towards that person who he/she considers as a competitor, because he/she believes that has deprived him/her of his/her love. The proud one, trapped by his/her envious feelings, strives to not reveal his/her romantic reality. He/she hides to others what are his/her feelings, at the same time while subtly tries to get what he/she wants, without openly manifest it, because he/she is afraid of rejection. He/she will try to make greater merits than his/her supposed rival to conquer the person who he/she supposedly loves. He/she can make use of gallantry, good manners, suggestions, charm and persuasion. Given the impossibility to achieve his/her goal, he/she encloses him/herself in sadness, in anger, in powerlessness. He/she isolates him/herself and rejects the help that can be provided for leaving that situation. It can even cause injuries in feelings of a greater depth than in the vain person, because he/she knows better the feelings and can use his/her knowledge to hurt someone's feelings. For example, he/she can get to concoct plots to generate discord between the couple and give to the object person of love the understanding that the partner in reality is not really in love. If they get to sow doubt, they will take advantage to become surrogates. Blinded by envy, he/she will not notice that he/she is violating the free will of the being who he/she supposedly loves, because doesn't respect the will and is not admitting the feelings from the loved person addressed to another person and not to him/her.

How can envy be overcome?

First, admitting that you feel envy, recognizing it. The proud person is more aware of feeling envy than the vain one, because he/she is more knowledgeable of the egoistic feelings.

Unfortunately, envy is an egoistic feeling very frequent in your world and most of the envious people don't recognize themselves as such, so they stagnate, since the one who doesn't recognize his/her bad habit cannot proceed to its modification.

To overcome envy must to be given up the desire to be more than others, renounce the desire to possess what others have and to become aware that happiness does not depend on snatch anything to others, but to awaken the own qualities and feelings.

On the contrary, both the perfidy and jealousy are a great cause of unhappiness, a disease of the inside, since they feed the most pernicious egoistic feelings and the most contrary ones of love to others, because they generate rejection toward others, that it can be of a greater or a lower intensity. It can go from antipathy, repulsion and anger until even hatred. The inability to achieve what one wishes also generates rage, helplessness and sadness.

And how can we overcome perfidy?

It is a bad issue just having a difficult solution through comprehension and awareness, because the one who suffers perfidy acts with full awareness to be causing damage in others.

The perfidious persons are beings very stubborn in generating suffering. Generally until they don't suffer themselves what they did to others, they don't start to be shocked. In those moments of debility and vulnerability an act of unconditional and selfless love for them by those who were their victims in the past may be the trigger for their change because it disturbs all their mindsets. They are beings used to always acting in an interested way. They cannot grasp that those who they did so much harm, having now the possibility of taking revenge, decide to forgive them and help them. That's when the perfidy usually comes down and uses to get replaced by a feeling of unwavering loyalty toward their former victims who granted them forgiveness and helped them

when help was needed, despite knowing that they were not worthy of mercy nor rescue.

Talk to me now about ambition.

Ambition is a powerful desire to possess or dominate. If the possession which is aspired is of a material type then it is manifested in the way of greed and avarice. I mean, that greed and avarice are actually variants of ambition. The ambition for power and dominion over territories and people is another variant of ambition. Ambitious people are also often envious, because they aim to be above everything and everyone and they don't allow anyone to put them in the shade. Ambitious people are never satisfied with what they are acquiring and they feel an unsatisfied desire to possess more and more. They believe that as they go getting the objectives proposed, they are going to achieve to be happy. However once got what is proposed they are not satisfied, but they always want more. Then they look for an objective even more excessive and difficult to get.

But aren't there people who aspire to noble objectives, like the world peace or the eradication of hunger or war? Do they act incorrectly?

Those are not ambitions, but aspirations. The difference between aspiration and ambition in the sense that here we are giving to the word is that ambitious people don't move for noble ideals but for egoistic ones, that's why they don't usually have scruples at the time to act. The ambitious ones never stop in their desire to possess and dominate, because they are never satisfied with what they have. I mean, ambition is insatiable and inordinate. Ambitious people respect no ethical or moral code. They have the concept that the end justifies the means, and therefore they don't respect the free will. That's why they often impose their judgement on others and cannot handle failure. They get very angry when their expectations are not satisfied and they use to look for more aggressive and harmful ways to try to get their objective. I mean, if it is not possible for them to get what they

want in a good way, then, they do it in a bad way. That's why only a few times ambition is satisfied without a prejudice for others.

How is ambition overcome?

Becoming aware that the powerful desire of wanting to possess or dominate does not lead to happiness, but it only creates confusion and distress in oneself and suffering of all kinds in others. The excessive ambition is an extremely pernicious manifestation of selfishness. People dominated by excessive ambition, are the ones who cause further damage and suffering to humankind, but also a great karmic debt for themselves. The big criminals of humanity are the powerful ones who claim to be the owners of the material world, who move the strings of politics and of international finances at their whim, as in their quest to dominate the world, they don't hesitate in taking decisions that are going to generate suffering and death to millions of people, if by that their wealth and power are seen increased. But they don't realize that all the suffering they generated will turn back against them when they will return to the spiritual plane.

All what they have striven to achieve, everything, absolutely everything they will lose it when leaving the material world, and what they are going to find when they'll pass to the spiritual world is a huge karmic debt, which will begin by them experiencing for themselves all the suffering that they have generated in others. And until they have repaired all the evil they did, their spirit will not stop suffering, which may cost them so much time that it can seem to them like an eternity.

Talk to me now about hypocrisy.

More than an egoistic feeling itself, hypocrisy is a manifestation of vanity. It is the wish to pretend to be what one is not, to give a good image. Hypocritical people are those who don't wish to advance spiritually, but only pretend it with the aim to be praised and admired. They don't seek to change but only to give an

image facing to the exterior. Therefore hypocrisy is a great enemy of spiritual progress, since those people do not work to change and eliminate their selfishness, but only for hiding the selfishness to others and give an image of fake goodness. They tend to be people who act with cunning for getting to convince that they are really good and they are going to act on behalf of others, when in reality they act to satisfy their own selfishness. The hypocritical behaviour is very common in politics, especially at the election time, as all the candidates strive to give a good image and appearance of desiring to improve the conditions of citizens for convincing them to vote for them. But once they come to power, they act to promote their own interests or the ones of those who they owe favours to. But not only in politics, in all areas of life there is a tendency to show an image different from the one the person has, with the purpose to take advantage of others. So hypocrisy is a big enemy of love to others, since there are many who pretend to love others when behind that appearance of goodness they hide selfish purposes, which can be desires for recognition, fame, wealth or power.

And how can we differentiate someone who acts with true kindness from someone who only pretends?

The kind person acts with sincerity and selflessness and maintains consistency between what he/she says and what he/she does. The hypocrite pretends and constantly contradicts him/herself, since he/she says one thing and does another quite different. This would be the evidence for recognizing that person. For example, they often boast of being humble, when people who are humble never brag about the good things they do for others. They just do it to be fulfilled. Meanwhile, the hypocrite does nothing for anyone unless he/she gets something in return. The hypocrite at some point will commit a mistake and will leave uncovered his/her egoistic purpose, and in that moment will be possible to unmask him/her.

And what can be done to overcome hypocrisy?

First, recognizing one has it and then fighting to overcome it. It would be good also to realize that in reality to spend the whole

life pretending is exhausting and generates emptiness and, therefore, unhappiness. Let's think also that in the spiritual world there's no possibility of cheating and that there each one is seen just how they are and not how they try to pretend, which from a spiritual point of view is a vain and futile effort. Hypocrisy arises from the desire to be more than others, so it is very closely related to vanity and desire for prominence. When it is given up that desire then it is possible to overcome it.

Can you talk to me now about the desire for prominence?

Yeah. In reality we have already spoken previously about the desire for prominence and now we are not going to extend it too much, because it would be repeating. In a summarized way, we can say that the desire for prominence is the desire to be the centre of attention, for others to look to that one. The desire for prominence is given with greater intensity in the stage of vanity, for the wish to obtain fame, success, admiration and praise of others. Also the desire for prominence can be done in the stages of pride and haughtiness, and in those cases it usually is motivated by an emptiness of feeling and a wish to be loved. The desire for prominence in people who are at the stage of pride or haughtiness is called arrogance. The arrogant person is that one who feels him/herself superior to others and acts with predominance and despotism.

But is there anything bad in wishing to be loved by others?

Again I say no, but this is not the right way to look at. The one who does something expecting another something in return, uses to be disappointed or annoyed if that something doesn't arrive, which reflects that he/she didn't do things for love to others but for his/her own interest. The one who truly loves is fulfilled with what he/she does for others, without being necessary any recognition.

Also it has to be kept in mind that the decision for someone to love us is not in ourselves, but in the will of that someone. Forcing that feeling toward us, demanding this as a way of gratitude for what we have done for that person, would be a violation of the free will of that person.

How do you overcome the desire of prominence and arrogance?

By practicing humility.

And what exactly is humility? Could you define it?

We could define humility as the spiritual quality that characterizes people who act with total sincerity, transparency and simplicity, able to recognize their flaws and mistakes and who do not flaunt their virtues. Humility is a quality that is indispensable to develop for being able to help others spiritually, because without it, it's easy to fall into self-worship or cult of oneself, in conceit and arrogance.

And how can the lack of humility lead to self-worship, conceit and arrogance?

If someone who shows interest in helping others manages to capture the attention of a growing number of people and he/she is lacking humility, he/she will surely be dazzled, will be fascinated. Surely his/her desire for prominence will skyrocket, because he/she feels to be the spotlight of many people. As he/she doesn't reflect about his/her own flaws, will end up believing to be better than others, and to be above them. What motivates that person in this moment above all is to capture the attention, admiration and praise of a growing number of people every time bigger. Although all this can be given in such a subtle way, using such good manners, wherefore at the beginning it is only noticeable by a spirit with a great ability to capture the spiritual inside. At the same time can be aroused the envy for those who demonstrate greater spiritual skills than oneself, because he/she considers them rivals who steal followers. In a sly and malicious way he/she can get to underestimate them whether he/she finds that on comparison with them, his/her flaws remain evident. It is also tend to elevate to a position of privilege, but subordinate to his/her own one, to those who even not having enough ability, are obedient followers of his/her orders. At that moment the motivation to help others already remains at a

second plane, although it continues being used like a cover for getting more followers. And all this has happened because humility has not been cultivated, I mean one has not acted with total sincerity, transparency and simplicity, there has not been any recognition of flaws (desire for prominence, arrogance, envy) and has flaunted supposed virtues.

Seen in that way it seems impossible to love and help others, because it is very difficult to achieve that state of humility necessary to not get trapped into the desire for prominence. I mean, can you love and help others without falling into the traps of selfishness?

Of course you can. You can when you do things with your heart and you are vigilant of your own flaws, for recognizing them when they are manifesting and to fight for them not to dominate our will. You can when you are not presumptuous or pretentious, and you don't want to go further than your ability can achieve.

When one seeks to help others, one must not do things with the purpose to highlight over the others, not for engaging in competition nor in comparison with what others do, but only because one is fulfilled with the satisfaction to see how that aid has impacted for the good for someone. This is the way to advance with firm and safe steps towards unconditional love.

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS IN THE LIGHT OF THE LAW OF LOVE.

What is the origin of the Ten Commandments? Were they dictated by God himself, or are they an invention from Moses or the work of another human being?

Not by God himself. That is to say a lot. But it is true that what you call original Commandments were transmitted to Moses by beings of higher evolution. Because of their high level of evolution they can be considered God's messengers.

And what was the intention of those beings to convey the commandments?

To give some basic notions to people of that era about where spirituality was going. More than commandments were tips, as highly evolved beings neither require nor force anything. Commandments is a mistranslation, but if you like the word we'll continue using it.

Dude, I'm glad that at least there's some truth remaining.

That does not mean they have not been tampered with, modified and added.

I thought so. And what has been manipulated and what not?

If you want we can review them one by one. Some manipulations you can see them, as they are more recent and obvious, simply comparing what says the text of the Old Testament with the Decalogue that has remained as an official of the Catholic Church.

Ok, let's start with the first commandment. According to the Catholic Church it is "Love God above all things". What do you have to say about this?

It is a good commandment, although it does not appear in the text of Deuteronomy where supposedly Jehovah transmits the commandments to Moses. This is rather better what Jesus says when a scribe of the temple asks him "What is the first commandment of all?" And he answers: "The first is: listen, Israel,

the Lord our God, the Lord is the one. And you will love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, with all your mind and with all your strength". And the second is this: you will love others like to yourself. But the text of Deuteronomy says: "You will have no other Gods before me. You will not make image or any likeness of what is above in heaven, nor on the earth beneath, nor in the waters under the earth. Do not bow down to any image, nor serve them."

And which one is the true one?

The two messages are spiritually advanced. The one from Moses was a plea against polytheism and idolatry, so common at that time. It wants to give the message that there is only one God, and that the adoration of images has nothing to do with God, nor with spirituality. I mean, he says to the human being "Do not build images to praise them as gods."

The one from Jesus, besides confirming that there is only one God, adds something more advanced: You will love God and others like you do to yourself, a good summary of the law of love.

If both are good, what is the problem?

For me, none. The problem is for who blindly believes that the Ten Commandments of the Catholic Church are written in the Deuteronomy as they were unveiled by Jehovah, Yahweh or whatever you want to call him, to Moses, because that's not true. There is the modern fraud. If we stick to what the Bible says, the first commandment would belong to Jesus and not to Moses.

And which would be the reason for this change?

The first commandment according to Deuteronomy tells to the human being: "Do not build images to praise them as if they were gods." If you look, the Catholic Church does not fulfil this commandment, because it sets too much emphasis on the worship of many images of saints, virgins and Jesus himself in a thousand different versions. One way to avoid this contradiction,

which was seen by reformers like Luther, was simply to delete this commandment and replace it for another one less uncomfortable.

And what is the reason that Catholicism has made to incline to the worship of images?

We already told that the Catholic Church, from Constantine, took over customs and rites of earlier religions. In them was very frequent the worship of images of "the Gods". It was a deeply rooted tradition in many places of the Roman Empire and a forced conversion like the one decreed by Constantine could not be eliminated in one hit. Also, neither was it convenient for them to eliminate that habit, because this whole cult to the images and associated offers was a way to entertain people for them to not notice the really spiritual values, nor question their selfish way to behave, so much in opposite to those values. Figures of male gods of yesteryears came to be Jesus and the male saints, and for the female ones, the Virgin and the female saints. Only remained excluded the images of animals, before the impossibility to assimilate them to the leading figures of the new religion. If you are surprised with what I say, look for the most recent phenomenon, but similar, that has been produced after the conquest of America and the forced evangelization of the indigenous populations, where the same rituals and worships to pre-Columbian deities are still being made, only that now the names of these gods have been replaced by those of the saints of the Church. This is one of the reasons why Jews do not worship images, while Christian Catholics they do, despite the fact that these two religions supposedly accept as valid the Ten Commandments.

I would like you to talk to me with a greater depth about the concept existing in the spiritual world about the rituals, because the human beings, through religions, based a big part of their believe in the supposed sacred character of the ritual.

Rituals are games that humans invent mistakenly believing that with that they are approaching God, but in reality these games are a cover preventing them from accessing the authentic

spirituality. Rituals have gone changing from period to period depending on the customs and the level of sensitivity of human communities. In past ages, the rituals were terrifying acts of barbarism as it came to torture and to sacrifice human beings with the belief that this was pleasing to the gods. Later human sacrifice was replaced by animal sacrifice, which still exists in many societies. Thanks to Jesus, the sacrifice of animals as a ritual act fell into disuse in Christian Communities, and was replaced by less aggressive rituals. However, know that neither God nor the spiritual guides ask or need rituals neither offerings to grant their help. They consider it as a proper characteristic of less advanced humanities and they get sad when with them is generated the destruction of lives, suffering and pain, and because of the delusion that they provoke themselves those who perform them, since rituals that cause damage, like human or animal sacrifices, in reality produce all the opposite, spiritual debt, as they are acts against the law of love, while that the ones which are harmless, are irrelevant from the spiritual point of view. They neither need nor ask for pilgrimages to holy places, nor absurd renunciations, like prolonged fasting, nor whippings, nor physical punishments which generate unnecessary pain and endanger health and benefit no one. It is only necessary the sincere willingness to move. We have already said it on repeated occasions but again we say: the only thing that serves to progress spiritually is the advancement that we can do in removing selfishness and the development of feelings, and this has to be manifested in the day to day. Therefore, there are no shortcuts, I mean, there are no rituals or practices allowing anyone to achieve this objective without the self effort, as many people like to believe. Rituals, like the worship of images, repetitive prayers, everything is vain from the spiritual point of view.

There are also people who promise the acquisition of spiritual powers through certain rituals or spells. What truth is there in it?

Nothing. Of course, it's false promises that can only deceive the unwary. We have already said that having developed certain abilities, such as telepathy or clairvoyance, is exclusively linked to the spiritual advance in love. Therefore, nobody will acquire superpowers through these practices.

I'm sorry to insist on this point but, what opinion do you have of witchcraft and sorcery? Is it true they work? I mean, is it possible to get that certain spirits cooperate in requests one does, even being these ones with the purpose to make damage, such as the evil eye or voodoo? Do they have any basis?

Neither sorcery nor spells can be considered spiritual practices. Like rituals, spells are a game, sometimes harmless, when what is requested does not imply any harm for anyone, as the one who requests to win the lottery; but sometimes it is very macabre, since that the requirements are done with the intention to harm other people, thus what is manifested is a selfish intent.

Certainly there are negative spirits that can be linked to certain requests of incarnated people with evil purposes, which have the same kind of bad intentions, and who can try to harm specific individuals. This does not mean that they get it, as it would be a violation of the free will of the incarnated ones if these spirits were allowed to harm anyone just by their own desire or by the desire of an incarnated spirit to hurt them. If the negative spirits would have the ability to harm who they would want to, I assure you they would not let any puppet with a head. We've already told that their level of influence is limited and may only adversely affect over those who by their low intentions allow such bad influence or that by fear and self-suggestion, end up believing that it is real. Therefore, the best protection that one can have against the influence of negative spirits is his/her own attitude in front of life. The one who acts with a good faith in life, taking care to not harm others, he/she automatically protects him/herself against this type of influences. It is rather the one who wants to

harm others through witchcraft the most frequent victim of such practices, as he/she attracts to him/herself the influence of those same negative spirits who, facing the impossibility to harm others, They will pick on with the one who opened them the door with his/her bad intentions. By the law of cause and effect, that one who used witchcraft against others is exposed, in the future, to be the victim of witchcraft acts from others, and by this way he/she will experiment in him/herself the dire consequences of the evil generated against others.

Then, what is your opinion about people who claim to feel bad because someone has thrown them evil eye or because they feel tormented by any negative spirit?

In most cases it is not true. It is true that they feel bad, but it's not because no one has cast an evil eye on them, but for their own selfish attitudes or emotional problems. There are some people who, thinking that spirits can harm them, get scared and believe in their imagination the evil beings whom they are so afraid to. This makes them emotionally weak and depressed, with which they generate discomfort to themselves by self-suggestion. All this happens because it is easier to blame others of the discomfort rather than to delve into oneself for knowing where that discomfort is coming from.

But may there be real cases of influence of negative spirits? Are there people demonized or possessed by evil spirits?

Demonized people don't exist because the devil doesn't exist. Most "demonized" people who appear in Scripture were in reality mentally ill, persons with very strong psychological disorders, some of them caused by having lived highly traumatic circumstances, while others could be victims of infectious diseases such as rabies. But it is true that when one generates egoistic feelings can attract the influence of negative spirits who feed them even more. And it is not because someone has thrown them a curse and that this one is effective, but it is a process caused by one self. But it is true that there may be people influenced to a greater or lesser extent

by obsessive spirits for different reasons: some because they asked for contact with negative spirits, others because they have some weakness that draws their influence, such as drug addiction, or because they maintain highly negative selfish attitudes. Other influences are given because the incarnated person has committed negative acts in the past against the disembodied spirit who haunts him and this one has the desire for the reparation of the damage taken. But this influence is usually quite limited, generally is limited to generate negative thoughts in the mind of the victim and never gets to become a possession. People who have the gift of mediumship can be disturbed in a more forceful way by negative spirits, because their own nature which is favourable to the contact with the spiritual world predisposes them to that contact to be more intense. But this will only occur in the case that they let themselves to be carried by their low instincts or perverse attitudes. The cases of possession that you see in the scary movies are pure fantasy.

In those cases, how can one be released of that influence? Do the so-called "exorcisms" have any power to release from the influences of negative spirits?

We have said it. If there is any negative spirit bothering us, it tends to be the reflection that, by our attitude, we have allowed it to come in. A change to a positive attitude, i.e., by abandoning the bad habits caused by selfishness, will release us from that influence, and not by the practice of any spell or particular ritual, as what you call exorcism, which, apart from being useless, it is also ludicrous.

Are energy cleansings, based on the transmission of energy to the person affected, possibly helpful to free from the influence of a negative spirit?

They help, if the transmitter of those energies is a good energy channel and does not use his/her ability with selfish purposes, because advanced spirits can act through him/her to release of that influence. But if one keeps his/her negative attitude, that effect will be passing. So it does not depend on others, but on oneself, to be released from the influences of negative spirits.

Are there people who are sensitive and can perceive environments where there are negative spirits, without that being by a bad attitude of themselves?

Yes. They may feel tired and exhausted. But that discomfort will be temporary and will disappear when the place is left. I mean, it will not be "stuck" any negative spirit to torment him/her by the fact of having been in an environment frequented by spirits of low vibration, as some people believe. Sometimes that bad environment is generated by the own incarnated people with their egoistic feelings. People who are sensitive can grasp it and feel bad, but it will only be a fleeting sensation.

Is it true that some spirits cause the so-called "Paranormal phenomena", such as objects in movement, lights and appliances switching on by themselves or even voices or images which are detected in video and audio devices, and causing a great fear in those who are witnesses of these phenomena?

Yes, but this does not mean that they have a negative purpose. They are sometimes only spirits trying to contact with the incarnated people because they want to make known that they continue alive. They tend to be people who have recently disembodied, who are still attached to the physical life and do not want to abandon the environment where they lived or the relationships they had, and try to draw the attention of those closed to them to let them know that they are still alive. They try

to talk and touch them, but as their possibilities of communication and contact with the incarnated ones are limited (it depends on the sensitivity of the incarnated person) these are not perceived by their presence. Sometimes they manage to interfere with devices working with electricity (switching on and off lights, TV, radio), since it is easier for them to interact on energy rather than on materials. Even at times they can move objects from their place with the collaboration of the energy from an incarnated person, if this one has some kind of mediumship. And all this scares a lot the incarnated people by ignorance of what is happening, when in reality it usually has no bad intention but desires to draw the attention and unconsciousness of the fear that they could cause to the incarnated people.

Is it possible to help somehow these disembodied beings for them to realize of their situation and so that they can go on their way by the spiritual plane?

This depends more on them rather than on you, because in the spiritual plane they have the help they need to perform this transition, but sometimes they find it hard to get rid of the ties which united them to the material world. The spirits assisting them wait for them to voluntarily decide to continue along the way.

It is also good to talk to them mentally because in that state they capture thoughts. It is possible to explain them what is their situation, i.e. that they have already left the physical life (some of them are so confused that they don't even know that they have disembodied), and that they cannot remain indefinitely there, that they should allow themselves help by companions and loved ones of the spiritual plane. The thing that more can help them is to avoid feelings of grief and desolation for the loss, because that retains to the less prepared ones. Disembodied beings feel shame when loved ones suffer from their absence and they are sad leaving them alone in that state. To overcome this state of loss and pain enables them to leave calmer.

Is it possible to contact these disincarnated relatives through mediums or psychics who make themselves intermediaries?

Contact may occur spontaneously through dreams or conscious experiences, because the deceased usually wants to say goodbye to the incarnated person and exploits the moments of greatest sensitivity to contact. If this does not occur spontaneously it makes no sense to provoke it. Sometimes the craving for contacting with the deceased ones is so large that the person falls into the hands of people who take advantage and with a previous payment of an amount of money they promise you the desired contact with the already dead being and in many times such contact is not real. It is only pretending. You should not worry if you have no immediate evidence of contact with your disembodied loved being. Death does not exist and everyone who died continues his/her life in the spiritual plane, even if you have not had that contact. If it does not occur, sometimes it is due to your lack of preparation for it. Many times grief floods you and blocks you to perceive what your beloved being wants to transmit you. A contact at that time could increase in you the sense of loss and to extend even further the period of detachment and, therefore, the suffering. Overcome the grief and then maybe you can have what you want. During the sleep you become detached of the physical body and you can get to where they are. If you are sensitive and receptive you can remember that experience.

And what is your opinion about the psychics and those persons who affirm to guess into the future or penetrate into the past, through palmistry, tarot and other similar techniques?

The future is not written. Access to the memories of the past and the possibilities of the future of each person in particular, which are called "Akashic records", though possible, is something that is very restricted. It only is permitted to the incarnated one to exceptionally access his/her personal record, but not to the records of others, if it may be beneficial for his/her evolution. This access usually occurs while sleeping and the experience is recalled as a dream or premonition, and even at times as visions

in a state of deep relaxation. But it is not when one wishes it, rather when the spiritual world considers it appropriate.

Keep clear that guide spirits do not facilitate access to this knowledge to satisfy curiosity, greed or some kind of selfish interest, which is largely the reason why people want to know things about their future or their past. However, it is amazing to see the number of people claiming to be able to penetrate into the Akashic records of others, many times upon payment of an amount of money, and to be able to know the past and future of a person with enormous ease, just throwing a few cards at random, or opening a book at random, or interpreting in the position of the entrails of a sacrificed animal or any other type of game or ritual, more or less unpleasant. All these are false, sure.

But isn't it true that some of those psychics are right in their predictions?

In most cases, not. The appearance of success comes because the supposed psychic acts with cunning, and knows how to flatter the client, at the same time knows how to get the necessary information to be able to respond and tell the customer what he/she wants to hear. And satisfied customer is a permanent customer who will gladly pay the price of the session. Who can believe that their destiny or their future may be written in some cards dropped at random? Does it not happen that if someone throws the cards again after shuffling, shall appear some different cards in a different order? Does this mean that their future shall be so different then? Use the common sense and you will realize that, for example, tarot is not more than a game. The one who believes that throwing some letters can see into the future or penetrate into the past is like that one who believes to be an economist by playing good at the Monopoly or by knowing how to play well at aircraft videogames, believing to be already a pilot. Do not confuse the games with the spirituality, nor give credibility to something that does not have a basis. All these are not spirituality and if you are not aware of that, you can mix lies with truths and confuse spirituality with trickery.

And what about that minority of cases in which they are right and it is known that it is true what they say? For example, when they give some details of someone's life which are true, what is the explanation?

It is true that some of these people have the gift of mediumship, but they use it incorrectly, since mediumship is a spiritual gift that should not be used vainly neither with a profit purpose, and even much less exercising it as a profession. Some less advanced spirits join them because it is fun for them to see the reactions of customers when they tell them something certain from their past. But if they succeed is not for what they see in the cards, but because those spirits give them some certain information to earn the confidence of the client, which it does not mean that everything they say is true. There are also people with mediumship who have no bad faith in what they do, but by their ignorance have been carried away by the selfishness of the world and have mixed their true ability with earthly learnt practices. In these cases they usually receive assistance from some spirits, whom although they are not very advanced, have no bad intention.

What is your opinion about Astrology, i.e., the influence of the stars in people's lives? And about horoscopes and Astral charts? Is it true that knowing the date and time of birth of a person can be predicted traits of personality or events that will happen in life?

It is true that all beings of creation are interconnected and that the stars have an energy aura that influences on the other stars, and on the creatures that inhabit them. It is also true that their influence becomes more intense when one is closer to them, similar to the gravitational force felt in a greater or lesser measure in function of the closeness or remoteness to the Earth. It is also true that certain Astral influences may be more or less favourable to accomplish certain spiritual works and, knowing this, advanced spirits can choose certain more favourable times to perform certain work on the spiritual plane. But know that they are only influences, not determinations. The marathon runner

desires always a pleasant temperature and a moderated humidity for the competition, because he knows these are the most suitable conditions to get a good mark. But the favourable weather is not what makes of him a good marathon runner, nor will unfavourable weather make him a bad marathon runner. The influence is restricted to modulate his mark. Then it occurs like this with astrological influences. The spirit which is advanced will be it regardless of the position of the stars at the moment of its birth and the one which isn't, neither a favourable position of the stars is going to turn it into an advanced spirit. Who can think that a spirit which is going to embody soon will have a different life or its personality is going to be different by the fact of being born two weeks before or after? Haven't we already said that personality and spiritual advancement of that being is the result of his/her spiritual learning achieved in countless incarnations? Or how can we think that the events of his/her life are predetermined by the date of his/her birth, when we are saying that tests are chosen and are prepared before to incarnate by free choice, and that it depends on their will and freedom to overcome them or not? Keep clear one thing: the future is not written. If the future of humankind would have been determined by the date of their birth, where would the free will be then? If you are very focused in what is accessory, you will pass over much of what is important.

Well, let's talk about the second commandment. You will not take the name of God in vain. What do you have to tell me about this?

This one yes it is in Deuteronomy, however it is mistranslated. The literal translation from the Hebrew is "you will not use God's name to deceive". Therefore, the problem of this commandment is not the commandment itself, which is correct, but the interpretation that has been made of its meaning, which has to do with the alteration of the translation from the original Hebrew. We already talked about this previously, but we will do it here in greater depth, because it is quite important. Many people believe that "not taking the name of God in vain" means that they must not use the name of God in rude expressions, although very common

in popular language. They are greatly offended when they hear someone pronouncing them, without thinking that the one who says them does not even focus on the meaning of the phrase that has just made. They consider that it is an offense to God, when in reality these expressions, although they express vulgarity and lack of tact, are harmless and do not have any kind of spiritual consequence. However, the true meaning of this commandment is "You will not use the name of God to justify selfish purposes".

A common practice of humankind has been and is to violate this commandment. The largest atrocities have been committed in the name of God. This includes from sacrifices of humans in rituals to divinity, "the killing of infidels", the "religious" wars or Crusades, the forced Gospel, persecution, torture and murders of "heretics", to the exploitation of the human being to enrich the elites of religious power and the manipulation of religious beliefs to take advantage of the faithful people or generate discord and strife among humans. All these are very damaging selfish purposes that humans have committed, in which they have used the name of God. This is really serious and with baleful consequences at the spiritual level. And that is the deceit, to make the world believe that it is God who sent them to do all this, when everything is the result of their selfishness. It is intolerable to make people believe even in the own Sacred writings, that God commanded to the Israelites to commit genocide against other people, or that God himself, or Moses, who is considered to be sent by God, sent plagues which caused the death to the first-borns of Egypt to force the Pharaoh to free the people of Israel. If this were so, we would have to admit that God and Moses behave with the same cruelty and disregard for life as any hit man, assassin, and genocide of humanity.

Although we would be deviating from the subject, it has stung me the curiosity when you've spoken of Moses and the Pharaoh. If it was not happening like this, what is it that happened in reality?

Because this about the plagues of Egypt, it is given as an absolute truth within the religion.

It happened that Moses convinced the Pharaoh of Egypt to allow the Hebrews to depart, because at that time they had a good relationship.

Then weren't the Hebrews pursued by the Pharaoh with an army to finish them?

They were pursued, but not by the Pharaoh and his army, but by powerful people of Egypt who were not in accordance with the decision of the Pharaoh. When they knew about their departure, they formed a force of mercenaries to pursue them. They thought to trap them now outside the domains of Egypt to avoid confronting the Pharaoh.

And what happened then? The Bible says that it was Moses, with the help of the divine power, who divided the waters of the Red Sea for the Hebrew people to pass and then he dropped them on the Egyptians, who drowned.

It did not happen like this. First, it is not true that Moses separated the waters. The route that Moses had plotted implied passing through an area that normally is found under the water, but that occasionally, due to effects of the weather and the tides went down temporarily in its level to allow passage through certain places. This was known by the Councillors of Moses, who informed him of when it was going to happen. They simply waited to drop the tide for packing and leaving. Even operators of the Pharaoh worked for conditioning stepping areas. When the pursuers, who were a couple of days later, arrived at that point, the tide had already begun to rise. It was clear that if they entered that area the tide would catch them. If they would have used common sense they would not have crossed. What just happened is that the tide came up more while they crossed, and they drowned. As you can see, there is nothing supernatural in what happened. They did not die for the wrath of God, as has been made to believe. They died by their own anger, because their desire to

reach the Hebrews could do more than the common sense of preserving their own life.

And why the Bible tells another different story?

I have already said that everything is manipulated by selfish interests. Keep in mind that the sacred texts were only accessible to the priests. When the ones who lived it in first person they were already dead, it was relatively easy to change the story to promote their interests. To the leaders of the Hebrew Church, as usually happens with others, was interesting for them to introduce fear towards God in the bodies of people for them to be submissive and not to rebel to their control. For this reason they created that figure of punishing God and his relentless executing arm, Moses. Once created the myth, when they wanted to force people to obey them, just saying that it was the word of God spoken by Moses it was enough to make them tremble and, by fear, to obey.

Oh! I'd like to know more about what happened really at that time in history, since what happened has had so much influence on the religious beliefs of humankind.

Now is not the time, because this would divert us from the topic that we are talking about, which is quite important. What I have told you take it as a sample of how the human being, to satisfy their voracious selfishness, is capable of handling it all, also the spiritual teachings, and even to convey a concept of God and his envoys totally misleading and frightening.

It seems then that religious authorities are the ones, above all in the past, which have most commonly violated this commandment, isn't it?

In the past and in the present. Although it is now made in a more subtle way, is still used the name of God with selfish purposes. God's name is still used to justify religious dogmas which are spiritually false and hindering the spiritual progress of the human

being. It is still used the power given by the status of senior ecclesiastical position to commit abuses and crimes of all kinds, although many of them are now made clandestinely because, if the authors would be discovered, they would be led in front of the courts. Political power also makes use of religion when it suits them, to convince their citizens of their conquerors and selfish purposes, for example, so that they go to war. They convince them that it is God who asks them that sacrifice and that he is on their side and is going to protect them during the battle. But they are not only religious or political authorities the ones violating this commandment, although by having greater influence they are the ones that have done more damage. Also in an individual way, selfish and hypocritical behaviours, that under the guise of religious orthodoxy, or of spirituality, restrict human freedom and will, and that they obey to the selfish desire to control and manipulate others, are a violation of this commandment. Also those who intend to use spiritual or religious beliefs to their own benefit are breaking this commandment. For this reason, if we properly develop the commandment of "You will not use the name of God to justify selfish purposes", we will arrive to the conclusion that this implies also to say "you will not do business with spirituality". I.e., the one who trades with spirituality, also violates that commandment.

What do you mean exactly with "doing business with spirituality"?

I mean that spirituality is an inherent characteristic to every spirit by the mere fact of existing. It is a gift, a quality that the spiritual world gives to every being for it to be the force and the guide prompting them to evolve. Spirituality does not belong to anyone in particular, but it belongs to all in general. Since free it was given to us, we must use it free. Therefore, it cannot be an object of trade. It would be as if someone would want to take ownership of the air and would want to charge others for the right to breathe. If we have at our scope the ability and spiritual knowledge, and we allow selfishness, through the mind, to take possession of them, then what would have had to be executed

as a spiritual mission of help to others and for the own evolution, in a disinterested way, will become a material occupation from which to take advantage and profit.

Neither must you trade with the gifts provided from the spiritual world, like mediumship in all its manifestations, which also includes the transmission of energies, nor aids nor contacts received from the spiritual world, because everything is given to us as an aid for our evolution, not as a commodity for trading with. To the one who is doing a misuse of his/her spiritual gift, it is withdrawn the spiritual assistance, because evolved spirits do not collaborate in selfish purposes.

Well, there are people who say that their aim is not to enrich themselves, but that after having found their vocation in the spiritual, they want to devote themselves fully to this, whereupon they do not have time for another work, and as they need to sustain themselves with something to live, they need to charge for what they do spiritually. What do you have to tell me about this?

Who told them that they were exempted from the material work? If the spiritual evolution concerns to everybody and all of them would take the decision to quit their jobs to devote themselves to "the spiritual", what was the world going to live on? Many people nowadays believe that their spiritual transformation has to do with the abandonment of the material work and the exclusive dedication to what they call spiritual work. In front of the lack of income from a material job, they believe justified to charge for transmitting knowledge or to give advice about the spiritual, but this is not so. Spiritual evolution is fully compatible with the material work, and no one is exempted from it, unless by reason of illness, old age or physical or mental disability. Do not use spirituality to evade the proper responsibilities of life as an incarnated one, like that of work because, he who evades work hiding him/herself behind a shield saying that is already working spiritually, reflects laziness and comfort, not spiritual elevation. It is necessary for everyone to work to survive and everyone has the right to receive fair remuneration for it. What is not fair is to make from the spiritual a material profession.

Do you mean that from the spiritual point of view it is incorrect to professionalize spirituality?

Yes, it is incorrect. The professionalization of spirituality, as you call it, it is what has made religion and the priesthood to exist. The priests have believed and made people believe that by making a supposed spiritual work (which in reality is not that one, because dedicating time to ritualism and worship is a useless job spiritually), they were exempt from the material work, and that for sustaining themselves they needed from believers or the faithful to provide them the money that they were not able to win. I repeat, nobody should believe to be exempted from material work to be devoted exclusively to the spiritual work.

So the Catholic Church bases that it is necessary to do things in that way in the example of Jesus and his Apostles.

In what example? Jesus was the son of a carpenter and worked in his father's carpentry while he lived there. Although it is true that when he began his intense mission he had no time to exercise as a carpenter, he never claimed anything for the spiritual or asked anyone to sustain him. Nor any of the Apostles. Each one brought what they had and none of them stopped taking care of their family and occupational obligations, since they combined their material work with the spiritual. Notice that no Apostle was a Jewish priest, as they were the only ones who did not work. While they were alive, never did they structured themselves as a church nor did they proclaim themselves priests, nor asked anybody to maintain them. They simply lived humbly and shared what they had. If precisely the Hebrew priests had so much dislike to Jesus and his followers, it was because, as a consequence of his preaching, many people stopped going to the temple to make sacrifices of animals, which it was the business reporting more income to the Jewish clergy.

What is it that the Church has done wrong, in this case the Catholic Church, to become almost the same as the Hebrew Church, contrary to what its founders did and preached?

We have said that Jesus and his Apostles did not establish any church nor did they have any intention to do it. Were others who came after them the ones who, making a bad use of the spiritual message that their predecessors transmitted to them, created that institution. Even in the form of asking about it, it is revealed the importance that you give it to the religious institutions, since you speak of them as if they had a life of their own. Bear in mind that churches actually do not exist, because they have no conscience nor will in themselves. Therefore, they do neither good nor bad. They are just material structures created and directed by specific human beings, although these may be changing form one age to another. Fortunately, the brevity of life prevents them to perpetuate themselves in power further in time than a few decades. A better question, what has made the humankind to transform the true spiritual message, which was given to them for using it in their spiritual growth, in precisely the opposite, that is, in a doctrine which converts them into slaves, that cancels out their will and freedom, that fosters exploitation, bigotry and inequality among human beings? The Church has been designed, created and perpetuated along the time by spirits who have allowed themselves to be taken by their selfishness. In reality, it was simply a conversion of previous forms of oppression which took control by force of a spiritual movement that escaped from their hands. And little by little they got it.

What do you mean with that it was a conversion of previous forms of oppression which took control by force of a spiritual movement that escaped from their hands?

So after the death of Jesus, his message of unconditional love quickly spread, as his followers were responsible to help his message arrive wherever it wants to be heard. With the passage of time, the number of adherents to the message of unconditional love multiplied enormously. The powerful of that time saw a threat in them, because their belief preached

equality and fraternity among human beings and this was showing the evidence of their way of doing things.

Therefore several Roman emperors launched persecutions against them. But, despite the killings, the number of Christians, as they were called, grew steadily. In front of the impossibility to destroy that movement from outside, they decided to infiltrate inside it, to lead it and change its course. One of the most notable facts of this new strategy occurred during the reign of the Emperor Constantine, who allegedly converted to the new doctrine and ordered the forced conversion of the Empire to Christianity. But that Christianity, which was adulterated by the passage of time, was more adulterated thereafter, because now it did not have to be a belief of poor people and slaves, but it had to be compatible with wealth and power. And as it was not so, they changed it from head to tail for it to be. We arrive newly to the same root of all the bad things of humankind: human selfishness is the main problem. These same selfish spirits are the ones, erected themselves in moral authorities, who have made others believe the importance to keep the Church and make it big and powerful, inciting people even to give their life and to take the lives of others for it, for believing that this was pleasing to God. And this is a great farce that only relies on ignorance, fear and fanaticism of beings who are still little advanced in the spiritual.

Know the truth, those structures that you call churches do not mean anything for God and for the spiritual world, since the spiritual world only cares about what has a spiritual life. In a few words, God cares about the human being and not about the Church. Therefore, do not waste your life striving to magnify religious or spiritual institutions, nor to make them grow materially or in number of parishioners. This is a futile effort from the spiritual point of view that will not help you at all in your evolution. Rather strive to eradicate selfishness from your heart and to develop feelings, as it is the only thing by which is worth fighting for and the only thing that allows you to ascend on the spiritual evolutionary scale.

Yeah, but is there anything in particular, any manifestation of that selfishness, that might have been avoided for it not to be materialized on facts? I mean, what concrete facts can be considered as selfish actions which have contributed to creating an institution like the Church?

The main fact is to have created a church or religion taking as a basis of it the spiritual message that Jesus transmitted. As I have already said, Jesus never had the intention to create any church, only to convey a very simple message to humanity: to develop feelings and to eliminate selfishness. This is an individual work which does not require the creation of any material structure.

Any advice to prevent this from happening again in the future?

Don't group together under any acronym. Because human beings have a quick tendency to distinguish between those who belong to their group and those who don't, to promote those of their group and to discriminate against the rest, either being these reasons for religious, political or patriotic beliefs. And that is a behaviour of collective selfishness. One of the consequences that should bring the knowledge of the spiritual reality is to discover that all human beings are brothers. Placing tags to some and to others only leads to generate differences that then, over time, are used as an excuse to provoke discord and strife.

I don't know what you refer to.

I mean that human beings have used religious beliefs to look themselves different from each other to the point that by these beliefs they have had confrontations and they are still confronting in fratricidal wars. There is practically no combination that has not been given: Jews against Muslims, Christians against Muslims, Christians against Jews. Within Christianity, Catholics against Protestants, within Islam, Shia against Sunni. The funny thing is that all these religions say to believe in only one God and recognize Abraham as the first Patriarch and Moses as a prophet of God, who received the law of God to give it to men.

Do not seek to separate yourselves from society, or to create communities isolated from the rest of the world. Better to the contrary, try to transform society so that it is increasingly harmonised with the spiritual laws, especially with the law of love. Every human being has the right to freedom and happiness and nobody should be excluded from that right. If you isolate yourselves from the world, creating locked communities, you prevent other human beings to benefit from the achievements that you have been able to get.

But it does not occur that when they are mixed with the world, the unity of action is dispersed and there is the risk to be infected of bad spiritual habits? Perhaps the early Christians, and even before them the Essenes, were not grouped into communities isolated from the rest?

If early Christians or the Essenes took refuge in places away from the cities of their time it was to save their lives due to the continuous persecutions that they were subjected to, and not for the desire to withdraw from society. There is nothing wrong in seeking association with people who pursue the same ideal, but this must not be an argument to separate from the rest, nor for excluding those who do not share the same ideals or beliefs. The ones who have clear convictions do not allow themselves to be dragged easily by those of the others, and if they do it, it means that their convictions were not so clear. On the other hand, there's nothing wrong with learning about other faiths and cultures, since this enriches humankind and allows them to have more information to form their own ideas and beliefs. The one who is Catholic because he was born in a Catholic country or that one who is a Muslim because he was born in a Muslim country, has not chosen freely his belief, since he only had one option to choose.

But if you cannot create a type of material institution, is it not a contradiction with the message of love of to others? Does it not prevents putting into practice projects of material assistance, for

example, for educative attention, health care or shelter to those in need?

We refer here to the creation of an institution of a material type having as the main objective the sustenance of itself, and that on its expenses can accumulate power and wealth. Wealth and power are claims attracting the greedy and the ambitious who seek to place themselves in positions of privilege in which to satisfy their selfish expectations, and that contribute still more to spoil everything. If you want to help the homeless you can create homeless centres, if you want to attend the sick you can create hospitals, if you want to educate children you can create schools. It is important for them to have a practical use of help to others, and they not to be simply centres for performing rituals or stores of relics, because then they would already not accomplish the function for which they were supposedly created, that it should be helping others. You can make use of what is already created and under-utilized to give it a social use, or to create it new if it does not exist and with this you do not break the advice given here to you. Here what it is censured is not the use of material resources which, well used, can bring the common welfare, which is a fair and noble ideal, but the abuse of them to achieve just the opposite, that is, the satisfaction of selfish interests, which are the source of social inequality, i.e., the opulence of a few at the expense of the misery of the rest.

Then is it wrong to do collections, since here we ask people money for other people?

Requesting help for that one in need is not bad. On the contrary, as if the fate of that money is a good cause, which must be to those who need help, is a spiritually noble act. What is wrong is to ask for oneself in order to avoid work. It is also wrong to ask for useless or selfish causes. And much more wrong it is to ask for a just cause and then use that money for a selfish purpose, like that one who asks for money to help the poor and once raised the money invests it in the Stock-market.

But I understand that the one who raises the money tends to think that his/her cause is noble. Which for some people is one noble cause to others can be a futile cause. How can we distinguish one thing from another? For example, there will be people who consider as a noble cause to build a worship Centre or restore an old church, while for others it will be a useless cause.

A noble cause is helping the needy. Those which do not contribute at all to the elimination of inequalities, injustices, and that they are not intended to care for those in need are selfish causes. That each person looks in his/her conscience about what is the thing moving him/her when requesting money to others, because so he/she will know if what is moving him/her is a selfish ideal or not, because although we can fool others, we will not be able to mislead our conscience. The Catholic Church is multimillion dollar and does not need of collections to restore cathedrals or make a new worship building, although if it gets others to pay the bill for their house it will feel very satisfied.

Is there something more that must be avoided?

What we have said before. The professionalization of spirituality should be avoided. This means that the person must not hope to remain economically with the activity that develops spiritually. The one who charges for the spiritual loses the condition of spiritual advisor and becomes a spiritual merchant. Neither must be used spirituality to obtain goods or economic benefits, advantages or favours in regard to the others. This will avoid to be creating hierarchies of religious professionals (the priesthood), to be maintained with the Organization's resources, and having no other function therein than to attend to cults and rituals of the Church and the search of proselytizing as a way of maintaining the structure. A current example that can give you a better idea of what I'm talking about are the pyramidal type companies.

You've also commented on the proselytizing that it is something negative. This causes me a contradiction, because if one knows the spiritual, it has helped him in his life and he wants to make it known to others for it also to help them, is he is acting incorrectly?

When we talk about doing proselytizing we refer to those who try to persuade or convince others of something without respecting their free will. I refer to those who use force, manipulation or coercion to get followers. Or those who help others under the condition that one is affiliated to certain belief, or the person who tries to convince to that one who has no interest in listening, or the person who tries to impose his/her ideas or beliefs above all the others. All that is forcing the free will. Loving others means to help them in what they need without expecting from them to share ideas or beliefs that one has. There is nothing wrong with disseminating spiritual knowledge. On the contrary, it is something good and necessary for human beings to evolve and be happy. But it cannot be done against the will of the other. It is to say, that even if one believes to be in the possession of the truth, if that one imposes it on the other, that one is already wrong. Therefore, it should have neither to be forced, nor to overwhelm others trying to convince them of the own beliefs. Do not ever impose your beliefs to anyone. Rather apply them to yourselves to be happier, to develop your feelings and eliminate your selfishness, because there is no better teaching for others than the example lived in oneself.

And in what way does one have to act when other people approach searching for spiritual help?

In helping others do not condition this help for they to accept or to share your beliefs. One has to be opened to respond and share with those who take interest. One has to be willing to accept the diversity of opinions and to respect other points of view differing from ours, to be opened to listen and even to change our point of view, if we find that the one from the others is more accurate. When someone asks you for help to solve an emotional problem, before giving your opinion please, ask them, "what is what your heart tells you to do?" or "what do you feel you

should do?", because there is no better guide than the feeling of oneself, although many times it is confused feeling with thought. Help them then to distinguish between what they feel and what they think, because selfishness influences on thought. You can give your opinion and expose your experiences, especially those that can help them to be clear. However you do not decide for others, but you let each of them decide following their criteria with regard to their own life. Each person needs a different kind of help and depth. We must be placed at the level of each person and give them up to where they need and want to receive, neither more nor less, and also until where your ability arrives. See if you are sufficiently prepared or not to provide the help that person needs. If you observe that you are not, recognize it, and seek another more prepared person for this one to be one who provides the help because, even though you have no bad intention, if you advise without knowing you can confuse rather than help. If someone needs help but doesn't want to receive it you must respect their will. You can advise but not to impose. In this case the only thing you can do is to remain in the hope for if they change their mind. I.e. do not close the door to those who did not want to enter, but rather leave it ajar so that if they change their mind they dare to ask for the help previously rejected.

Something more important to add?

Yes, that your beliefs are not formed by the criterion of authority, but that you continue your own criteria. I mean, do not give more validity to the word of some people only because of who they are, but that you assess them depending on the quality of their own message conveyed, and that you take them into account or set them aside according to your own criteria. In this way will not be underestimated true spiritual messages by the fact of proceeding from humble people, nor will be extolled selfish messages by the fact of proceeding from renowned authorities. The power of religions resides precisely in having convinced their faithful that the criterion of authority is the one having value, i.e. that the word from the person who has a higher rank is worth

more than the one from who has a lower rank or from who does not have it. The highest priest, pontiff, Pope or as please you call, is in possession of absolute truth and that what he says does not support discussion, because nobody has greater authority than him in reference to the spiritual. In this way the religious authorities have achieved to give for good the selfish beliefs blocking the spiritual progress of the human being, but which favour their interests, while that they have condemned, defamed or hidden the beliefs which were spiritually true, but being an obstacle to their interests.

Something more that we should avoid?

Yes. Do not seek recognition, fame and admiration in what you do for others, because then you are not using love, only feeding your vanity.

Well, let's move on to the third commandment, which is "You will sanctify the holidays".

This is a command which has also suffered changes, because in the text of Deuteronomy it says: "remember the day of Saturday to keep it Holy. Six days you will work, and you will do all your work. But the seventh day is for rest". The meaning of this commandment was to provide the worker of the deserved rest, to recognize this right against the abuse of the powerful. Keep in mind that it was a time in which slavery was common and that the powerful had tendency to exploit their workers, free ones or slaves, without letting them rest. That's why it is specified that the rest is for everyone, including the servants, and the pack animals. It was a way of trying to put a stop to all these abuses. It is a way of saying: "you will keep holidays to rest from work, one a week as a minimum". The Church also wanted to contribute their bit, modifying this commandment at their convenience. What was initially the respect to the days of rest is conveniently transformed to give emphasis to the celebration of rituals in honour to Jesus, the Virgin Mary or the Saints. Common sense tells us that some celebrations are impossible to match with what is supposedly

celebrated, because if we stick to the dates on the calendar, the conception of Jesus is celebrated at the beginning of December, while the birth of Jesus is celebrated at the end of the same month. If dates were real I would like to say that the gestation of Jesus was totally abnormal. Or it lasted less than a month, or more than one year, which has no logic. This also is an assimilation of the rites of the Roman Empire prior to Constantine, since the festivities of Saints, even the birth of Jesus, coincide with celebrations on those same dates of previous pagan festivities, such as the solstices in spring, summer or winter, which were converted into Christian celebrations (Saint Joseph, Saint John and Nativity of Jesus).

Let's go to analyze the fourth commandment: You will honour your father and your mother. What do you have to tell me about this?

This commandment was aimed at protecting the elderly. Keep in mind that at that time there were no coverage systems of social security or retirement protecting the elderly. Governments did nothing to protect the weak and dispossessed, and therefore there was no protection for the elderly. Their only choice of protection was in the family, i.e., that the children, once they are adults, they would take charge of the maintenance of the elderly, who were no longer in a position to be able to fend for themselves.

But this commandment has also been perverted in its meaning since the human being has transformed something that was positive, which was the respect and care for parents, into an obligation of the children to submit to the will of the parents. Under the umbrella of this commandment is given to the parents the right of ownership of the children, and many unscrupulous people have bullied their children, turning them into slaves, controlling and dominating their lives, crushing the will of the children on basis of mistreatment, humiliation or manipulation, violating their free will since their most tender early childhood, like when marriages were arranged to the children against their will, and thus condemning them to a life of unhappiness. They

believed to be with the divine right to do so. So it happens that in strongly religious societies it is where is manifested with a greater intensity the domain that parents exercise over the children's lives, and it is not surprising that many times children, when become older and find strength to break their chains, do not want to know anything of their parents. It is then when these pitifully complain that their children have abandoned them and say "with everything that I've done for them... and look how they pay me for it!", when in reality they are only reaping the fruits of their bad seed. That is why I tell you that not only is "honour your father and mother", but understanding, respect and affection has to extend to the entire family, grandparents, parents, mothers, brothers, children, or grandchildren, especially to children, for being the weakest. The children, when they are young, are the most vulnerable and defenceless, and therefore they should be treated with a higher comprehension, affection and respect. You should never hit or humiliate the children. We have already talked about love to children with depth above, because it is very important. Therefore, understand this commandment in a broader sense, show love, respect and understanding to all of your relatives with whom you share your life, especially with the most vulnerable ones, who are the children.

Let's talk now about the fifth commandment, which is "You shall not kill".

This commandment cannot be clearer. This commandment is preserved such as it was given by the spiritual world. There is no room for interpretations. Not to kill is not to kill, not to take life. We know that the spirit is immortal and, fortunately, nothing of what human beings can do is going to end up with that immortal life. The only thing we can do is to interrupt a physical life. But the physical life is one of the gifts that the spiritual world gives to the spirit. The physical life is the stage in which the spirit is put to test on what it has learned in the spiritual world. To the spirit, the physical life is necessary for it to evolve as much as for the body the air that breathes to live. Hence is why there is an instinct, the one of survival, which it programmes to human beings so that

they conserve their life and that of their offspring even before that they are aware of their own existence. In removing the life it is run out the opportunity of evolution of a being and this is something very negative from the spiritual point of view. Therefore, while this simple but fundamental commandment is not respected, the terrestrial humanity cannot be considered sufficiently prepared to give the evolutionary leap that it aspires.

Well, I think that there is no criminal code in the world that does not condemn the murder.

Certain. But it seems that the human being makes distinctions between some deaths and others. Some lives seem more important than others, and it legitimizes the murder in many cases.

What are you referring to?

If a man kills others in times of peace, he is a serial murderer and surely justice will condemn him. If that same man kills others, in times of war, and they are on the enemy side, then he is a war hero and his Government will give him a medal. But if that same man defects from the army because he doesn't want to kill those men, then his Government captures him and condemns him as a traitor, and it can even come to execute him. If a man blows a bomb that kills thousands of people in times of peace, then he is a terrorist, he is pursued as such and condemned if he is caught. If a commander orders the army of his country an attack with bombs on an enemy country and thousands of people die, he is accomplishing his duty; and to the murdered, if they are military, they are called "down" and if they are civilians, "collateral damage". If that country wins the war, this commander will be remembered as a hero and history will remember him with honours. Streets and schools of his country will take his name written. In many nations of the world there is the death penalty in the criminal code depending for what crimes, and it is applied to "do justice".

The conclusion of all this is that you apply the commandment of "do not murder" with an addition, which is like the small print of the abusive contracts: "You shall not kill... to who does not deserve it. But if he deserves it, then it is well done." Now it is only needed to find a good excuse for the person who is going to be murdered to deserve it, because everyone who kills or orders to kill believes to have reasons to do so.

What opinion do you have about wars?

The killings and collective massacres that you call wars are some of the most serious crimes from the spiritual point of view. It is not only because it skews the physical life of countless beings, but also for the destruction and suffering generated for the survivors. Therefore I say unto you that it is also a very important spiritual advice not to promote war. The highest managers of the wars will face harsh and prolonged sacrifices to repair all the damage they did.

But many times the one going to war does not become aware of the damage that he is doing, but he goes convinced to be doing something good, like defending the country, his ideals or his religious beliefs.

He misleads or he is deceived. There is nothing that justifies the murder of human beings, nor homeland, religions or ideologies. Therefore, there is no Holy War. It is an invention of human beings wanting to introduce God in the middle as a means to justify their lust for power and wealth, and convince others so that through fanaticism they accept to become the executioners of their brethren. You will not promote the war neither will participate in it, as there is nothing to justify it.

I would like you also to give me your opinion about the death penalty, since in many countries of the Earth is considered a fair form of punishment for the most serious crimes.

The death penalty, wherever it comes from, regardless of the reason, is somewhat infamous, heinous, horrible, repulsive and repugnant from the spiritual point of view. With such a deep sadness we contemplate that precisely the states claiming to be the most religious and believers in God are those who more often apply the death penalty as a punishment for criminals. In what to be better than a murderer if justice representatives are equal to the convict when running a punishment equal to the offense committed? In some countries still crueler, the death penalty is even applied for misdemeanours, even though some of them are not punishable from the spiritual point of view, as when women are executed for to have been unfaithful to the husband, despite the majority have been obligated to marry someone who they did not love.

Three monotheistic religions, thousands of millions of people from hundreds of countries recognize as divine some commandments, among which one is "you shall not kill". But how many actually respect it in practice? If it seems that those who are considered more believers in God are those who respect it less? It occurs frequently the case that there are people who consider themselves fervently religious, that they accomplish with all the rites and rules of their religion and that they are scandalized of those who do not accomplish them, but they are at the same time the most insensitive and ruthless ones, because they do not have the least respect for the life and the suffering of others, since they support the death penalty or encourage their children to enlist in the armies to exterminate in the war their brothers from another country, firmly convinced that it is God who blesses them.

Anyone who wants to be considered a true believer in God must be completely against this horrendous crime disguised as an act of Justice, and has to know that it is not God who encourages him/her in the belief that the death penalty is something fair, but this one is fed by the fanaticism of those who want to make from their own selfishness a God to their own image and likeness.

What is the fate of the incarnated ones who committed murders, or were responsible for the death of someone or many people, once they die?

They are often held in certain areas of the lower astral plane, commonly called by some spirits as the Abyss. They stay there for a longer or shorter time, according to the load of the crimes that they committed if they were greater or smaller, along with others who had committed crimes similar to theirs. In these places they revive over and over again scenes of the crimes committed, perceiving it in this case as if it were their own the suffering lived by their victims, which makes them suffer greatly. These beings haunt among themselves and can be tormented by little advanced disincarnated victims that preserve desires for revenge.

When they show signs of awareness of what they have done and of repentance, they are rescued from the Abyss by more advanced spirits who transfer them to relief centres where they receive care in their recovery, and they prepare them for the rectification of their crimes, which starts at the spiritual plane, for example attending to the rescue of those who were in the same situation and, once the time is up, it continues when they return to incarnate in the physical plane with lives dedicated to the repair of the damage they did.

And what do you have to say about suicide?

A suicide is equivalent to the killing of oneself and from the spiritual point of view it is something negative, as you are wasting an opportunity for spiritual progress. It equals to an exam not submitted. What you interrupt at that time you will have to deal with it in the next life.

What is the fate of the victims of suicide in the spiritual plane?

They usually enter into a state of bewilderment in which they recall again and again the moment when they cut their life and perceive the pain felt by their loved ones as if it was their own. In this process they become aware of the futility of the act

committed. When they show signs of awareness and repentance they are prepared for a new incarnation, which tends to be fairly immediate, where they will have to face the same tests that they came to overcome in the life suddenly interrupted.

What do you think about euthanasia? Is it justified in some cases, for example in the case of incurable sickness or terminally ill patients?

We have already said that life is sacred and should not be cut before it reaches the time of death occurring by itself. Interrupting life, albeit with the good intention of preventing suffering, is something negative from the spiritual point of view. Keep in mind that if life would be cut to every person who lives a situation of suffering, there would not remain anyone alive in the world. All circumstances affecting the human being, congenital diseases, paraplegia, everything has a meaning that it is helping the spirit to evolve. They are tests chosen by that spirit before to incarnate. To stop them before time forces them to come back at another time to complete the unfinished test, which it does not help them at all. Sometimes the spirit who lives that situation of suffering, crows and wants to escape from it by cutting the life, but it is not by this way how he/she will get it.

And in the case of terminally ill is euthanasia justified?

If they are dying, what sense does it have to advance their death? Let them die by themselves.

I guess that the meaning is to shorten their suffering, because many of them experience unbearable pains.

Relieve their pain then, but do not cut off their life.

And in the cases of prolonged coma? Is euthanasia justified?

Neither is it justified. When someone has completed his/her time of incarnation and must leave the earthly world, from the spiritual

world he/she receives help to detach from the physical body as soon as possible. If the body remains alive, it is because that life has a meaning, because if it would have come the time to disembody for that spirit, nothing of what you would do could prevent its departure.

What do you think about abortion?

We talked earlier about this topic in depth and now we will not repeat it. The murder of a neonate does not stop being a murder just because you do not see the face of the victim or perceive how it suffers. Neither do the ones who order a bombardment see the faces of their victims and nonetheless does it stop of being less serious the crime they committed. The spirit linked to that being in gestation passes it as bad as people who are tortured to death. Avoid them that suffering and prevent yourselves from the suffering that entails of having been the executioners of your own children. Respect life, which is a very valuable spiritual gift to evolve, and do not interrupt it in any way or under any circumstances, not even with murders, wars, death sentences, suicides, euthanasias nor abortions, and thus you will avoid much suffering in you and in others.

The sixth is "You will not commit impure acts".

This is another commandment that has gone changing over time because, in the Catholic or Christian translations of Deuteronomy appears as "You shall not commit adultery".

And which is the correct version?

Neither of the two. Take the Hebrew version of the Ten Commandments that appears in Deuteronomy and you shall fall on the account that the original translation of the commandment is not "you shall not commit adultery", but "you shall not prostitute" which is to say, "you don't force anybody to maintain unwanted sex". This commandment would also encompass arranged marriages, because it forces to one or both spouses, usually women, to keep unwanted relations. This means that no one may be compelled to keep unwanted sex, neither inside nor outside the marriage.

Keep in mind that at that time the rights of women and children (especially girls) practically did not exist. They were treated only slightly better than cattle. From the earliest childhood trade was made with them, especially with those belonging to the most disadvantaged classes. They were bought and sold as slaves and prostitutes, to satisfy the low instincts of those who could afford them. Kidnappings and rapes of women were the order of the day. In the wars they were often considered spoils of war, raped by soldiers and later dedicated to prostitution and slavery.

Arranged marriages were also the order of the day. The families themselves considered a good business if they managed to marry any of their daughters to someone with money and power. The marriages of girls with adult or elderly men or between boys and girls by interests of the parents were very frequent. Practically we could almost say that more than 90% of the marriages were determined without the weaker spouse participating in this decision, since they were decisions made by parents when children were still small or were not even born. The powerful and ambitious people used the marriage as a way to accumulate greater wealth or power, annexing neighboring domains or simply to satisfy the whim of possessing sexually who they pleased to have. Polygamy for men was something normal and a sign of power and wealth, and it was well regarded. Imagine the suffering of all those women and girls subjected to all these abuses and extreme humiliation. The intent of this commandment was to put a stop to all those abuses. But the selfishness of the human being was responsible for perverting this commandment also and made from the victim the executioner, and from the executioner, the victim, because since quite soon it punished the woman forced to prostitute herself, and not to the pimp, the rapist or the forced "husband", or parents who negotiate with the lives of the daughters, who are the ones that prostitute and violate the commandment.

What would be the reason why there would be an interest in modifying that commandment? I mean, when and why it goes from being 'you shall not prostitute' to "you shall not commit adultery"?

If the powerful person openly raped and prostituted, it was clear that he breached the commandment "you shall not prostitute". Arranged marriage and polygamy were in reality forms of cloaked prostitution and rape, only afforded by the most powerful people, because in return they had to be responsible for the maintenance of wives or concubines and their offspring. In reality, all this occurred long before Moses was born and it was very widespread. He was aware of all these abuses, which generated in him a great indignation, and he attempted to legislate for avoiding they to continue committing, leaning himself on a Divine Council. While he was alive he could restrain the most flagrant abuse cases. But when he was no longer, the powerful interpreted the commandment at their convenience. They did not dare to change the commandment. What they did was to add new laws of their own invention that were darkening the meaning of the original commandment. The first thing was to give the image that the arranged marriage, polygamy and to own concubines was "pleasing to God" and that the marriage itself was a sacred institution. Later, to avoid loading with the maintenance of the wives who they were not interest in, they invented the repudiation and loaded on women the faults of the repudiation, misinterpreting the law itself in a selfinterested way, under the accusation that they practised prostitution. In some cases it was true that these women had sexual relationships with another man, just that one who they were in love with, since being forced to be wives of the powerful, they could not establish an opened relationship with him, and so they lived their love in secrecy. Other women, after being repudiated, they had no other choice than to resort to prostitution to survive, as they were completely excluded from society, whereupon they end up just confirming the false accusation which had been made on them.

Catholicism was more daring and finally it changed the commandment to give all the importance to the institution of

marriage and none of it to the freedom of choice for a partner, as the powerful of later times were still using the arranged marriage as a weapon of satisfaction of their selfishness and they were not willing to resign to it. That is why they introduced the concept of adultery and used it in the redefinition of the commandment, which became "you shall not commit adultery", to punish the spouse who had sexual intercourse out of wedlock. In practice only the woman was convicted of adultery, since Catholic society was deeply chauvinist, as it was the Hebrew one, the man remained leading the double life he wanted, without anything happening to him.

Notwithstanding of what you say, societies which are considered more religious still consider that arranged marriage is something normal and pleasing to God and it is a common practice. What you have to say in this respect?

Do know that arranged marriage is a form of institutionalized rape to which has been given the appearance of "honesty". So that there is not any doubt in this regard, I will add that from the spiritual point of view it deals with a flagrant violation of free-will, a horrendous manipulation made from the feelings of a person, because it forces her to live and maintain a sexual relationship with someone who she has not chosen. In addition, she is prevented to break free from that slavery under a multitude of threats and blackmail, among which is to make her believe that, if she does not submit, she is a dirty, impure person and that she disobeys the designs of God, which also violates the commandment of "you shall not use the name of God with selfish purposes".

But then is it adultery something negative from the spiritual point of view or not?

We have already discussed this issue widely when we touched the topic of relationships and we said that fidelity to the feelings is the only thing that matters at the spiritual level, as it is the key to happiness. Fidelity spontaneously arises when there is a feeling of

mutual love of a couple between spouses, and this can not be forced. Your conventions hardly matter here. If a marriage union is forced, rest assured that there will be a complete rejection, an aversion to sexual intercourse with the forced spouse and a desire for a relationship chosen voluntarily, including sexual intercourse. If it is a voluntary relationship but there are no feelings there is dissatisfaction, loss of appetite and even a rejection of sexual intercourse and an unfulfilled desire that seeks to be satisfied in another relationship. In these cases infidelity, adultery or as please you call it, is a reflection of the absence of feelings between the spouses, that they themselves undertake or are required to keep a relationship without love and seeking outside of that relationship what does not lie within it. Then the problem is in wanting to force or prolong unwanted marriages.

Etymologically, the word adultery comes from to adulterate, to alter the quality or purity of something by the addition of a strange substance, or also to falsify or manipulate the truth. These meanings bring us closer to the spiritual definition that should have the word adultery. An adulterated relationship is done when two people come together as a couple under the guise that there is a feeling and there really is not. It is to say, the union of the couple is manipulated or falsified, the purity of the union is altered when this is not done by love. When relationships of couples are based on a feeling of mutual love and affinity will not exist adultery in its spiritual definition nor in the earthly one, because in being united to the beloved, the sexual relationship with the partner will be truly full and then other relationships will not be searched to satisfy the sexuality.

But for this to be possible it is necessary that there exists freedom of feeling. For this reason I say to you that this commandment, the one of "you shall not prostitute", since mankind has advanced enough to assimilate it, can be reformulated currently in this way: "You shall respect the freedom of feeling". Said in another way, every human being has the right to choose freely who wants and does not want to have relationship with, including sexual intercourse, and no one can break that right. Therefore nobody is

forced to join another person if he/she does not wish it, nor is forced to perpetuate a relationship if he/she does not desire it.

Depending on what you have exposed, in what situation would remain the indissolubility of marriage, so praised by the Church?

We already said it previously. The extension of a relationship, if there are solid feelings within the couple, it will be made spontaneously, whether or not there is a signed marriage contract. But it cannot be forced, because this would be attacking against free will. Therefore, the indissolubility of marriage is not a divine law, but human and it does not come from Moses or Jesus. In fact, it is a standard that was introduced more than a thousand years after the passage of Jesus on Earth. If you review your history you will see that divorce was current during the reign of all the Christian Roman emperors. The civil law in the time of the Christian emperors allowed remarriage after divorce. Also it was in all the States that were originated after the fragmentation of the Roman Empire. Pope Gregory IX (1227-1241) was who, at enmity with the emperors and Kings of the time, in seeing that these were accustomed to change women oftenly, he imposed by Decree the indissoluble marriage on the Christian kingdoms.

Then does divorce not contravene any divine law?

Of course not. On the contrary, it allows that free will and freedom of feeling can be exercised. As we have said, no one is obligated to perpetuate a relationship if they don't wish it and is not going to be the spiritual world who puts obstacles to the free will and to the freedom of feeling of humankind.

There are people who interpret that the increase in the number of divorces is a reflection that there is a decrease in the feeling of love within couples. Are they right?

No. It is a reflection that there is greater freedom to break relationships and that people feel freer to break off relationships when they are not satisfactory to them. If there were no more

divorces before, it was not because relationships were better, nor because there was more love, but because either the law did not allow divorce or well because, although it allowed it, the repressive education made many people to feel obligated to continue the relationship even not feeling in love.

Since we are talking about the commandment "You shall not prostitute", I'd like you to give me your opinion about prostitution, from the spiritual point of view.

Prostitution is a reflection of the little progress that exists regarding the development of feelings, as an advanced spirit does not conceive to maintain a sexual relationship without love, and much less without having a mutual desire between those who hold it. The one who satisfies him/herself with the sexuality of prostitution reflects poverty of feelings and predominance of instinct over feeling and sensitivity.

Yeah, but how should one legislate concerning prostitution? Should one allow it or ban it?

It should be banned in all cases involving minors, and pimps as well as customers should both be pursued, in this case child molesters, and to protect children for they not to suffer again any kind of abuse. In the case of prostitution involving adults, forced prostitution should be banned, i.e. when the person exercising prostitution has been forced or pressured in some way to exercise it, and justice should pursue those who forced him/her into prostitution, because they are violating their free will, and also to the customer if this one is aware that the person is exercising prostitution against his/her will. The person who has been prostituted must be protected to prevent more damage to be suffered. Also Governments should also seek the support of people with limited economic resources so that nobody exercises prostitution out of economic necessity, because there are those who resort to it as the last option to earn their livelihood or the one for their family, because there is no other way to get it, therefore this is a form of prostitution in which society itself is

complicit. However, it cannot be forbidden when a person, with full possession of his/her faculties and by free and voluntary decision, without having a need for family support, wants to sell his/her body. Although a decision like this reflects little progress on the inside, it is not an object of violation of their free will, as they exercise it by their own will, nor does the customer incur in crime, as he/she did not force the free will of the person who prostitutes him/herself.

On the other hand, I will add that a total ban on prostitution, as it is your world, where there is a great demand for satisfaction of the sexual instinct quite primitive and a lack of respect for the free will, would not work to eradicate it. Rather it would result in an increase in the cases of rapes and sexual abuses and for prostitution to be exercised in a clandestine manner. If we look well at it, people who are voluntarily engaged into prostitution in your world prevent many rape and sexual abuse, since they satisfy voluntarily the low instincts of many little advanced spirits, who in the absence of such a possibility would seek sexual satisfaction by force. Therefore, the eradication of prostitution in your world cannot be produced forcibly, but that will happen when humans increase their sensitivity enough as to make sexual desire pass from being a satisfaction of a biological instinct, to transform into the expression of a couple's love feelings. And for all this to happen it is necessary that human beings can have freedom of feeling and freedom regarding their sexuality. Then, sexual relationships will be natural and not a business nor a source of exploitation.

The next commandment is “You shall not steal”.

Yes. Usually, one understands by stealing the theft, the act of removing to other people a material possession belonging to them without their consent, and it considers as thieves only the pickpockets, the assailants of banks, jewellery stores and other establishments. But I say unto you that the one who deprives the worker of the fair wage to enrich themselves with it, the one who accumulates power and wealth at the expense of the prejudice,

the suffering and the need of others, using deception, fraud, blackmail, although the laws never reach to find his/her crime, that one is the biggest thief existing. Therefore the commandment of "You shall not steal", can be grouped in one only set with the "You shall not say false testimony nor lie" and the one of "You shall not covet the property of others" since they all form part of a same intent, the one of harming others to satisfy our own selfishness. Accordingly to it can be enunciated a Council which brings together the three mentioned, which would be this: "You shall not act moved by selfishness to harm others." The more materialistic selfishness manifestations are avarice, greed and ambition, because they are responsible of people surrendering to the accumulation of wealth and power without paying attention to the damage they cause to others. But also other manifestations of selfishness which are not materialistic, as all the egofeelings that we discussed in the theme of personal relationships as attachment, jealousy, hatred, rage, absorbency, resentment and spite, they cause harm to others.

If one person is enriched without causing harm to others, does this one incur in some kind of spiritual debt or does he/she violate the maxim of "you shall not act moved by selfishness to harm others"?

It does not violate the commandment, but it also does not reflect a great advance, since the advanced spirit does not aspire to wealth nor wastes its time and effort to become rich, because nothing attracts it of that condition. It may not cause prejudice directly, but if it has got the wealth or the material power and does not employ it in helping others, but rather to satisfy material whims, then it wastes a good chance of helping others and advance towards its own evolution in love, because although it could have done much good it did not. If a spirit incarnated asking for material wealth for the common good, and once incarnated, it is dedicated to using it to meet its selfishness, it fails in its mission. In any case, in your world, it is difficult for a person to become rich without harming anyone, unless it is because he/she receives an inheritance or wins the lottery, because in your way of work in the economy and trade rules the law of the

strongest, and people of good will can hardly thrive in a system so aggressive without being infected with their bad practices.

What are you referring to exactly?

Well about the economic system that prevails in the land, the one you call capitalism, is a system that is born of the selfishness of the human being and contradicts this commandment from beginning to end, because one can say that it is a system that allows and pursues the disproportionate nonstop enrichment, without the slightest respect for human rights.

I don't understand much about economics, but the truth is that I feel it quite complicated to understand what it is that moves the global economy, with so many macroeconomic indicators. I note that there are many inequalities, injustices and much poverty being increasingly more, and this is exacerbated in times of economic crisis like the current time. It seems difficult to me to glimpse a better future for the human being so and as we are and nor do I see what is the solution.

It is easier than it seems, although it makes us to believe that everything is complicated and that nobody is responsible for things to work that way, so that you do not see any solution or you cannot ask responsibilities to anyone. Your current economic system is like a large pyramidal type company. It is based on a sophisticated system of loan with growing interests where each intermediary goes increasing the interest for making a profit, choking the one who receives the money ultimately and does not lend it, as this one must return the loan and interest with his/her work or his/her production. These, which are at the base of the pyramid, which are the majority, are those who hold the entire system with their effort. The rest of them live from usury and speculation, because they also create markets for speculative trading, where they obtain profit based on buying cheap and selling expensive whatever.

Some of the products that are bought and sold are real, such as agricultural products, those of farming, fishing, mining or industry, while others are fictional products, what are called "financial products", such as stocks, bonds, and investment funds. In reality, nowadays everything is very simple: a few have appropriated the right to mint coins. I.e., they have the machine to make money. They make practically free money and lend it to all others with interests, which everyone is indebted to them, and with this system to get everyone to do what they want, speculating in the markets that they created, always with privileged information enabling them to buy cheap and sell expensive.

Does this have something to do with the economic crisis?

Yes. Economic crises do not occur by coincidence, but they are generated from the top of the pyramid. First it is provided the loan at a low interest to promote the debt. To those of the below part of the pyramid, after passing through several intermediary steps, arrives to them that money borrowed with higher interest rates and they use that money to operate their businesses or acquire goods, which results in an activation of the economy and an increase in consumption. This is what is known as good economic times. There is an appearance of wealth and welfare, but it is only appearance, because everything has been built with borrowed money, which has to be returned with interest. When fishermen from above observe that many fishes have bitten the bait, i.e., that there are many indebted people, they pull the line to collect their prey. I mean, at a determined moment they close the tap of the loan. This makes the money shortage. For obtaining credit there has to be paid a higher interest and the loans that have already been granted also increase their interest rate. All this hinders the economic activity. Those who were indebted cannot cope with the loan payments and they are divested of all their goods. The standard level of life of the population significantly worsens while all the wealth that has been generated in this period passes into the hands of those who dominate the system. The rich are becoming richer and the poor

ones each time are becoming poorer. So, this is how an economic crisis is produced.

And what solution has all this?

The solution is very simple: give up selfishness, greed, avarice, each one in the position in which they are, and start to share, to see the other as oneself and to seek the welfare of the other just like that of oneself. If everyone gave that step the world would change quickly. This system is held because avarice, greed and ambition abounds in the human being, and love and generosity are scarce. There is reluctance to share. The one who has a lot does not conform with what is having. He/she does not plan to share his/her wealth with who has less, but he/she aspires to have even more, more money and more power, albeit at the cost of harming others. Many of those who have less wish to be like the ones above, succeed in life and be rich and powerful. They would do the same as those who have a lot in their circumstances. So that is why it is not enough with the change of the ones who are above, but there has to be a change of general awareness, which covers every human being, in the sense of recognizing that in reality we are all spiritual beings, siblings who share one same path, that of spiritual evolution, and one same destiny, to become happy through experiencing love, and whereas, to that end, we need each other. It is necessary to understand that to accumulate wealth is useless because it doesn't make us happy, but to deprive us from what we need to live, it does generate suffering, whereupon, if there is everything in abundance and we share what there is, nobody comes out harmed and we all finish up benefiting. But I repeat, for that, you have to give up the accumulation of wealth and be willing to share.

That seems to me very nice but very utopian. I think that there should be more concrecion in the measures.

There is not any recipe book of measures to take, if that's what you ask me, because everything depends on the intention and

good will of the human being to renounce selfishness and of a greater disposition toward fraternal love and sharing. Without that predisposition, every effort would be useless. There should be a desire from most of people favourable to make changes that will lead to a society based on love, a good willingness to cooperate actively in its implementation, because nothing can be done by imposition or without cooperation of everyone in general. We should choose as rulers people who have a high spiritual capacity, loving people, humble, of great generosity, completely devoid of greed, avarice and ambition, knowledgeable of the situation and willing to apply measures that promote the common good, social justice and equitable redistribution of wealth. They would know what to do in every moment. One of the things that should be done more urgently is dismantling all of that economic system based on usury and speculation and to enact fairer and equitable laws that pursue and avoid self-serving practices to control the world again. So the commandment "You shall not act moved by selfishness to harm others," would be completed in the following way: "You shall promote the common good and social justice and equitable redistribution of wealth".

So after having analyzed three commandments at a stroke now we only have one: "You will not allow impure thoughts or desires". What do you have to say about this?

This commandment does not exist. It is not even picked up in Deuteronomy. It is of a later invention. Neither do the Protestant Christian churches include it. It would be too much to ask the human being, that one who finds hard to act without selfishness, not even to have selfish thoughts. The term "impure" is also quite ambiguous, although surely it refers to the sexual desire that does not fall within the canons allowed by Church, i.e. when there is produced a sexual desire outside of the relationship of marriage. It is a command created by the human being in order to suppress freedom of feeling, thinking and sexual freedom.

So if we have combined three commandments in one, and we have eliminated another, we are left with seven commandments and not ten.

And who said that they had to be necessarily ten? Well, it doesn't matter because there are three tips more that I'd like to add that seem to me to be quite important and that you should keep very much in mind.

Which are they?

You shall respect the free will, shall respect the law of spiritual justice and shall solve conflicts, individual and collective ones, in a peaceful way. These three tips are very closely linked between each other, as the resolution of conflicts in a peaceful manner implies fairness and respect to the free will of others, individually and collectively.

Could you delve a bit into each one of them to clarify what they mean?

Yes, although we already talked about this when we mentioned in what consists the law of free will and the law of spiritual justice. To respect the free will is to respect the freedom of others, that is, respecting their will, their opinions, their beliefs, their feelings and the decisions they take regarding their own life. The freedom of feeling is no more than a variant of free will. No one belongs to anybody, so nobody has the right to appropriate the will of others or to decide for others. To abide by the law of spiritual justice is to treat others as you would want to be treated and not do to others what you would not want them to do to you, because in reality all that you do to others you are doing it to yourself. And this must be respected as much in individual form as in collective form.

I have it clear about the individual form. But at the collective level, what do you mean?

As to humanity as a whole, to be able to coexist in a harmonious way, has to respect justice and free will and put it into practice, and that has to be reflected in the functioning of societies, in the

forms of Government, laws, economy, education and culture. And although in theory some countries of the world collect in their laws the principles of freedom and justice, in practice the selfishness of the human being is responsible for throwing them away and they only remain like wet paper.

Any example of what you say?

Formal slavery is illegal in all countries, but practically all mankind is governed under an economic and political system which tolerates and encourages the exploitation and abuse of the human being in a manner so similar to formal slavery that it merges with it. Many countries hide under an appearance of democracy in governments that pretend to serve the people but that actually are served by the people to satisfy selfish purposes, or that appear to want peace but which promote war and justify it for it to seem that it is the only option to resolve conflicts, when in fact they never sought another option. The one who doesn't see another option is because his/her selfishness, ambition and greed blind him/her and he/she wants to get his/her own whatever it costs. But there's always another option if there is will, respect and understanding for others and willingness to renounce selfish attitudes. Therefore, keep in mind this tip which will avoid you much suffering to you and to others: you will solve conflicts, individual and collective ones, in a peaceful way. Do not ever use violence, coercion, or blackmail, nor ever impose your will over others, even if you consider yourself to be in possession of the right opinion.

This generates me some doubts. If a person is attacked, abused or coerced, to sum up, if that one feels his/her free will infringed by another person in any aspect of his/her life, does he/she have to allow this abuse to avoid a conflict, or does he/she have the right to defend him/herself?

Of course he/she has the right to defend him/herself. Not only he/she has right to defend him/her self but also the duty to do so, because it is just as important to respect the freedom of others as

to defend one's own freedom. It is not about avoiding conflicts on the basis of submitting oneself to the will of the strongest, but to solve them avoiding violence. But this does not imply to have to reach to the level of that person.

Any example that could serve us to clarify this point?

If a woman receives mistreatment from her husband she should not tolerate it under any circumstances. But this does not mean that the way to avoid it would be to respond with the same aggression, as this would make her equal to the aggressor. It is logical to move away from the aggressor and denounce the mistreatment, for justice to handle it.

But surely the offender is going to be more enraged with these measures and he/she can increase his/her level of violence, so the conflict becomes more violent; that seems to contradict the message of resolving conflicts peacefully. What answer can you give me in this regard?

Violence is not generated by the victim with his/her actions, but by the aggressor because this one has not come out with what he/she wants to get. It is the aggressor who must apply the advice that here we give you to resolve the conflicts without violence, and not the victim. Please, do not confuse being peaceful with being submissive, because they are different things. Here we recommend to be peaceful, but to not be submissive. A good example which will clarify for you the difference is that one person who by being pacifist refuses to serve the military in those countries in which it is mandatory. Do you not call this one unsubmissive? A pacifist is unsubmissive with violence, and acts with consistency and firmness in his convictions. He does not allow others to force him to do something that his conscience tells him is wrong, which thus he is fighting so that his free will is not infringed on.

And at a collective level, if a country is attacked or invaded by another, does it have the right to defend itself or not?

It has the right to defend itself, but it must always exhaust the peaceful way. There you have the example of Gandhi to check

that there is a difference between being submissive and pacifist, and how the conviction in fair and noble ideals, the will and the firmness, can get big things without resorting to violence. Wars, armed conflicts in general, are not produced overnight, nor those who have the will to generate them are the majority. Generally there are some selfish interests behind the armed conflict, the desire to take possession of something by a few ones, and these are those who deceive others to make them the dirty work. Separate the ambitious belligerents from governments and you will see that all wars and violent conflicts are generally preventable.

Well, I think that what Gandhi achieved is an exception, because it is normal that the stronger always imposes on the weaker. And even so there were many innocent victims.

There would have been more victims if there had been a war. And even if it was as you say, understand that the goal of life is not the political struggle, it is the spiritual advancement. And although you may believe it is unfair for one country to invade another, and you finish up that the stronger finally seizes the weaker, you must think that the invaded ones of today may be invaders of the past who now live the same they made others to suffer. Review history and you will see that struggles between peoples have been a constant in the history of the human being and the oppressor and oppressed position has gone changing over time. The peoples who were oppressed become oppressors with ease, because if they were not before it was not because they didn't want to, but because they could not. And this is because in all the towns, in all races, spirits were embodied with a very primitive selfishness, full of ambition, greed, and avarice, who struggled among themselves to see who came to be the most rich and powerful. This is what has pushed and still pushes human beings to fight against one another, ambition, greed, avarice and fanaticism. But all empires, by very powerful that they came to be, have broken down over time, because that which it is not based on love is ephemeral. What has to be learned from all this is that selfishness in the form of ambition, greed, and avarice generates much suffering, and that nobody is glad to live that

suffering, so that each one must fight to eliminate that selfishness from the heart. When this lesson is learned there will be no more fights between countries, peoples, races and religions, because the spirits that embody will have very clear that no reason justifies damage to one's brother, because it would be like to hurt one's self.

THE MISSION OF JESUS ON EARTH II

I find it surprising that, if reincarnation is so important to the process of spiritual evolution, Jesus does not speak in a clear and direct way about reincarnation.

Yes he did it. He also spoke of the spiritual laws and everything concerning spiritual evolution in a clear and simple way. Another thing is that the information you have from him is correct and complete.

And are there documentary proofs of it?

Nobody of your world knows all the truth about Jesus, about his personality and his work. Barely been left a few snippets from part of his thoughts, his personality and from the message he came to transmit. And of the little good that has been left, most has been modified, manipulated or hidden to the people by those who have ruled and rule your world since then. And so they continue maintaining it, since their intention is that none of this can be known, because they consider that the truth harms their selfish interests.

Then is not all this information new?

Of course not! This is the same message that has been taking place throughout history in different parts of the globe. Transmitters were, in fact, always the same spiritual envoys, with higher level of development than the average of the planet, connoisseurs of the law of love and the rest of spiritual laws, but known by different names according to the historical era in which they lived.

And why have we not been connoisseurs of it?

We have already said it.

When the spiritual envoys disappear and the message remains in the hands of less advanced spirits, these are infiltrating their selfish ideas in the original message, without it being avoided, because the original transmitters are no longer there to rectify the deviations. In the concrete case of Jesus, it also occurred the same. With the passage of the centuries, the message that Jesus

gave was adulterated, always to favour the powerful, or to not harm their interests. The true teachings were modified consciously hiring scribes who eliminated what the powerful didn't want anyone to know and adding what suited them to be.

And what type of teachings were the ones omitted?

The same ones as we are giving to know now. Knowledge about the reincarnation of the souls and the law of evolution. The right of each being to decide themselves about their life and their feelings. The call for the protection and the respect for life and the rights of the weak and defenceless, beings, including animals. All of those messages that condemned and denounced the selfishness in all its manifestations, such as avarice, greed, hatred, abuse and exploitation of some beings by others, everything was removed consciously or modified so that its original sense would not be recognizable.

And why did Jesus not avoid his teachings to be manipulated once he left?

Because neither Jesus nor any other envoy from the spiritual world can force the world to do what they want, as it would be a violation of free-will. The only thing you can do is to incarnate newly to redo what human selfishness undoes.

Do you mean that Jesus will come back to embody on Earth? Ie, will he come back for a second time?

Yes. But it will not be for the second time, but just once more of so many others that he has come.

Then are they true the prophecies of a second arrival of Christ?

We have already said that Christ does not incarnate, since he is a very advanced evolutionary entity, who surpassed the human phase of evolution many eons ago, and what he does is to influence over spirits in the stage of human evolution when they incarnate with a spiritual mission. But it is true that Jesus will return to incarnate. Although, as I have said, it will not be the second time. But he will not come to put himself in front of the Catholic Church, as some expect. He neither will be well received by

many who are considered Christians, primarily by the hierarchy, because, among other things, he will come to dismantle all the falsehood and error that the Church has created in his name, as he did two thousand years ago with the Hebrew Church.

Why in asking you earlier about whether Jesus would return to incarnate newly on Earth, you answered me speaking of Christ, and now that I ask you about Christ you answer me speaking to me of Jesus, is it that they are two different entities?

Because you identify Jesus with the Christ. And it is true that when Jesus will return to incarnate he will count with the inspiration of Christ. But it is also true that Christ can inspire to other beings of great evolution when it is necessary for them to return to incarnate in order to continue with the work of spiritual evolution.

I understand from your words that the Christ has inspired other beings apart from Jesus.

Of course.

And can that Christ inspire to less evolved beings, even when there has not yet been produced the incarnation of the Messiah?

Of course, since Christ in particular, and in general the advanced spiritual beings, are not limited to uniquely inspire to one only being at specific moments, but to all the beings who act moved by unconditional love, although if they are not belonging at a level as high as the one of Jesus. Whether the connection with Christ and other evolutionarily advanced entities could be more or less intense is going to depend on the degree of evolution of the incarnated being. Many want to be "elected" to feel important, and pretend to want to love, but they are not willing to give up their selfishness. The spiritual world helps anyone who wants to move forward on the path of love. But the one who acts motivated by selfishness, cannot expect that spiritually advanced entities honour him/her in his/her goals. The choice, therefore, is from one self, and it consists in choosing between selfishness and

love. Depending on what you choose you will attract towards you some influences or others.

How do we have to understand that Christ-Jesus combination? Is it like a state of Christic consciousness?

The Christ is a much evolved spiritual being existing the same as each one of us, with its own will and individuality. Therefore it is much more than a state of consciousness, since a state of consciousness is not a being, but a manifestation of a being. Certainly the connection of a human with the Christ allows the human beings to expand their consciousness until much higher limits than the ones they could cover by themselves, and to be under the inspiration of this super evolved being allows them to act with much greater clarity, courage and determination for the assigned mission rather than if they would only count with their own capacity.

What is the most advanced being after God? Is it incarnated? What concrete and general mission does it have?

If you say it whether Christ or Jesus are beings immediately below God in evolution, I already can tell you in advance that it is not. The spiritual Universe is very large and there is an infinity of very advanced beings, more than Christ and Jesus. The birth of these beings is so earlier in time that it would be impossible for me to explore up until so far in the history of evolution, which does not have a beginning, since God has always existed and never stopped creating. You believe, with your limited conception, that the maximum help these beings can deliver is going down to the planet incarnating into a human personality. That is why you even believe it as normal that the same God incarnates into a human, when you consider Jesus as the incarnation of God himself. With scant broadmindedness that you have, you cannot even imagine how far the ability of these super evolved beings reaches. They have under their charge responsibilities much bigger than the ones you can imagine, such as creators and directors of an infinity of worlds and humanities; an incarnation into a human personality would be to restrict its ability to act to an infinitesimal part of its potential. Therefore, they do not

incarnate into human personalities, since it would be similar to expect that a human being would incarnate into the body of an ant for taking the life of an ant. That is why, they are beings evolutionarily closer to you, the ones who assume these type of missions, although they do not stop being assisted by beings of a higher evolution.

And why if Jesus was not the direct incarnation of God or of Christ did he say about himself I am the way, the truth and the life?

Jesus never uttered that phrase such and as you know it, because he could not personalize in himself a message that was universal. It is a simplification of the following message: I came to show you, as an envoy from the spiritual world, the path of spiritual evolution, the truth of the spiritual world and what the life of the spirit really is.

You said that Jesus had come more times before, do you mean that Jesus has embodied more times in the past, before coming in the personality of Jesus of Nazareth?

Of course. He was incarnated previously on Earth, in ages of antiquity in which your official history neither collects nor admits it.

And what did he do in those other lives?

Jesus was like you, like all of you. And when he evolved enough, he came as a spiritual messenger.

But before coming like Jesus, I guess he also realized similar missions in the past. Is there any historic record of what he did?

The missions are spiritual works that are making their mark in the souls in all periods of history. And although history books do not collect it, or they do it in a different form, the work is not fruitless, because the spirit which is touched in its inside by the spiritual message, will never forget this teaching and it will manifest it in its later incarnations. When Jesus came to leave his message of

love, he did it in different periods and places around the world. The great commitment of Jesus was to find a way to convey to the people of those times that all the bad things of the world were a result of selfishness. And also the power to transmit them the basic spiritual notions for they to understand the process of spiritual evolution and spiritual laws in the simplest way possible. But the world of the past did not recognize him, nor was it willing to implement the changes he proposed, since the majority of the people of that time, compared with the current one, were very limited, both in intelligence and sensitivity. That is why they were much fascinated by the acts, for them supernatural, that Jesus performed, but they did not understand the deep spiritual message transmitted by him. They knew he was an exceptional being, but did not understand him. Only a few, his closest disciples, came to understand him.

Therefore, it is necessary to continue with that same labour. And those who understood him in the past are responsible to continue his work in the present, for helping in the present those who, due to a lack of evolution, did not understand his teachings in the past.

Is the new salvation of Humankind depending on the incarnation of Jesus, or can they be saved without his incarnation, since he had already incarnated in the past?

The "Salvation", if we understand it as a spiritual change toward the love of human beings, does not depend on the incarnation of any advanced spirit in particular. If many people come to make a change in a simultaneous way, this will provoke a positive change towards love at the collective level, let's call it "salvation of mankind", but it does not depend on anyone in particular, but of all in general. We have said that the spiritual advancement depends on what each one makes and decides by him/herself. We cannot burden Jesus, or other beings of great evolution, with the obligation to make evolve to other siblings of lesser evolution. Advanced spirits can, with their example, help other beings to awaken, but evolution is individual and voluntary. Not even God, who is omnipotent, forces you to move forward.

Perhaps one of the consequences of this lack of understanding of Jesus' mission is the fact that we have believed that with his coming our sins were going to be redeemed.

That's it. Because if he could save all mankind with his sacrifice, it would mean that the human being, doing well or doing evil, shall be saved even against their will and their merits. And this would go against free will. The coming of advanced spiritual beings to the planet always has the aim to instruct humanity for themselves to take awareness and evolve. Whether they do it or not, it already depends on themselves.

Then if the salvation of mankind did not depend on Jesus dying on the cross, I don't know to what extent this big sacrifice was necessary.

Look, the choice of Jesus was to come to this world to convey a message of love for humanity, knowing that as a result of it he had the risk of being killed. At a certain point in his life it was made known to him clearly, through visions, that as events were developed it was going to be produced his murder by crucifixion and it was given to him the option to retire, since the higher spiritual world fully respects the free will, and never forces to do anything to anyone, not even to those who it is known that they are completely related.

And if he knew that he was going to be killed, why did he not avoid it? Would this not be a kind of suicide, which, as you say, is contrary to the spiritual law?

It is not that he wanted to be murdered, nor that he had a special predilection to die crucified, if it is that what you mean. But for his personal courage and example that he wanted to give of taking his message of love to the ultimate consequences, he decided to continue. I said that the merit of Jesus was not in to have died on the cross, but the courage that he had to fulfil his mission of Messenger of God, because despite knowing that it was going to cost him a tremendous suffering that would end with his martyrdom and murder, he accepted this sacrifice despite everything.

Then, if Jesus did not come to redeem our sins, is it Jesus the Savior who is announced in the Old Testament or not?

Jesus indeed he is the envoy who is announced in the Old Testament. A different thing is that he came with the purpose with which the Catholic Church has made us to believe, or with the one that the people of Israel expected of him. Israel hoped for a political king, similar to their King David, who would free them from the foreign dominion and would turn them into a conqueror country. But Jesus didn't come with that purpose. His mission was for all humanity, not as a material ruler, but as a Messenger of God, transmitter of the truth of the spiritual world, who came to take the confused humanity out of the darkness, lost in misinterpreted, absurd and erroneous beliefs. He came to show the true path of spiritual evolution to a humanity totally confused about its concept of God and human evolution, and completely trapped in selfishness.

And may it be that some big avatars or prophets collected in history, I'm thinking about Moses, Krishna or Buddha, were previous incarnations of Jesus?

None of those who you have mentioned was Jesus. Although they were indeed the messengers of God, i.e., envoys from the spiritual world, with the same mission as Jesus. All served for the same cause, and their work was more or less successful, according to how receptive were the mentalities of the peoples among which they incarnated.

Could we say then that Jesus and Buddha are the more evolved beings who have been on planet Earth?

Among the ones you know, yes.

But is it not true that the Jewish people rejected Jesus because he saw his ideas opposite to the law of Moses?

Not all the Jewish people. It was the Hebrew clergy and people who let themselves be influenced by them. And the ideas of Jesus were not contrary to the law of Moses, but to the laws which the Hebrew clergy had been established for the people,

using Moses as a cover. Therefore, he did not come to abolish the law of Moses, but to show it again as it was given originally, stripping it of the lies and manipulations that had been subjected, and to give it compliance.

Do you refer to the Ten Commandments?

It turns out that the Ten Commandments is one of the little things that has been saved, although some of them have been altered to change their original meaning. We have already discussed this widely and will not repeat. The true writings of Moses were short, simple, yet spiritually true. Nothing to do with the so-called Pentateuch, that is attributed to Moses, which was written sufficiently after he died and is full of altered, fanciful stories and unspeakable acts ordered by the leaders of the Hebrew people, who, to justify themselves and to silence the dissenters, they attributed it to God or Moses.

Let's go back to Jesus. The last time that Jesus was incarnated on Earth, was it two thousand years ago or has he come any other time more since then without us having recognized him?

The last time he incarnated it was as Jesus 2000 years ago and since then he has not returned to incarnate on Earth.

Is Jesus currently incarnated on Earth?

No. Not yet. But it is missing a few time.

The decision to incarnate, and when that incarnation is going to be produced, does he take it or another higher entity?

He decides it by his own free will, knowing what the evolutionary necessities of the planet are and what the most favourable moments are to achieve a greatest depth of the message.

How long in time exactly is missing for him to come back to incarnate?

I cannot answer you that. He will return in a not-too-distant future, depending on how the events are going developing. But not yet in this generation. But by now are incarnating since some time ago the ones who are going to prepare the ground for him.

What do you mean with that “the ones who are going to prepare the ground for him”?

That the spiritual missions are not isolated and individual works, nor they are improvised, but they are prepared conscientiously and in detail long before being carried out. They are collective aid missions involving many beings which, although not as evolved as Jesus, act in harmony with him, with the purpose of making humanity advance spiritually. Some assist and cooperate from the spiritual plane, and others in the physical one, incarnating before, during and after the main Messenger does it.

What consists in that preparation?

In giving to know the message, on a small scale, so there is already a good predisposition in people to the spiritual message, so that when the avatar incarnates, its message would have a greater depth.

What characteristics does the planet need to have for a greater quantity of evolved beings to be manifested?

We have already said that spiritual assistance missions are not new now, but are linked with work done at other times. The same spirits incarnate in different times with the same purpose, the less advanced ones try to learn the basic notions of love and the most advanced ones with the responsibility both to further develop their own capacity to love, as well as educating on the love to those who less know it, preaching with their example.

With the measure that the "educator" spirit progresses, its missions go acquiring a greater depth. As the less advanced spirits go also evolving as a result of that work, the number of spirits who understand with a greater depth the significance of the spiritual message and they decide to put it into practice goes increasing, and they themselves become also to be transmitters of the message. In each spiritualising wave, more spirits go progressively adding themselves to the cart of the evolution and this makes every time the number of advanced spirits to be higher. Therefore

the incarnation of a greater number of evolved spirits is a reflection that the spiritual level of humanity is increasing.

What you just said about the incarnation of a larger number of advanced spirits is occurring, makes me remember a passage in the Gospels where supposedly Jesus says: "You will do greater things than I!" You will be agree with me in recognizing that until the day of today, the things he did have not been matched by no one and already two thousand years have passed. Was Jesus wrong in saying this or is it that also this assertion is misunderstood?

He is referring here to something we have said previously, and is that when human beings evolve enough, they will be able to reach the evolutionary level that Jesus had when he incarnated on this planet. And since there is no limit to the evolution they can also get to higher evolution levels. This means that in that state of evolution they will have the same capabilities or greater than those that Jesus had when he incarnated on the planet. If yet there is no one who expresses an ability to love so great like the one of Jesus on your planet is because it still has not gone long enough so that not even the more evolved beings from your world have reached that level. Although to you it means a long time, spiritually speaking 2000 years is a short period of time. Therefore neither is wrong, nor is the message manipulated, it just happens that it still has not arrived the time when that statement is to be accomplished.

There are many people who they consider themselves spiritually advanced and they say they are God's messengers. Are they right?

The majority no. They express a desire for notoriety they have, fed by their desire for prominence, that is not a reality. The advanced spirit is recognized by its capacity to love and its humility, and by the respect for the ideas and beliefs of others. Many of the people who claim to be God's messengers flaunt that alleged condition and used this supposed superiority to impose on others and make a profit. Those who boast to be more than others and also want to impose on others are lacking humility and are

lacking respect for the free will. In that it is known that they are not what they claim to be.

In speaking of a new incarnation of Jesus it has come to my mind that the Apocalypse seems to announce that coming. Is this interpretation correct?

Yes.

But the Apocalypse makes a prediction of events regarding the future of the Earth, many of them of a catastrophic kind. Are these predictions certain? Can you clarify a little this topic for me?

The Apocalypse, as I said, is a vision of the possible future of the Earth that John had. Within that vision, he had access to certain events that could occur on Earth in the future, some caused by humankind and others, a consequence of natural geological changes, which he tried to convey, according to his ability, to the people of his time, and also the events and transformations that humankind would experience during that period. It can give the sensation of that, telling everything at once, everything was going to happen very quickly, but in reality these events span a quite prolonged period of time, of thousands of years, at the end of which is going to be produced a spiritual advancement in humanity. The Human being will then take consciousness of its origin, of its destiny, of the existence of a spiritual world and of the discovery that there are entities above it, starting with God, Christ, Jesus and other beings unknown to you or for those you don't have a name for, who love it, who watch over its spiritual development and its happiness.

The same as the Apocalypse speaks of the coming of Christ it is also spoken of the reign of the Antichrist. My question is does it exist the Antichrist? Is he going to incarnate? If so, when?

We have already said that there is no omnipotent being in the evil, nor any spirit incarnates with the manifest purpose of doing harm. If it ends up doing it is not because it brings this purpose as if it were a spiritual mission. No spirit incarnates with a negative purpose in advance, but rather by their lack of spiritual evolution it leans towards evil following the impulse of its own selfishness, once incarnated. Therefore, if you expect that the Antichrist to be a powerfully bad being, which incarnates with the purpose to destroy the world or to destroy Christ or to his followers, I tell you now that it doesn't exist.

And if it does not exist, what is the sense with which it is used this word in the Apocalypse? Or is it one more manipulation of the Scriptures?

The evangelist saw in the events of the future that there was a big selfishness in humankind, which was governed by selfish values opposite to love. In addition, part of the message was encrypted for it to be more difficult its later manipulation. In this context, the Antichrist is a symbolic figure, who represents the selfish, ambitious and ruthless facet of man's lack of evolution, which, as a result, it acts causing great damage to fellow beings. It is selfishness personified. And the reign of the Antichrist represents the world governed by selfishness. If we assume that the message of Christ is the unconditional love, the anti-Christ is the one who acts against the Christ, i.e., that it is strongly contrary to love.

Then characters like Nero, Napoleon, and Hitler, who did a lot of damage to humanity, were they or were they not the Antichrist?

The historical figures that you mention who have been identified with the Antichrist were extremely selfish people, who driven by ambition and the desire for power, have caused serious harm to humanity. But like them there have been many in history, there are and there will continue being while selfishness makes comfortable camp in the world. How you call them does not make them neither better nor worse, though perhaps it makes them more important and scary in the eyes of the world.

This about the end of the world, the Apocalypse, brings me also to remember the Mayan prophecies, setting in the year 2012 events of a catastrophic type for humanity...

You mean that Westerners have wanted to see in the Maya writings that, because if you ask to the descendants of the Maya they will tell you that it is not so.

But is it going to happen something apocalyptic, as a planetary cataclysm, or the beginning of a third world war which would destroy humanity in 2012 or not?

In 2012 it is not going to happen any of that. Natural disasters will continue occurring, the ones we have now more or less in the same proportion, but none will be so strong as to cause a destruction of a planetary scope. You are very worried of natural disasters, which you cannot avoid and just a few about the ones you can prevent, which they are the wars and barbarism, the work of the human being. The warfare conflicts, unfortunately so prevalent in your world, will continue developing more or less on the line of the ones that currently exist and it will continue so until there is a change of consciousness toward love. But nothing that destroys the Earth or humanity, for the moment. If you remember, at the end of the last century there was a similar psychosis which predicted different catastrophic events by the end of the century or beginning of the next, which supposedly rested on the prophecies of Nostradamus. And the year 2001 passed and none of that happened. It is fanaticism, fantasy and the ignorance of many people what has made a mountain from a molehill. People who get carried away by these bad omens are trapped in a psychosis of fear or hallucination that prevents them from focusing on what's important, which is the spiritual evolution. We have already said that the fundamental change that is approaching is of a spiritual kind and that is not limited to one year or one specific date, but that it covers a time which may be of hundreds of years. The one who awaits the end of the world for 2012 is going to be tremendously disappointed.

Also in different parts of the world, there have been manifestations of supernatural type with some apocalyptic air that have had much impact. I refer to the so-called Marian Apparitions of Lourdes and Fatima. Is there some truth in it, if it is that they are?

What is true is that there exist spiritual beings who communicate directly with people with mediumship capacity, with the purpose to convey messages, some of a more personal type and others of a collective type. In general, these apparitions usually do not have large repercussions because the people who have them tend to be discrete and do not give publicity to these facts, because they know that most likely they are labelled as mentally unbalanced. The cases of Lourdes and Fatima acquired notoriety for the fact that they were seen by children and these told with all naturalness what they had seen.

But in the specific case of Lourdes and Fatima it is said to be the Virgin Mary who appeared. Is it true? What was the message transmitted by her?

No, it was not Mary the one who appeared, although this does not have greater importance. It is true that they were advanced spirits who appeared with the physiognomy of a woman. But they never said to be Mary. They tend not to give a name or, if they give it, they are generic names. The identification with Mary usually occurs because children identify it with the characters of religious beliefs in which they have been educated, or because after the visions they have been conditioned by the adults so they can identify them with Mary. The message they give tends to be very clear, in the line of what we're talking about, that the human being is in the world to evolve, that for doing so it has to develop its capacity to love and let go of selfishness.

Sometimes they warn about the future risks that at a collective level lead the selfish individual and collective attitudes, as future military conflicts. But then the Church appears and manipulates all messages to its convenience, and shuts up on which it is not

interested in giving to know because it harms its interests. Above all it makes believe that the emergence of the supposed Virgin Mary is a call to the conversion of humanity to its religion to get more proselytes or to ensure those it already has. Fanaticism and superstition make all the other, making those places into pilgrimage centres, which provide huge profits at the expense of the fanaticism and the ignorance of the faithful.

**And what is the third secret of Fatima if it is possible to know?
Does it have something to do with the end of the world?**

If the spiritual world would want to keep a secret it would have not revealed it to the world. It is the selfishness of the human being, above all that one of those who hold the material power of the world, who keep the revelations of the spirit world under key and they do not want to make them known by the fear to be uncovered. In any case do not slice your brains for it, because what it was said there, has already been revealed in other ways.

THE FAREWELL

One of the times when I was relaxing talking to Isaiah, he said to me:

-HELLO BROTHER. TODAY I WOULD LIKE YOU TO GO OUT OF YOUR BODY BECAUSE I WANT YOU TO SEE ONE THING.

And immediately then I was out of body catapulted at full speed towards the interior of one of the glass pyramids that were part of that place so precious where Isaiah used to take me. He took me to a place that seemed a kind of circular exhibition hall. In the centre of it there was kind of a small circular stage surrounded by surrounding stands. In the centre of the stage there was something like a support holding a crystal stone that seemed Quartz, very large and well carved.

-SIT DOWN WHERE YOU WANT AND WAIT- he told me.

After me the stands began to be filled with other people who were also accompanied, like me. I understood that those people were incarnated as I, and figured that their companions, by the way they were dressed, with tunics, and by the light they released, that they were their guide spirits. They sat down the same as I did while the guide spirits, the same as Isaiah, they went to the centre forming a circle around the support with the stone. They all held hands. At a certain moment the light of the room was mitigated to almost shut down. Later we began to see how the crystal of Quartz lit up little by little, and suddenly we saw how the light of the crystal impacted on the roof and activated some unknown mechanism which made all the centre of the arena to light up, like forming a kind of luminous cylinder. Later the luminous cylinder was expanding until to include us all who were in the room, like if it would put us inside. "DON'T BE AFRAID, NOTHING CAN HAPPEN TO YOU." PAY ATTENTION TO WHAT YOU

ARE GOING TO SEE"- we could hear in our minds. Gradually the light was blurring and we began to see images. It was like a 3D movie but much more real, because it was as if it were inside, with a total realism. The images were so perfect that I would have said that I was really in that place. We started to see men who seemed politicians to make speeches in front of a lot of people and the people applauded and roared fervently. Although I didn't understand the words, I could perceive the thoughts. Politicians obeyed the orders of other beings whose appearance we never got to see, but that were dark and transmitted flows of darkness to the politicians who spoke. They were inciting them to make a war. As the measure that the politicians talked, the flow of darkness was spreading as if it were a mist over the public and penetrated into them so that they stayed like if they were permeated with that dark fog. I discerned like a great current of fear, hatred and fanaticism that struck me deeply. Then, the images disappeared and others appeared where armies were paraded. Later we started to see images of aircrafts, battle tanks, warships, tanks, shuttles of missiles in full activity. We saw soldiers with machine guns getting ready to get into action. Then we began to see bombs falling and explosions that they destroyed everything in its path. We saw the way in which died a lot of people, men, women and children, some riddled with bullets, others blown out by explosions of bombs, others burned. We also saw how soldiers took women and raped them without any regard and later killed them without any contemplation. We saw prisoners beaten and tortured to death. Cities, towns, fields completely destroyed, corpses and bodies scattered everywhere. It was the most horrible that I've seen in my life because all that happened as if I were right there. I was in a state of shock, so we were all. At a certain time it was like if we would ascend suddenly in a ship and saw all the destruction from above. We began to see missiles along the sky and we saw what happened when one of the missiles made target over a very large city. It was produced an enormous rumble, at the same time that an explosive wave of fire was extending at high speed, razing all with an impressive capacity of destruction.

A huge cloud of gigantic dust was formed. I don't know how to calculate the extension that was razed but it was huge. In a short moment we descended again at the level of the ground, at a distance quite far from where that bomb had exploded. I saw the shape of the cloud. It was similar to the mushroom from the explosions of the atomic bombs of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, but the sensation I had was that they were much more powerful and destructive detonations. We saw exploding various similar nuclear bombs in different places. The spectacle was Dantesque. In some places there was nothing standing. Nothing. All razed completely to dust and ashes. Elsewhere there were ruins where dead bodies could be seen destroyed everywhere. We saw in some places how some survivors emaciated and covered with rags moved without a certain destination, trying to run away from the most devastated areas. That vision passed. And then we began to see another vision of a place where the Earth began to tremble and it opened in many points. There were produced very strong earthquakes that destroyed what little remained standing. Volcanoes were also formed in many places, and lava flowed through all the places razing everything along an already devastated Earth's surface. In a different moment we experienced a much greater rumble, which I have no words to describe. The land of that place was sinking. Simultaneously we saw images of different places, all going through a similar cataclysm. The sinking of the land made giant waves being formed in the surrounding seas, in the manner of gigantic tsunamis which when they reached the coasts of the continents that had not sunk razed everything in an enormous, difficult to determine extension. The sudden contact of lava with the water caused huge water evaporation.

The sky was completely covered with very thick clouds. Storms and huge tempests beat everything, and the light of the sun ceased to be seen. We were then moving away progressively from the Earth's surface until to completely see the terrestrial sphere from space. The aspect of it was bleak. No longer was seen the blue of the sea nor the brown and green of the continents, nor the white of the clouds.

A sphere was seen completely covered with a dense, gray atmosphere that prevented us from seeing the Earth's surface. Such a big sadness, to see what had been the fate of our world! There the vision ended. The cylindrical screen lessened again until the middle of the room, and then it was turned off.

The light of the projection room turned to be intense. All of us attendees were in a state of shock. We saw how one of the guides was approaching to the middle of the room and pulled out the quartz crystal, replacing it with another one. Before we had time to react the cylinder turned to be reactivated in the same way as the previous time, and newly the cylindrical screen of 3D images returned to surround us. We went back to see the same politicians of yesteryear, the ones who made speeches in favour of the war, with the dark entities transmitting negative influences. But this time they did it in studios of television.

They were communicating through television, the decision to enter into war against other countries. But people reacted in a different way to the previous vision. They also formed crowds, but this time was not to support their militaristic rulers, but to protest against them. The manifestations were massive. Leaders tried to quell the protests by giving orders to the army and the police to act against the people. But the soldiers and policemen themselves refused to abide by the orders of assaulting their fellow citizens and joined the protest. We saw the fall of these rulers against the impulse of popular rebellions and how they were arrested and imprisoned. This happened simultaneously in all the countries that were going to enter into war. We then saw appearing other people who transmitted very different sensations from the ones of the politicians. These were accompanied by luminous beings who transmitted luminous flows, and they spread them over the others. They released humility, serenity. We saw how a halo of light extended from them towards the people transmitting them peace and love. These new leaders enacted the cessation of all violent activity and formed a kind of World Congress to decide what would be the new direction for humanity. We saw another vision where all war machines were dismantled and melted, the armies were dismantled and all those who had contributed to take the world on the brink of war

were brought to trial. The vision disappeared. They made us know mentally that we were going to see the changes that had been produced in the world after this decision, after a certain period of time that I didn't know how to specify. Everything had changed for the better. We saw people in their daily activities. There were no wars, there were no conflicts, there was no poverty nor inequalities. Humankind lived in harmony. The face of the people was seen and they emanated happiness. The vision finished, the same as before, with an image of the Earth seen from the exterior. What a so great contrast with the first vision! How beautiful it looked now, compared with the previous vision! The luminous cylinder returned to shrink until the middle of the arena and then it turned off. The lights were lit. I was shocked and excited in the extreme. I saw others and found that they were also as impressed as I was.

There had been many very strong emotions and conflicting ones in a very short time. The guides were spreading around the circle that they had formed and met with their protegees. I could see how they transmitted them waves of energy to help them to recover from the impact of the experience lived. In a few time all of them had disappeared from the room. "IT IS ALSO TIME FOR YOU TO GO BACK." It was Isaiah the one who spoke to me. I noticed a strong pull and a free fall that led me directly into my body. However I did not wake up immediately, but rather I stayed in a state of paralysis.

-LET'S TALK A LITTLE WHILE BEFORE YOU WAKE UP. WE DO IT THIS WAY FOR YOUR MIND TO REMEMBER IT BETTER.

-Who were they?- I asked.

-THEY ARE PEOPLE LIKE YOU, INCARNATED SPIRITS OF YOUR WORLD- said Isaiah- THEIR COMPANIONS WERE BROTHERS OF THE SPIRITUAL WORLD WHO HELP THEM.

-They looked very affected- I said.

-YES. AND ALSO YOU. MANY OF THEM WILL NOT REMEMBER CONSCIOUSLY THIS EXPERIENCE. IT WOULD BE AN IMPACT TOO STRONG FOR THEIR EARTHLY MIND. BUT THEIR INNER BEING WILL REMEMBER IT AND WILL HAVE IT IN COUNT.

- What is what we have seen?- I asked.

-WHAT YOU HAVE SEEN ARE TWO DIFFERENT POSSIBILITIES OF THE FUTURE OF YOUR WORLD. THE FIRST ONE IS THE POSSIBLE FUTURE IF HUMANITY LETS ITSELF TO BE TAKEN BY SELFISHNESS AND THE SECOND ONE IS THE FUTURE AWAITING IF THE DECISION IS TO LEAN OVER TOWARD LOVE.

-Then nothing of that has happened yet, nor has reason to happen necessarily. I mean that I would not like the first possibility of future to occur.

-EXACTLY. NOTHING OF THIS HAS HAPPENED. YET.

-And are there more possibilities of future, apart of the ones we have seen?

-YES. THIS THAT YOU HAVE SEEN ARE THE NEGATIVE AND POSITIVE EXTREMES. THERE ARE INTERMEDIATE SITUATIONS. BUT BASICALLY ALL THE POSSIBILITIES CONVERGE, IN GREATER OR LESSER TIME OF DEVELOPMENT , TOWARD ONE OF THESE TWO. THEY ARE THINGS THAT ARE NOT GOING TO HAPPEN OVERNIGHT. BUT IT IS GOOD THAT YOU KEEP A PERSPECTIVE MORE LONG TERM, FURTHER OF THE TIME THAT ONE INCARNATION LASTS.

- And who are watching these possibilities about the future?

-THOSE INCARNATED PEOPLE WHO WANT TO ADVANCE SPIRITUALLY. THE SAME AS THE ONES YOU HAVE BEEN TODAY, MANY INCARNATED HUMANS ARE BEING TAKEN BY THEIR GUIDES ALONG THE NIGHT, WHILE THEY SLEEP, TO WITNESS THIS KIND OF PROJECTIONS ABOUT THE FUTURE.

- And for what reason?

- IT IS PART OF A PREPARATION OF YOUR INNER BEING, FOR YOU TO TAKE AWARE OF THE CONSEQUENCES THAT YOUR ACTIONS HAVE AT A GLOBAL LEVEL, AND SO YOU CAN DECIDE WITH KNOWLEDGE OF THE FACTS IN WHAT SIDE OF THE BALANCE YOU WANT TO BE, IF IT IS IN THE SELFISHNESS SIDE OR IN THE ONE OF LOVE.

-I don't think that anybody wants to live the situation of the first possible future.

-OF COURSE. NOBODY WANTS TO SUFFER. THE ONE WHO ACTS SELFISHLY ALWAYS THINKS THAT HE NEVER IS GOING TO SUFFER THE CONSEQUENCES OF HIS/HER ACTIONS. WHAT WE TRY TO MAKE YOU UNDERSTAND IS THAT EVERYTHING IS INTERCONNECTED AND WHAT YOU DO TO OTHERS SOONER OR LATER WILL HAVE REPERCUSSIONS ONTO YOU. ON ALL OF YOU.

-But why this vision in concrete. It is very upsetting.

-BECAUSE ONE PART OF HUMANKIND OF YOUR PLANET IS ACHIEVING SUCH EXTREME OF EGOISM AND OF CAPACITY OF DESTRUCTION THAT IS PUTTING IN DANGER THE SURVIVAL OF ALL HUMANKIND. ARE YOU GOING TO COOPERATE IN THAT DESTRUCTION, OR ON THE CONTRARY, ARE YOU GOING TO COOPERATE TO TRY TO AVOID IT? BECAUSE EVERYTHING DEPENDS ON YOU, ON YOUR FREE WILL. AT ANY MOMENT IN THIS OR IN OTHER LIVES IT WILL BE YOUR TURN TO CHOOSE ON WHAT SIDE YOU ARE. THE FATE OF THE WORLD IS IN YOUR HANDS.

-Pfff!, the fate of the world is in your hands. Such an enormous responsibility! It is too much for anyone!

-UNDERSTAND THAT THE FATE OF THE WORLD DOES NOT DEPEND ON THE ACTIONS OF A SINGLE PERSON, BUT ON THE ADDITION OF MILLIONS. EACH ONE CONTRIBUTES A LITTLE BIT WITH HIS/HER LOVE OR SELFISH ATTITUDE FOR THE WORLD TO BE A LITTLE BETTER, OR A

LITTLE WORSE. ALTHOUGH SOME CAN DO MORE OR LESS DAMAGE, OR CONTRIBUTE MORE OR LESS LOVE THAN OTHERS, DEPENDING ON THEIR ABILITY AND WILLINGNESS TO DO GOOD OR EVIL. IT IS LIKE ONE OF THOSE COMPETITIONS OF STRENGTH IN THAT TWO TEAMS WILL FACE OFF BY PULLING ON ONE END OF THE ROPE TO TAKE THE HANKERCHIEF TIED IN THE CENTER TO THEIR FIELD. YOUR CHOICE CONSISTS IN TO KNOW ON WHAT EXTREME OF THE ROPE YOU WANT TO PULL, THE SIDE OF SELFISHNESS OR THE SIDE OF LOVE. THE HANKERCHIEF OF THE GAME IN THIS CASE IS THE FATE OF YOUR WORLD. THE MORE PLAYERS PULL ON THE SIDE OF LOVE, THE MORE POSSIBILITIES THERE ARE THAT THE FATE OF THE WORLD LEANS OVER TOWARDS LOVE.

-And how is the competition going at this moment?

- IF I TELL YOU THAT IT IS GOING WELL THEN MAYBE YOU RELAX YOURSELF, AND IF I TELL YOU THAT IT GOES BADLY THEN MAYBE YOU LOSE HOPE. HOW DO YOU THINK IT GOES?

- Well then, you are not going to tell me anything. I was thinking so. I believe that by the moment selfishness wins. But I see that people are changing side, because they are realizing that things, as they go, are not going to end up well. I mean that before they pulled from the extreme of egoism but they have changed and now they pull from the side of love.

-AND THERE ARE MANY OTHERS THAT FOR A WHILE THEY PULL OF ONE SIDE AND AFTER A WHILE THEY PULL FROM THE OTHER, AS IT SUITS THEM, HA HA...

- I don't think this topic should be taken as a joke.

-I DON'T TAKE IT AS A JOKE. I ONLY TRY TO TAKE SOME IRON OUT OF THE ISSUE, BECAUSE I PERCEIVE THAT YOU ARE AFRAID AND IMPACTED FOR WHAT YOU HAVE LIVED. BUT YOU WILL RECOVER YOURSELF. WELL, NOW IS THE MOMENT OF ME TO SAY GOODBYE.

- Are you leaving, so soon?- I said to him.

-IT IS TIME FOR ME TO GO BACK HOME. HERE WITH YOU I FEEL GOOD, BUT THERE I AM BETTER. DON'T WORRY. SOON WE WILL SEE EACH OTHER AGAIN. LOVE, BROTHER. A HUG FOR ALL THE FAMILY. YOU KNOW, OUR DEAR HUMANITY.

END

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS FROM THE AUTHORS.

It is our express desire that the message manifested through this work may reach everybody in a totally free and disinterested way, in accordance with the philosophy of unconditional love which we have described, in other words, giving without expecting to receive anything in return.

For this reason, we support and allow the free distribution, of the entire or partial reproduction of this work, by all means currently available, on condition that it is not done for profit nor its contents modified.

Our intention is that this production goes expanding with the contribution of everyone. If you have any questions about the subject of the book, that is to say, about spirituality and love, whether these are personal or general, feel free to express them and send them to us via email and we will be pleased to try to reply to them as soon as possible. Those questions that are considered of a general interest and mean new and valuable contributions to the aim of this production, will be included together with their answer in future publications. In this book, THE LAW OF LOVE (THE SPIRITUAL LAWS PART II), have been already incorporated some of the questions made by some readers of THE SPIRITUAL LAWS PART I. We also request the collaboration of those people interested in translating this work into other languages, altruistically, so that its message can reach the greatest number of people possible.

If you would like us to travel to your city or town, because you consider that there are a sufficient number of people interested in listening to a talk on the subject of this book, please let us know. It does not matter whether your city or town is in another country or continent, we will try to respond to your request as far as we can. The talk itself will not incur costs for those requesting it, as we do this totally free of charge and altruistically, and the transport and accommodation expenses of the trip will be

charged to our account. The condition is that admission is always open and free of charge to all those interested.

Send your request to:

Vicent Guillem Primo

Email address: thespiritualaws@gmail.com

On our Web Page (<http://thespiritualaws.blogspot.com>), you can download the book free of charge in electronic format, request a paper copy and consult the schedule of talks about the book.

With all our love to you. See you soon.