



Vicent Guillem Primo holds a PhD in Chemistry from the University of Valencia. He works as a researcher in the determination of genetic predisposition to cancer.

He is the author of the book The Spiritual Laws. The Law of Love is his second book.

The content of this book is a message of love for you.

I hope that it will help you to know your feelings better, that it will allow you to distinguish the feelings of true love from the forms of selfishness that imitate love but are not, that you will seek to nourish the former and eliminate the latter, as this is the only way to be happy. I hope that you lose the fear of love, so that your life is a reflection of what you feel. I hope that after reading this book it will be clear to you that you have a fundamental right that you should not allow anyone to violate, and that is the right to freedom of feeling.

With all my love, for you.

P.V.P. Sale at a higher price is prohibited.
2€

THE LAW OF LOVE. The Spiritual Laws II.

Vicent Guillem

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.
Subtitle: The Spiritual Laws II
Author: Vicent Guillem Primo
Correction of the text: Raquel Martínez Sanchis.
Author of cover photo: Josep Guillem Primo
First edition, February 2012
Intellectual property registration number V-289-12
(Valencia, Spain).
Printed by: Grafo Impresores S.L.
Printed in Spain.

This work may be reproduced in whole or in part by any means currently available, provided that it is not reproduced for commercial purposes and its contents are not modified.

Official website of the book:
<http://lasleyesespirituales.blogspot.com>
E-mail: lasleyes.espirituales@gmail.com

INDEX

FOREWORD	4
INTRODUCTION	5
THE LAW OF LOVE	13
RELATIONSHIPS IN THE LIGHT OF THE LAW OF LOVE	20
INFIDELITY IN THE RELATIONSHIP IN THE LIGHT OF THE LAW OF LOVE	55
EGOSENTIMENTS IN COUPLE RELATIONSHIPS	59
RELATIONS WITH THE CHILDHOOD IN THE LIGHT OF THE LAW OF LOVE	76
LOVING THE NEIGHBOR IN THE LIGHT OF THE LAW OF LOVE	86
THE TEN COMMANDMENTS IN THE LIGHT OF THE LAW OF LOVE	105
JESUS' MISSION ON EARTH II	152
THE FAREWELL	167
FINAL CONSIDERATIONS BY THE AUTHORS	175

FOREWORD

Dear reader. If you are reading these lines, you have certainly already read the book *The Spiritual Laws*. That is why you will understand why I prefer to call you brother or sister. We began the foreword of *The Spiritual Laws* by saying that the content of the book was a message of love for all humanity. The content of the book you are about to start reading is still a message of love, for it is in fact a continuation of the previous book, where we will go even deeper into one of those spiritual laws, perhaps the most important one: The Law of Love. In this second part we will continue asking our friend Isaías all those doubts that we still have to ask about the meaning of life and about feelings. Many of the questions that you will find below are your own questions, the ones that you have sent us by e-mail, that you have asked us in meetings or in person. We have selected those that were of most interest to all of you and that had to do with the subject we are going to deal with: love.

I hope that it will help you to know your feelings better, that it will allow you to distinguish the feelings of true love from the forms of selfishness that imitate love but are not, that you will seek to nourish the former and eliminate the latter, as this is the only way to be happy. I hope that you lose the fear of love, so that your life is a reflection of what you feel. I hope that after reading this book it will be clear to you that you have a fundamental right that you should not allow anyone to violate, and that is the right to freedom of feeling.

With all my love, for you.

INTRODUCTION

Are you happy? No, don't answer me yet. Because I don't think it's a question that can be answered joyfully. Besides, I would like it to be a sincere answer, that you don't answer simply to make yourself look good by thinking about what answer I would like to hear. Don't think I'm asking you to be honest for my sake. You could probably fool me and that would be fine. I am asking you to be honest with yourself, not to try to deceive yourself, because your whole life depends on the answer to this question. Why do I think it is so important? Because I believe that the desire of every human being is to be truly happy. Don't you want to be happy? I look at people and I don't see that most of them are happy. They don't give off happiness. Why? Maybe we don't know how to be happy. Is it possible to be happy and how? I think we have all asked ourselves this question at one time or another, how can one become happy? Intuitively we relate being happy with knowing love. I am referring to the love of a partner. That is why we have often dreamt of finding that love that makes us happy. Some people would say no. It is not true. Love does not bring happiness because I have loved a lot and that love has made me suffer. They are people who associate love with suffering, and in order not to suffer they prefer not to love. But what is love, what are feelings, do we know what love really is? Let's leave this question open. We will have time to think about it a lot in the course of the book. Now I want to talk to you about another subject.

After my first contacts with the spiritual world and my first experiences with astral travel, a strong feeling of nostalgia for that world and at the same time a lack of interest in the life of this one awoke in me. My view of the world and of life had changed radically. If before I did not understand what was going on, now, after my first out-of-body experiences, I had the feeling that this world is like a kind of theatre where human beings spend their whole life playing a role, as if they were actors who, by spending so much time playing the same play, end up so deeply immersed in their character that they believe that their personality is that of the characters they are playing, and that there is no other reality than that of the play in which they are acting. I used to look at

people with the feeling that we were all robots acting mechanically, unaware of the true reality, entertained by banal and irrelevant things to which we gave a lot of importance. I am referring to the importance we attach to being successful in life, that is, to having recognition, fame, prestige, money or power. Most people put all their efforts into achieving these goals, as if their happiness depended on it. My feeling was that everything to which people attach so much importance was totally irrelevant to me, because in none of it did I find a reason to be happy, happy as I had felt when I was on the spiritual plane. At the same time, another concern made me uneasy, and that was to be able to remember completely all the details of my experiences on the spiritual plane, because even if I wrote down everything I remembered, I had the feeling that it was impossible to remember everything completely and expose as I had lived it. And so, when I tried to relax in order to detach myself from the body, I could not succeed. Disorganized thoughts came to my mind preventing me from the complete relaxation I needed. My conscience was not relaxed and calm enough for that experience to happen again. This made me even more nervous and helpless.

One of the many times I was trying to relax, lying on my couch, locked in the room, in almost total darkness, in complete solitude and silence, amidst the jumbled thoughts that came to my mind, I heard very clearly: DON'T WORRY. This startled me enormously, as when you are suddenly awakened when you are sleeping. My first reaction was to open my eyes and look around. It was dark. I fumbled to turn on the light. No one was there. Everything was quiet. I never heard any opening or closing of doors or any other noise at any time.

At that moment I thought to myself, could it be my imagination? I turned off the light again and lay back on the couch, trying to relax again through deep breathing exercises. But after a while I heard again very clearly: DON'T WORRY. This second time I was less startled, and instead of getting up, I remained completely still and expectant. I realized that the voice was not actually ringing in my ears. It was rather a voice speaking in my mind, like a very

clear thought, but not from myself.

- Who are you?- I asked mentally, just to try something, with no hope that the question would be answered. There was no immediate answer. A few minutes passed and nothing happened, so I relaxed again.

-YOU, MAN OF LITTLE FAITH. WITH ALL YOU'VE BEEN THROUGH AND YOU STILL HAVE DOUBTS? WHO DO YOU THINK I AM?

-Are you Isaías?- I asked.

-YOU TELL ME, DON'T ASK ME- he replied.

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

-FEEL AND DON'T JUST THINK AND YOUR DOUBTS WILL DISSIPATE. YOU DON'T SEE ME BECAUSE YOU ARE BOUND TO YOUR BODY. BUT YOU CAN HEAR ME CLEARLY AND THAT'S ENOUGH FOR WHAT YOU WANT.

-And what do I want? I don't know what you mean- I said.

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

-Yes? And why am I worried?- I said.

-YOU TELL ME. OR DO YOU WANT TO PLAY A GUESSING GAME? I'M SURE I'D BEAT YOU. NOTE THAT I CAN READ THOUGHTS. BUT I PREFER TO LEAVE IT FOR ANOTHER TIME, AS I DON'T LIKE TO PLAY WITH AN ADVANTAGE.

-Well, there are several things that worry me. On the one hand, I worry to see how people are, to see how they are suffering.

-BEFORE THEY ALSO SUFFERED AND IT DIDN'T WORRY YOU SO

MUCH.

-It's because I didn't realize it before. I mean, I didn't realize it like I do now- I said.

-OF COURSE, BECAUSE NOW YOUR SENSITIVITY HAS BEEN AWAKENED AND IT'S NOT THAT YOU SEE IT, IT'S THAT YOU FEEL IT AND YOU LIVE IT. THEY WERE SUFFERING BEFORE BUT BECAUSE YOU DIDN'T REALIZE IT, IT DIDN'T AFFECT YOU. NOW THAT YOU ARE AWARE IT AFFECTS YOU. IT'S VERY NORMAL. BUT SUFFERING YOURSELF IS NOT GOING TO STOP THEM FROM SUFFERING.

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

-SO START AT THE BEGINNING. HA HA!

I felt a bit annoyed because I had the feeling that Isaías was making fun of something that for me was very serious. And of course, he noticed it right away.

-DON'T GET ANGRY. DON'T THINK IT'S NOT AN IMPORTANT ISSUE FOR ME, THAT'S WHY I'M HERE. I WAS JUST TRYING TO MAKE YOU LAUGH A BIT TO RELAX. DON'T YOU KNOW THAT HUMOR AND LOVE ARE RELATED? LAUGHTER IS A REFLECTION OF INNER WELL-BEING, OF HAPPINESS, JUST LIKE LOVE.

-I'm sorry, I'm just very touchy.

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

-It may sound silly, but I don't know how to get this message out, and I'm also worried that I won't remember what I've been through. I also feel that I don't know enough to be able to spread all that people need to know. I don't see myself as prepared, and

I myself have many questions. How will I be able to clarify the doubts of others if I am not clear?

-YOU WILL, BECAUSE I WILL HELP YOU.

-I don't think you understand me. Even if you help me, I'm afraid I won't remember what you've told me later, when I return to the body.

-I UNDERSTAND YOU, BUT YOU DON'T UNDERSTAND ME BECAUSE YOU'RE CONFUSED. I TOLD YOU BEFORE NOT TO WORRY ABOUT THAT. EVERYTHING HAS A SOLUTION AND EVEN MORE SO AT THIS TIME OF YEAR. CAN YOU TALK?

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

-YOU DIDN'T UNDERSTAND ME. NOT WITH THE MIND. NOW WE COMMUNICATE WITH THOUGHT. I MEAN IF YOU CAN SPEAK WITH YOUR VOICE, MAKE SOUNDS. REALIZE THAT YOU ARE STILL ATTACHED TO YOUR BODY.

-I don't know. I haven't tried it- I answered.

-TRY IT, BUT TRY NOT TO LOSE FOCUS.

I tried to do what Isaías was asking me to do. That's when I realized what Isaías had told me. I was still in my body, even though I had forgotten it. I mean, I hadn't been paying attention. Now that Isaías was asking me to speak is when I started to notice it, even though it didn't seem to respond to my commands and I hardly felt it. I felt like I was paralyzed, numb. I tried to move my mouth to speak, but I could not. I was in my body but I couldn't 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 feel a tingling sensation in the area of my head, coming in at the crown of my head, very pleasant and soft. The tingling went progressively down the inside of my head to the neck area. It was as if I was suffering an electric shock, but of very low intensity and not at all uncomfortable, but very pleasant. The tingling had like pulses of greater and lesser intensity and circulated from the top of the head to the neck as if it were a jet. This stopped the numbness in the head area, although the rest of the body was still in complete paralysis.

-TRY NOW- he said.

It was still difficult to move my mouth, but now I could move it a little, although I couldn't articulate a word. I could only barely swallow saliva.

-I'm having a hard time- I thought.

-KEEP TRYING.

I was moving my mouth and tongue for about five minutes without anything happening, until finally I could emit a small whisper, which sounded more like a guttural snore.

-CAN YOU STILL HEAR ME?

-Yes- I answered mentally.

-THAT'S ENOUGH FOR TODAY. WE WILL PRACTICE THIS EXERCISE IN OTHER SITUATIONS.

-And what is the point of this exercise?

-SO THAT YOU CAN TALK WHILE YOU LISTEN TO ME MENTALLY.

-What for?

-TO RECORD WHAT I SAY TO YOU.

-To record?

-YES. DON'T YOU HAVE VOICE RECORDING DEVICES? USE THEM. SO YOU CAN RECORD IN DETAIL WHAT WE TALK ABOUT WITHOUT HAVING TO REMEMBER. YOU'VE GOT YOUR PROBLEM SOLVED.

-And what do I do with that?

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

-Write 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 HELP PEOPLE TO DEVELOP THEIR CAPACITY TO LOVE IN ORDER TO BE HAPPY? WELL, SO DO I. I WILL HELP YOU TO TRANSMIT TO PEOPLE THE KNOWLEDGE THEY NEED TO AWAKEN THEIR INNER SELF AND TO REMEMBER THE REASON WHY THEY CAME TO THE WORLD, WHICH IS NONE OTHER THAN TO DEVELOP THEIR CAPACITY TO LOVE SO THAT THEY CAN START TO BE A LITTLE HAPPIER. ALTHOUGH ONE BOOK ALONE WILL NOT BE ENOUGH. IT WILL TAKE A FEW VOLUMES. BUT EACH THING IN ITS OWN TIME. IF YOU WANT TO START TODAY WITH THE TITLE. SEE IF YOU CAN REMEMBER IT. THE TITLE IS "THE SPIRITUAL LAWS".

-Oh! But what are "The Spiritual Laws"?

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

-Very funny.

-WELL, I AM GOING TO TELL YOU SOMETHING NOW. DO YOU KNOW THAT ONE OF THOSE SPIRITUAL LAWS IS THE LAW OF LOVE? IT'S THE MOST IMPORTANT ONE, BECAUSE EVERYTHING IN THE

UNIVERSE REVOLVES AROUND LOVE. AND WE HAVE A LOT TO TALK ABOUT IT. THAT'S WHY WE'LL HAVE TO WRITE MORE THAN ONE BOOK TO TALK ABOUT THE LAW OF LOVE.

THE LAW OF LOVE

- The destiny of the spirit is to attain happiness through the experience of unconditional love, by free choice.
- Without love there is no evolution. Without love there is no wisdom. Without love there is no happiness.
- Love is the harmonizing and energizing force of the spiritual universe.

What do you consider to be the most important human aspiration?

Achieving true and lasting happiness.

What is the secret to happiness?

To love, but it is no secret. Every spirit, that is, every human being knows, intuitively that he or she needs to love in order to be happy. Its entire evolutionary process revolves around this objective, to develop the capacity to love in order to be happy.

What is the way forward, I mean, if we want to move forward in love, where do we start?

The path begins with oneself and continues with others. In other words, one must love oneself in order to be able to love others.

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

Do not think that it is a simple or short path. In the process of loving oneself and loving others there are different stages to go through in order to reach the final goal, which would be to unconditionally love anyone as oneself. Jesus summed this up in a very simple but profound message when he said: "love your neighbor as yourself". It is a path that involves living many experiences through incarnating countless times. The work is twofold. On the one hand we have the development of feeling and on the other the elimination of selfishness. Earlier we spoke of the different levels of selfishness from the spiritual point of view, of the stages of vanity, pride and arrogance, and how selfishness manifests itself in each of these stages. Now I would like us to go deeper into the development of feelings, how they gradually develop from oneself to others, starting with those closest to us to those who have no special connection with us. We will talk about love as a couple, love within the family (between parents and children) and in human and social relationships. We will also look at how selfishness infiltrates and adulterates feelings, causing huge problems, confusing human beings and leading them away from the path of love and happiness. Selfishness is the greatest enemy of the development of love and has many

ramifications. If we are not aware of them, we can twist our evolution to the point where we may come to believe that we are loving, when in fact we are indulging in forms of selfishness disguised as love, as if it were a wolf in sheep's clothing.

But what is it to love oneself?

To act with freedom of feeling, that means to recognize one's affective needs and feelings and to develop them so that they become the driving force of life, so that important life decisions are made in accordance with these feelings.

What is it to love others?

Feeling others as oneself. When one feels others as oneself, one feels the other's happiness as well as one's own, and perceives the other's suffering as if it were one's own. When a person loves others, he or she wants the happiness of others as much as his or her own, and strives both to help them achieve that happiness and to ensure that his or her actions do not harm them or create suffering.

And where does the suffering come from?

Suffering can come as a consequence of the selfish actions of others, or as a consequence of one's own selfishness. That is, sometimes we suffer because we are victims of the selfish actions of others, while at other times our own selfish attitude causes us to judge the actions of others wrongly, blaming them for our suffering, when in fact we suffer because others do not act as we expect or demand of them. One also suffers when represses his or her feelings and does not live in accordance with them, but against them. The latter is the cause of more intense suffering.

How can we know whether we suffer as a consequence of the actions of others or whether it is a consequence of our own attitudes?

By being honest with ourselves. Without sincerity there can be no progress, for it will happen that instead of recognizing reality as it is and changing our way of acting in accordance with that recognition, we will distort it to justify our selfish acts, to justify the

selfish acts of others, or to justify the repression of our feelings.

How can we know whether others are suffering as a result of our actions or not? Can it not happen that you generate suffering in others even if you do not intend to harm them? What should we do in such cases?

We must distinguish where suffering comes from, before deciding whether it is a consequence of our selfish acts or our repressive attitude towards feelings, or whether it is a consequence of the selfishness of others.

There are certain sufferings that we cannot spare our loved ones, which are those that appear in their lives as a consequence of their own selfishness, because they are faced with the painful consequences of their past selfish acts. In these cases the best we can do for them is to advise them the best that we can to become aware that the suffering may be a consequence of their own selfish attitudes, and to take good note of the experience they are going through so that they do not themselves generate that suffering in others. There are sufferings that arise when faced with some difficult trial that they chose before incarnating, and this trial is part of their spiritual learning process. In these cases, you can comfort the person who is experiencing this moment and give them encouragement and hope so that they feel strong enough to overcome this trial, making them see that this trial has a meaning and that if they overcome it they will be able to advance spiritually.

Let's take the case that another person has let us know that we are making them suffer. How should we deal with this situation?

With sincerity and realism. Let us first analyze our attitude towards that person, whether we recognize selfishness on our part or not. If we recognize a selfish attitude on our part that causes harm or suffering to the other person, it is up to us to change our selfish attitude. Awareness of our selfish attitudes is part of spiritual learning, for we often act selfishly without realizing that this selfishness causes harm to others. It is therefore necessary for us to experience the consequences of our actions in order to become aware of the suffering we have caused.

It can also be the case that the other person suffers because we

have repressed our feelings of love for them, because the repression of feelings not only harms us, but also harms others. In other words, they suffer from deprivation of love.

We should also consider the possibility that this person's suffering is not caused by our selfishness but by his or her own, that it is a false appreciation of reality on the part of the other person. In this case, their own selfish attitude makes them unfairly perceive our actions as selfish, because they have not been satisfied in their expectations or because we have not acted as they expected or demanded of us.

In the latter case, should we satisfy the others' demands? I mean, should we give them what they expect from us in order to spare them suffering?

Use common sense and assess whether what is being asked of you is fair and honest and whether it is in your hand or your will to do it or not. In any case it cannot be demanded, because the demand itself is already an act of selfishness. At most it has to be formulated as a request in which there is the possibility of saying no without there being any kind of retaliation, otherwise it would be an infringement of free will.

In any case, it is not good to force oneself to do things without feeling them just to please others. If we renounce our own will or freedom, all we achieve is useless suffering, because we neither advance ourselves nor help the other person to advance. We only satisfy their selfishness. To give an example, it would be as useless an effort as that of someone who carries on his back another person who pretends to walk with a limp and who can walk perfectly well. In this case, the other person is pleased by making an unnecessary overexertion, because what we do for him, he can do for himself.

But there are people who believe that if you love someone you have to sacrifice yourself for them, that is, they put their loved one's happiness before their own. What do you think about this?

That it is wrong to think this way. One person's happiness cannot be sustained by another's suffering. It would be unfair on the part of the spiritual world to ask anyone to give up their right to happiness. All spiritual beings have the right to be happy, without

this diminishing the right of others. Therefore, it is not right to give up one's own happiness for the happiness of others, nor is it right to demand renunciations or sacrifices from others for the benefit of oneself. It is selfishness, not love, that diminishes the right to be happy. What happens is that you have a mistaken conception of what love is, because your way of loving is mostly impregnated with selfishness, and that is why you believe that in order for others to be happy you have to make sacrifices in your own right to be happy, or you believe that you have the right to demand sacrifices from others in order to be happy. That is why it is important to analyze very well our way of loving, to separate what are true feelings of love from what are selfish manifestations. In this way you will not confuse yourselves by making or asking for unnecessary sacrifices and renunciations.

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

Well, it depends on what you mean by giving up. Giving up selfishness for love is a good thing. What makes no sense is to renounce love for love's sake.

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

Imagine the case of a materialistic couple who are considering having children. Having children can be experienced as a renunciation of their material whims, because they now have to provide support for their children, or they can experience it as a renunciation of leisure time, because now they will also have to devote part of their time to their children. If they experience it as a renunciation, it is because selfishness prevails over love, because they value material possessions and comfort too much and value feelings too little. If, out of love for their children, they strive to be less whimsical, it will be a good thing for them, because what they lose is due to selfishness and what they gain is due to feelings. A quite different case is that of the woman who, because she has a child in common with a man, forces herself to live with him without loving him, and who loves another, because she thinks it is the best thing for her child, and condemns herself to a life of suffering. This is the person who wrongly renounces love

for love, because she renounces her freedom of feeling in the mistaken belief that this will favor the happiness of her child.

This example you have just given makes me reflect on how many different situations can arise and how difficult it is to analyze them all clearly and to know what to do in each one of them without mistaking feelings for selfishness. You mentioned the subject of relationships between partners and relationships with the children. I think that analyzing these situations that occur within personal relationships in an exhaustive way would be very useful for all of us, me first, because I believe that they concern almost everyone and I think that many people suffer as a consequence of not knowing how to face them with clarity of spiritual awareness. One could write a book on it alone.

Well. We are here to try to clarify all that. It is true that most of the emotional suffering of human beings has to do with personal relationships, starting with couple relationships and family relationships (between parents and children, siblings, etc.), so it is good that we deal with them comprehensively. Where do you want us to start?

If I can choose, I would start with relationships.

Then go ahead. Ask away, I'm all ears.

RELATIONSHIPS IN THE LIGHT OF THE LAW OF LOVE

I observe that one of the greatest causes of unhappiness in human beings has to do with the subject of relationships between couples. Some people suffer because they cannot find a partner and others suffer because they are unhappy in their relationships. Why are so many people unhappy in their relationships?

Because there is no real feeling of love between them as a couple, or because their faults override their feelings, or both at the same time.

What makes two people happy in a couple's relationship?

Complete happiness in this relationship is only possible when there is a complete affinity from within and a true feeling of mutual, reciprocated and free love. But this is rarely the case in your world.

Why is that?

Because selfishness and need predominate in choosing a partner, and this is compounded by the fact that most people lack sufficient development of the capacity to love to be able to recognize the being who is kindred to them, to awaken and recognize their feelings for them, and to have the courage to fight for them.

When you talk about recognizing the kindred being, do you mean recognizing the soul mate?

Yes, although a more accurate term than soul mates would be kindred souls.

Why?

Because you identify the word twin with identical and you believe that soul mates must be identical, equal in everything. But this is not so. Kindred or twin souls are beings that come from the same act of creation, from the same "spiritual birth", so to speak. They are one hundred percent complementary spirits, created at the same moment to be united in love. But this does not mean that they are equal.

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

Because the fact that they are kindred does not mean that they have only one will. Each one has his own personality, the result of his personal evolutionary process, which is never identical, because each one decides for him or herself. This marks differences at all levels.

You mean they don't have the same evolutionary level?

They are usually similar, but it is impossible to be identical, because each one has his or her independent free will and has had different experiences. Although they are not usually very great differences, 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 others, and this marks a difference in their spiritual personality and in their evolutionary level. But even though they are different, they are still kindred.

So, if two people who come together as a couple are soul mates, does it mean that they will achieve perfect happiness in their relationship?

They will achieve perfect happiness when they have evolved enough that their feelings for each other are stronger than their faults. Being kindred does not mean that they are perfect. While their capacity to love is underdeveloped, the selfishness of each predominates and this creates obstacles to the manifestation of affinity and feeling, and this prevents them from being completely happy.

And can it happen that your soul mate is not simultaneously incarnated with you in one lifetime?

Yes.

Well, I really don't understand what the point of that would be. I mean, if they don't incarnate simultaneously, aren't those spirits being deprived of the possibility of being happy experiencing the union of a couple?

You say that because you are seeing only the embodied part of life. I remind you that the separation is only temporary, for the

physical life is an instant of the real life. It is only a part of the time of the spirit's life that is spent in incarnation, which is shorter in the more advanced spirits, since they space out their incarnations quite a bit.

But why choose such a circumstance, that is, not to incarnate simultaneously?

These are choices made by the spirits, in this case the twin or kindred souls, depending on the test or mission they wish to carry out. This does not mean that they are totally separate, since during the dream the incarnated spirit returns to the spiritual world and is temporarily reunited with the loved ones who have remained on the spiritual plane, and not only with the kindred soul, but also with other loved ones who have not incarnated simultaneously. In reality, both collaborate in this mission, each from a different plane.

But does the incarnated person remember this contact during sleep?

Consciously, most do not.

So what good is it if you can't remember the moments of meeting your disembodied soul mate?

Although they do not consciously remember it, inside they are comforted by what they have experienced.

But is it not a frustration, at least for the incarnate, to live in this way?

It is a difficult trial, similar to that of one who, having lived with the loved one in life, sees them pass away and is left on the physical plane without them. In the case we were just discussing, not being fully aware that their kindred soul is on the other plane saves them from further suffering.

And is there anyone who will become aware of this?

Yes, if they are sensitive, they can contact consciously.

So they will suffer a lot more, won't they?

This depends on their evolutionary level, on how prepared they

are to deal with this situation. Keep in mind that even if they incarnate simultaneously, it is very difficult for kindred souls to be united permanently. It can take a relatively long time for them to meet. Often, even though they meet, they do not fight to be together, either because of lack of firmness of feeling, lack of courage to fight for them, or because selfishness still predominates in them. It also happens that the disincarnation of one and the other may occur at different moments and spaced out in time, so that one of them remains on the physical plane, while the other returns to the spiritual plane. If, during this period of separation, each fulfils the goal they have set for themselves, the reunion will be wonderful.

What if when you return to the spiritual plane your soul mate has already reincarnated?

Keep in mind that incarnations do not occur immediately. A fairly long time is spent on the astral plane before incarnating again. There is usually time for kindred souls to reunite and live together on the spiritual plane before returning to the physical plane.

Does the awareness that your soul mate is on the other plane prevent you from having a partner in the material world?

No. Just as a widowed person can have a new partner without transgressing any spiritual law. The incarnates can do as they see fit with regard to their life, to have or not to have a partner, for they have their free will to decide.

Won't the soul that remains on the other plane feel jealous that its soul mate has another earthly partner?

No, because the perspective you have from the spiritual world is broader than the one you have on earth. Your kindred soul understands the situation and will want you to make the choices that will lead you to be happier. Although it wishes for reunion, of course.

But can them be happy in such a relationship?

That will depend on the affinity between them. If there is affinity, you can achieve a certain degree of happiness. But it is true that

there will always be a gap inside that cannot be filled. They will never be able to experience complete happiness in the relationship, because the complete affinity is with the being on the other plane.

And how can the two feelings be reconciled? I mean, how do you reconcile your feelings for your spiritual partner and your earthly partner? Isn't that a dilemma with no possible solution?

The solution is the understanding of the situation. In any case, it is a tremendous mistake to want to forget what they feel for their spiritual partner who is in, or who has passed to, the spiritual plane before them in order not to suffer, for then they suffer more for the sake of annulling their feelings. It is also a mistake to force oneself to feel for the earthly partner the same as for the kindred soul, or to feel guilty for not feeling the same for the latter as for the former, for the feeling arises from complete affinity, and if this is not given, it is not possible, and no one is to blame for this. But it is true that very advanced spirits who have known and experienced the feeling with their kindred soul do not usually commit themselves to another partner, but prefer to wait for the reunion because they know that no other relationship will fulfil them. Moreover, their capacity and sensitivity enable them to maintain contact even though each one is on a different plane of existence.

When two soul mates incarnate simultaneously, do they always incarnate to be a couple?

They do not always incarnate for the purpose of being able to unite as a couple, although this is most common.

Do soul mates have to be of the same earthly age or can they be as much as 30 years apart?

There is a bit of everything. They can be many years apart, or only a few. The moment of incarnation and the circumstances in which it will take place are chosen before birth, and everything has a reason.

And isn't the age difference an obstacle for these spirits to

become a couple?

It will be as long as one is a child and the other an adult. Not when they are both adults.

Can soul mates incarnate in a situation that makes it impossible for them to be a couple, for example incarnate as mother and child or be siblings?

Yes, there can be a multitude of situations, parents and children, siblings, etc.

Does this situation make it impossible for them to find another partner?

Of course not. But it is true that they will always have more affinity for their kindred soul, incarnated as a family member, than for the partner they choose in life.

And can two soul mates be incarnated in the same sex, simultaneously?

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

If it occurs to me that homosexuality may be due to the fact that two soul mates incarnate in the same sex.

No, it is not for this reason. Just as incarnating as mother and child, father or brother and sister does not incite incest.

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

It is difficult to give a general answer applicable to all cases, because each case is unique. But what is certain is that the homosexual condition of a person who is born homosexual has to do with what that spirit experienced in previous lives. The spirit devoid of the material sheath has no sex. It is upon incarnation that it acquires the sexual condition, and although there is usually a preference for a particular sex when incarnating, in general, the same spirit can incarnate in one life as a man and in the next as a woman, or vice versa, as it chooses for its evolutionary needs. It sometimes happens that the spirit who is to incarnate as the opposite sex to the one chosen in the previous incarnation has

not completely shed the personality (including the sexual condition) of the previous life, and this affects his or her perception of sexuality in the current life. Depending on the degree of identification with the sexual condition of the past life, we will find different situations, from the transsexual, who directly identifies with the opposite sex in everything, and wants to acquire the physiognomy with which they identify; the homosexual who, without identifying with the opposite sex feels the same sexual inclinations as in the previous life in which they incarnated in the opposite sex to the current one; or the bisexual, in whom there are sexual inclinations proper to their current condition and to the past life.

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

The causes of this lack of detachment can be many and varied, but in general they are due to deep-seated selfish attitudes in the spirit that have used and made use of the sexual condition to manifest themselves, and have meant the violation of the free will of others, including freedom of feeling.

Any examples?

A spirit who, when incarnated as a man, was extremely chauvinistic, and abused women. For example, he may have forced a woman who did not love him to be his wife, and therefore forced her to have sexual relations, or mistreated and humiliated her during his life, and in general had the same attitude of contempt towards all women. In this life he incarnates having the same sexual condition that he despised, but retains the personality of the previous life, with similar tendencies, because not having overcome them they are strongly impregnated in his spirit. Or a spirit who, in incarnating as a woman, used her physical attractiveness and power of seduction to dominate and subjugate men. In this life she incarnates having the same sexual condition as those she abused, but retains the personality of the previous life because it is strongly ingrained in her, and thus retains all or part of the same sexual inclinations.

And what is there to learn from that circumstance?

The spirit chooses to incarnate in the same sex it abused in order to learn to respect the gender condition. That is, if as a man it abused women, it incarnates as a woman in order to learn to respect women, because now it is a woman too. Or if as a woman it abused men, it now incarnates as a man in order to learn to respect men, because now it is a man too. The condition of transsexuality or homosexuality is self-generated in these circumstances because they maintain the personality of their previous life, including the sexual inclination, in whole or in part, because it is strongly rooted in them.

Many religions, including Catholicism, have the concept that homosexuality is a negative thing and that homosexuals should renounce their homosexuality as they consider it deviant. It even recommends that they seek to form a heterosexual relationship. What is your opinion?

It makes no sense for homosexual people to force themselves to be heterosexual when they are not, just to keep up appearances. In other words, not admitting or repressing one's homosexuality leads to nothing good. This would be a cause of unhappiness for him or herself and for the partner he or she chooses, because one cannot force what does not come spontaneously. Homosexual people, like any other, has to be themselves, to admit themselves as they are and to seek their happiness accordingly. The homosexual condition in itself is not negative. On the contrary. For those spirits, it is a condition that can help them to advance in appreciating the value of free will and freedom of feeling, because when you are forced to be the way you are not or forced to live the way you don't want to live, you suffer a lot. That is their test. To struggle to be themselves in spite of incomprehension and rejection. When someone finds it difficult to be himself or herself, he or she values respect for free will very much and begins to realize that he or she should not force others' free will in any way, because it is a great cause of suffering. I will only add that homosexuality and transsexuality are very much related to vanity, and as long as vanity is not overcome, these kinds of circumstances will continue to occur.

Let's go back to the subject of soul mates. If you are telling me

that happiness as a couple comes from the union of soul mates, isn't it a contradiction to choose circumstances in which they cannot be together as a couple in that life, such as having a blood tie?

Sometimes blood ties are chosen because it is a way of making sure that your most closely related person will always be close to you. When there is no blood bond there are usually more material difficulties for two related beings to get to be together, so that, although the union is desirable, in most cases it does not happen. In this case, you play it safe, even if it is not the most desirable situation.

Do you mean that most people who have a partner are not paired with their soul mate?

Yes, we have already said it. One can count on one's fingertips the earthly couples that are the union of kindred souls. Though, of course, hardly anyone will admit that this is their case, that is, that their union is not that of kindred souls.

Yes, but there will be people who have doubts about who their soul mate is. I mean, how can you recognize your soul mate? I understand that it must not be easy.

It would be easier if you acted according to your feelings and there was more freedom in your world to love. But since this does not happen, what was possible becomes complicated.

What are those difficulties that prevent two soul mates from coming together as a couple when they are incarnated?

We have already said it. Because the human being on your planet is still so steeped in selfishness and has little developed capacity for love, he or she takes other factors than feelings of love into account when choosing a mate. Although before incarnating kindred souls have made it a point to unite as a couple, once incarnated they often end up with other people.

And what are these factors? In other words, why can a union take place without love?

There are different motives. It may be because of physical attraction, material or emotional convenience, mental affinity,

the need to be loved or the need to love.

Can you tell me more about each of these reasons, so that I am clear on what they are?

Of course. Let us begin if you will with the number one reason in your world: physical attraction or sexual instinct.

When the spirit is still undeveloped in its capacity to love, its will is greatly influenced by the instincts, and in the specific case of the choice of a partner the sexual instinct predominates over the feelings. This is why it tends to choose according to what activates its sexual instinct, it looks externally and not internally. For this reason, people who are physically attractive have an easy time finding a partner, while those who are unattractive seem to be doomed not to find one. This behavior is common in your world because, in general, the majority of beings have little developed capacity for love, and it is more accentuated in adolescence, because it is a stage where the sexual instinct emerges, coinciding with the immaturity of youth, which makes even the most advanced spirits predominate in the desire to satisfy their sexual instinct over the awakening of feelings.

I believe that in a couple's relationship there must necessarily be a mutual sexual attraction; if there is no sexual desire between them, what would be the point of them coming together as a couple?

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

But do not confuse sexual instinct with sexual desire. There is a nuance that differentiates the two. It is true that sexual desire can be triggered by biological sexual instinct, but not only by instinct. It can also be triggered by feelings. The biological sex instinct is triggered primarily by physical attractiveness and novelty. It is a biological programming, which drives the individual towards promiscuity, because from a biological point of view this favors genetic exchange and the proliferation of the species.

When two people get together out of physical attraction, without any feelings in between, once they have satisfied each other sexually, there is usually a decrease in sexual desire between them, since the sexual instinct is no longer novel and is not activated as it was at the beginning.

The consequence is that, if the relationship is prolonged, there is often a loss of sexual appetite, as the sexual desire between them used to depend entirely on instinct. Sexual relations become rare and tedious. Interest in this partner is lost, as it is no longer a novelty, and interest in other candidates is activated, because they are a novelty. If these relationships are prolonged, they are a constant source of unhappiness, because then the lack of affinity and feeling, which at the beginning were overshadowed because the sexual instinct covered them, comes to the surface. And this is reflected in an increase in disagreements and reproaches. It is then often said that love has ended in the couple, that there is no passion, when in reality there was never love, only instinctual attraction. When there is an affinity of feeling, sexual desire is awakened and never dies out, because it is not fed by instinct, but by feeling.

Let us now talk about the union due to material convenience.

There is not much to clarify about this one. It is the union for material interests. It occurs when one of the two, or both spouses, considers that he or she will gain some kind of material advantage in life that he or she did not have before, such as material comfort, social position, success, fame, wealth or power. This motive of union is even poorer than the previous one, because there is not even sexual attraction, and it is more evident that there is no feeling of any kind, although there is usually a pretense of feeling, that is to say, the other spouse is made to believe that the motive of the union is the feeling of love.

This means that the motive that unites two people may be different, because if it were a material interest in both, there would be no need for pretense.

Indeed. It is often the case that in each of the spouses the motive for the union is different. In one case it may be material interest and in the other case physical attractiveness. For example, unions between an unattractive millionaire who is attracted to beautiful women and an attractive but penniless woman who aspires to have money. In neither case are there feelings, only an expectation of satisfying a desire, but both will probably pretend that there is a feeling in order to hide their intentions. It will be a

relationship where neither of them will be happy, although initially there may be a relative satisfaction in seeing their expectations fulfilled.

And what does emotional bonding consist of?

It occurs when one of the two people considers that the psychological profile of the other person may favor him or her when it comes to manifesting certain characteristics of his or her personality that he or she knows are selfish but does not wish to change. For example, a dominant and authoritarian person may find someone submissive and docile as a partner, a capricious person may find someone complacent, a fearful person may find someone determined, or a lazy person may find someone active.

But my understanding is that it does not have to be negative to have seemingly opposite psychological traits, but rather it can be an opportunity to help. For example, the determined person can help to overcome the fear of the fearful partner.

Understand that the problem is not that there are personality differences, but that the partner is chosen for emotional convenience, not because there is a feeling for him or her. If a person needs to overcome fear, they can seek psychological help to overcome it, even from a partner, but they should not choose their partner for that reason. In these cases what usually happens is that the relationship between the partners is one of dominance or psychological dependence. In a relationship of domination, the dominated partner will feel enslaved in the relationship, as he or she only receives orders from the other partner and not feelings, while the other partner, the dominator, also suffers, because although his or her selfishness is satisfied, the absence of feelings on his or her part makes him or her feel empty and unsatisfied in the relationship.

Tell me now about mental affinity union.

It is the union that occurs between two people who share the same tastes, the same hobbies or the same interests. For example, people who have the same social status, the same type of work, similar intellectual level, the same professional or material expectations, or who enjoy the same hobbies, for

example playing sports or going to parties.

But is there anything wrong with sharing tastes or hobbies? I think it is natural and desirable in a couple.

There is nothing wrong with sharing hobbies or interests. The point we are making here is that the decision to choose a partner cannot be made on the basis of mental affinity, as this unites them only on a mental level, but not on a feeling level.

For many people are convinced that having similar tastes and interests has a lot to do with compatibility as a couple, and that feelings can arise as a result of this compatibility. For example, marriage agencies prepare compatibility tests to try to find the ideal partner for their clients based on their tastes, interests and aspirations, with the idea that this increases the likelihood of an affinity between them.

It will only be a mental affinity, never a sentimental one. Feelings do not understand probabilities, nor can they be planned. They have to arise spontaneously, even if they do not fit into one's mental schemes of "the ideal partner", which are usually stereotypes, such as the tall, handsome, romantic guy for women, or the sexy, blonde, hot girl for men. These are just mental fantasies that feed the imagination and have little to do with feelings. If feelings worked by probability, kindred souls could never be united with each other, since the probability of such a union occurring by chance is very low. These unions by mental affinity often have a time of apparent smooth sailing, but they generate a feeling of emptiness within, the source of which is difficult to identify, for in the eyes of the outside, which functions very much with the mind, it seems that one has all that is needed in life to be happy. However, the only thing that is needed to be happy, which is feelings, is missing.

Let us now talk about people who come together out of a need to be loved.

This is a fairly common reason. It usually corresponds to people who have felt unloved in life or nostalgic for a love that they have not known in this life, but that their inner self senses they have experienced (in their past before their present life). They have

such a great need to be loved that when someone is interested in them as a partner they feel so grateful that they accept this relationship regardless of their own feelings. They tend to be people with low self-esteem. They feel unattractive and believe that nobody will love them. They do not believe they have the right to be happy. Many of these people have had a difficult childhood, with huge emotional deficiencies, neglect or situations of physical or psychological abuse. If they have not yet freed themselves from the oppressive family environment, they can use the relationship as an escape valve to free themselves from this unbearable family relationship.

But is there anything wrong with feeling the need to be loved? I think it is natural and inherent in every human being and I don't think there is anyone who doesn't want it.

There is nothing wrong with wanting to be loved. Indeed, it is natural to every spirit and a symptom of a certain level of evolution, because one is already aware that the key to happiness has to do with love. The problem is that if this need to be loved is very pressing, it can lead to desperation and emotional blindness, anxiety to quickly find someone to fill this void, which makes the person hasty when choosing a partner, as he or she will surely accept as a partner anyone who presents themselves at that moment, and not the one who awakens his or her feelings. Affective emptiness causes emotional blindness, which prevents the person from seeing their partner as they are. Rather, they idealize them according to their expectations in order to be able to love them.

These people also often live in relationships of domination or dependency. Many of these people are those who have come into the relationship fleeing from a stifling family relationship. When they meet someone authoritarian and dominant, they are often submissive and allow the other to dominate and humiliate them. Emotional blindness, lack of clarity and the desire to escape have made them choose the unknown in the belief that it could not be worse than what they had previously experienced. And it has turned out that the unknown was equal to or worse than what they were trying to leave behind. The lack

of knowledge of something better even makes them accept this situation as normal and they end up adopting the same role of submission that they had in their family, so that in their life as a couple they reproduce the same situations of suffering as in their family life.

Sometimes they do make an informed choice, looking for the opposite of what they have had, that is, they look for loving, peaceful, tolerant and kind-hearted people, who they know will treat them well. In these cases there is more of a paternal/filial or maternal/filial relationship, as they seek to receive from the partner the affection they did not have from their parents, and therefore the spouse acts more as a protector than as a partner. The person rescued from the family relationship of suffering feels grateful and indebted to the protector who rescued them from the situation of suffering and tries to compensate him or her in some way, to the point of convincing him or herself that this feeling of gratitude is partner love. A relationship of dependency is generated between the two.

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

There is less suffering, but still no happiness, because there is no correspondence of feelings, for at least on one side there is only gratitude and this makes neither person happy, the one because he or she does not love and the other because he or she is not loved.

This last example of the protective relationship then resembles emotional convenience, doesn't it?

It is similar in that one seeks a partner with a certain psychological profile, with the nuance that in emotional convenience there is no need to be loved, whereas in this case it is the need to be loved that promotes the search for a certain psychological profile in the partner.

I think that there are also many people who join other people out of fear of loneliness. Can the person who seeks a relationship out of fear of loneliness be considered to have a need to be loved, or is it for emotional convenience?

Sometimes it is one thing and sometimes it is the other. There are people who are afraid of loneliness and it is not because they need to be loved, but for convenience, because they need someone to please them in their desires, to make their life easier or more comfortable, especially as they grow older, because they fear old age and illness and do not want to be left alone at the end of their lives. 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.

Agreed. This type of relationship occurs when one or both of the partners already has a well-developed capacity to love and needs to manifest it in order to be fulfilled and feel happy. They are also usually people who are nostalgic for having loved intensely in a relationship that they have not known in this life, but that their inner self senses that they have lived (in another life). When this need to love and to find the loved one becomes very pressing, it can happen, as in the case of those who need to be loved, that the need to feel is imposed over one's own feelings, and the partner is chosen not on the basis of the feeling that arises for them, but because of the need to love.

But is there anything wrong with the need to love? I say that if there is no need to love there can be no feelings, because if there were no need to love there would never be a search for a partner. It seems a contradiction to the message of developing feelings, doesn't it?

As I said when we talked about people who need to be loved, there is nothing wrong with feeling the need to love. As you say, the need to love is linked to the capacity to love. People who have a great capacity to love can love many people, but this does not mean that they can fall in love with any of them, because the feeling of love as a couple does not awaken with just anyone. The problem comes when, out of a need to feel, one forces oneself to feel what one does not feel, that is to say, forces feelings, and in love relationships feelings cannot be forced, but must occur spontaneously. Forcing feelings is different from 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 from an emotional blindness that prevents them from distinguishing love from the need to love. In other words, they convince themselves that they are in love, when in reality they are striving to feel love. They also tend not to look at whether or not they are reciprocated in their supposed feelings of love. They simply convince themselves that they are, or that if they are not at that moment, it will be reciprocated if they give themselves totally to the other person, that is that the other person will not be able to resist their flood of feelings and will end up falling in love with them.

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

And it is still true that those who truly love do so without expecting anything in return, for they cannot demand to be reciprocated in their feelings by the person they love, or if they are reciprocated, they cannot force the other to recognize their feelings or to agree to become a partner with them if they do not want to. In other words, he or she must respect the will and freedom of the other and be willing to take no for an answer, even if he or she has given his or her heart. But it is true that in the case of a couple's relationship, in order to be happy, it is necessary to have a reciprocated, mutual love. Not reciprocated love does not allow either person to be happy.

You have outlined here different motivations, other than feelings, that can give rise to a partnership. You have talked about physical attraction, material convenience, emotional convenience, mental affinity, the need to be loved, and the need to love. Do these motivations stand alone or can they go together? I mean, if a person can be physically attracted to another person at the same time as feeling the need to be loved, for example.

Yes, of course. In fact there is almost always 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 it is also absent. In reality, depending on the spirit's capacity to love, one type of motivation predominates over another. In less advanced spirits, who still have little knowledge and appreciation of love, any combination of the first four is more common: physical attraction, material convenience, emotional convenience and mental affinity. In more advanced spirits, combinations of physical attraction with the need to be loved and the need to love are more common. And at an intermediate stage there may be combinations of physical attraction, emotional convenience, mental affinity, and the need to be loved. It is also sometimes the case that these motivations do not occur simultaneously, but appear at different points in the relationship. For example, a relationship may be initiated by physical attraction, and when this fades, other types of motives for prolonging the relationship, such as material or emotional convenience, may come to the fore.

Well, this complicates things even more. I think it must not be easy, when it comes to analyzing what one feels, to know how to distinguish feelings from everything else. For example, when there is a mixture of sexual attraction, the need to love and the need to be loved, I think it must be difficult to know what love is and to separate it from needs and desires.

In your world it is difficult for the vast majority, because you do not yet have clarity and firmness of feeling. But that is what the process of evolution is for, to learn from what you have experienced and to know how to distinguish what is from what is not.

But I also understand that not all love is the same. I say this because there are people who say they are very fond of their partner, who get along very well, but who do not feel the need to have sexual relations with them. What is happening in these cases?

This person feels a brotherly love for his or her spouse, as he or she might feel for a brother or a friend, but is not in love with him or her. It is not a couple's love. He or she confuses one feeling with

another.

And how does one know whether or not one's love is a couple's love?

He who feels that something is missing in his relationship to fill him completely, even if there are no quarrels or conflicts, knows that he has not found true love. When one is not united to the kindred soul, there is no complete affinity in the couple. The lack of affinity manifests itself on all planes, sentimentally, mentally and sexually, and this causes an emptiness within that is not filled. Those who have experienced in this life the love of a kindred soul will know how to distinguish it very well, because just the memory of the loved one makes them vibrate inside and feel full. Those who have not yet experienced in this life the feeling that is awakened by the recognition of their kindred soul may have more doubts. They will have to trust what they sense spiritually, for even if they have not experienced it in this life, the feelings between kindred souls are never destroyed and remain in the spirit forever, leaving an indelible mark, even if the recall of past memories is temporarily lost when they incarnate again. It is this sentimental intuition that enables them to distinguish what is and what is not true love.

Forgive me for insisting, but how can one distinguish between brotherly love and soulmate love? Can one not be filled when one loves one's siblings or one's children?

Those who see their partner as a brother and not as a partner already know that it is not love as a couple. What I mean is that if they have affection for their partner, as they have for a child or a sibling, and do not feel sexual desire for them, or when they have sexual relations with their partner, they experience an emptiness or do not feel the need to give themselves in this relationship and can go on without them, the love they feel is of a brotherly or sisterly kind.

What if one discovers that one loves the partner fraternally and not as a couple? Should one continue the relationship or not?

If you want to be happy you should be honest with yourself and your partner about what your feelings are and what they are not

and act accordingly. There is no point in prolonging a relationship when one of both knows that they are not in love, because they are neither happy nor can you make the other happy. For example, having unwanted sexual relations will be a source of suffering for one partner and dissatisfaction for the other. And if they stop having sex in order to avoid this, how is this different from a brotherly relationship? In other words, that person loves his or her partner as a brother or sister and lives the relationship as he or she would live it with a brother or sister. It makes no sense for them to continue the relationship as a couple, because they do not live with their brother as a couple either.

There will be people who say that by loving their partner as a brother or sister they are already happy and that it is better than nothing. In other words, they are content with what they have. Are they acting correctly or not?

Talking about right or wrong here is meaningless. It is better to talk about being or not being truly happy. There are people who resign themselves to this situation and convince themselves that they are happy this way. But this is self-deception, because it is not true.

There are people who find it difficult to take the step of separating because they have conflicting feelings, because although they recognize that they are not in love with their partner, they still have great affection for them and do not want to lose the bond. What would you say to them?

Recognizing that we do not feel love for our partner does not necessarily mean that we have to dislike him or her, or that we have to cut him or her out of our lives altogether. We simply have to recognize the kind of feeling we have for someone and act to make our life fit the kind of feeling we have. If there is a feeling of friendship, that friendship can continue without forcing the relationship to continue. If we do not admit this reality we will come to feel rejection for that person, because we force ourselves to live in a relationship that is not in line with our feelings for that person.

Many people admit that they are not in love. They say that if it

were up to them they would take the step of separating. But because they don't want to hurt the other person, they prefer to continue the relationship. What do you have to say about this?

That the damage is done by prolonging the relationship, because if they do not love him or her they cannot make him or her happy. If they prolong the relationship, they prevent them from finding a partner who does reciprocate their feelings, and they are also deceiving them, because they make them believe that they love them as a partner when in reality it is not true. Prolonging the relationship in these circumstances is more harmful than breaking up, because there are no emotional ties. It will be a fictitious union, a forced relationship that will generate suffering for both partners.

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

No. If one partner does not want to continue the relationship, it is enough to leave the relationship. It does not matter if the partner does not agree with that decision. No one, not even the partner, has the right to force the other to continue, as this would be an infringement of their personal free will. Often this argument is nothing more than an excuse that reflects a lack of courage to leave the relationship, and one expects the other to take the steps that one does not dare to take.

But doesn't it often happen that when a person tells their partner that they are not in love and want to leave the relationship, it is the partner themselves who takes it very badly and insists on continuing the relationship in spite of everything?

It is true, because they refuse to admit reality. They are comfortable, accustomed to this relationship and fear the changes that are going to take place in their lives. They prefer the bad things known than the good to be known. This is greatly influenced by the education one has received, which, if it is of a traditional type, considers that the break-up of a couple, especially if there is a marriage contract involved, is something dishonorable for a person's reputation. It is also influenced by

attachment or possessive love, that egosentiment that simulates love, which makes the person who suffers from it have a tendency to consider the partner as his or her property and to take very badly to lose that property. Despite being unhappy, the person may have been pleased with his or her pretensions and is not willing to give up what he or she is used to and believes they belong to him or her. Unfortunately, because of attachment there are very few people who are willing to admit a change of sentimental status. In other words, they do not accept the change from being a partner to being a friend and interpret the change of status as a rejection or contempt. As they do not respect the will of the other, they sometimes try to force the continuity of the relationship using victimhood, persuasion, blackmail and even aggression as weapons, causing their now ex-partner great emotional and/or physical suffering that reflects the little love they felt for them. The ex-partner is often forced to avoid any kind of contact in order not to be attacked psychically or physically, to the point that they wish they would never meet the person who was once their partner.

What you say brings up another very common situation, that of the person who does not dare to leave the relationship for fear of their partner's violent reaction. Some people even fear for their lives if they leave the relationship.

Yes, unfortunately in your world there is little respect for the freedom of feeling, and this means that many relationships are not of love, but of domination and submission, because they coexist as an executioner and a victim. In these cases the victim of domination feels fear and not love for their supposed partner. This fear paralyses them from deciding to leave the relationship, because they know that when they take the step they will be relentlessly persecuted. In addition, the abuser often psychologically manipulates his victim into believing that he still loves her, which makes some women feel guilty if they leave the relationship.

Does the increase in the number of cases of gender-based violence have to do with the fact that people, in this case men, have become more aggressive towards women in their

relationships?

No. In the past, violence and aggression existed as much or more than now, but because 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 gender-based violence because there are more courageous women who dare to break free from their abusers, especially in countries where there is legislation to protect them and a greater social awareness that abuse and mistreatment are intolerable. The abuser, faced with the impossibility of continuing to dominate his victim, resorts to more drastic actions to restrain her, even going as far as murder.

I understand that there are women who, for fear of being killed by their husband or partner, make the decision not to 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 self to live like that is worse than dying. It is better to fight to be free to be happy, even if you lose your life in the attempt, than to lose your whole life under the tyranny of an abuser.

Everyone has the right to be free and happy and no one has the right more than oneself to decide about one's own life and feelings.

Spiritually, what can be learned from such an abusive situation?

These kinds of trials, although very painful, help the spirit to acquire firmness and courage in its will to fight for its freedom of feeling, and to become aware that no one should be deprived of their right to freedom of feeling, because it is one of the causes that generate the greatest suffering and unhappiness in the human being.

There are people who argue that although they are not in love, they do not separate because their partner has never given them any reason to do so, because they have a cordial relationship, they have never had any arguments and there has never been any abuse. What would you say to them?

Sometimes it is believed that there must be an unpleasant reason

for leaving a relationship, for example physical or psychological abuse, or that one of the partners has some kind of addiction (drugs, alcohol, gambling) that ruins a normal cohabitation. People who take this view, that is, that if there is no abuse they have no justification for leaving the relationship, are usually those who have received a traditional religious upbringing, because it seems that in this upbringing abuse is the only case in which a separation from the spouse is relatively tolerated, and they feel obliged to make the relationship last for life regardless of whether or not there are feelings between them as a couple. However, this is not the case. All that is necessary to leave a relationship is that there is no mutual partner feeling.

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

Many religions are against divorce, but I say to you that forcing a person to continue a relationship against their will does contravene a spiritual law, which is the Law of Free Will. We are saddened to see how many people are empty and loveless, but at the same time they force themselves to be in unfeeling marriage relationships, either out of fear, out of comfort, or because they believe that if they divorce, by contravening the religious law of the indissolubility of marriage, they are committing a fault in the sight of God. Many people have been led to believe that it is God who asks that a person's marriage be for life, so that the person believes that by suffering in a loveless relationship he or she is "earning heaven". However, this is not true. There is no spiritual advancement in the person who renounces to live according to his or her feelings, because it is not God who forces him or her, but the person himself or herself or the social or religious norms he or she professes that force him or her. It must be clear that it is not God or the higher spirituality that demands it, but the laws of men impregnated with selfishness, who trade with everything, even with feelings.

So, if not from God, where does the idea of the indissolubility of marriage come from?

In your selfish and mercantile mentality you put a price on everything and establish title deeds to everything that exists, to which you attach more value than your own life, for you do not care to kill or die for them. You take it for granted that everything can be bought and sold, and that if it were not beyond your control you would seize even the air you breathe or even the rays of sunlight and sell them at a price of gold to those who have less power or ambition to say "this is mine". In the same way you believe that people, their will, their feelings, can be bought. You believe that with the contract you sign in what you call marriage you are entering into some commercial transaction, in which some believe they are buying a person's will and feelings, and others convince themselves that they are bound by the contract to surrender their will, their decision-making ability, their freedom and their feelings to their spouse. In the height of selfish delirium, you have made yourselves believe that the notary of this contract is God, and you have convinced yourselves that this contract must be fulfilled at all costs, regardless of your own happiness or that of others, otherwise you will be dispossessed of all your "goods" in the next life, like a person whose property is seized when he or she cannot repay a bank loan. For know that all this is a great lie invented by human selfishness. That God has given you complete freedom with regard to your person, your feelings and your thoughts, and that you do not transgress any divine law at all when you fight for your freedom to feel and think. No one can take away your right to be free, to decide about your own life and feelings in any way and under any circumstances, least of all in the name of God.

This could be taken as an incitement to break up marriages.

Although you may not want to admit it, a partnership that is not based on mutual feeling does not really exist. Even if you can keep the contracts signed for a lifetime, and even if you want to give an image of union to others, it will be an apparent union, a false one, because everyone inside knows what the reality is and, even if you try to hide it from others, you will be unhappy because you will experience the bitterness, emptiness and sadness of feeling trapped in your own life. If you also set yourself the goal of not letting anyone know about it, you will experience this suffering

in solitude, which makes it all the more painful.

You seem to make a big deal about emphasizing that people have the right to separate or divorce if they wish to do so without offending God.

For it is a great cause of deep unhappiness in many human beings and this must begin to change, so that every person knows that they have the right to be happy and that there is no divine law that prevents them from being happy. On the contrary, the spiritual world wants the happiness of every being that exists and must do everything possible to help him or her discover the path to happiness. It wants to help them to remove the obstacles that stand in their way, and the laws of your world are like a gigantic stone that stands in the way of happiness. Moreover, you have made it appear that this stone has been thrown by God, and this can no longer be tolerated.

So you mean we shouldn't get married in order to regularize relationships?

From a spiritual point of view it is only the mutual love between two people that defines a true partnership, whether or not there is a signed marriage contract is irrelevant. In your material world it is often necessary to sign contracts to protect the spouse or the descendants of the family, for example, so that if one of the spouses dies, the other person can have a pension or so that other relatives cannot dispossess the deceased's spouse of his or her home, and this is understandable. But be aware that this only has a material validity and do not try to give it more value than it has. In other words, the bond of marriage should not be used as an argument to curtail a person's freedom, nor ultimately to withhold or blackmail him or her if he or she decides to leave the relationship, for this is considered from a spiritual point of view to be an act against the law of free will.

Let's return to the subject of the reasons that make a couple continue their relationship even though they are not in love. There are people who fear material destitution if they leave their partner, and continue with them because this guarantees them a house and a livelihood. What do you have to say about these

cases?

They are a reflection of the fact that in reality it is a union where material convenience predominates. If it was not the main reason for the union in the beginning, it is now the main reason for the prolongation. These people will have to decide what they value more, their freedom of feeling or security and comfort. If they choose to continue the relationship for these reasons, they will probably lack nothing materially, but they will lack everything emotionally, because they live without love. If they are materialistic people who value feelings little, they will choose to continue the relationship. If they are people who above all want to be happy, they will overcome their fears and even if they have to start from scratch materially speaking, they will gladly do so because they will have regained their freedom of feeling.

Another argument of many people who have children from such a relationship is that they do not separate in order to protect their children. They say that they prefer to stick it out at least until their children are of age. They believe that they are acting correctly, out of love for their children, because they put their children's happiness before their own. They believe that a break-up of a couple or marriage can cause severe emotional trauma for their children and prefer to avoid it. Is that right?

No, that is not right. They come to the wrong conclusion because when you divorce you don't divorce your children, you divorce your partner. If both parents love their children, they will love them even if they are not together. This argument of "holding on for the sake of the children" is very common among people who have received a traditional religious upbringing, where the family unit is put before personal happiness.

On the contrary, the prolongation of this relationship generates suffering for the children, because when two people do not love each other and are forced to live together, it generates an emotionally negative environment for the children, because the unhappiness they experience is radiated to the environment. Often the children witness the fights and arguments between the parents, they perceive their discomfort and suffering and this generates emotional suffering for them. There are children who

grow up with the feeling that they are to blame for their parents' unhappiness, because some parents tell them that if it were not for them they would have divorced by now. In other words, they blame the children for their own cowardice.

But for the child, the break-up of the parental relationship is a radical change in his or her life. Isn't it true that many children experience the separation of their parents in a traumatic way?

When the child is young, the break-up in itself does not cause any kind of emotional trauma, as the child does not yet have sufficient knowledge for the conditioning of the upbringing to have taken place.

The changes that occur in children's life, if they continue to have contact with both parents and they continue to show their love for them, even if only separately, they will experience it as a game.

What makes young children suffer the most is being used as a weapon in marital disputes due to separation and witnessing fights, quarrels and blackmail between the spouses. Therefore, if this is avoided by the parents, they will be able to prevent the children from being traumatized by the separation.

And what about the children who are older? Many of them already have the knowledge of the cause and do not take this change in their lives well.

Often the separation comes after years of enduring. Consciously or unconsciously, the message conveyed to the children during that time was that family unity comes before personal happiness. Therefore, children tend to interpret what is happening from that point of view. That is why they perceive the break-up as something negative, because they see it as contrary to what they had previously believed to be right and good. In order for them to be able to deal with what they are experiencing, it is necessary to deprogram them from the education they were given and make them understand now that freedom of feeling and personal happiness are above all else and that no one should renounce them under any circumstances.

I think it is difficult for an almost adolescent child to fit all this in

overnight when he or she has already lived a whole childhood brought up with other norms, instilled by his or her own parents. He or she will probably think that his father or mother has gone mad.

That depends on how evolved that child is. Some children are more understanding than others. Sometimes it is the children who advise and help the parents to take this step, because they are more aware of reality than their parents. The one who is more advanced is the one who will be more understanding and will fit in better, because above and beyond the education he or she has received will be his or her evolutionary level to make him or her understand the situation. But even if it is difficult for them to fit in at that moment, they will appreciate it in the future when they are older if find themselves in a similar situation. I mean that if they get into a relationship and realize that they are not in love and have to decide whether to continue or leave the relationship, it will be clear to them that they should not force themselves to continue it for anything in the world. They will have an example in their own parents that there is nothing wrong with being free. They will be more confident and courageous and feel less guilty about leaving a relationship in which they are unhappy. However, if they have had the opposite example, that is, their parents have forced them to continue living together against their own feelings, they may take this bad example and repeat the same unhappy life their parents had.

Summarizing all that we have discussed so far, I get the feeling that the message is conveyed that the love of a couple is more important than the love of siblings or children. Is it not selfish to make a distinction between couple love and siblings or children love? Does this distinction not contradict the concept of unconditional love?

On what basis do you say that?

I guess in the example Jesus gave. He didn't make any special reference to couple love, did he?

You can't know that, because you rely on the information in the canonical gospels, which reflect very little of what he said. But I tell you that he also spoke about couple love, especially to those

closest to him, who were more able to understand. He taught them that it is only mutual and perfectly affine love that binds couples together, and that the decision to unite or disunite a couple should be taken by each of them in complete freedom. This does not sound like a big deal now, as it seems reasonable to any moderately sensible mentality. But at that time the mentality of the human being was poorer in understanding and respect for freedom of feeling was practically non-existent. Polygamy was common and most unions were loveless, arranged marriages in which one or both spouses were forced into marriage without regard for their will.

I think many people today are aware that arranged marriages are an abuse and are against this practice.

It may seem obvious in Western societies, with more advanced legislation, which protects some of the rights and freedoms of the individual. But still today this practice is common in many countries, where laws, often encouraged and enforced by "religious" leaders and regimes, allow even young girls to be married to adults "in the name of God", backing up the sexual abuse, moral and physical exploitation of girls and women. They are made to believe that if they do not submit to these abusive practices, they are unclean, impure and disobedient to God's designs. And when, in spite of everything, they try to free themselves from their inhuman condition, they are treated as if they were criminals, sometimes even cruelly tortured and killed. Know that arranged marriage is a form of institutionalized prostitution, for a person is being forced to live together and have a sexual relationship with someone they have not chosen, under the guise of "honesty", and this is a very serious violation of their free will, specifically their freedom of feeling.

Well, I think that by now most people know that they are free, at least in Western countries, and that the law protects individual freedom, providing for the right to divorce and punishing those who impede its exercise, right?

This is true. And this represents an enormous spiritual advance that has been achieved with enormous sacrifices and struggles, which unfortunately have been opposed only by the religious

authorities, who again, instead of contributing to the spiritual progress of mankind, have done their utmost to hinder and obstruct it. And the most regrettable thing is that they have done so in the name of God. But religious customs and norms are deeply rooted in societies, and sometimes, though they have no power to prohibit, they have the power to influence psychologically.

Know that still in your time and in your society, although there are few arranged marriages, there are still many unions without love. And it happens that when a person becomes aware of this and wants to undo this union, he or she has many difficulties because of these religious norms, as we mentioned earlier.

Let's get back to where we were, about whether partner love is selfish and contradictory to achieving unconditional love. If it is not a teaching of Jesus, at least the Church has interpreted it this way. I believe they rely on a quote from the Gospel (Luke 14:26) in which Jesus supposedly says: "If anyone comes to me and does not hate father and mother, wife and children, brothers and sisters—yes, even their own life—such a person cannot be my disciple". I believe that the Church's interpretation of this text is that in order to love your neighbor unconditionally, you cannot distinguish between your partner, your family and the rest, because this makes you trapped by the love towards your partner and the love towards your children, and prevents you from a deeper dedication to your neighbor. I think the Catholic Church requires priests to take the vow of chastity and celibacy for this reason. Am I wrong?

This text you mention is a poor translation of what Jesus actually said. Change the word hate to detach and you will understand what he meant. He means that in order to attain unconditional love (to follow him) it is necessary to overcome attachment, possessive love, which is very common in families, because often this selfish way of loving restricts the freedom of human beings and limits them greatly when it comes to giving themselves to a mission of unconditional love for their neighbor. Therefore, the interpretation of what Jesus said is totally contrary to reality. I say to you that those who have not experienced love as a couple

cannot experience unconditional neighborly love. The feelings of partner-love, when one fights for them, are the strongest thing there is.

It is these feelings that help us to move forward in life. To carry out a mission of dedication to others as Jesus did, he needed an inner strength. He had this inner strength because he was sure of what he loved, whom he loved and why he loved. I tell you that all true envoys of the spiritual world have felt and lived the love of kindred souls, and have been nourished by that love to carry out the work they have done. If one denies these feelings, what happens is that one feels utterly empty and lacking in courage and strength, and in the face of the adversities involved in such a mission, one falls down.

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

Their faith in God gives them strength, but the being in the human stage of evolution needs the love of a being equal to itself, and this being is the kindred soul. Why reject something that brings happiness and fulfils the human being in all aspects? Where is the problem? I say to you that to renounce the love of a partner, far from making you evolve, stagnates the spirit in its process of evolution. The prejudices that you have in this regard, that is, to think that renouncing the love of a partner makes you more evolved and more capable of loving your neighbor, are an invention of the Church to subjugate the will of the human being and are contrary to the Spiritual Laws, because they hinder the freedom of feeling and prevent the human being from attaining happiness.

But isn't it true that sometimes a partner can be an obstacle in an intense work of helping others?

It is not the fact of having a partner per se that hinders this work, but when, because of attachment, one of the partners believes that he or she has the right to restrict the freedom of the other partner and holds him or her back because he or she believes the other partner is his or her property and sees the others as adversaries who steal his or her attention. This is often the case

when someone has joined a partner who is not in affinity with him or her. The lack of affinity leads to misunderstanding and divergent motivations in life.

It can also occur within a couple composed of kindred souls if egosentiments get in the way, mainly attachment, but also others such as fear. Generally, this is fear of the loved one's suffering, or fear of losing him or her if he or she gives himself or herself to a mission that puts him or her in danger. When the partner is akin and fears and other manifestations of selfishness have been overcome, it is not an obstacle. Quite the contrary. If they agree to incarnate together, they are both involved in the mission with the same intensity. This makes the mission much more profound, since mutual love strengthens, comforts and soothes all the bitterness of the path they have chosen to live.

But it seems that Jesus did not have a partner during his life and this did not prevent him from loving his neighbor and carrying out his mission, did it?

We have talked about this before. Jesus is like everyone else. He also has his kindred soul, but it did not incarnate simultaneously with him, which does not mean that he did not maintain contact with it. For beings of Jesus' evolutionary level, the fact that the loved one is not simultaneously incarnated with him is not an insurmountable obstacle, for due to their capacity and sensitivity they have relative ease in detaching themselves from the material plane and are thus able to contact their kindred beings on the spiritual plane.

So isn't it selfish to love some people more than others?

You call selfishness what are simply differences of affinity. It is always easier to love someone who is like-minded than someone who is not. It is only when the spirit is very advanced that it is able to love with the same intensity beings with whom it has differences in affinity. I say to you that in order to experience unconditional neighborly love, one must first have experienced the love of the kindred soul, for this love is the nourishing force for loving others. Therefore, those who want to love their neighbor unconditionally but repress or cancel out the love of the soul

mate will never be able to achieve true neighborly love, for lacking the source from which it is nourished, they will quickly empty themselves in giving themselves to others when the first signs of ingratitude begin to appear. To reach the tenth degree, one must begin with the first, and pass through the intermediate degrees. But you seem to think that you have reached the tenth degree without being clear about the one, that is, if you still deny love to those who are like-minded, as is the case with soul-mate love, how can you want to love those who are not?

But it's not so easy to get it right and find true love the first time.

Exactly because it is not easy to get it right, you should allow yourselves to be able to turn back once you become aware that you are not in love. What is really sad is not that unions occur without love, but that you try so hard to prolong them by force, establishing earthly chains that prevent you from releasing them once you become aware that there is no love.

I think that young people are more aware that they are free to decide who they want and don't want to be with and are less hesitant to leave a relationship if they don't want to continue it.

Yes, it is true. Young people have more freedom now, especially in Western countries, because they have not experienced such a repressive upbringing. Above all, they have more freedom in sexuality and they know that the fact of having sexual relations with someone does not oblige them to be with that person for life. And that is a good thing. The problem for young people is not so much to leave relationships when they want to, but to know how to find true love, because most of them get together for reasons other than love. Despite having more freedom in life, they are not taking advantage of it to develop feelings.

And for what reasons do they unite?

What predominates are unions through physical attraction, especially in adolescence, or through similarity of mental interests. Physical attractiveness is valued above all else, as well as being important. That is why people with sexual attractiveness, fame, money, are highly desired as partners. Physically attractive young people are satisfied because their good looks guarantee

them suitors and they often choose according to their physical attractiveness. Partner relationships tend to be short-lived because once the sexual instinct has been satisfied, interest is lost and a newer relationship is sought. But sexuality practiced without love takes its toll, because in the most sensitive people it generates an inner emptiness and is the reason why many young people sink into deep depression, because they try to fill with sex what can only be filled with feelings. On the other hand, the one who is less attractive, while desiring the same, feels frustrated in his intentions, as they have more difficulties in getting what they want, because what is most valued is the physical attractiveness that they do not possess. They live with a complex about their physical appearance and feel undervalued and with little chance of finding a partner. Complexes and repressions as a result of physical appearance lead to depression and serious disorders such as anorexia and bulimia, due to the desire to be thinner and to increase attractiveness in order to be liked more.

Why does this happen to young people, if they have lived through a time of greater freedom?

Now there is greater sexual freedom, but there is still no freedom of feeling, because sentimental repression has yet to be overcome.

Your way of bringing up children is still very materialistic and not very spiritual. Children are not yet sufficiently educated in feelings. They are not taught in life to seek happiness by developing their feelings, they are not taught to value love and to have a spiritual outlook on life. On the one hand, they develop their minds, their intelligence and they are taught knowledge that will help them to have a profession in life. This is the academic training in schools. Outside of school, what is experienced in families and what is transmitted through the media and social relations is that happiness is achieved through the satisfaction of vanity. That is, they are taught to value external qualities that make one stand out from others, such as physical attractiveness, intelligence, success, fame, power and money.

Many young people have taken refuge in the satisfaction of whim and pleasure, in entertainment, in sex without feeling, in drugs, as a way of escaping the emptiness and dissatisfaction

they feel in life. They try to fill with pleasure and fun what should be filled with feeling, and in the absence of feeling, the inner self becomes depressed.

A large part of the youth suffers because they are trapped by the desire to satisfy their vanity and because their sensitivity to feelings is repressed or suppressed. They lack meaning in life.

The young people of this age need to understand that life does have a meaning beyond the amusement of gratification of whim and pleasure. To be truly fulfilled, they need to develop and live their feelings in complete freedom, as well as their spirituality. This is the only way to be happy.

Some people have the notion that the reason why young people have turned to consumerism, banality and sexual promiscuity is that the moral values of the past have been lost, that there has been a regression in spirituality. Are they right?

No. As we have already said, they take refuge in the material to escape the emptiness inside. 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 today's, but because they were more repressed and suffered more economic hardship. Religious puritanism stifled the free development of sexuality and condemned it to secrecy. Young people were free neither in their feelings nor in their sexuality and lived repressed and fearful, because in the eyes of religious puritanism everything was a sin. In the past, sexuality was almost completely repressed and was only allowed within marriages. And since in many marriages there was no love, but rather they were an imposition, sexual experiences for many people were horrible and traumatic. Many people had a double life, the one that was given outwardly to maintain social appearances and the hidden one, where many found an escape valve to a life full of taboos and repressions. This way of acting, that of double standards, still persists today, especially in older people who have lived a repressive upbringing, accustomed to having two faces for fear of what people will say.

INFIDELITY IN THE RELATIONSHIP IN THE LIGHT OF THE LAW OF LOVE

What do you think about fidelity and infidelity within a couple?

That one can be faithful to an obligation or one can be faithful to a feeling. Spiritually, only faithfulness to feelings has value.

What exactly do you mean by those words?

What I mean is that when there is no mutual feeling and affinity in a couple's relationship, fidelity is kept out of obligation, as a duty to be fulfilled that is striven for, not felt. When there is true feeling, fidelity arises spontaneously, without the need to make an effort to maintain it. You place too much value on the contract signed in front of the priest or the judge, which you call marriage, and too little on whether there is love between the spouses. That is why you condemn every extramarital sexual relationship, even if there is no love between the spouses, even though it may happen that in the extramarital relationship there is true love. You speak of unfaithfulness in marriage when you should know that the only unfaithfulness that exists spiritually is unfaithfulness to feelings. There are people who have spent a lifetime in a loveless marriage, even when they were in love with another person, and who have renounced this feeling by convincing themselves or being convinced that this was good, right and in harmony with divine law. They are deeply unhappy people who are considered by others to be saints, a display of virtue and impeccable morals, because they have sacrificed themselves to fulfil a promise that the priest solemnly sentenced on their wedding day: "What God has joined together, let no man put asunder". From a spiritual point of view, however, things look different, because only faithfulness to feelings has a spiritual value. These people, who have an unblemished image in the eyes of the norms and customs of their community, are people who are being unfaithful to their feelings and have therefore stagnated in their spiritual evolution. When they return to the spiritual world they will realize that they have made a futile sacrifice and that they will have to return in a future incarnation to do what they did not dare to do in this one, to fight for their feelings. On the other hand, those who were the executioners of other people's feelings, those people who do not seek to fight for their feelings but take pleasure in persecuting those who struggle

to be happy by loving in freedom, and are satisfied when they succeed in making someone unhappy caught in the bonds of forced marriage, expose themselves in succeeding lives to being themselves the victims of the repressive attitudes to their feelings of other beings similar to themselves in selfishness.

On the other side, the person who fights for his or her feelings, to be by the side of the person he or she loves, and who suffers misunderstanding, humiliation, blackmail and physical and/or psychological abuse, and who is considered by society, the community or the family to be an adulterer, unfaithful or immoral person, is the one who is truly advancing in his or her feelings. It is the one who is truly in harmony with the spiritual law of love and who will enjoy in the spiritual world the true happiness so hard won in the physical world, for he or she will find that there will no longer be any obstacle to the free manifestation of feelings.

I still don't understand it. I think if you give me an example it would be clearer for me

OK. Imagine that a woman is married to a man whom she does not love, but loves another man with whom she would like to form a couple and who corresponds to her in feelings. Both men, let's call them husband and lover, want to have sexual intercourse with this woman. According to your world's concept of fidelity, if she maintains a relationship with the lover, she is acting wrongly, because she is being unfaithful to her husband. But I tell you that if she makes the opposite decision, that is, if she maintains a relationship with the husband but not with the lover, she is being unfaithful to her feelings, because she loves the lover and not the husband.

I don't understand at all. So it's okay to have extramarital affairs?

You understand more than you pretend to. But I will make it clear so that there is no doubt. Spiritually, earthly contracts have no more validity than one wants to give them. That is to say, no one is obliged to love anyone or to be faithful to anyone else because of the obligation of a marriage contract, or for any other reason. What is wrong is to deceive another person into believing that

there are feelings that do not really exist. It is right to be honest about one's feelings and to act accordingly. In the above example, since the wife acknowledges that she does not love her husband, it is right that she should tell him so and, consequently, end the loveless relationship so that she can live the relationship of feeling with the loved one without the need to hide.

There are people who know that they are not in love with the one with whom they signed the contract of marriage, or the commitment to be a couple, and who maintain the bond out of convenience, out of necessity, out of guilt or out of fear of the reaction of others. We have already talked enough about this. On the other hand, there are people who know whom they love, but out of fear or comfort, they do not fight to unite with the loved one, but prefer to repress or annul their feelings so as not to suffer, and they adapt to earthly relationships that are comfortable but do not fulfil them, because they lack the essential, the mutual and reciprocated love. They live a life of appearance on the outside, and of emptiness and repressed suffering on the inside. Be honest with your feelings and make your life a reflection of your feelings. In this way you will avoid unnecessary suffering. Have the courage to fight for your feelings, because it is the only thing worth fighting for.

But can it not happen that even if people want to fight for their feelings, they are prevented by circumstances from achieving their goal? Continuing with the previous example, what happens if the husband does not agree to leave the relationship and forces the wife to continue it? In fact, there are women who are murdered by their ex-husbands or ex-partners because they do not accept the break-up of the relationship. Or what happens when the legislation of a country rejects divorce and even condemns the woman who leaves her husband to death? What option is left to that woman?

It is true that you may encounter many difficulties, because unfortunately in your world there is very little respect for freedom of feeling, especially for the most defenseless. However, respect for freedom of feeling has increased in comparison to the past and is recognized as a right in the laws of many countries. In Western countries, divorce is a right and there are laws that

protect against gender-based violence, although it is true that in other countries the situation is intolerable and there is still much room for improvement. But even if you have everyone against you, I tell you that it will be worth it, because there is no better reason to fight for than feelings, because it is the basis of spiritual evolution and happiness. The one who chooses to fight for the feelings will have the greatest of rewards, which is the happiness felt when reunited with the loved one, to be able to feel and live the feelings to the fullest. Though they may lose their physical life in the attempt, because of the hindrances of human selfishness, and thus fail on the material plane, let them be assured that what he has sown in the physical life they will reap as a reward on the spiritual plane.

On the contrary, those who do not fight for their feelings, who repress and suppress them, and at the same time force and strive to maintain a relationship without feelings, are already suffering the consequences of their lack of courage and will have to return in later lives to overcome what they have left unresolved in this life.

EGOSENTIMENTS IN COUPLE RELATIONSHIPS

Can it happen that a person has found his or her soul mate and still does not value him or her and desires to have sexual relations with other people, and even cheats on them?

Yes, when there is no firmness in the feelings, when there is no struggle to care for and develop them, and when egos are allowed to get in the way, this is often the case. In spirits that are not very sensitive to feelings, the biological sexual instinct predominates over the undeveloped feeling, and this results in seeking the satisfaction of the body rather than the happiness of the spirit. Sexual desire at this stage is aroused primarily by physical attractiveness and novelty. When there is satisfaction of the body, interest in the relationship is lost and new relationships are sought. There is no special preference for anyone in particular at this time. As the spirit progresses in the development of feelings it becomes bored with the purely sexual relationship, for once the desire is satisfied it feels an emptiness within, and seeks something

more in a relationship, that is, to love and be loved. And this is where sentimental affinity comes into play, because if it does not exist, the inner fullness cannot be reached. Then begins the struggle for feelings, to find happiness in the relationship. On this path, the spirit will live through innumerable experiences of personal relationships, where it will experience everything, instincts, feelings and egosentiments, and depending on the degree of happiness and unhappiness that it experiences, it will gradually perfect its sensitivity and its capacity to love. It will gradually discard egosentiments and develop feelings of love. It will be more and more clear about its feelings and will also be firmer when it comes to living in accordance with what it feels. It will also gradually show more respect for the freedom of feeling of others.

What are the most important egosentiments that interfere with feelings as a couple?

There are different ones. The main one is attachment and from it derive other egosentiments such as absorption and victimhood, jealousy, resentment and spite, sentimental obsession, guilt in love, fear of love and sentimental confusion.

Can you explain to me what each of these egosentiments consists of?

Yes, of course. Let's start with attachment. Although we have talked about it before, we will talk about it in more depth now. Attachment is what is commonly known as "possessive love". The person suffering from attachment assumes that when a partnership is created, it forces the partners to give up part of their will and freedom in favor of each other and, at the same time, that rights are acquired over the will and freedom of the partner. We can differentiate between two facets of attachment, active attachment and passive attachment.

Active attachment occurs in the person who considers the loved one to be his or her property and therefore has certain rights over him or her. It manifests itself as a desire to possess the will of the other person and an eagerness to control his or her life so that the other person does what one wishes. In other words, people with

active attachment believe they have the right to impose their will on their partner's will. They want to have someone who satisfies their desires, who pleases them, and they believe they have the right to demand this from the other person because they consider this to be part of the obligations of the couple's relationship.

Passive attachment happens when the person allows his or her partner to infringe on his or her freedom and will because he or she believes that the partnership obliges him or her to do so. The person suffering from passive attachment has a tendency to turn to the partner's satisfaction and complacency, renouncing his or her own freedom and will.

Traditional male chauvinist upbringing encourages attachment in both variants, as it approves the active attachment of the man and educates the woman to conform to living with passive attachment. In a male chauvinist relationship, the husband would act with active attachment, as he claims the right to dominate the wife, imposing his will on her and restricting her freedom, while the wife would act with passive attachment, as she is forced to give up part of her will and freedom to her husband.

Do you mean that, in general, men tend to act with active attachment and women with passive attachment?

No. There are many cases that are the other way around. Active and passive attachment can also occur in the same spouse and in both at the same time. Whether there is active or passive attachment has to do with the evolutionary level of each spirit. Active attachment is most prevalent in the vanity stage, where love is little known and is desired and needed more than loved. One seeks in the relationship that the other satisfies one's own desires and needs. If this spirit in the vanity stage incarnates as a man, it will take advantage of the male chauvinist upbringing to justify its attitude of dominance, and if it is a woman, it will also seek to dominate with other weapons.

Passive attachment is more common in proud people because of their need to be loved and their greater capacity to love. They believe that if they make an effort to please the other person they

will get them to love them, and as they have a great capacity to love, they give a great deal in the relationship, to the point of giving up their freedom and their will.

How can attachment be overcome?

Active attachment is overcome when we realize that wanting is one thing and wanting to possess is another. That if you really love someone you must start by respecting their will and their freedom in all aspects of their life, just as much as you like your freedom and your will to be respected.

Passive attachment is overcome when you realize that loving someone does not imply giving up your freedom or your will, and that it makes no sense to give them up because you want them to love you, because if the person really loves you, they will not ask you to give them up as a condition for loving you. The person who demands a sacrifice in order to love you does not really love you now and will not love you later, because true feelings arise spontaneously, they are not conditional on you doing something specific.

Absorption and victimhood

Absorption is the desire to attract the attention of others in order to satisfy or please one's own desires and needs. The person dominated by absorption tends to think only of himself or herself and demands and forces others to pay attention to him or her. In a couple's relationship, they often demand almost exclusive attention from their partner, often violating their freedom and will, by convincing them that this attention is rightfully theirs, because of the emotional bond between them. If they do not get the attention willingly, they often use victimhood to get it.

Victimhood is an egosentiment that characterizes a person who seeks to attract the attention of others to himself or herself by trying to arouse a feeling of pity, to make others feel sorry for him or her, with the purpose of subjecting others to his or her will or taking advantage of them. It is closely related to absorption, as the victimizers are often absorbing, because they demand the attention of others without respecting their free will. It is also

cowardly, for they do not fight to advance, but to get others to take their place in their trials and responsibilities.

It is a very subtle form of manipulation, as the manipulated person is often sucked in without realizing it. The victimizer often plays on the feeling of guilt, that is, they try to make their victim feel guilty if they do not agree to please or satisfy their demands.

For example, they often use their own illness to trap others. They invent ailments or exaggerate their own to avoid responsibility or to force others to take responsibility for them. Another argument they often use to cause pity and justify their absorption is to say that their discomfort is caused because they were not loved in childhood, when it is not true that this is the main cause of their discomfort. In relationships, they tend to look for compliant spouses, who always accede to their demands. They make themselves voluntarily dependent on their partner by their behavior, pretending to be physically or psychologically unwell all the time, in order to receive constant attention and for the other person to bear the burden of everything. This behavior ends up suffocating and exhausting the spouse, as they have practically no life of their own, but their life revolves around satisfying and pleasing the victimizer in the smallest details, as they convince them that they cannot fend for themselves. They themselves feed their discomfort and do not want to get better, because they use it as a weapon to trap.

How do you overcome absorption and victimhood?

Renouncing to control the lives of others and respecting their free will. This means that we must realize that we have no right to demand or impose anything on anyone, least of all under the pretext of having an emotional attachment to them. At the same time, it is necessary to overcome cowardice, laziness and comfort in order to face problems on one's own, instead of always looking for someone from outside to solve them.

Jealousy

We could define jealousy as an uneasiness that a person suffers from the fear of losing someone they consider their property. Jealousy in a couple's relationship is characteristic of a person with active, possessive and absorbing attachment, as they

consider their partner to be their property and demand exclusive attention from them. This is why they become enraged when their partner shows any attention or affection towards other people. Jealousy usually manifests itself as a permanent distrust of the partner and a recurrent obsession with the idea that the partner may be unfaithful. This obsession leads to an exhaustive control over the other person's life under the pretext of avoiding the possibility of infidelity, and makes them have animosity towards those people who are related to their spouse, especially those they consider as possible competitors as a partner. Jealousy can feed other egosentiments, which are used to exert control over the spouse's life, such as aggressiveness, absorption, victimhood or spite. The jealous person during the relationship is often the scorned person when the relationship breaks up. The jealous person reflects poverty and weakness of feeling. First, because they do not pay attention to the other person's happiness. They think only of satisfying their desire for domination without thinking of the great harm they cause to their partner. Secondly, because they do not trust that the bond of feelings is sufficient to maintain the union of the couple. That is why they resort to coercion and intimidation. When there is true love, feelings are trusted and there is no fear of interference from third parties. If a third person appears in the relationship, it is a symptom of poor or non-existent feelings.

How do you overcome jealousy?

Jealousy is a symptom of a lack of feelings, only active attachment. Jealousy is overcome by recognizing this lack of feeling and recognizing one's own active attachment. To overcome it, one must renounce the desire to possess the other and respect the freedom of feeling. It is necessary to realize that true love is free and cannot be forced, that it arises spontaneously and that it is on the basis of this free and mutual spontaneous feeling that the union will take place, without the need for any obligation or effort to maintain it.

Resentment and spite

Resentment is an egosentiment characterized by animosity

towards someone we feel has wronged us. One feels hurt in one's self-respect, or feelings, and feels justified in harming the wrongdoer because one expects satisfaction from that harm. There is a desire for redress or revenge. When people act out of resentment, they tend to harm not only those who have harmed them, but everyone in general, because when resentment takes over the people's will, it makes them believe that all acts of others towards them have a hidden intention to harm them. Resentful people become extremely distrustful.

A variant of resentment is spite. In this case it is animosity towards the partner because he or she decides to break off the relationship.

The scorned person feels hurt in their feelings because they feel that they have lost something that belonged to them and they resent this loss. They want their ex-partner to suffer and often act to harm them. The person feels that he or she is a victim and has the right to hurt the other person, whom he or she considers to be the cause of his or her pain. Their motto is: "For what you have made me suffer I will make you suffer".

The scorned person uses everything they consider a weapon to make amends, victimhood, defamation, manipulation, blackmail, threats, coercion or aggression.

They believe they are justified in taking actions that harm the ex-partner, through aggression, threats, false accusations of mistreatment, desire to dispossess the other of the material goods that they have had in common, etc. If there are children in common, they are used as a weapon, trying to impede their relationship with the children or giving a bad image of the ex-partner to the children so that there is discord between them. If the ex-partner has a new relationship, the new partner may also be the target of the scorned partner's attack, especially if he or she believes that his or her separation is related to this new relationship.

But isn't it normal that when someone is abandoned by their partner they feel bad?

One can feel sadness, disappointment, frustration, loneliness or nostalgia as a consequence of the break-up. But it is one thing to

feel sadness and quite another to wish suffering for the other person and act to make him or her suffer. The scorned person also reflects poverty and weakness of feeling, for the one who truly loves never acts to harm the loved one, even when the loved one makes a decision that one does not understand. This is because there is still no respect for freedom of feeling, which gives each person the right to decide with whom he or she does or does not want to have a relationship. If there were respect for freedom of feeling, there would be less suffering when a relationship breaks up and less suffering for others.

How do you overcome spite?

It all revolves around the same thing, that is, overcoming attachment and respecting freedom of feeling. As we said in the case of active attachment and jealousy, we must realize that no one belongs to anyone else. There is no right of ownership over one's spouse, and therefore no right to decide for him or her, let alone to demand the continuity of the relationship if he or she does not want it. Therefore, there is no justification for acting against him or her.

Sentimental obsession or fascination

Obsession in personal relationships refers to the unfulfilled desire to get or possess a person one has set as a goal. If the desire is easily attainable, once achieved, interest is lost. But if it is costly, it becomes a challenge. The desire increases and, when it is not satisfied, it becomes an obsession. Often this does not reflect a real feeling, but only a dissatisfaction and a need, which may be sexual and/or affective. Therefore, obsession makes people lose their sense of reality. Obsession is characteristic of capricious people, who have lived a long time focused on satisfying their whims and when these desires are not fulfilled, they become self-obsessed. Also repressed people, who find it difficult to express their feelings, are subject to sentimental obsession. They are often fascinated by the person who is the object of their desire and create a fantasy around him or her that does not correspond to reality, but which feeds this desire and also the hope that if they can achieve it, they can become happy.

The way you put it reminds me of what Don Quixote's character ends up feeling for Dulcinea del Toboso.

It is a good example of what fascination and sentimental obsession are all about.

Obsession is all about the mind and little about feelings, to the extent 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 about whether they are reciprocated or not. They tend to be people who do not act sincerely, as they are often afraid of rejection and are unwilling to admit it. Their aim is to get the desired person at any cost, even going beyond their will if necessary. That is why they do not openly express their intentions, but act cunningly to get what they want without giving the other person a chance to say no. If they are physically beautiful, they believe they can bend the other person's will and feelings through seduction. If they are intelligent, they study the other person's weaknesses and use that knowledge to win them over through persuasion, flattery and satisfying the other person's needs and whims. If they are not very sensitive spirits, if they do not succeed in these ways, they will use other methods that violate free will even more, such as blackmail, intimidation, coercion and violence.

What would happen if they got the person they wanted? Would they be happy?

No. For a while they feel the satisfaction of having achieved what they wanted. But when they realize that the reality does not live up to their expectations, they suffer great disappointment and quickly become disappointed with the relationship. In their eyes, their partner, whom they once saw as a god or goddess, now becomes ordinary and vulgar to them, and they gradually lose interest in them. They often blame the other for the relationship not working out, when in fact their dissatisfaction comes from the lack of feeling behind the fascination. However, they can become possessive if they perceive that other people are interested in their partner, because they consider her a hard-earned trophy that is their property. And then they neither live nor let live, as they are neither happy in the relationship nor allow the other person to free themselves from it and seek happiness

elsewhere. It is like the capricious child who kicks when the parents do not agree to buy him a toy he wants and, when he gets it, he plays for a little while and then gets tired of it. But if another child is interested in the toy then he becomes interested in it again, not because it is attractive to him again, but because he does not want to give up what he consider his property.

How does one overcome sentimental obsession?

Active attachment, that is, the conception of love as a property right, must be overcome. If the person's feelings are not reciprocated, he or she must accept this reality without trying to force a change, since feelings are free and cannot and should not be forced, as the only thing that would be achieved is to suffer and make people suffer. If the obsession occurs in a repressed person, it can be overcome by overcoming shyness and repression, having the courage to express what you feel at any given moment with sincerity, without hiding your intention for fear of rejection. In this way, they will make their relationships real and will not generate fantasies or obsessions about the person they like, because if they are reciprocated, they will be able to have a natural relationship with them, without the need for deceit or manipulation, and if they are not, they will be able to turn the page with a clear conscience, without clinging to the thought of what could have been and was not because they did not try.

Sentimental guilt in the couple's relationship

It is the feeling of guilt that occurs when a person tries to force their own freedom of feeling, either because they force themselves to feel what they do not feel, or because they force themselves to repress what they feel. It occurs frequently in people who suffer from passive attachment.

One of the situations in which sentimental guilt becomes evident is when a person in a relationship realizes that he or she is not in love, but believes that because the couple has formed a bond and has spent time together, this obliges him or her to be in love and to continue the relationship. In other words, they make an effort to feel partner-love for their partner because they believe it is their obligation. This effort includes giving the other person what they are supposed to give them as their partner, such as

indulging them sexually, taking care of them and spending time with them. And they do all this because they feel guilty for not loving them, because they believe that they must compensate them in some way for the lack of love on their part. Another situation where sentimental guilt is evident is when a person falls in love with another person but at the same time judges that this love is wrong according to his or her moral code of conduct. Let us take as an example the case of a person who falls in love with someone who already has a partner, or this person already has a partner. In this case the person feels guilty for loving this "unsuitable" person whom he or she is not supposed to love and forces himself or herself to repress or renounce this love that he or she judges immoral or forbidden. In this way he or she condemns himself or herself to be unhappy.

And what is a person supposed to do if this happens, I mean if they fall in love with someone when they already have a partner?

They can do whatever they want. But if they want to be happy, they will have to fight for their feelings.

Does it mean that they should break off the previous relationship in order to unite with the person they love?

A loveless relationship is already broken by the mere fact that love is missing. You just need to recognize it and act accordingly. We have talked about this before. If you do not love your partner, you should be honest and have the courage to tell him or her and then formally end the relationship. This is independent of whether you love someone else or not. If you also love someone else, you should admit the reality of your feelings and then express them to the loved one, in order to know whether there is a correspondence of feelings or not, and then accept the other person's decision, whatever it may be. If there is a correspondence of feelings and a willingness to be together as a couple, nothing and no one can or should prevent it, least of all the feeling of guilt, because spiritually it has no basis.

But I understand that a situation like the above often arouses feelings of guilt. How does one overcome such sentimental guilt?

It awakens feelings of guilt because you have a mistaken

conception of what love as a couple is, of a "possessive" or attachment type, and because you have created equally mistaken moral norms around it, such as marriage with property rights and the indissolubility of marriage. To overcome guilt, it is necessary to realize that feelings are free and spontaneous, that they cannot and should not be forced, and that they do not obey any conventionalism. Everyone has the right to love freely whoever they want, and not even we can force ourselves to feel what we do not feel, or to stop feeling what we feel, without this being anyone's fault. Again we come to the same point, respect for freedom of feeling. In this case it is about respecting one's own freedom of feeling and not punishing oneself unjustly for a supposed crime that does not exist. No one should feel guilty about feeling true love, even if it means transforming one's life from end to end, because the feeling of guilt, if not overcome, is an obstacle that prevents one from feeling and living these feelings fully and from enjoying the happiness that emanates from them.

What is the fear of love?

As its name suggests, it is the fear that someone may have of feeling love because they believe that this will cause them suffering.

It usually occurs in people who have lived traumatic experiences in the past, either because their ex-partner made them suffer or because third parties acted to destroy an existing sentimental relationship, and achieved their goal. It also occurs in people who have received a repressive upbringing with feelings since childhood that has limited their freedom of feeling. They are afraid to feel freely because they fear some kind of retaliation against them. They are also often conditioned to feel remorse if their feelings are not correct from the point of view of the norms of behavior they have learned.

People who are afraid of love tend to be distrustful when it comes to relating to others, because they fear that others will use what they know about them to hurt them. That is why they tend to be reserved and find it difficult to make themselves known as they are. They fear misunderstanding, rejection, blackmail, threats,

manipulation, slander, aggression and believe that if they do not make themselves known, if they hide or repress their feelings, they will prevent anyone from acting against them. That is why they have a tendency to emotional isolation, because they believe that this is the best way to avoid being harmed.

So emotional isolation is a good weapon to avoid being hurt, isn't it?

No. The fear of emotional suffering causes the person to cover themselves under a shell that apparently protects them from the emotional aggressions of others, but at the same time prevents them from being happy, because this shell also prevents them from expressing the love they feel for others and from perceiving the love that other people may feel for them. In this case, the damage is not caused by others but by themselves, but it is nonetheless a very intense suffering.

Can you give an example of how isolation creates suffering?

Yes, imagine that an emotionally isolated person meets their kindred soul and the kindred soul approaches them with the intention of expressing their feelings. Under normal conditions both would be able to express their own feelings and feel the love of the other, and this would make them happy. But the person who is isolated, because of fear and mistrust, does not perceive the love given to them and at the same time represses their own feelings of love. And this is what makes them suffer. At the same time they make their kindred soul suffer because they prevent them from transmitting their love and because they does not feel loved either. Their kindred soul will probably feel frustrated and confused because they do not understand what is going on. They may even feel guilty for their suffering, be afraid to express their feelings and even question whether they are reciprocated, so one may give up trying to start a relationship with the other. And so, because of emotional isolation, which stems from fear and mistrust of love, two kindred souls who could have been happy together end up going their separate ways and continue to experience no happiness.

But isn't it true that there are people who have had no bad

experiences in life with regard to love relationships and yet are still afraid to love or to fall in love? What is the reason for this fear in these cases?

Emotional trauma can come from a previous life. Even if the circumstances of the past are not retained in the memory, if the trauma has not been overcome, it remains impregnated in the spirit and is therefore retained in later life, and manifests itself in the form of fear. People with a fear of love have no illusion about life, because they believe that happiness cannot exist for them, and they do not trust that anyone will truly love them. They feel like the stray dog that has been beaten for a long time by an abusive owner from whom it managed to escape. One day this dog comes across some sensitive people who take pity on it and decide to take it in for loving care. When one of them comes to pet it, the fear of mistreatment makes the dog believe that the hand that rises to pet it is a hand that rises to mistreat it and it runs away terrified from the people who could have given it a better life. This is what happens to many people who, because of fear, lose their chance to be happy in life.

How can isolation and fear of love be overcome?

First of all by recognizing that one is afraid and that because of fear one isolates oneself. One can overcome fear and overcome isolation by allowing the free expression of one's feelings, by having the courage to fight to live in accordance with them, by trusting in them when making decisions in life without thinking about the opinion of others. No matter how difficult the circumstances may seem, one should never give up one's feelings, nor repress them, because this is the only way to be happy. It is necessary to regain faith and hope in love.

But there are people who, despite courageously fighting for their feelings, do not achieve their goal of living together with the person they love, or do not manage to free themselves from forced relationships because other people prevent them from doing so. We have already talked about gender-based violence and the women who have been murdered for defending their right to freedom of feeling. Have they failed in their fight?

You never fail when you fight for your feelings. If, because of

human misunderstanding and selfishness, that person does not get to taste the happiness of love on the physical plane, rest assured that they will be rewarded on the spiritual plane. And the courage they showed in their struggle to live according to what they felt will be an evolutionary achievement that will live on forever in their spirit. They will have clarity and courage of feeling, valuable spiritual qualities hard-won in the trials they have experienced in their incarnations.

These will be qualities that they will manifest from then on and forever, and this will help them to be happy and prevent them from falling into the traps that made them unhappy in the past.

Sentimental confusion

Sentimental confusion is an emotional state that arises when people force themselves to feel what they do not feel, or to repress what they really feel, or both. If they persist in this attitude for a long time, there comes a moment when they can no longer distinguish between what they really feel and what they force themselves to feel. And this is the confusion that these people have, that they confuse feeling with "must-feel" and substitute feeling for obligation. People who force themselves to feel what they do not feel, suffer because this obligation to feel exhausts them and generates emptiness, since feelings cannot be forced, they either occur spontaneously or not at all. They can also suffer from the repression of a true feeling, because they believe that they should not or do not have the right to feel it. However, the self-deception motivated by sentimental confusion makes them believe that they suffer from remorse for having awakened an inappropriate feeling, that this is the cause of their unhappiness and that they must struggle to eliminate it.

Sentimental confusion often occurs in people who have nullified their freedom of feeling. One of the reasons that nullify their freedom of feeling may be that they have been brought up according to a moral code that is repressive of the feelings they have assimilated as their own. In this case their sensitivity is strongly conditioned by the moral norms of that code. It may also be because they have gone through some painful circumstance in their life related to feelings in which they were forced to

renounce them.

I find it difficult to understand what sentimental confusion is and how it manifests itself. Could you give me an example to clarify it better?

OK, so let's take the case of a person who is married in church and has been married for several years. During that time this person has realized that he or she is not really in love and that is not happy in that relationship. If this person felt free, this person would quickly realize that he or she is not in love with his or her partner, would let them know and would ask for a divorce.

But if this person has a religious upbringing, which believes that marriage should be for life and cannot be broken, his or her sense of duty and fear of a negative reaction from others will force him or her to continue the relationship. He or she may make the decision to force himself to love his or her spouse because he or she believes that it is also a moral obligation to "love forever the person to whom you are joined in marriage". This person will strive to please him or her in every way so that the partner does not realize that he or she is not in love, and this person will convince himself or herself that he or she is making all these sacrifices out of love. The fact that it is a sacrifice and that he or she experiences it as an obligation actually reflects the fact that there is no love, because the one who feels true love does not experience giving himself or herself to the other as a sacrifice but as an act that he or she does freely and that generates happiness for him or her.

Another option to which one may resort is to justify the break-up by a bad attitude of the spouse, in this way the responsibility for the break-up is placed on the spouse, thus exonerating oneself of having failed in their duty. In other words, "I love him but I cannot go on living with him because I feel that he does not love me, does not pay attention to me or has done this to me and I cannot forgive him".

Another option is to make the spouse's life miserable so that he or she takes the decision to leave the relationship. In this way, the

one who formally fails in the sense of duty-feeling is the other and he or she is exempted from his or her responsibility for the breakup of the marriage. In the eyes of others, one will make the other person believe that they are the victim and the spouse is to blame, when the opposite is true.

In this way, a situation of emotional conflict that had a clear origin "I don't love my partner" and a very simple solution "I'm leaving the relationship", because of sentimental confusion becomes a monumental mess that causes suffering to oneself and to others. In other words, reality has been falsified by the refusal to recognize one's lack of feelings and the cowardice to contravene the religious moral code.

How can sentimental confusion be overcome?

By going deep into oneself with total sincerity in order to know how to distinguish what are true feelings from what are obligations acquired through repressive education. And once one is clear about one's feelings, one must have the courage to live as one feels, without being influenced by the opinions of others, disassociating oneself from all the repressions and prejudices of one's upbringing, because if they violate the right to freedom of feeling, they are wrong rules and precepts from a spiritual point of view and do not deserve to be taken into consideration.

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

Are there any measures that could be applied at the societal level that would allow humanity to move forward spiritually faster?

Yes, love the children and try not to hurt them, either physically or emotionally. Never humiliate them. I warn you that from a spiritual point of view one of the most serious crimes that exists is the mistreatment of children. Allow children to be free, to express their feelings, to play and to learn through play. If you raise a generation of children with love your world will change quickly, because love changes the world. You will not change the world, they will change the world because of the love they have known.

Any advice on how best to deal with children?

Have you never been children? Put yourselves in their place. Remember when you were children, the good and the bad. Remember the bad things that were done to you so that you don't repeat them and the good things so that you can take them as an example. And here we are not only talking about physical abuse, but also about emotional abuse, because there are many people in your world who emotionally abuse children, starting with their own children, although very few people will admit it. They are so wrapped up in their own problems that they do not have a minimum of sensitivity to realize the harm they are doing to their children. They think that children, just because they are children, do not understand things as adults do and are therefore less sensitive, so they have no compunction in dealing with them, and they take out all their frustrations on them. However, the opposite is true: children are more vulnerable and sensitive to physical and emotional harm than adults, so more emphasis should be placed on treating them as respectfully and lovingly as possible. Accept and love them as they are.

Do not set any conditions for loving them. There are people who do not love their children, they only use them to give themselves importance, to boast about them because they are intelligent, because they have some quality that makes them better in the

eyes of others, and if they do not have these qualities they look down on them, and this greatly affects their self-esteem. He who truly loves his children loves them as they are, whether they are more or less handsome, more or less intelligent, more or less determined.

Some people think that physical punishment is necessary to educate children. What do you think about this?

Then they will also be in favor of their boss giving them a slap in the face from time to time if they feel they have not done their job properly.

Well, I don't think they would be very happy about it, to be honest. I think the normal thing to do would be to report the boss for mistreatment at work.

Of course they don't like it, because nobody likes to be hit. If you consider hitting an adult a criminal and deplorable act, why don't you have the same criteria when adults hit children, who are also weaker and cannot defend themselves? What you do not want for yourselves, do not do to others, especially not to the weakest and most defenseless, which are children. How sad it is to observe how some parents, when their children hit other children, punish them by doing the same thing they have just forbidden them to do, that is, hitting them. What can the child learn when he sees the adult doing the same thing he is censuring himself, apart from the fact that the strongest is the one who imposes his law through violence? Never hit a child and never use the excuse that it is for his or her own good, to educate and teach him or her discipline. Those who use physical punishment do not educate, they only show their inability to educate, their lack of tact, patience, tenderness and gentleness towards children. If we fight against abuse and gender violence, equal or more emphasis should be placed on fighting against child abuse.

Well, I believe that in many countries today, child abuse is a punishable offense and the adult is punished if it is proven that the child has been abused.

Yes, especially in the West, and this is a major step forward. The problem is that it is often difficult to prove that a child is being

abused, because the evidence of abuse is not obvious. An adult who has been abused has the capacity to defend himself and file a complaint if he has been assaulted, but children need an adult to defend themselves, and if the abuse occurs in the family environment, who is going to defend them if those who are there to protect them are their tormentors? Moreover, your society is still excessively tolerant of minor physical punishment, as many people consider a slap, a smack or a slap on the bottom to be acceptable, although I am sure that if it were done to them, they would not find it funny. Let everyone think to themselves how it would feel to be the object of the treatment they give to children. This will help you to be more sensitive to them.

Some people argue that the ideal would be not to use physical punishment and agree with limiting its use, but that there are children who are very rebellious and do not listen to reason, and that in these cases it is necessary to have a “heavy hand”, that is, to apply more forceful measures. What do you think about this?

Those who believe that educating their children, or children in general, means imposing oneself on them and, in order to submit them to their will, use verbal or physical aggression with the aim of scaring them so that, out of fear, they end up obeying, reflect their own incapacity and spiritual immaturity. When there is love, sensitivity and understanding, there is always another way of doing things, but if there is not, any excuse is a good one to bring out the bad attitudes one carries inside.

But isn't it true that many of the adults who abuse children were themselves abused as children? I mean, they have not had a good example to follow.

In such cases they should remember how they felt when they were abused and how it hurt them to be treated with contempt and insensitivity, so that they will try not to repeat with their children or with any other child what they did not like for themselves. There are many people who have been abused, physically or psychologically, as children to a greater or lesser extent, because in your world selfishness still prevails in all aspects. Those who have taken good note of the experience and remember the suffering they experienced will try to spare their

children, and childhood in general, the suffering they have experienced.

What are the alternatives for education without resorting to heavy-handedness?

Play is the way in which children learn in a natural way without the need to force them. Through play, children can be taught values and knowledge of all kinds. If they have acted negatively, the first step is to talk to them so that they become aware of the negative act they have committed. There is a very simple question that can help them to reflect: how would you feel if someone had done the same thing to you as you have done? For example, if they have hit another child, a good argument to induce them to reflect on this is to ask them "do you like being hit?" It is necessary to encourage dialogue and reflection in the resolution of conflicts, to help the child to become aware, to understand where the problem lies in their actions and to offer them the possibility of repairing the damage they have done. In fact, there are educational currents in your world that act in accordance with this philosophy. But for this to happen, it is necessary that the child receives more attention than is usually the case.

Some people think that education today is worse than in the past. That children now learn little because these new educational methods are too soft and all they do is make children tease their teachers and pay little attention in class. What do you think about this?

They are completely wrong. It is true that some people, especially those with a rigid way of being, seem to be nostalgic for the education of the past. They are the ones who tend to agree with the proverb "spare the rod and spoil the child". In times past, religious schools were highly valued by some parents because they had a reputation for educating with "discipline", as God intended. In reality, what they called "educating with discipline" consisted of forcing obedience on students through fear, threats and physical punishment, making the lives of these students bitter who, more than children, were frightened little recruits whose faces had lost all hint of the spontaneity, sensitivity and joy of

childhood. And all this, moreover, was done in the name of God.

But this education, although it may have made children more submissive and obedient, did not make them smarter, happier or freer. These children who have grown up with fear in their bodies as adults have many shortcomings. If they have not overcome the trauma of childhood, they tend to have difficulty expressing feelings, low self-esteem and are prone to emotional problems, although they may still remember the list of the Goths Kings by heart, as their lives depended on it.

It is also questionable whether the students of the past were more intelligent and better educated than those of today, as in the past there was a strong emphasis on memorizing content and little on logical reasoning. The appropriateness of educational content was also questionable, the resources allocated to education were less, and the length of compulsory schooling was also shorter. Current education aims for children to have a greater capacity for reflection and thinking, to memorize less and reason more. On the other hand, the countries that show better academic performance rates and lower school failure rates are not those that opted for discipline-based educational models, but rather the opposite, 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 with the best educational model in the world, is a clear example of what I am telling you.

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

Look, what happens is that often the problem is not the children but the parents themselves, because many parents don't know their children's feelings or their emotional needs. They suffer from sentimental ignorance. They think that by feeding their children, taking them to the doctor when they are sick, providing for their material needs and getting them into a good school so that they have a good education, they have done everything as parents. They still lack something fundamental, and that is to take care of the emotional care of their children. It is sad to observe how many

parents are bothered by their own children and therefore do not spend time with them or express affection and understanding. Rather, they are overwhelmed when they are with them, irritated by everything they do and do not pay attention to them. In addition, there is a common tendency for some parents to value their children according to their academic merits. Some parents only worry about their children if they get bad grades or if they get sick.

This makes children feel unwanted and try to get their parents' attention. They may use the tactic of lowering their academic performance because they know that in this way parents will pay attention to them. Or it simply happens that children feel so emotionally bad that they lose interest in everything, including their studies. Due to ignorance and lack of attention towards their children, parents believe that their children's problem is that they are lazy in their studies and that they need to go to a school where more discipline is imposed, with more authoritarian teachers who force them to study more. And the problem is not in the school but in the lack of attention from parents.

But is there anything wrong with wanting children to study, so that when they grow up they will have a means to earn a living?

There is nothing wrong with wanting children to study. But this should not be used as an argument for loving them more or less.

If they are only valued if they are intelligent and good students, children can have problems with their self-esteem and also feel under excessive pressure to study. Children should be loved unconditionally as they are and cared for emotionally so that they can be happy.

Sometimes it also happens that the adult tries to make the child conform to rules that are absurd, as they greatly limit their freedom and spontaneity, and then the child rebels against these rules, which he or she considers unfair. It is absurd to ask a child not to play or to sit still permanently. As they are unfair, it is impossible to sustain them through reasoning, so some parents resort to imposition and coercion.

So should children be allowed to do whatever they want, even if what they want is harmful to themselves or others?

Not everything. Use common sense. Everything in its own time. Children's freedom and responsibility should increase as they grow older and acquire greater abilities. When children are young they are not aware of many of the dangers, they cannot be left alone in the street without supervision, as they can commit imprudent acts such as crossing the street without looking. They should be taught progressively what is dangerous for them and what is dangerous for others. They must be taught to respect other children, not to hit, not to insult, to assume the responsibilities of their age, such as doing their homework, picking up their toys when they have finished playing, etc. No more and no less than a child can assume according to their age, always trying to be respectful, understanding, affectionate and patient with them, and respecting their freedom and sensitivity.

But where is the limit? For example, if the child does not want to go to school, or to do homework, should he or she be forced or left alone?

Use your common sense. Instead of trying to force them to do things, talk to them, talk to them about the importance of learning, stimulate them, share with them the time to do their homework, make it fun and enjoyable and you will see that the child will respond much better than if you force them to do it.

And how can we get the child to learn what is necessary but at the same time boring or tedious?

Make it fun and share this moment with them, make them feel cared for and supported in what they are doing, as this stimulates them to continue. We have already said that children have fun playing and through play they can be taught many things without finding it tedious, and so they themselves will want to learn because learning will be fun for them.

What should education be like at home, in the family?

Spend time with your children, play with them, talk to them about their things, their problems and worries. Always be open to answer

their questions. Remember that they are discovering the world and that in order to learn they need to ask everything, although it may seem obvious to you, for them it is not and if they see that you are making fun of them they will hold back. Be very patient with them. Allow them to play whenever possible, because for children, playing is their life and if you stop them from playing you are doing them a lot of harm. Constantly show them your feelings in an expressive way, with words, kisses, caresses and hugs. Allow them to develop their personality freely, do not impose on them the personality you would like them to have. Love them as they are and help them to gradually polish their selfishness and to develop their sensitivity and affection without restrictions. Do not allow your adult problems and worries, which have nothing to do with them, to interfere in their lives.

But aren't there times when if you are too benevolent with your child, they become demanding and capricious and use tantrums to get their own way? What can you do in such cases?

It is true that there are parents who allow children to do even what is dangerous for them and give in to their every whim, out of laziness, weakness of character or because they no longer listen to the child's complaint, and this causes the child to become demanding and capricious and to use his or her cunning to bend the parents' will. In such cases, act firmly, do not give in to the blackmail the child tries to use, but never respond with violence or aggression. When the child acts in a despot-like manner, that is when you should pay the least attention to him or her. If they notice that when they act in this way they are ignored and do not get anything they demand, they will eventually tire of it. Help them to become aware of their own selfish attitudes through dialogue and reflection.

Any recommendations for future parents?

Yes, that they try to conceive their children with love, so that they come into the world with the certainty that they will be loved, cared for in all aspects of their lives, especially emotionally. I assure you that if the children who come into the world were conceived with love, the suffering in the world would diminish enormously.

I think things have improved nowadays compared to earlier times. I mean that today's parents are more aware of their children's needs, am I wrong?

It is true that there has been a certain level of progress. In earlier times, children were brought into the world mostly through the ignorance and unconsciousness of the parents. They were brought into the world without the explicit wish of the parents. They came into the world accidentally, because couples had sexual relations without any form of contraception, because there was neither the means nor the education that exists today. As a result, they gave birth to as many children as biologically possible, and this meant that the children were often born in very difficult material circumstances. The only concern most parents had for their children was to ensure their survival, while there was little or no emotional care. These were not the best conditions in which to come into the world, but since it is necessary for spirits to incarnate in the material world in order to learn and evolve, they took whatever opportunities were available to them. The sensitivity of those spirits was less developed than it is now, both in parents and children, and even if the children received little emotional and sentimental attention, their suffering was also tempered by the lesser sensitivity.

Today, in many countries, especially in the West, things have changed. The percentage of children who come into the world accidentally, without the will of the parents, has decreased. Many are now conceived with the will and awareness of the parents to have them. Because of the greater economic well-being in the West and the lack of large numbers of offspring, the survival and material care of the children is guaranteed by the parents. They will be children who do not go hungry, thirsty, cold or suffer from diseases caused by malnutrition and lack of hygiene. But something fundamental is still missing, which is to conceive children out of love and with love. Most children are still conceived for reasons other than love.

What are the reasons other than love that drive parents to have children?

Often this is done because there is a kind of obligation to continue the family lineage, or because it is convenient for the children to take care of the parents when they are older. There are couples who reach a certain age and still do not wish to have children because it implies making changes in their lives that they are not very well disposed to. But they have them anyway because biologically their chances of conceiving decrease with age. As the saying goes, "they are past their prime". Sometimes children are conceived as a way of trapping the spouse and forcing them to continue the relationship when they fear a breakdown of the relationship, or as a desperate attempt to save a relationship that is not working.

What are the consequences for these children conceived without love?

Many of these children who come into the world conceived without love will suffer from the lack of love from their parents, in the form of mistreatment, misunderstanding, neglect, coldness, and all of this will cause them to suffer greatly, for the children coming into the world today are more advanced and sensitive spirits than in times past, the fruit of learning acquired in a multitude of incarnations. Therefore, their level of suffering in the face of emotional neglect, in the face of psychological discomfort, is greater than in times past. And this is the cause of most of the suffering of children in the West, who are not loved by their parents, even though the parents try hard to believe that it is always the child's problem because he or she has a bad attitude. Many of these suffering children develop emotional trauma or physical illnesses as a result of this suffering due to lack of love, without most parents being aware of it. It is therefore necessary for parents to become more aware and sensitive to the emotional well-being of their children and in this way they will avoid many of the sufferings that now plague them.

LOVING THE NEIGHBOR IN THE LIGHT OF THE LAW OF LOVE

We have focused a lot on personal relationships, especially relationships with couples and children, but I understand that unconditional love goes beyond personal relationships.

Of course. There are no limits to love. The more a spirit has the capacity to love, the more people it is capable of loving, regardless of whether there is a blood relationship or not. The goal is to achieve unconditional love, which embraces all beings in creation without distinction of any kind. Jesus already spoke to you about this when he told you to love your neighbor as yourself, and when he said to love your enemy.

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

Everything we talked about revolves around this. To evolve to the levels of Jesus, much emphasis must be placed on eliminating selfishness and developing the feelings. And this is not easy. It is not a job of a single lifetime. It is hundreds of thousands of years of evolution, thousands of incarnations. Moreover, although all spirits incarnate for this purpose, once they are incarnated, they do not become conscious of what they did it for.

Most people's consciousness only extends as far as a physical life, and while material fortune smiles on them, they devote their lives to the satisfaction of material desires.

They take any existential reflection as meaningless talk, a waste of time. They do not want to make any changes because they are not interested in leaving the capricious life they lead.

Some evade their own inner concerns by developing their intelligence under materialistic scientific education, and scoff at or consider useless any kind of existential enquiry.

There are others who confuse spirituality and religion, and allow themselves to be carried away by religion because it is an easy path, believing that following rituals is enough to achieve a privileged place in "heaven" and substituting spiritual work with

themselves for religious fervor, under the delusion that the latter is pleasing to God.

There are people who do awaken existential concerns within themselves. Often this awakening is a consequence of having experienced circumstances in life of great suffering to which they are not resigned and which they want to find an explanation for. They are not satisfied with the biased or incomplete explanations provided by religion or materialistic science about the meaning of life. But they fall into despair when they do not find satisfactory answers to their questions.

The conclusion of all this is that, out of disinterest, ignorance, disbelief, fanaticism or hopelessness, most people fail to find the true meaning of life, and thus live without understanding life or learning from it, because they do not use it to evolve, that is, they make little effort to detach themselves from selfishness and to develop their feelings.

As I understand it, Buddhism talks about the cause of human evil being due to the existence of desire in human beings, and that the annulment of desire will bring inner peace and spiritual advancement. What is your opinion on this?

Well, it is necessary to differentiate where the desire comes from. A selfish desire is not the same as a desire motivated by feelings. Some people confuse the elimination of selfish desire with the elimination of all desire, and so they come to the conclusion that they have to cancel their will in order to advance spiritually, and this is a tremendous mistake that many people take advantage of to manipulate others. The one you call the Buddha knew that the cause of human evil was selfishness and that the elimination of selfishness was necessary for spiritual advancement to take place, and he referred to selfish desire as that impulse which human beings must try to eliminate from within themselves in order to become happy. But as always, as time goes on, words and teachings are misinterpreted, and the spiritually insufficiently advanced being has difficulty in distinguishing the true from the adulterated, and takes an adulterated teaching for good just because it is wrapped in the guise of spirituality.

Any examples?

The attitude towards sex. There are people who believe, because they have been led to believe so in many religions, that sexual desire, because it is desire, must be eliminated if one wants to advance, and they make every effort to repress their sexual desires in all circumstances. This is a great mistake, since sexual desire can also be awakened as a manifestation of the love of a partner, which brings happiness and of which they are wrongly depriving themselves. Those who understand well will realize that it is the sexual desire that comes from lust or lasciviousness, that is, selfish sexual desire, which one must fight against in order to overcome. In this case the breakthrough lies in bringing the desire for sexuality in line with the feeling and not as a manifestation of a vice. Do not, therefore, confuse the elimination of lust or lasciviousness, that is, the manifestation of selfish sexuality, with puritanism, which regards every manifestation of sexuality as pernicious. We have already said that it is also a manifestation of feeling, a reflection of the love of a couple. Puritanism is not holiness but prejudice and repression, and the one who is most scandalized by others is almost always the one who hides the most from himself in prejudice and repression.

You said earlier that some people confuse spirituality with religion. What is the difference between spirituality and religion? Some people think they are the same.

It is not the same thing. Spirituality is an individual quality and capacity of the spirit that drives it to evolve more and more. To evolve implies freely developing the capacity to love and in this way to reach progressively greater levels of feeling, sensitivity, awareness, comprehension, wisdom and happiness, in order to know, among other things, what is the meaning of one's existence and that of what surrounds them, the development of their link with the rest of the beings of creation and their Creator and how the universe of which they are a part works, including the laws that govern it.

Religions are human organizations with a hierarchical structure that are grouped around a series of more or less correct

dogmatic beliefs that are not open to discussion, that function according to the criterion of authority, that is, the one with the most authority within the hierarchical structure is the one who has the power to decide which are the true and appropriate beliefs that others should believe in.

How is it possible that, if love of neighbor is the basis of most 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 talked about this before. In many religions love is only a dead word that is used as a hook to catch, but it is not lived or manifested by example. It is also overshadowed by other rules and beliefs that are given greater prominence, many of them in contradiction to love itself and the other spiritual laws. For example, forcing faithful people to believe unquestioningly in a set of dogmas violates the law of free will, as it prevents freedom of belief. Religions are a phenomenon linked to human selfishness, as they manipulate individual spirituality to suit the selfishness of a few. In times past, the authorities of the dominant religions imposed their creed by force and those who did not submit were annihilated. Their power was such that there was no possibility of dissent without risking one's life. Today, although with less force, in some countries religion is still a yoke that stifles human freedom.

Do you mean that religions are an obstacle to the evolution of human beings towards love?

What I mean is that human selfishness is an obstacle to evolution in love, for it is so skillful that it infiltrates human spirituality to adulterate and manipulate it, and the result of this mixture of spirituality and selfishness is what gives rise to religions. We have already mentioned that many of the religions have their starting point in the missions of more evolved beings who transmitted true spiritual messages that managed to penetrate the hearts of the people, but that over time these messages were adulterated and deformed by unevolved spirits with a desire for prominence and ambition with the purpose of satisfying their lust for power and wealth. Under the influence of these selfishly driven beings, true

spiritual laws are substituted for the laws of selfishness which are cloaked in apparent spirituality with the trappings of rituals and ceremonies.

Any examples of how true spiritual laws are replaced by the laws of selfishness?

Yes, in your world, you have replaced the law of spiritual justice with the selfish "law of the funnel", that is, the wide for yourselves and the narrow for others. Each one sees as fair what favors oneself and as unfair what favors others. Although it is the same thing, you see it differently depending on whether it is you who do it or others who do it. You justify your own selfish actions and criticize those of others with fervor, even though they are the same thing. And the one who feels he has the most power to act is the one who ends up imposing his law on the law of others. For example, those in power often enjoy privileges that others do not have, such as disproportionate salaries, abusive pensions and tax exemptions, while the rest of the citizens are held to much stricter standards.

You have substituted the law of love for the selfish law of the satisfaction of wealth and success, and so you understand doing good to mean acting to achieve the satisfaction of your material interests and desires, success, fame, a comfortable life with an abundance of whims and comforts, even at the cost of the suffering of your fellowmen, and you understand evil when you experience the slightest deprivation of those. But this is not so. To do good, rightly understood, is to act in harmony with the law of love, and to do evil reflects acts contrary to the law of love, generally selfish acts which generate suffering and unhappiness.

You have replaced the law of free will with the law of the strongest. That is to say, the stronger forces the weaker to do as he pleases.

That is why in your world much attention is given to who says what, what their position, their title, their rank, and not whether what they say is true or not. The humble ones are not listened to even if they speak the truth, while the powerful ones, the ones who have the fame, the success, the ones who exalt themselves

with ranks and titles invented by human beings, can say whatever they want and whatever they say will be taken into consideration. Many of these celebrities convey false messages that serve to manipulate and fanaticize people, and yet they are considered to be above others. This dominance of the "law of the strongest" and little respect for the law of free will is evident when it comes to religious authorities. How is it possible that people who consider themselves spiritually advanced are the most intolerant, uncomprehending, rigid, who only make it a point to scrupulously follow rules and rituals and criticize those who do not, who readily condemn others in their actions and behavior, and who place so little emphasis on correcting themselves in selfish bad habits? Is not tolerance and understanding of the ideas of others a spiritual virtue? Where is this virtue in them?

But I understand that at least today there are many people who recognize these selfish behaviors, who recognize the manipulation that has taken place of spirituality within religions, and who are going on a search for true spiritual knowledge.

This is a good thing, but it is not enough to know. It is necessary to recognize what is true and separate it from what is false, because not all that glitters is gold, even if it bears a supposed stamp of spiritual knowledge. The most important thing is to put into practice in oneself what one learns about feelings and selfishness, otherwise no progress will be made. I mean, do not confuse spiritual advancement with the fact of knowing certain spiritual knowledge. If the knowledge learned, which should serve to advance the development of feelings, is used to give free rein to selfishness, thinly disguised in the guise of spirituality, one falls into the same trap into which the religious hierarchs have fallen.

What do you mean?

I mean that there are many people who put a lot of effort into knowing and studying spiritual knowledge from different sources. But if they then use the acquired knowledge for profit or as a way of acquiring fame, admirers, prominence, believing themselves to be better than others, what they are doing, instead of developing their feelings, is giving free rein to their vanity. And this

is even more serious not only when one loses oneself, but also when one contributes to confuse and divert others from the spiritual path, for by their example they confuse those who follow them. This is exactly what Jesus denounced in his time when he called the Jewish priests “blind leaders of the blind”. This is why it is very important to look at oneself first before one starts to “preach” to others, for they who do not look at themselves first and do not recognize their own selfishness and try to eliminate it, are not in a position to set an example of selfless behavior to others.

I could use an example to clarify this point.

I will tell you a story as an example of this.

In a class in a spiritual school there was a professor with his group of one hundred students. They had been learning about the different stages of selfishness in the process of evolution (vanity, pride and arrogance) and how selfishness manifested itself in each of these stages. As a final summary of the whole lesson, he told them: “The main characteristic of vanity is the desire for prominence, the desire to be more than others. The main characteristic of pride is the fear of being known as you are. The main characteristic of haughtiness is that, although they are the most humble of all, they are still not totally humble”.

After the explanation, he asked each student, according to what they had learned, to place themselves on one of these three levels and then to anonymously write it down on a piece of paper. He then asked them each to place the paper in a ballot box in order to make a tally to collectively analyze the evolutionary level of the class. The professor, after counting the ballots and analyzing the results, said to the students: “80 of you are in the vanity stage, 19 of you are in the pride stage, and only one is in the haughtiness stage”. In light of the results, the students, surprised and disgruntled, begin to murmur among themselves. They ask each other what their assessment of themselves has been. In agreement, they choose a spokesperson, who addresses the professor to express his disagreement with the results.

“Professor, we asked each other what each of us had written on the paper and they do not coincide with the results that you have

indicated, because at least ten people have recognized themselves as haughty while you have only counted one.

The professor says to them: "If you disagree, count the votes yourselves".

The students take the box with the ballots and count them, and it turns out that 80 of them voted in the haughtiness stage, 19 voted blank and one voted in the vanity stage.

In light of the results, the students' spokesperson takes the floor and says: "Did you see, professor? We were right, because the majority of the students were in the haughtiness stage, as we told you.

The professor replies: "You have certainly given the results of the count, but you have not found the true result".

"We don't understand what you mean," said the spokesman.

To which the professor gladly replied, "I'll explain it to you right now. The 80 who voted for haughtiness are in fact in the vanity stage, a stage characterized by the desire to be more important and to want to be more than others. Knowing that haughtiness was the most advanced stage, they did not want to be the last but the first in everything, and they identified themselves as being in the highest stage. The 19 who voted blank are actually those who are in the stage of pride, which is characterized by the fear of making themselves known. That's why they voted blank, because of the fear of being known. 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, because when in doubt he placed himself on the lowest rung of all".

So is lack of humility a characteristic of the haughty or not?

The lack of humility is present in all the stages, in the stage of vanity, in the stage of pride, and in the stage of haughtiness, and is more pronounced in the vain than in the other two, because it is a less advanced stage. The fact is that it is very difficult to become truly humble, and even spirits in the stage of haughtiness have not succeeded in completely ridding themselves of it. When we say that the haughty person is characterized by a lack of humility, it is because he or she has already overcome other defects and this remains the main defect to be overcome,

whereas the vain or proud person has other defects to overcome before he or she is faced with overcoming his or her lack of humility. Some people believe that by recognizing that they lack humility they have already reached the stage of haughtiness. In reality they identify with this stage not because they like to recognize that they lack humility, but because it is a stage more advanced than pride and vanity and they like to see themselves on the highest rung of spiritual advancement, above others. And this is a characteristic of vanity, wanting to be more than others and not wanting to be less than anyone else.

It would be good if you could clarify exactly what the moral of the above story is, because it is not clear to me.

What I wanted to bring out in this story is that you have great difficulty in admitting your own selfishness. That is why you try to conceal it, to keep it out of sight, rather than to try to really improve it, and this causes you to stagnate hopelessly, because he who does not want to admit his selfishness cannot overcome it. That is why you take very badly the advice of people who want to help you and who point out to you the manifestations of selfishness in you. You only want to be showered with flattery, but you do not want to hear the truth. You praise those who praise you while you criticize those who tell you the truth for the purpose of moving you forward. It is very difficult to move forward in this way.

But isn't it true that we are living in a time of spiritual awakening and that there are many people eager to do something for others?

There are many people today who say they want to awaken to spirituality and want to do something for others. And that is good. But before helping others you have to take a good look at yourself and know if what you want to do is to help others or is it to get admiration and recognition from others. If it is the latter, then it is better not to do anything. It is good to look at yourself first and see how far you are able to go. Helping people is not easy and requires a lot of preparation. If you are not trained, you may get tired at the first opportunity or you may confuse others instead of helping them.

I understand from your words that each person has a capacity to love and not everyone can do the same for others. But what is the first step one can take if one truly wants to love one's neighbor?

The first step must always be to recognize one's own selfishness and to place great emphasis on avoiding acting selfishly towards others. If this step is not taken, it is not possible to move on to more advanced stages. Normally, almost nobody wants to do the work of going deep inside and recognizing the selfish part of oneself. That is why they get stuck at the beginning of the path and cannot go one step further.

There are people who start on the path of helping others in the right way by receiving the spiritual help they need to do so. But it often happens that people are not satisfied with what they receive, but would like to receive more and to have more capacity than they have because they feel good in that situation. But the capacity of the inner self does not increase overnight, but with a great effort, with a long time of evolution, it requires many lifetimes of constancy in the elimination of selfishness and the development of feelings. But there are many people who want to bypass this personal work. They would like a wand to magically touch them and turn them into magicians capable of the greatest wonders. They would like to be filled not only with love, but with the praise and admiration of others, and this ambition drives them to believe that what they desire is a reality. It is then that their own defect makes them believe that the thoughts that their own selfishness suggests to them are a message from spiritual guides, and that what is now being done with the intention of gaining prominence is a selfless help to others. The aim is no longer to advance spiritually, but only to appear to do so. Some people are more aware of this than others, for selfishness has very subtle and suggestive ways of convincing us. If a person is not aware of this, they will believe that they are advancing spiritually when in fact they are only increasing their selfishness. There are forms of selfishness that especially interfere with the development of love of neighbor, and if not countered, people will replace the intention to love their neighbor with the intention to take advantage of their

neighbor.

What are these forms of selfishness that interfere with the development of neighborly love?

They are perfidy, envy, ambition and hypocrisy, self-seeking and arrogance.

Can we talk about them now?

Yes.

Tell me about perfidy.

Yes. Perfidy or malevolence is the egosentiment that defines one who acts with the will or intention to do harm on purpose, who is aware of it and who finds a certain satisfaction or enjoyment when he or she succeeds in causing suffering in others. The perfidious person usually uses his or her intelligence to find ways to do as much harm as possible without being discovered, and in this way also develops hypocrisy. Perfidy feeds on other egosentiments, such as envy or ambition, so that the perfidious person is often both envious and ambitious.

Tell me about envy.

Envy is the egosentiment that manifests itself as aversion or rejection towards those who possess something that one wishes to obtain. That something can be a material possession or a material, mental or spiritual quality. That is, one can envy someone for their wealth (material possession), for their beauty (material quality), for their intelligence (mental quality), for their goodness or for their capacity to love (spiritual qualities).

Envy is most pronounced in vanity, since it is born of the desire to be more than others, which causes one to constantly compare oneself with others with the intention of being more than others. The person trapped by envy is capable of hatching any plan to humiliate, harm or criticize the one he or she envies. The envious person rejoices in the misfortunes of others and is saddened by their joys.

Does envy manifest itself equally at different levels of spiritual advancement, or are there nuances?

There are nuances. Envy for material matters is usually characteristic of the stage from primitive to advanced vanity, while envy aroused by spiritual qualities occurs from advanced vanity and pride, and even in haughtiness. The severe vain person may envy both the material and the spiritual. The proud person envies all the spiritual and sentimental.

How exactly does envy manifest itself in the vain person?

The vain person envies those who possess goods or qualities that he himself does not have. The vain and envious person has a tendency to humiliate the one he envies, to defame and criticize him in front of others in order to create a bad image of him. In other words, vain people transform reality to make others believe that they are being harmed by the person they envy or to justify or cover up their aggressions towards the person they envy. They will try to achieve their aims of discrediting the people they envy through suggestion, manipulation, victimhood, falsehood and deception. If they do not succeed in this way, they may resort 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. They put the satisfaction of their desire above all else and do not take into account the harm they may be causing to others.

How does envy manifest itself in proud people and what exactly do they envy?

Proud people, in contrast to vain people, do not usually envy people for what they have materially, but rather for matters related to feelings. The greatest cause of envy in proud people is in emotional relationships. If they have not yet found love and are not happy, they may be envious of the feelings of love that exist between other people.

Let us take an example. The envious proud one falls in love with a person. If this person does not reciprocate because he loves someone else, then the envious person will envy the receiver of that love, because he considers that the other person has what he desires for himself. That is to say, he will arouse animosity

towards the person whom he considers his competitor, because he considers that he has deprived him of his love. The proud person, trapped by his envy of feelings, tries hard not to make his sentimental reality known. He hides his feelings from others, while at the same time subtly trying to get what he wants, without openly expressing it, because he is afraid of rejection. He will try to outdo his supposed rival to win the person he supposedly loves. He may make use of gallantry, good manners, suggestion, charm and persuasion. Faced with the impossibility of achieving his goal, he withdraws into himself in sadness, anger and impotence. He isolates himself and rejects the help that can be given to him to get out of his situation. He can cause deeper wounds to feelings than the vain one, because he knows feelings better and can use his knowledge to hurt feelings. For example, he can plot to generate discord between the couple and give the person he loves to understand that their partner does not really love them. If he succeeds in sowing doubt, he will take advantage of this to become the surrogate. Blinded by envy, he does not realize that he is violating the free will of the person he supposedly loves, as he does not respect his loved one's will and do not admit that his feelings are directed at someone else and not at them.

How can envy be overcome?

First, by admitting that one is envious, by acknowledging it. The proud are more aware of their envy than the vain, for they are more aware of egosentiments. Unfortunately, envy is a very common egosentiment in your world, and most of the envious do not recognize themselves as such, and so they stagnate, for he who does not recognize his bad habit cannot change it. To overcome envy, one must renounce the desire to be more than others, renounce the desire to possess what others have, and realize that happiness does not depend upon taking anything from others, but upon awakening one's own qualities and feelings. On the contrary, both perfidy and envy are a great cause of unhappiness, a disease of the interior, since they feed the most pernicious egosentiments and the most contrary to the love of others, because they generate rejection towards others, which can be of greater or lesser intensity. It can range from

antipathy, repulsion and resentment to hatred. The impossibility of getting what one wants also generates anger, impotence and sadness.

And how can we overcome perfidy?

It is an evil that is difficult to solve through understanding and awareness, because the person who suffers from perfidy acts in full awareness that he or she is causing harm. Perfidious people are very determined to cause suffering. Generally, it is not until they suffer in themselves what they have done to others that they begin to be moved. In those moments of weakness and vulnerability, an act of unconditional and unselfish love towards them by those who were their victims in the past can be the trigger for their change, because it unsettles all their mental schemes. They are beings accustomed to always acting in a self-interested way. They cannot assimilate that those they hurt so much, having the possibility to take revenge, decide to forgive them and help them. It is then that the perfidy usually collapses and is usually replaced by a feeling of unshakeable loyalty towards their former victims who granted them forgiveness and helped them when they were in need of help, even though they knew that they were not worthy of clemency or help.

Now tell me about ambition.

Ambition is a powerful desire to possess or dominate. If the possession that is coveted is of a material kind, then it manifests itself in the form of greed and avarice. That is, greed and avarice are actually variants of ambition. Ambition for power and domination over territories and people is another variant of ambition. Ambitious people are also often envious, because they aspire to be above everything and everyone and do not allow anyone to overshadow them. Ambitious people are never satisfied with what they are acquiring and feel an unsatisfied desire to possess more and more. They believe that by achieving the goals they set for themselves they will be happy. However, once they achieve what they set out to achieve, they are not satisfied, but always want more. So they look for an even more excessive and difficult to achieve goal.

But aren't some people ambitious for noble goals, such as world peace or the eradication of hunger or war? Are they acting wrongly?

These are not ambitions, but aspirations. The difference between aspiration and ambition in the sense that we are using the word here is that ambitious people are driven not by noble ideals but by selfish ideals, and therefore has no scruples in their actions. Ambitious people never stop in their desire to possess and dominate, because they are never satisfied with what they have. In other words, ambition is insatiable and boundless. Ambitious people have no respect for any ethical or moral code. They have the concept that the end justifies the means, and therefore do not respect free will. This is why they tend to impose their criteria on others and do not admit failure. They get very angry when their expectations are not met and tend to look for more aggressive and harmful ways to try to achieve their goal. That is to say, if they cannot get what they want by the easy way, then they do it by the hard way. This is why ambition is rarely satisfied without harm to others.

How does one overcome ambition?

Realizing that this powerful desire to possess or to dominate does not lead to happiness, but only generates turmoil and unrest in oneself and suffering of all kinds in others. Unbridled ambition is a most pernicious manifestation of selfishness. It is people dominated by unbridled ambition who cause the greatest harm and suffering to humanity, but also great karmic indebtedness to themselves. The great criminals of humanity are the powerful who claim to be the masters of the material world, who pull the strings of international politics and finance as they please, for in their eagerness to dominate the world they do not hesitate to make decisions that will bring suffering and death to millions of people, if their wealth and power are thereby increased. But they do not realize that all the suffering they have caused will come back to haunt them when they return to the spiritual plane.

All that they have striven to achieve, everything, absolutely everything, they will lose when they leave the material world, and

what they will find when they pass into the spiritual world is an enormous karmic debt, which will begin with the experience in themselves of all the suffering that they have brought upon others. And until they have repaired all the evil they have done, their spirit will not cease to suffer, which may take them so long that it may seem like an eternity.

Now tell me about hypocrisy.

More than an egosentiment in itself, hypocrisy is a manifestation of vanity. It is the desire to appear to be what one is not, to show a good image. The hypocritical person is one who does not wish to advance spiritually, but only to appear to do so in order to be praised and admired. They do not seek to change, but only to give an outward image. That is why hypocrisy is a great enemy of spiritual advancement, since the person does not work to change and eliminate his or her selfishness, but only to hide the selfishness from others and to give an image of false goodness. They are often people who act cunningly to convince others that they are really good and will act on behalf of others, when in fact they are acting to satisfy their own selfishness. Hypocritical behavior is very common in politics, especially at election time, as all candidates strive to give a good image and the appearance of wanting to improve the conditions of citizens in order to convince them to vote for them. But once in power they act to further their own interests or those to whom they owe favors. But it is not only in politics, in all areas of life there is a tendency to give a different image of oneself in order to take advantage of others. That is why hypocrisy is a great enemy of neighborly love, since there are many who pretend to love others when behind this appearance of goodness they hide selfish purposes, which may be desires for recognition, fame, wealth or power.

And how can we tell the difference between someone who acts with true kindness and someone who only pretends to?

Kind people act with sincerity and selflessness and maintain consistency between what they say and what they do. The hypocrite pretends and contradicts himself or herself constantly, saying one thing and doing something quite different. This puts

them on display. For example, they often boast of being humble, when people who are modest never boast of the good they do for others. It is enough for them to do so to fill themselves up. Meanwhile, hypocrites do nothing for anyone unless they get something in return. Hypocrites will at some point make a mistake and expose their selfish purpose, and at that point it will be possible to unmask them.

And what can be done to overcome hypocrisy?

First of all, we must recognize that we have it and that we must fight to overcome it. It would also be good to realize that in reality, pretending all one's life is exhausting and generates emptiness and, therefore, unhappiness. We should also realize that in the spiritual world there is no possibility of deception and that in the spiritual world everyone is seen as they are and not as they try to appear, which from a spiritual point of view is a futile and useless effort. Hypocrisy is born out of the desire to be more than others, which is why it is closely related to vanity and the desire to be the center of attention. When this desire is renounced, it can be overcome.

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

Yes, in fact, we have already talked about the desire for the spotlight and we are not going to say too much about it, as it would be like repeating ourselves. By way of summary, we can say that the desire for the spotlight is the desire to be the center of attention, to be noticed by others. The desire to be in the spotlight is most intense in the vanity stage, because of the desire to obtain fame, success, admiration and praise from others. It can also occur in the stages of pride and haughtiness, and in these cases it is usually motivated by an emptiness of feeling and a desire to be liked. The desire for the spotlight in people who are in the stage of pride or haughtiness is called arrogance. The arrogant person is one who feels superior to others and acts with arrogance and despotism.

But is there anything wrong with wanting to be loved by others?

Again I say no, but this is not the right way to look for it. The one who does something expecting something in return is often

disappointed or angry if that something does not come, thus reflecting that he did not do things out of love for others but out of self-interest. The one who truly loves is fulfilled by what he does for others, without the need for recognition. We must also bear in mind that it is not up to us to decide whether someone loves us or not, but to the will of that person. Forcing this feeling on us, demanding this as a form of gratitude for what we have done for that person, would be an infringement of that person's free will.

How do you overcome self-seeking and arrogance?

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, who are able to recognize their faults and mistakes and who do not flaunt their virtues. Humility is a quality that is essential to develop in order to be able to help others spiritually, because without it, it is easy to fall into egocentricity or self-worship, conceit and arrogance.

And how can a lack of humility lead to egomania, conceit and arrogance?

If someone who shows an interest in helping others manages to capture the attention of a growing number of people and is lacking in humility, they will surely dazzle themselves, they will surely be fascinated. Surely their desire for the spotlight will soar, because they feel they are the center of attention of many people. As they do not reflect on their faults, they will end up believing that they are better than others, and that they are above them. What motivates this person at this moment above all else is to get the attention, admiration and praise of an increasing number of people. But all this can be done in such a subtle way, using such good manners, that at first it is only perceptible to a spirit with a great capacity to grasp the spiritual inner self. At the same time, they can be aroused to envy by those who demonstrate greater spiritual aptitudes than themselves, for they are seen as rivals who steal their followers. In

a cunning and malicious way, they may even belittle them if they find that the comparison reveals their faults. They also tend to elevate to a position of privilege, but subordinate to their own, those who, without sufficient ability, are obedient followers of their orders. At that point, the motivation to help others is put on the back burner, even if it continues to be used as a cover for gaining more followers. And all this has happened because humility has not been cultivated, that is, there has been a failure to act with total sincerity, transparency and simplicity, a failure to recognize one's faults (the desire to be the center of attention, arrogance, envy) and a failure to flaunt one's supposed virtues.

Seen in this way, it seems impossible to love others and to help others, because it is very difficult to reach that state of humility necessary to avoid being trapped by the desire to be the center of attention. I mean, is it possible to love others and help others without falling into the traps of selfishness?

Of course it is. You can when you do things from the heart and are vigilant about your own shortcomings, to recognize them when they appear and fight to prevent them from dominating your will. You can do it when you are not presumptuous or pretentious, when you do not want to go beyond what your own capacity can reach. When one seeks to help others, one should not do things for the purpose of standing out from others, nor to compete or compare oneself with what others do, but only because one is filled with the satisfaction of seeing that one's help has done some good for someone else. This is the way to move steadily and surely towards unconditional love.

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS IN THE LIGHT OF THE LAW OF LOVE

What is the origin of the Ten Commandments: did God himself dictate them, were they the invention of Moses or the work of another human being?

God himself did not. That is saying a lot. But it is true that what you call the original commandments were transmitted to Moses by beings of higher evolution. Because of their high evolutionary level they can be considered messengers of God.

And what was the intention of these beings in transmitting the commandments?

To give some basic notions for the people of that time of where spirituality was going. They were more like advice than commandments, since highly evolved beings neither demand nor oblige anything. Commandments is a mistranslation, but if you like the word we will continue to use it.

Man, I'm glad that at least some truth has been left behind.

This is not to say that they have not been subject to manipulation, modification and additions.

I thought so. And what has been manipulated and what hasn't?

If you want we can go through them one by one. Some of the manipulations you can see for yourselves, since they are more recent and evident, simply by comparing what the Old Testament text says with the Decalogue that has become official in the Catholic Church.

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

It is a good commandment, although it does not appear in the text of Deuteronomy where Jehovah supposedly transmits the commandments to Moses. Rather, this is what Jesus says when a temple scribe asks him, "Which is the first commandment of all?" And he answers, "The first is: Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God, the Lord is one! You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart,

with all your soul, and with all your strength.”. The second is this: you shall love your neighbor as yourself. But the text of Deuteronomy says: “You shall have no other gods before me. You shall not make for yourself an image or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth. Thou shalt not bow down thyself to any image, nor honor it.”

And what is the real one?

Both messages are spiritually advanced. Moses' message was a plea against the polytheism and idolatry so prevalent at that time. He wants to give the message that there is only one God, and that the worship of images has nothing to do with God and spirituality. In other words, he says to the human being “Do not build images to praise them as if they were gods.”

Jesus', apart from confirming that there is only one God, adds something more advanced: You shall love God and your neighbor as yourself, a good summary of the law of love.

If both are fine, what's the problem?

For me, none. The problem must be the one who believes that the ten commandments of the Catholic Church are written in Deuteronomy as Jehovah, Yahweh or whatever you want to call it, made them known to Moses, because it is not true. Therein lies the modern fraud. If we stick to what the Bible says, the first commandment would belong to Jesus and not to Moses.

And what would be the reason for this change?

The first commandment according to Deuteronomy says to man: “Do not build images to worship them as if they were gods”. If you notice, the Catholic Church does not keep this commandment, because it places too much emphasis on the worship of a multitude of images of saints, virgins and Jesus himself in a thousand different versions. One way to avoid this contradiction, which reformers like Luther saw, was simply to remove this commandment and replace it with a less cumbersome one.

And what is it that has made Catholicism so inclined towards

image worship?

We have already said that the Catholic Church, from Constantine onwards, absorbed customs and rites from earlier religions. In them the worship of images of "the Gods" was frequent. It was a deeply rooted custom in many parts of the Roman Empire and a forced conversion such as Constantine decreed could not eliminate it at a stroke. Moreover, it was not in their interest to do away with the custom either, for all this image worship and offerings were a way of entertaining the people so that they would not look at the really spiritual values, nor question their selfish way of behaving, so contrary to those values. The male god-figures of past became Jesus and the saints, and the female god-figures became the Virgin and the saints. Only images of animals were excluded, as it was impossible to assimilate them to the prominent figures of the new religion. If you find what I am telling you surprising, look at the more recent but similar phenomenon that has occurred after the conquest of America and the forced evangelization of the native populations, where the same rites and worship of pre-Columbian divinities are still performed, only now the names of these divinities have been replaced by those of the saints of the Church. This is one of the reasons why Jews do not worship images, while Catholic Christians do, despite the fact that these two religions supposedly accept the ten commandments as valid.

I would like to hear more about the spiritual world's understanding of rituals, since human beings, through religions, base much of their belief on the supposed sacredness of ritual.

Rituals are games that human beings invent in the mistaken belief that they are getting closer to God, but in reality they are a cover that prevents them from accessing authentic spirituality. Rituals have varied from age to age according to the customs and level of sensitivity of human communities. In earlier times, rituals were terrifying acts of barbarism, with human beings being tortured and sacrificed in the belief that this was pleasing to the gods. Later, human sacrifice was replaced by animal sacrifice, which is still practiced in many societies. Thanks to Jesus, animal sacrifice as a ritual act fell into disuse in Christian communities, and less aggressive rituals were substituted. However, know that neither

God nor spirit guides ask for or need rituals or offerings in order to grant their help. They regard it as a characteristic of unadvanced humanities and are saddened by the destruction of life, suffering and pain, and by the self-deception of those who perform them, for rituals that cause harm, such as human or animal sacrifice, actually produce the opposite, spiritual indebtedness, for they are acts against the law of love, while those that are harmless are irrelevant from a spiritual point of view. Nor do they require or demand pilgrimages to holy places, or absurd renunciations, such as prolonged fasting, or whippings, or physical punishments which generate useless pain and endanger health, and which benefit no one. All that is needed is a sincere will to move forward. We have said it many times before, but we say it again: the only thing that is useful for spiritual progress is the progress we make in the elimination of selfishness and the development of feeling, and this has to manifest itself in the day-to-day. Therefore, there are no shortcuts, that is, there are no practices or rituals to achieve this goal without self-effort, as many people like to believe. Rituals, as well as image worship, repetitive prayers, all are spiritually futile.

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

Nothing. Of course, these are 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 spiritual advancement in love. Therefore, no one will acquire superpowers through these practices.

Forgive me for insisting on this point, but what is your opinion of sorcery and spells? Is it true that they work? I mean, can you get certain spirits to cooperate with your requests, even if they are intended to do harm, such as the evil eye or voodoo? Do they have any basis in fact?

Neither spells nor incantations can be considered spiritual practices. Like rituals, spells are a game, sometimes harmless, when what is asked for involves no harm to anyone, such as one who asks to win the lottery; but sometimes it is very macabre, since what is asked for is done with the intention of harming other

people, thus manifesting a selfish intention.

It is true that there are negative spirits that can be linked to certain requests from incarnates with bad purposes, who have the same type of bad intentions, and who can try to harm specific people. This is not to say that they will succeed, for it would be a violation of the free will of the incarnate if these spirits were allowed to harm anyone merely because of the desire of themselves or an incarnate spirit to harm them. If negative spirits had the capacity to harm whomever they wished, I assure you that they would leave no one unharmed. We have already said that their level of influence is limited and they will only be able to negatively influence those who through their low intentions allow that bad influence, or who through fear and auto-suggestion, end up believing it to be real. Therefore, the best protection one can have against the influence of negative spirits is one's own attitude towards life. The one who acts in good faith in life, trying not to harm others, is automatically protected against such influences. It is rather the one who wants to harm others through sorcery who is the most frequent victim of such practices, for they attract to themselves the influence of those same negative spirits who, unable to harm others, will prey upon the one who opened the door to them with their evil intentions. By the law of cause and effect, the one who has used sorcery against others is exposed in the future to be the victim of the sorcerous acts of others, and will thus experience in themselves the dire consequences of the evil they have brought upon others.

So what is your opinion of people who claim to be unwell because someone has given them the evil eye or because they feel tormented by a negative spirit?

In most cases this is not true. It is true that they feel bad, but it is not because anyone has given them the evil eye, but because of their own emotional problems or selfish attitudes. There are people who believe that spirits can harm them, so they become afraid and create in their imagination the evil beings they fear so much. This causes them to become emotionally weak and depressed, and they themselves generate the discomfort through autosuggestion. All this happens because it is easier to

blame the discomfort on others than to go deeper into oneself to find out where the discomfort comes from.

But can there be real cases of negative spirit influence, and are there people who are possessed by evil spirits or possessed by demons?

There is no such thing as demoniacs because there is no such thing as the devil. Most of the “demoniacs” in the Scriptures were actually mentally ill, people with very strong psychological disorders, some of them caused by highly traumatic circumstances, while others may have been victims of infectious diseases such as rabies. But it is true that when one generates egosentiments one can attract the influence of negative spirits that feed them even more. And it is not because a curse has been put on them and is effective, but it is a self-induced process. But it is true that people can be influenced to a greater or lesser extent by possessive spirits for different reasons: some because they have asked to contact negative spirits, others because they have a weakness that attracts their influence, such as drug addiction, or because they have highly negative selfish attitudes. Other influences occur because the incarnate has committed negative acts in the past against the harassing discarnate spirit, and the incarnate has a desire to make amends for the harm done. But normally this influence is quite limited, usually limited to generating negative thoughts in the victim’s mind, and never becomes a possession. People who have the gift of mediumship may be more strongly disturbed by negative spirits, as their very nature favors contact with the spirit world predisposes them to more intense contact. But this will only be the case if they are driven by base instincts or perverse attitudes. The cases of possession that you see in scary movies are pure fantasy.

In such cases, how can one free oneself from this influence? Do so-called “exorcisms” have any power to free one from the influences of negative spirits?

We have said it before. If there are any negative spirits bothering us, it is usually a reflection of the fact that we have, by our attitude, allowed them to enter. A positive change of attitude, that is, by the abandonment of bad habits generated by

selfishness, will free us from that influence, and not by the practice of any particular spell or ritual, such as what you call exorcism, which, apart from being useless, is also ridiculous.

Can energy cleansing, based on the transmission of energies to the person concerned, help to free him or her from the influence of a negative spirit?

It helps, if the transmitters of these energies are good energetic channels and do not use their capacity for selfish purposes, for the advanced spirits can act through them to free them from this influence. But if they maintain their negative attitude, this effect will be short-lived. Therefore it is not up to others, but up to oneself, to free oneself from the influences of negative spirits.

Are there people who are sensitive and can perceive environments where there are negative spirits, without it being due to a bad attitude of their own?

Yes. They may feel tired and exhausted. But this discomfort will be temporary and will disappear when they leave the place. That is to say, they will not be “stuck” with some negative spirit to torment them because they have been in an environment frequented by low vibrational spirits, as some people believe. Sometimes that bad environment is generated by the incarnate ones themselves with their egosentiments. People who are sensitive may pick it up and feel bad, but it will only be a passing sensation.

Is it true that some spirits cause so-called “paranormal phenomena”, such as objects that move, lights and appliances that turn on by themselves, or even voices or images that are detected on video and audio devices, which cause great fear in those who witness these phenomena?

Yes, but this does not mean that they have a negative purpose. Sometimes they are just spirits who are trying to contact the incarnate because they want to make it known that they are still alive. They are usually people who have recently disincarnated, who are still attached to physical life and do not want to leave the environment in which they lived and the relationships they had, and they try to get the attention of those close to them to

let them know that they are still alive. They try to talk to them and touch them, but as their possibilities of communication and contact with the incarnate are limited (depending on the sensitivity of the incarnate), the incarnate is not aware of their presence. Sometimes they manage to interfere with electrical appliances (switching light bulbs on and off, TV, radio), as it is easier for them to interact with energy than with matter. Sometimes they can even move objects around with the help of an incarnate's energy, if the incarnate has some kind of mediumistic faculty. And all this is very frightening to the incarnate because of ignorance of what is going on, when in reality there is usually no malicious intent but rather a desire to attract attention and an unawareness of the fear they can cause in the incarnate.

Can these discarnate beings be helped in any way to realize their situation and to follow their path on the spiritual plane?

This depends upon them rather than upon you, for on the spiritual plane they have the help they need to make this transition, but sometimes they find it difficult to let go of the ties that have bound them to the material world. The spirits who assist them are waiting for them to decide of their own free will to continue on the path. It is also good to talk to them mentally because in that state they pick up the thoughts. It can be explained to them what their situation is, that is, that they have left the physical life (some are so confused that they do not even know that they have disincarnated), and that they cannot stay there indefinitely, that they must allow themselves to be helped by companions and loved ones on the spiritual plane. What can help them most is to avoid feelings of grief and desolation at the loss, for that holds back the less prepared. The discarnate feels pity when loved ones grieve for their absence and are sorry to leave them alone in that state. Overcoming that state of loss and grief allows them to leave more peacefully.

Is it possible to contact these disincarnated relatives through mediums or psychics who act as intermediaries?

Contact can occur spontaneously through dreams or conscious experiences, because the deceased usually wants to say

goodbye to the incarnate and takes advantage of moments of heightened sensitivity to make contact. If this does not happen spontaneously, there is no point in provoking it. Sometimes the eagerness to contact the deceased is so great that we fall into the hands of people who take advantage of us and promise us the desired contact with the deceased, after paying a certain amount of money, but often this contact is not real. It is only a pretense. You should not worry if you have no immediate evidence of contact with your disincarnated loved one. There is no such thing as death, and everyone who has passed on continues their life on the spiritual plane, even if you have not had such contact. If it does not occur, it is sometimes due to your lack of preparation for it. Often grief overwhelms you and blocks you from perceiving what your loved one wants to convey to you. A contact at that moment could increase the feeling of loss and prolong the period of detachment and, therefore, the suffering. Overcome the grief and then perhaps you will be able to have what you desire. In sleep you are detached from the physical body and can go where they are. If you are sensitive and receptive you can remember that experience.

And what is your opinion of psychics and people who claim to be able to tell the future or penetrate the past, through palmistry, tarot and other similar techniques?

The future is not written. Access to the past memories and future possibilities of each individual person, what are called "the akashic records", while possible, is highly restricted. Only exceptionally is the incarnate allowed access to his personal record, but not to that of other people, if it would be beneficial to his evolution. This access usually occurs while sleeping and the experience is remembered as a dream or premonition, and sometimes even as visions in a state of deep relaxation. But it is not when one wishes it, but when the spirit world sees fit.

Be clear that the spirit guides do not provide access to this knowledge to satisfy curiosity, greed or some kind of selfish interest, which is mostly why people want to know things about their future or their past. However, it is astonishing to observe how many people claim to be able to penetrate the akashic records

of others, often for a fee, and to be able to know the past and future of a person with enormous ease, just by throwing a few cards at random, or opening a book at random, or interpreting the position of the entrails of a sacrificed animal, or any other kind of game or ritual, more or less unpleasant. All this is false, of course.

But isn't it true that some of these psychics are correct in their predictions?

In most cases, no. The appearance of success comes from the fact that the supposed psychics act with cunning, and know how to flatter the client, at the same time that they know how to extract the necessary information to be able to respond and tell the clients what they want to hear. And a satisfied client is a fixed client who will gladly pay the price of the session again. Who can believe that their destiny or future can be written in cards thrown at random? Will it not happen that if the cards are thrown again after shuffling them again, some different cards will appear and in a different order? Does this mean that their future will then be different? Use your common sense and you will realize that tarot, for example, is nothing more than a game. Anyone who thinks that by casting cards one can tell the future or penetrate the past is like someone who thinks he is an economist because he plays Monopoly well, or a pilot because he can play airplane games well. Do not mix games with spirituality, nor give credibility to that which has no foundation. All this is not spirituality, and if you are not aware of it, you can mix lies with truths and confuse spirituality with tricks.

What about the minority of cases where they are correct and what they say is known to be true? For example, when they give some details of one's life that are true, what is the explanation?

It is true that some of these people have the gift of mediumship, but they use it incorrectly, for mediumship is a spiritual gift not to be used vainly or for profit, much less as a profession. Some less advanced spirits join them because they find it amusing to see the reactions of their clients when they get something right about their past. But if they are correct, it is not because of what they

see in the cards, but because these spirits give them some information that is true in order to gain the trust of the client, which does not mean that everything they are told is true. There are also mediums who have no bad faith in what they are doing, but because of their ignorance they have allowed themselves to be carried away by the selfishness of the world and have mixed their true ability with earthly learned practices. In these cases they often receive assistance from some spirits, who, though not very advanced, have no evil intention.

What is your opinion about astrology, that is, the influence of the stars on people's lives, and about horoscopes and astrological charts? Is it true that by knowing the date and time of a person's birth, one can predict personality traits or events that will happen in their life?

It is true that all beings in creation are interconnected and that the stars possess an energetic aura that influences the other stars and the beings that inhabit them. It is also true that their influence becomes more intense the closer one is to them, just as the gravitational force is felt to a greater or lesser extent depending on how close or far away one is from the Earth. It is also true that certain astral influences may be more or less favorable for certain spiritual work and, knowing this, advanced spirits may choose certain times more favorable for certain work on the spiritual plane. But know that these are only influences, not determinations. The marathon runner always desires a pleasant temperature and moderate humidity for competition, for he knows that these are the conditions best suited to achieve a good time. But it is not favorable weather that makes him a good marathon runner, nor will unfavorable weather make him a bad marathon runner. The influence is restricted to modulating his performance. So it is with astrological influences. The spirit who is advanced will be so regardless of the position of the stars at the time of his birth, and the spirit who is not advanced will not be so regardless of the position of the stars at the time of his birth, nor will a favorable position of the stars make him an advanced spirit. Who can think that a spirit who is soon to incarnate will have a different life or personality because he is born two weeks earlier or later? Have we not already said that the personality and

spiritual advancement of that being is the fruit of his spiritual learning gained in innumerable incarnations? Or how can we think that the events of his life are predetermined by the date of his birth, when we are saying that the trials are chosen and prepared for before incarnation by free choice and that it is up to his will and freedom to overcome them or not? Be clear about one thing: the future is not written. If the future of the human being were decided by the date of his birth, where would free will be then? If you focus too much on what is incidental, you will miss much of what is important.

Well, let's talk about the second commandment. You shall not take God's name in vain. What do you have to say about this one?

This is in Deuteronomy, though mistranslated. The literal translation of the Hebrew is "you shall not use God's name to deceive". Therefore, the problem with 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 of the original Hebrew. We have discussed this before, but we will discuss it in greater depth here, because it is quite important. Many people believe that "not to take God's name in vain" means that they are not to use God's name in crude expressions, otherwise very common in popular language. They take great offence when they hear someone uttering them, without thinking that the speaker is not even thinking about the meaning of the phrase they have just uttered. They consider it to be an offense to God, when in fact these expressions, although they manifest vulgarity and tactlessness, are harmless and have no spiritual consequence whatsoever. However, the true meaning of this commandment is "Thou shalt not use the name of God to justify selfish purposes".

A common practice of mankind has been and is to violate this commandment. In the name of God the greatest atrocities have been committed. These range from sacrifices of human beings in rituals to divinity, "the slaughter of infidels", "religious" wars or Crusades, forced evangelizations, persecutions, tortures and murders of "heretics", to the exploitation of human beings to enrich religious power elites and the manipulation of religious

beliefs to take advantage of the faithful or to generate discord and strife among humans. These are all very harmful selfish purposes that humans have committed, in which they have used the name of God. This is what is really serious and with dire consequences on a spiritual level. And that is the deception, to make the world believe that it is God who commanded them to do all this, when it is all the fruit of their selfishness. It is intolerable that even in their own sacred scriptures, people are led to believe that God commanded the people of Israel to commit genocide against other peoples, or that God himself, or Moses, who is considered to be sent by God, sent plagues that caused the death of the firstborn of Egypt in order to force Pharaoh to free the people of Israel. If this were so, we would have to admit that God and Moses behaved with the same cruelty and disregard for life as any of mankind's hitmen, murderers and genocidaires.

Although it's a digression from the subject, I got curious when you spoke of Moses and Pharaoh. If that's not how it happened, what actually happened? Because this thing about the plagues of Egypt is given as an absolute truth within religion.

It happened that Moses convinced the Pharaoh of Egypt to let the Hebrews go, for at that time they had a good relationship.

So the Hebrews were not pursued by Pharaoh with an army to wipe them out?

They were pursued, but not by Pharaoh and his army, but by powerful people in Egypt who did not agree with Pharaoh's decision. When they heard of their departure, they formed a force of mercenaries to pursue them. They planned to trap them outside Egypt's dominions to avoid confronting Pharaoh.

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

That is not how it happened. First, it is not true that Moses parted the waters. The route that Moses had mapped out involved passing through an area that is normally under water, but which occasionally, due to the effects of weather and tides, temporarily

lowered in level to allow passage through certain places. This was known to Moses' advisors, who informed him when it was going to happen. They simply waited for the lowering of the tide to pack up and leave. Even the Pharaoh's workmen worked to prepare the areas of passage. By the time the pursuers, who were several days behind schedule, reached this point, the tide had already begun to rise. It was obvious that if they entered this area the tide would catch them. If they had used common sense they would not have crossed. What simply happened is that the tide rose further as they crossed and they drowned. You see, there was nothing supernatural about what happened. They did not die because of God's wrath, as people have been led to believe. They died out of their own anger, because they were more driven by the desire to overtake the Hebrews and wipe them out than by the common sense of preserving their own lives.

And why does the Bible tell a different story?

I have already said that everything is manipulated by selfish interests. Keep in mind that the sacred texts were only accessible to priests. When those who experienced it first hand were already dead, it was relatively easy to change history to suit their own interests. The rulers of the Hebrew church, as is often the case with others, were interested in putting the fear of God into the body of the people so that they would be submissive and not rebel against their control. That is why they created this figure of the punishing God and his implacable executing arm, Moses. Once the myth was created, when they wanted to force the people to obey them, it was enough to say that it was the word of God spoken by Moses to make them tremble and, out of fear, obey.

Wow! I would like to know more about what really happened at that time in history, since what happened has had such an influence on the religious beliefs of mankind.

Now is not the time, for that would divert us from the subject at hand, which is quite important. Take what I have told you as an example of how human beings, in order to satisfy their voracious selfishness, are capable of manipulating everything, including spiritual teachings, and even of transmitting a totally misleading and terrifying concept of God and His envoys.

So it seems that it is rather the religious authorities, especially in the past, who have most commonly broken this commandment, doesn't it?

In the past and in the present. Although it is now done in a more subtle way, the name of God is still being used for selfish purposes. The name of God is still being used to justify religious dogmas that are spiritually false and that hinder human spiritual progress. The power that comes with the status of high ecclesiastical office continues to be used to commit abuses and crimes of all kinds, although many of them are now done clandestinely because, if the perpetrators are discovered, they will be brought to justice. Political power also makes use of religion when it suits it, to convince its citizens of its selfish and conquering purposes, for example, to go to war. They convince them that it is God who is asking them to make this sacrifice and that He is on their side and will protect them during the battle. But it is not only the religious or political authorities who break this commandment, although they have the most influence and have done the most damage. Also individually, selfish and hypocritical behavior, which under the guise of religious orthodoxy, or spirituality, restricts human freedom and will, and which is driven by a selfish desire to control and manipulate others, is a violation of this commandment. Those who seek to use religious or spiritual beliefs for personal gain are also in violation of this commandment. Therefore, if we correctly develop the commandment "Thou shalt not use the name of God to justify selfish purposes", we will come to the conclusion that this also implies "Thou shalt not trade in spirituality". That is to say, the one who trades in spirituality, also breaks that commandment.

What exactly do you mean by "trading in spirituality"?

I mean that spirituality is an inherent characteristic of every spirit by the mere fact of its existence. It is a gift, a quality that the spiritual world bestows upon every being to be the force and guide that drives it to evolve. Spirituality belongs to no one in particular, but to everyone in general. Since it was given to us free of charge, we must use it free of charge. Therefore, it cannot be traded. It would be as if someone wanted to appropriate the air

and wanted to charge others for the right to breathe. If we have within our reach spiritual knowledge and ability, and we allow selfishness, through the mind, to take possession of it, then what was meant to be exercised as a spiritual mission of helping others and for one's own evolution, in a selfless way, will become a material trade from which to profit and gain.

Nor should one trade in the gifts that come from the spiritual world, such as mediumship in all its manifestations, which also includes the transmission of energies, or the help and contacts one receives from the spiritual world, for all is given to us as an aid to our evolution, not as a commodity to be traded. To the one who misuses a spiritual gift, spiritual assistance is withdrawn, for evolved spirits do not collaborate for selfish purposes.

Well, there are people who say that their aim is not to get rich, but that having found their vocation in the spiritual, they want to devote themselves fully to it, so they have no time for other work and, as they need to support themselves with something to live on, they need to get paid for what they do spiritually. What do you have to say to this?

Who told them that they were exempted from material work? If spiritual evolution concerned everyone and everyone made the decision to give up their work to devote themselves to "the spiritual", what would the world be living on? Many people today believe that their spiritual transformation has to do with giving up material work and devoting themselves exclusively to what they call spiritual work. In the absence of income from material work, they believe they are justified in charging for transmitting knowledge or giving advice on the spiritual, but this is not so. Spiritual evolution is fully compatible with material work, and no one is exempted from it, except for reasons of illness, old age, or physical or mental incapacity. Do not use spirituality to evade the responsibilities of life as an incarnate, such as work, for he who evades work by claiming that he is already working spiritually, reflects laziness and convenience, not spiritual elevation. It is necessary for everyone to work in order to survive, and everyone has the right to receive fair remuneration for it. What is not right is to make the spiritual a material profession.

Are you telling me that from a spiritual point of view it is wrong for spirituality to be professionalized?

Yes, it is wrong. The professionalization of spirituality, as you call it, is what has brought religion and priesthood into existence. The priests have believed and have made people believe that by doing a supposed spiritual work (which in reality is not such either, because dedicating time to ritualism and worship is spiritually useless work), they were exempt from material work, and that to maintain themselves they needed the believers or faithful to contribute the money that they were not able to earn. I repeat, no one should think oneself exempted from material work in order to devote oneself exclusively to spiritual work.

But the Catholic Church bases the need to do things this way on the example of Jesus and his apostles.

In what example? Jesus was the son of a carpenter and worked in his father's carpenter shop while he lived there. While it is true that when he began his intense mission he did not have time to be a carpenter, he never charged anything for the spiritual or asked anyone to support him. Neither did any of the apostles. Each one contributed what they had, and none of them failed to take care of their family and work obligations, since they combined their material work with their spiritual work. Notice that none of the apostles were Jewish priests, the only ones who did not work. While they were alive, they never structured themselves as a church or proclaimed themselves priests, nor did they ask anyone to support them. They simply lived humbly and shared what they had. If the Hebrew priests were so bitter towards Jesus and his followers, it was precisely because, as a result of his preaching, many people stopped coming to the temple to make animal sacrifices, which was the main source of income for the Jewish clergy.

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

We have already said that Jesus and his apostles did not build any church, nor did they have any intention of doing so. It was

others who came later who, misusing the spiritual message that their predecessors passed on to them, created such an institution. Even in the way you ask questions, the importance you attach to religious institutions is evident, for you speak of them as if they had a life of their own. Keep in mind that churches do not really exist, for they have no conscience and no will of their own. Therefore, they do neither good nor evil. They are only material structures created and run by individual human beings, even though these may change from age to age. Fortunately, the brevity of physical life prevents them from perpetuating their power beyond a few decades. Better question, what have human beings done to transform the true spiritual message, which was given to them to be used for their spiritual growth, into just the opposite, that is, into a doctrine that turns them into slaves, that overrides their will and freedom, that fosters exploitation, fanaticism and inequality among human beings? The Church has been conceived, created and perpetuated over time by spirits driven by their selfishness. In reality, it was simply a reconversion of previous forms of oppression that took control by force of a spiritual movement that got out of their hands. And little by little they succeeded.

What do you mean it was a reconversion of earlier forms of oppression that took over by the force of a spiritual movement that got out of their hands?

For after Jesus' death, his message of unconditional love spread rapidly, as his followers took it upon themselves to spread his message wherever there was to be heard. As time went on, the number of followers of the message of unconditional love multiplied enormously. The powerful of the time saw a threat in them, for their belief preached equality and fraternity among human beings, and this was a clear demonstration of their way of doing things. That is why several Roman emperors launched persecutions against them. But despite the massacres, the number of Christians, as they were called, grew steadily. And since it was impossible to destroy this movement from the outside, they decided to infiltrate it in order to direct it and change its course. One of the most remarkable events of this new strategy occurred during the rule of Emperor Constantine, who supposedly converted to the new doctrine and decreed the

forced conversion of the empire to Christianity. But this Christianity, which was already adulterated by the passage of time, became more adulterated thereafter, because it no longer had to be a belief of the poor and slaves, but had to be compatible with wealth and power. And since it was not, they changed it from end to end to make it so. We come back to the same root of all the ills of humanity: it is human selfishness that is the main problem. It is these same selfish spirits, setting themselves up as moral authorities, who have made others believe that it was important to maintain the Church and to make it great and powerful, inciting people even to give their lives and to take the lives of others for it, because they believed that this was pleasing to God. And this is a great farce that is only sustained by the ignorance, fear and fanaticism of beings who are still not very advanced spiritually. Know the truth, these structures that you call churches mean nothing to God or to the spiritual world, for the spiritual world cares only for that which has spiritual life. In short, God cares about the human being and not about the church. Therefore, do not waste your life in striving to aggrandize religious or spiritual institutions, nor to make them grow materially or in numbers of parishioners. This is a futile effort from the spiritual point of view and will not serve you in your evolution. Rather, strive to eradicate selfishness from your heart and to develop your feelings, for this is the only thing worth striving for and the only thing that allows you to move up the spiritual evolutionary ladder.

Yes, but is there anything in particular, any manifestation of that selfishness, that could have been avoided so that it did not materialize in deeds? I mean, what concrete deeds can be considered selfish actions that have contributed to the creation of an institution like the Church?

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

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

Do not group yourselves together under any group name. Because human beings have an immediate tendency to distinguish between those who belong to their group and those who do not, to favor those who belong to their group and to discriminate against the rest, be it for reasons of religious beliefs, politics or patriotism. This is collectively selfish behavior. One of the consequences that knowledge of spiritual reality should bring is the discovery that all human beings are brothers and sisters. Labelling one or the other only leads to differences, which in time are used as an excuse to provoke discord and strife.

I don't know what you mean.

I mean that human beings have used religious beliefs to see themselves as different from one another to the extent that they have fought and continue to fight each other in fratricidal wars over these beliefs. There is practically no combination that has not occurred: Jews against Muslims, Christians against Muslims, Christians against Jews. Within Christianity, Catholics against Protestants, within Islam, Shiites against Sunnis. The curious thing is that all these religions claim to believe in one God, and recognize Abraham as the first patriarch and Moses as God's prophet, who received the law from God to give it to men.

Neither seek to separate yourselves from society nor to create communities isolated from the rest of the world. On the contrary, seek to transform society so that it becomes more and more in harmony with spiritual laws, especially the law of love. Every human being has the right to freedom and happiness and no one should be excluded from that right. If you isolate yourselves from the world by creating closed communities, you prevent other human beings from benefiting from the achievements you have been able to make.

But is it not the case that by mixing with the world, unity of action is dispersed and there is a risk of catching bad spiritual habits? Did not the early Christians, and even before them the Essenes, group themselves together in communities isolated from the rest?

If the early Christians or the Essenes took refuge in secluded places in the cities of their time, it was to save their lives because of the continual persecution to which they were subjected, and not out of a desire to separate themselves from society. There is nothing wrong in seeking association with people who pursue the same ideal, but this should not be an argument for separating oneself from the rest, nor for excluding those who do not share the same ideals or beliefs. Those who are clear about their convictions are not easily swayed by those of others, and if they are, it is because they were not so clear. On the other hand, there is nothing wrong with getting to know other beliefs and cultures, since this enriches the human being and allows him to have more information to form his own ideas and beliefs. The person who is Catholic because he is born in a Catholic country, or the person who is Muslim because he is born in a Muslim country, has not freely chosen his belief, since he had only one option to choose from.

But isn't not being able to create a type of material institution a contradiction to the message of love for one's neighbor, and doesn't it prevent the implementation of material aid projects, for example for education, health care, or the reception of the needy?

We refer here to the creation of an institution of a material kind which has for its main object the support of itself, and which at its expense can accumulate power and wealth. Wealth and power are lures which attract the greedy and ambitious who seek to place themselves in positions of privilege in which to satisfy their selfish expectations, and which contribute still more to the spoiling of everything. If you want to help the homeless you can create shelters, if you want to care for the sick you can create hospitals, if you want to educate children you can create schools. It is important that they have a practical use in helping others, and that they are not simply centers for performing rituals or storing relics, for then they would no longer fulfil the function for which they were supposed to be created, which was to help others. You can make use of what is already created and underused for social use, or create a new one if it does not exist, and in doing so you do not violate the advice given here. What is being

censured here is not the use of material resources which, if properly employed, can bring about the common welfare, which is a just and noble ideal, but the abuse of them to achieve just the opposite, that is, the satisfaction of selfish interests, which are the origin of social inequality, that is, the opulence of a few at the expense of the unhappiness of the rest.

So it is wrong to make collections, since people here are asked for money for other people?

Asking to help those in need is not a bad thing. On the contrary, if the money is intended for a good cause, which is to help those in need, it is a spiritually noble act. What is wrong is to ask for oneself for the purpose of avoiding work. It is also wrong to ask for useless or selfish causes. And it is much more wrong to ask for a just cause and then use that money for a selfish purpose, such as one who asks for money to help the poor and once the money is collected, invests it in the stock market.

But I understand that the person who raises the money often thinks that his or her cause is a noble one. What is a noble cause for some people may be a useless cause for others. How can we distinguish one from the other? For example, some people may consider it a noble cause to build a place of worship or to restore an old church, while for others it may be a useless cause.

Helping the needy is a noble cause. Those that contribute nothing to the elimination of inequalities and injustices, and which are not aimed at helping the needy, are selfish causes. Let each person look into their conscience to see what it is that moves them when they ask others for money, because then they will know if what moves them is a selfish ideal or not, because although we can deceive others, we cannot deceive our own conscience. The Catholic Church is a multi-millionaire and does not need collections to restore cathedrals or make a new building for worship, although if it gets others to foot the bill for its house it will be very satisfied.

Anything else to avoid?

What we have said before. The professionalization of spirituality

must be avoided. This means that people should not aspire to support themselves financially through their spiritual activity. The one who charges for spirituality loses the status of a spiritual counsellor and becomes a spiritual merchant. Spirituality should also not be used to obtain goods or economic benefits, advantages or favors in relation to others. This will prevent the creation of hierarchies of religious professionals (the priesthood), who maintain themselves with the resources of the organization and who have no other function in the organization than to attend to the worship and rituals of the church and the pursuit of proselytizing as a formula for maintaining the structure. A current example that may give you a better idea of what I am referring to are pyramid-type enterprises.

You also said that proselytizing is a negative thing. This creates a contradiction for me, because if you know about the spiritual, it has helped you in your life and you want to make it known to others so that it can help them too, are you acting wrongly?

Proselytizing refers to those who try to persuade or convince others of something without respecting their free will. I am referring to those who use force, manipulation or coercion to gain adherents. Or those who help others on the condition that one adheres to a certain belief, or those who try to convince those who are not interested in listening, or those who try to impose their ideas or beliefs on those of others. All this is forcing free will. Loving others means helping them in their needs without expecting them to share one's own ideas or beliefs. There is nothing wrong with spreading spiritual knowledge. On the contrary, it is good and necessary for human beings to evolve and be happy. But it cannot be done against the will of the other. That is to say, even if one believes to be in possession of the truth, if one imposes it on the other, one is already wrong. Therefore, do not force or burden others by trying to convince them of your own beliefs. Never impose your beliefs on anyone. Rather, apply them to yourselves in order to be happier, to develop your feelings and to eliminate your selfishness, because there is no better teaching for others than the example lived in yourself.

And how should we act when others approach us for spiritual

help?

In helping others, do not make this help conditional on them accepting or sharing your beliefs. Be open to responding and sharing with those who take an interest. Be willing to admit diversity of opinion and to respect other points of view that disagree with your own, be open to listen and even to modify your own views if you find that others' are more accurate. When someone asks you for help to solve an emotional problem, before giving your opinion, ask them, "What is your heart telling you to do?" or "What do you feel you should do?", because there is no better guide than one's own feelings, even though feelings are often confused with thoughts. Help them then to distinguish between what they feel and what they think, for selfishness influences thinking. You can give your opinion and present your experiences, especially those that can help them to clarify. But do not decide for others, but let each one decide for oneself what concerns one's own life. Each person needs a different kind of help and a different depth. You have to put yourself at the level of each person and give them as much as they need and want to receive, no more and no less, and also as much as you are capable of. Look at whether or not you are sufficiently prepared to give the help that person needs. If you observe that you are not, recognize it, and look for someone else who is more prepared to give the help because, even if you have no bad intentions, if you give advice without knowing, you can confuse instead of helping. If someone needs help but does not want to receive it, you have to respect their will. You can advise, but you cannot impose. In this case, the only thing you can do is to wait and see if they change their mind. In other words, do not close the door on the person who did not want to enter, but rather leave it ajar so that if they change their mind, they will dare to ask for the help they refused before.

Anything else important to add?

Yes, that your beliefs are not formed by the criteria of authority, but that you follow your own criteria. I mean, do not give more validity to the word of certain people just because of who they are, but evaluate them according to the quality of the message itself that they convey, and take them into account or set them

aside according to your own judgement. In this way, true spiritual messages will not be belittled because they come from humble people, nor will self-serving messages be extolled because they come from renowned authorities. The power of religions lies precisely in having convinced their followers that the criterion of authority is the one that counts, that is, that the word of the one who has a higher rank is worth more than the word of the one who has a lower rank or the one who has no rank. That the high priest, pontiff, pope or whatever you want to call him, is in possession of the absolute truth and that what he says is not open to discussion, because no one has greater authority than he has with regard to spiritual matters. In this way the religious authorities have succeeded in having selfish beliefs which hinder the spiritual progress of mankind, but which are in their own interests, accepted as good, while they have condemned, defamed or concealed beliefs which were spiritually true, but which were an obstacle to their interests.

Anything else we should avoid?

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

Well, let's move on to the third commandment, which is "You shall hallow the feasts".

This is a commandment that has also undergone alterations, because in the text of Deuteronomy it says: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days you shall labor, and do all your work. But the seventh day is the rest". The meaning of this commandment was to provide the worker with the deserved rest, to recognize this right in the face of the abuse of the powerful. Keep in mind that this was a time when slavery was common and the powerful tended to exploit their workers, free or slave, without allowing them rest. That is why it is specified that rest is for everyone, including serfs and pack animals. It was a way of trying to put a stop to all these abuses. It is a way of saying: "you shall keep holy days to rest from work, at least one a week". The Church has also wanted to do its bit by modifying this commandment to suit itself. What was initially a respect for days

of rest was conveniently transformed to emphasize the celebration of rituals in honor of Jesus, the Virgin or the saints. This is also an assimilation of the rites of the Roman Empire prior to Constantine, since the festivals of the saints, including the birth of Jesus, coincide with celebrations on the same dates of earlier pagan festivals, such as the spring, summer or winter solstices, which were reconverted into Christian celebrations (St. Joseph, St. John and the Nativity of Jesus).

Let's look at the fourth commandment: You shall honor your father and mother. What do you have to say about this one?

This commandment was intended to protect the elderly. Keep in mind that at that time there were no social security or retirement systems to protect the elderly. Governments did nothing to protect the dispossessed and weak, and therefore there was no protection for the elderly either. Their only option for protection was in the family, that is, that the children, once they became adults, should take over the maintenance of the elderly, who were no longer in a position to look after themselves.

But this commandment has also been perverted in its meaning because mankind has transformed something that was positive, namely respect and care for the parents, into the obligation of the children to submit to the will of the parents. Under the umbrella of this commandment, parents have been given the right of ownership over their children, and many unscrupulous people have tyrannized their children, turning them into slaves, controlling and dominating their lives, bending the will of their children by mistreatment, humiliation or manipulation, violating their free will from their earliest childhood, as when marriages were arranged for children against their will, and thus condemning them to a life of unhappiness. They believed they had a divine right to do so. That is why it is in strongly religious societies that the dominance of parents over their children's lives is most evident, and it is not surprising that children, when they grow up and find the strength to break their chains, often want nothing to do with their parents. It is then that they complain piteously that their children have abandoned them and say "I have done so much for them... and look how they repay me", when in reality they are only reaping the fruits of their bad sowing.

That is why I tell you that it is not only the father and mother who must be “honored”, but that understanding, respect and affection must be extended to the whole family, grandparents, fathers, mothers, brothers and sisters, children and grandchildren, especially the children, because they are the weakest. Children are the most vulnerable and defenseless when they are young, and should therefore be treated with the greatest understanding, affection and respect. Children should never be beaten or humiliated. We have already spoken about the love of children in depth before, because it is so important. Therefore, understand this commandment in a broader sense, show love, respect and understanding to all those close to you with whom you share your life, especially the most vulnerable, which are children.

Let us now turn to the fifth commandment, which is “Thou shalt not kill”.

This commandment could not be clearer. This commandment is preserved as it was given, by the spirit world. There is no room for interpretation. Not to kill is not to kill, not to take life. We know that the spirit is immortal and, fortunately, nothing human beings can do is going to end that immortal life. The only thing we can do is to interrupt a physical life. But physical life is one of the gifts that the spirit world gives to the spirit. Physical life is the stage where the spirit is tested in that which it has learned in the spiritual world. The spirit needs physical life to evolve as much as the body needs the air it breathes to live. Hence there is an instinct, the instinct of survival, which programs living beings to preserve life for themselves and their offspring even before they are aware of their own existence. By taking life, the opportunity for a being to evolve is being taken away, and this is a very negative thing from a spiritual point of view. Therefore, as long as this simple but fundamental commandment is not respected, terrestrial humanity cannot be considered sufficiently prepared to make the evolutionary leap to which it aspires.

Well, I don't think there is a penal code in the world that does not condemn murder.

That is true. But it seems that human beings make distinctions between some deaths and others. Some lives seem more

important to them than others and they legitimize murder in many cases.

What do you mean?

If a man kills others in peacetime, he is a serial killer and justice will surely condemn him. If that same man kills others, in wartime, 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 deserts from the army because he does not want to kill those men, then his government captures him and condemns him as a traitor, and may execute him. If a man blows up a bomb that kills thousands of people in a time of peace, then he is a terrorist, is prosecuted as such and condemned if captured. If a leader orders his country's army to bomb an enemy country and thousands of people are killed, he is doing his duty; and those killed, if they are military, are called "casualties" and if they are civilians, "collateral damage". If that country wins the war, this leader will be remembered as a hero and history will remember him with honors. The streets and schools of his country will have his name written on them. In many nations of the world, the death penalty exists in the penal code depending on the crime, and it is applied to "do justice".

The conclusion of all this is that you apply the commandment "Thou shalt not kill" with an addition, which is like the small print of abusive contracts: "Thou shalt not kill... whoever does not deserve it. But if he deserves it, then it is well done". Now all that remains is to find a good excuse so that the one who is to be killed deserves it, because everyone who kills or orders to kill believes that he or she has a reason to do so.

What is your opinion of the wars?

The collective killings and slaughter that you call wars are among the most serious crimes from a spiritual point of view. It is not only because the physical lives of countless beings are taken, but also because of the destruction and suffering they create for the survivors. That is why I say to you that it is also very important spiritual advice not to promote war. The ultimate perpetrators of wars will have to face harsh and prolonged atonements until they

make reparation for all the damage they have done.

But often those who go to war are not aware of the harm they are doing, but are convinced that they are doing something good, such as defending their homeland, their ideals or their religious beliefs.

They deceived themselves or are deceived. There is no justification for the killing of human beings, no homelands, no religions, no ideologies. Therefore, there is no such thing as Holy War. It is an invention of human beings to want to put God in the middle to justify their lust for power and wealth, and to convince others through fanaticism to agree to become the executioners of their brothers. Thou shalt neither promote war nor participate in it, for there is no justification for it.

I would also like to get your opinion on the death penalty, since in many countries on earth it is considered a just form of punishment for the most serious crimes.

The death penalty, wherever it comes from, for whatever reason, is infamous, atrocious, horrible, repulsive and spiritually repugnant. With what deep sadness do we contemplate that it is precisely those states that presume to be the most religious and God-believing that most assiduously apply the death penalty as a punishment for criminals. How is one better than a murderer if the representatives of justice are equal to the condemned when they carry out a punishment equal to the crime committed? In some even crueler countries, the death penalty is even applied for minor offences, even though some of them are not punishable from a spiritual point of view, such as when women who have been unfaithful to their husbands are executed, even though most of them have been forced to marry someone they did not love.

Three monotheistic religions, billions of people in hundreds of countries recognize as divine commandments among which is "thou shalt not kill". But how many actually respect it in practice, if it seems that those who consider themselves to be the greatest believers in God are the ones who respect it the least? It often happens that there are people who consider themselves

fervently religious, who observe all the rites and rules of their religion and are scandalized by those who do not, but are at the same time the most insensitive and ruthless, having no respect for the life and suffering of others, supporting the death penalty or encouraging their children to join armies to exterminate their brothers in another country in war, firmly convinced that it is God who blesses them.

Anyone who wants to consider oneself a true believer in God must be totally against this horrendous crime disguised as an act of justice, and must know that it is not God who encourages them in their belief that the death penalty is just, but that it is fed by the fanaticism of those who want to make their own selfishness into a god in their own image.

What is the fate of incarnates who committed murder, or who were responsible for the death of someone or many people, once they pass away?

They are usually held in certain areas of the lower astral plane, commonly referred to by some spirits as The Abyss. They remain there for a more or less prolonged period of time, depending on the greater or lesser burden of the crimes they committed, together with other beings who committed crimes similar to theirs. In these places they relive the scenes of the crimes they committed over and over again, perceiving in this case as their own the same suffering that their victims experienced, which makes them suffer enormously. These beings torment each other and can be tormented by disincarnated victims who are not very advanced and who retain a desire for revenge. When they show signs of realization of what they have done and of repentance, they are rescued from the Abyss by more advanced spirits who transfer them to relief centers where they are cared for in their recovery, and prepare them for the rectification of their crimes, which begins on the spiritual plane, for example by attending to the rescue of those who were in their situation and, when the time comes, continues when they reincarnate on the physical plane with lives dedicated to repairing the harm they have done.

And what do you have to say about suicide?

Suicide is tantamount to self-murder and from a spiritual point of view it is a negative thing, for you are wasting an opportunity for spiritual progress. It is equivalent to a missed exam. What you interrupt at that moment you will have to face again in the next life.

What is the fate of suicides on the spiritual plane?

They often enter a state of confusion in which they repeatedly recall the moment when they cut their life short and perceive the pain felt by their loved ones as if it were their own. In this process they become aware of the futility of the act they committed. When they show signs of realization and repentance, they are prepared for a new incarnation, which is usually quite immediate, where they will have to face the same trials they came to overcome in the life they suddenly cut short.

What is your opinion on euthanasia, and is it justified in some cases, for example in the case of incurable or terminally ill patients?

We have already said that life is sacred and should not be cut short before the time comes for death to occur of its own accord. Interrupting life, even if it is with the good intention of preventing suffering, is a negative thing from a spiritual point of view. Keep in mind that if every person in a situation of suffering were to have his or her life taken away, there would be no one left alive in the world. All the circumstances that human beings live through, congenital illnesses, paraplegia, all have a meaning which is to help the spirit to evolve. They are tests chosen by that spirit before incarnating. Interrupting them prematurely forces them to come another time to finish the unfinished test, which does not help them at all. Sometimes the spirit in such a situation of suffering becomes cowed and wants to escape from it by cutting off life, but this is not the way to do it.

And is euthanasia justified in cases of the terminally ill?

If they are dying, what is the point of bringing their death forward? Let them die on their own.

I suppose the point is to shorten their suffering, because many of

them experience unbearable pain.

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

What about cases of prolonged coma? Is euthanasia justified?

Nor is it justified. When someone has finished his time of incarnation and must leave the earthly world, the spirit world helps them to get rid of the physical body as soon as possible. If the body remains alive, then that life has meaning, for if the time had come for that spirit to disincarnate, nothing you could do could prevent its departure.

What is your opinion on abortion?

We have discussed this issue in depth before and we will not repeat it. The murder of a newborn baby does not cease to be murder just because you do not see the victim's face and perceive how he or she suffers. Nor do those who order a bombing see the faces of their victims, and that does not make the crime they commit any less serious. The spirit attached to the unborn child suffers just as much as those who are tortured to death. Spare them that suffering and spare yourselves the suffering that comes with being the executioners of your own children. Respect life, which is a precious spiritual gift for evolution, and do not interrupt it in any way or under any circumstances, neither by murder, war, death penalties, suicide, euthanasia nor abortion, and you will avoid much suffering for yourselves and for others.

The sixth is “Thou shalt not commit impure acts”.

This is another commandment that has been varied over time as, in Catholic or Christian translations of Deuteronomy, it appears as “Thou shalt not commit adultery”.

And what is the correct version?

Neither. Take the Hebrew version of the Ten Commandments in Deuteronomy and you will realise that the original translation of the commandment is not “thou shalt not commit adultery”, but “thou shalt not commit prostitution” which is equivalent to saying, “do not force anyone to engage in unwanted sexual relations”.

This commandment would also cover arranged marriages, since one or both spouses, usually the woman, are forced into unwanted relations. This means that no one can be forced to engage in unwanted sexual relations, either inside or outside marriage.

Bear in mind that at that time the rights of women and children (especially girls) were virtually non-existent. They were treated little better than cattle. From their earliest childhood they were traded, especially those who belonged to the lower classes. They were bought and sold as slaves and prostitutes, to satisfy the base instincts of those who could pay. Abduction of women and rape were the order of the day. In wars, they were often considered as spoils of war, raped by soldiers, and then forced into prostitution and slavery.

Arranged marriages were also the order of the day. The families themselves considered it good business if they could marry off one of their daughters to someone with money and power. Marriages of girls to adult or elderly men or between boys and girls for parental interests were very common. Practically we could say that more than 90% of the marriages were decided without the weaker spouse being involved in this decision, as they were decisions made by the parents when the children were still children or not even born. Powerful and ambitious people used marriage as a way to accumulate more wealth or power, to annex neighboring domains, or simply to satisfy the whim of sexually possessing whomever they pleased. Polygamy for men was normal and a sign of power and wealth, and was well regarded. Imagine the suffering of all those women and girls subjected to such extreme abuse and humiliation. The intention of this commandment was to put a stop to all those abuses. But human selfishness took it upon itself to pervert this commandment and made the victim the executioner and the executioner the victim, for from very early on the woman forced into prostitution was punished, and not the pimp, the rapist or the forced "husband", or the parents who negotiate with the lives of their daughters, who are the ones who prostitute and break the

commandment.

What would be the reason why there would be an interest in modifying this commandment? I mean, when and why does it change from “thou shalt not commit prostitution” to “thou shalt not commit adultery”?

If the powerful raped and prostituted openly, it was clear that they were in breach of the commandment “thou shalt not commit prostitution”. Arranged marriages and polygamy were in fact covert forms of prostitution and rape that the more powerful could afford, since in return they had to provide for the maintenance of wives or concubines and their offspring. In fact, all this was going on long before Moses was born and was widespread. He was aware of all these abuses, which caused him great indignation, and he tried to legislate to prevent their continuation, relying on a Divine Council. While he was alive he was able to curb the most flagrant cases of abuse. But when he was gone, the powerful interpreted the commandment to suit themselves. They did not dare to change the commandment. What they did was to add new laws of their own invention that obscured the meaning of the original commandment. The first was to give the image that arranged marriage, polygamy and the possession of concubines was “pleasing to God” and that marriage itself was a sacred institution. Then, in order to avoid bearing the burden of supporting wives who were of no interest to them, they invented repudiation and laid the blame for repudiation on women, misinterpreting the law itself in a self-serving way, under the accusation that they were engaged in prostitution. In some cases it was true that these women had sexual relations with another man, precisely the one they were in love with, since they were forced to be the wives of the powerful man and could not establish an open relationship with him, so they lived their love affairs clandestinely. Other women, having been repudiated, had no choice but to resort to prostitution in order to survive, as they were totally excluded from society, thus confirming the false accusation that had been made against them.

Catholicism was bolder and eventually modified the commandment to give full importance to the institution of

marriage and none to the freedom of choice of partner, for the powerful of later ages continued to use arranged marriage as a weapon to satisfy their selfishness and were unwilling to give it up. They therefore introduced the concept of adultery and used it in the redefinition of the commandment as "thou shalt not commit adultery" to punish the spouse who had sexual relations outside marriage. In practice, only the woman was condemned for adultery, since the Catholic society was profoundly male chauvinist, as was the Hebrew one, and the man continued to lead the double life he wanted without anything happening to him.

Well, despite what you say, societies that consider themselves more religious still consider arranged marriage to be normal and pleasing to God, and it is a common practice. What do you have to say about this?

Know that arranged marriage is a form of institutionalized rape that has been given the appearance of "honesty". For the avoidance of doubt, I would add that from a spiritual point of view it is a blatant violation of free will, a horrendous manipulation of a person's feelings, forcing them to live together and have a sexual relationship with someone they have not chosen. Moreover, they are prevented from freeing themselves from this bondage by a multitude of threats and blackmail, including making them believe that if they do not submit, they are unclean, impure and disobedient to God's will, thus also violating the commandment "thou shalt not use God's name for selfish purposes".

But then is adultery a negative thing from a spiritual point of view or not?

We have already discussed this topic at length when we talked about relationships and said that faithfulness to feelings is the only thing that matters on a spiritual level, for it is the key to happiness. Fidelity arises spontaneously when there is a feeling of mutual love between the spouses, and this cannot be forced. Your conventions are of little importance here. If a marital union is forced, be sure that there will be a complete rejection, an aversion to the sexual relationship with the forced partner and a

desire to have a relationship of one's own free will, including the sexual relationship. If it is a voluntary relationship but there are no feelings, there is dissatisfaction, a lack of desire and even a rejection of the sexual relationship and an unsatisfied desire that seeks to be satisfied in another relationship. In these cases infidelity, adultery or whatever you want to call it, is a reflection of the absence of couple feeling between the spouses, who force themselves or are forced to maintain a relationship without love, and who seek outside that relationship what they cannot find within it. The problem then lies in wanting to force or prolong unwanted unions.

Etymologically, the word adultery comes from adulterate, to alter the quality or purity of something by the addition of a foreign substance, or also to falsify or tamper with the truth. These meanings bring us closer to the spiritual definition that the word adultery should have. An adulterous relationship is when two people come together as a couple under the appearance that there is a feeling and there is not really a feeling. In other words, the union of a couple is manipulated or falsified, the purity of the union is altered when it is not given out of love. When couple relationships are based on a feeling of mutual love and affinity, there will be neither adultery in its spiritual nor in its earthly definition, because by being united to the loved one, the sexual relationship with the partner will be truly fulfilling and other relationships will not be sought to satisfy sexuality.

But for this to be possible, there must be freedom of feeling. That is why I say to you that this commandment, "Thou shalt not prostitute", since mankind has advanced sufficiently to assimilate it, can be reformulated today in this way: "Thou shalt respect freedom of feeling". In other words, every human being has the right to choose freely with whom he or she does and does not want to have a relationship, including a sexual relationship, and no one may violate this right. Therefore no one is obliged to unite with another person if he or she does not want to, nor is anyone obliged to perpetuate a relationship if he or she does not want to.

According to what you have said, what would be the status of the indissolubility of marriage, so extolled by the Church?

We have already said it before. The prolongation of a couple's relationship, if there are strong feelings within the couple, will happen spontaneously, whether or not there is a signed marriage contract. But it cannot be forced, as this would be a violation of free will. Therefore, the indissolubility of marriage is not a divine law, but a human law and does not come from Moses or Jesus. In fact, it is a rule that was introduced more than a thousand years after Jesus came to earth. If you look back in your history you will see that divorce was in force during the reign of all the Christian Roman emperors. Civil law at the time of the Christian emperors permitted remarriage after divorce. It was also in force in all the states that originated after the fragmentation of the Roman Empire. It was Pope Gregory IX (1227-1241) who, out of enmity towards the emperors and kings of the time, seeing that they were in the habit of changing their wives frequently, imposed indissoluble marriage in the Christian kingdoms by decree.

So divorce does not contravene any divine law?

Of course it does not. On the contrary, it allows free will and freedom of feeling to be exercised. As we have already said, no one is obliged to perpetuate a relationship if they do not wish to do so, and it will not be the spiritual world that will hinder the free will and the freedom of feeling of the human being.

Some people interpret the increase in the number of divorces as a reflection of a decrease in the feeling of love within couples. Are they right?

No. It is a reflection of the fact that there is greater freedom to break off relationships and that people feel freer to get out of relationships when they are not satisfactory. If there were not 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 because, even if it did, repressive upbringing meant that many people felt obliged to continue the relationship even if they did not feel in love.

Since we are talking about the commandment “Thou shalt not commit prostitution”, I would like to get your opinion on prostitution, from a spiritual point of view.

Prostitution is a reflection of the little progress that exists with regard to the development of feelings, for an advanced spirit cannot conceive of having a sexual relationship without love, much less without mutual desire between the partners. He who satisfies himself with the sexuality of prostitution reflects poverty of feeling and the predominance of instinct over feeling and sensibility.

Yes, but how should prostitution be legislated? Should it be allowed or prohibited?

It should be prohibited in all cases involving minors, and both pimps and clients, in this case pedophiles, should be prosecuted, and minors should be protected from further abuse. In the case of prostitution involving adults, forced prostitution should be prohibited, that is when the person practicing prostitution has been forced or pressured in some way to do so, and the justice system should prosecute those who forced them into prostitution, as they are violating their free will, and also the client if he knows that the person is practicing prostitution against their will. The person who has been prostituted must be protected from further harm. Governments must also provide for the support of people with scarce economic resources so that no one engages in prostitution out of economic necessity, as there are those who resort to it as a last resort to earn a living for themselves or their families, because they have no other way of earning a living, for this is a form of prostitution in which society itself is an accomplice. However, it cannot be prohibited when a person, in full possession of his or her faculties and by free and voluntary decision, without there being a need for family support, wants to sell his or her body. Although such a decision reflects little progress from within, it is not an infringement of their free will, as they exercise it of their own free will, nor is the client committing a crime, as they did not force their free will.

On the other hand, I would add that a total ban on prostitution,

the way your world is, where there is a great demand for the satisfaction of the rather primitive sexual instinct and a lack of respect for free will, would not serve to eradicate it. Rather, it would result in an increase in rape and sexual abuse and in prostitution going underground. On the face of it, people who voluntarily engage in prostitution in your world avoid much rape and sexual abuse, since they voluntarily satisfy the baser instincts of many low spirits, who in the absence of such a possibility would seek sexual gratification by force. Therefore, the eradication of prostitution in your world cannot be brought about by force, but will happen when human beings increase their sensitivity sufficiently so that sexual desire is transformed from the satisfaction of a biological instinct into the expression of feelings of love for a partner. And for all this to happen, human beings must be able to have freedom of feeling and freedom with regard to their sexuality. Then, sexual relations will be natural and not a business or a reason for exploitation.

The next commandment is “Thou shalt not steal”.

Yes, one generally understands stealing as theft, the act of taking from another a material possession that belongs to them without their consent, and considers only pickpockets, robbers of banks, jewelers' shops and other establishments as thieves. But I say to you that he who deprives the worker of his just wages in order to enrich himself thereby, he who accumulates power and wealth at the expense of the harm, suffering and need of others, using deceit, fraud, blackmail, even though the laws may never find his crime, is the greatest thief there is. That is why the commandment “Thou shalt not steal” can be grouped together with “Thou shalt not bear false witness or lie” and “Thou shalt not covet the goods of others”, since they are all part of the same intention, that of harming others in order to satisfy one's own selfishness. Accordingly, it is possible to enunciate a piece of advice that unites the three mentioned above, which would be: “You shall not act out of selfishness to harm others”. The most materialistic manifestations of selfishness are greed, avarice and ambition, for they are responsible for people giving themselves to the accumulation of wealth and power without paying attention to the harm they cause to others. But also other manifestations of

selfishness that are not materialistic, such as all the egosentiments that we discussed in the topic of personal relationships like attachment, jealousy, hatred, anger, absorption, resentment and spite cause harm to others.

If people enrich themselves without causing harm to others, do they incur some kind of spiritual debt or violate the maxim “Thou shalt not act out of selfishness to harm others”?

They do not violate the commandment, but neither do reflect great advancement, for the advanced spirit does not covet wealth, nor does it waste its time and effort in becoming wealthy, for nothing attracts it to that condition. They may do no direct harm, but if they possess wealth or material power and do not use it to help others, but rather to satisfy material whims, they miss a good opportunity to help others and to advance their own evolution in love, for though they could have done much good, they did not do it. If a spirit incarnated asking for material wealth to be used for the common good, and then, once incarnated, devotes itself to the satisfaction of its selfishness, it fails in its mission. In any case, in your world it is difficult for a person to become rich without causing harm to anyone, unless it is because they receive an inheritance or wins the lottery, for in your way of functioning in economics and commerce the law of the strongest prevails, and people of goodwill can hardly prosper in such an aggressive system without being infected by its evil practices.

What exactly do you mean?

The economic system that reigns on Earth, which you call capitalism, is a system born of human selfishness and contradicts this commandment from end to end, since it can be said that it is a system that allows and pursues unbridled enrichment, without the slightest respect for the rights of the human being.

I don't understand much about economics, but the truth is that I find it quite complicated to understand what drives the world economy, with so many macroeconomic indicators. I observe that there are many inequalities, injustices and a lot of poverty that is increasing, and this is exacerbated in times of economic

crisis like the current one. I find it difficult to envisage a better future for human beings as we are, and I don't see what the solution is.

It is simpler than it seems, although you are led to believe that everything is complicated and that no one is responsible for the way things work the way they do, so that you do not see any solutions and cannot hold anyone accountable. Your current economic system is like a large pyramid-like enterprise. It is based on a sophisticated loan system with increasing interest where each intermediary increases the interest in order to make a profit, suffocating the one who ultimately receives the money and does not lend it, because he has to pay back the loan and its interest with his work or his production. These, those at the bottom of the pyramid, who are the majority, are the ones who sustain the whole system with their effort. The rest live off usury and speculation, as they also create speculative buying and selling markets where they make profits by buying cheap and selling anything at a high price. Some of the products that are bought and sold are real, such as agricultural products, livestock, fishing, mining or industry, while others are fictitious products, what are called "financial products", such as shares, bonds, investment funds. In reality, it is all very simple nowadays: a few have appropriated the right to mint money. In other words, they have the money-making machine. They practically make money for free and lend it to everyone else at interest, so that everyone is indebted to them, and with this system they get everyone to do what they want, speculating on the markets they created, always with privileged information that allows them to buy cheap and sell expensive.

Does this have anything to do with the economic crisis?

Yes. Economic crises do not happen by chance, but are generated from the top of the pyramid. First, low-interest loans are made available to promote indebtedness. Those at the bottom of the pyramid, after passing through several rungs of intermediaries, receive this borrowed money at higher interest rates and use this money to run their businesses or purchase goods, which leads to an activation of the economy and an increase in consumption. This is called a boom time. There is an

appearance of wealth and well-being, but it is only an appearance, because everything has been built with borrowed money, which has to be paid back with interest. When the fishermen at the top see that many fish have taken the bait, that is, that there are many people in debt, they pull in their line to catch their prey. In other words, at a certain point they turn off the loan tap. This makes money scarce. To get credit you have to pay a higher interest rate and loans that have already been granted also increase in interest. All this hampers economic activity. Those who got into debt cannot afford the loan repayments and are dispossessed of all their assets. The standard of living of the population worsens dramatically while all the wealth that has been generated in that period passes into the hands of those who dominate the system. The rich get richer and the poor get poorer. This is how an economic crisis comes about.

And what is the solution to all this?

The solution is very simple: renounce selfishness, greed, avarice, each in whatever position he or she is in, and begin to share, to see the other as oneself and to seek the other's welfare as much as one's own. If everyone would take that step, the world would change rapidly. This system is sustained because greed, avarice and ambition abound in human beings, and love and generosity are in short supply. There is little willingness to share. Those who have much are not content with what they have. They do not think of sharing their abundance with those who have less, but aspire to have even more, more money and more power, even if it is at the cost of harming others. Many of those who have less wish to be like those at the top, to succeed in life and to be rich and powerful. They would do the same as those who have a lot in their circumstances. That is why it is not enough for those at the top to change, but there has to be a general change of consciousness, encompassing every human being, in the sense of recognizing that in reality we are all spiritual beings, brothers and sisters who share the same path, the path of spiritual evolution, and the same destiny, to become happy through experiencing love, and that for this we need each other. It is necessary to understand that accumulating wealth is useless because it does not make us happy, but that depriving ourselves

of what we need to live does generate suffering, so if there is an abundance of everything and we share what we have, no one is harmed and we all benefit. But I repeat, for that we have to renounce the accumulation of wealth and be willing to share.

I think this is very nice but very utopian. I think there should be more concrete measures.

There is no recipe book of measures to be taken, if that is what you are asking me to do, because everything depends on the human being's intention and willingness to renounce selfishness and a greater disposition towards brotherly love and sharing. Without such a predisposition every effort would be futile. There should be a desire on the part of the majority of people to bring about the changes that will lead to a society based on love, a willingness to cooperate actively in their implementation, for nothing can be done by imposition or without the cooperation of all in general. People should be elected as rulers who have a high spiritual capacity, people who are loving, humble, of great generosity, totally devoid of greed, avarice and ambition, knowledgeable about the situation and willing to implement measures that promote the common good, social justice and the equitable redistribution of wealth. They would know what to do at any given moment. One of the things that should be done most urgently is to dismantle the whole economic system based on usury and speculation and to enact fairer and more equitable laws that pursue and prevent selfish practices from regaining control of the world. Thus the commandment "Thou shalt not act out of selfishness to harm others" would be completed as follows: "Thou shalt promote the common good, social justice and the equitable redistribution of wealth".

After having analyzed three commandments in one go, there is only one commandment left: "You shall not indulge in impure thoughts and desires". What about this one?

That this commandment does not exist. It is not even in Deuteronomy. It is a later invention. Nor do the Protestant Christian Churches contemplate it. It would be too much to ask of human beings, who find it so difficult to act without selfishness, not even to have selfish thoughts. The term "impure" is also rather

ambiguous, although it surely refers to sexual desire that does not fall within the canons permitted by the Church, that is when sexual desire occurs outside the marriage relationship. It is a commandment created by man for the purpose of repressing freedom of feeling, thought and sexual freedom.

But if we have combined three commandments into one and removed another, we are left with seven commandments and not ten.

And who said it had to be ten? Well, it doesn't matter because there are three more tips I would like to add that I think are quite important and that you should bear in mind.

What are they?

Respect free will, respect the law of spiritual justice and resolve individual and collective conflicts peacefully. These three pieces of advice are closely interrelated, as resolving conflicts peacefully involves being fair and respecting the free will of others, individually and collectively.

Could you elaborate a little on each of them to clarify what they refer to?

Yes, although we talked about this when we discussed the law of free will and the law of spiritual justice. To respect free will is to respect the freedom of others, that is, to respect their will, their opinions, their beliefs, their feelings and the decisions they make about their own lives. Freedom of feeling is only a variant of free will. No one belongs to anyone else, so no one has the right to appropriate the will of others or to decide for others. To respect the law of spiritual justice is to treat others as you would want them to treat you and not to do to others what you would not want them to do to you, for in reality whatever you do to others you do to yourself. And this has to be respected both individually and collectively.

The individual form is clear to me. But at the collective level, what do you mean?

That humanity as a whole, in order to live together harmoniously,

must respect justice and free will and put it into practice, and this must be reflected in the way societies function, in forms of government, laws, the economy, education and culture. And although in theory some countries of the world enshrine the principles of freedom and justice in their laws, in practice human selfishness destroys them and they remain a dead letter.

Any examples of what you are saying?

Formal slavery is illegal in all countries, but virtually all of humanity is governed by an economic and political system that tolerates and encourages the exploitation and abuse of human beings in a way that is so similar to formal slavery that it is confused with it. Many countries hide under the guise of democracy governments that pretend to serve the people but in reality use the people for selfish purposes, or that pretend to want peace but encourage war and justify it to make it appear as the only option for resolving conflicts, when in reality they never sought any other option. Those who see no other option are blinded by their selfishness, ambition and greed and want to have their way no matter what the cost. But there is always another option if there is willingness, respect and understanding for others and a willingness to renounce selfish attitudes. Therefore, bear in mind this advice that will save you and others a lot of suffering: resolve conflicts, both individual and collective, peacefully. Never use violence, coercion or blackmail, and never impose your will on others, even if you think you are right.

This raises some doubts in my mind. If a person is attacked, abused or coerced, in short, if they feel their free will violated by another in some aspect of their life, do they have to allow this abuse in order to avoid conflict, or do they have the right to defend themselves?

Of course they have the right to defend themselves. It is just as important to respect the freedom of others as it is to defend one's own freedom. It is not a matter of avoiding conflicts by submitting to the will of the strongest, but of resolving them by avoiding violence. But this does not mean that one has to put oneself on the same level as the other.

Any examples to clarify this point?

If a woman is abused by her husband, she should not tolerate it under any circumstances. But this does not mean that the way to avoid it is to respond with the same aggression, as this would make her equal to the aggressor. The logical thing to do is to get away from the aggressor and report the abuse so that the courts can deal with it.

But surely the aggressor is going to be more enraged by such measures and may increase his level of violence, thus making the conflict more violent; this seems to contradict the message of resolving conflicts peacefully. What can you tell me about this?

That violence is not generated by the victim's actions, but by the aggressor because he does not get his own way. It is the aggressor who should apply the advice we give you here to resolve conflicts without violence, not the victim. Please do not confuse being peaceful with being submissive, because they are different things. Here we advise you to be peaceful, but not to be submissive. A good example that will make the difference clear to you is the person who, because he is a pacifist, refuses to do military service in those countries where it is compulsory. Don't you call him an insubordinate? A pacifist is insubordinate to 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, so he is fighting to ensure that his free will is not violated.

And at the collective level, if one 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 prove that there is a difference between being submissive and being pacifist, and how conviction in noble and just ideals, will and firmness, can achieve great things without resorting to violence. Wars, warlike conflicts in general, do not happen overnight, nor do those who have the will to generate them form the majority. There are usually selfish interests behind armed conflicts, the desire of a few to seize something, and these are the ones who

trick others into doing their dirty work for them. Remove the ambitious belligerents from governments and you will see that all wars and violent conflicts in general are avoidable.

Well, I think what Gandhi achieved is an exception, because the norm is that the strong always prevail over the weak. And yet there were many innocent victims.

There would have been more victims if there had been a war. And even if it were as you say, understand that the goal of life is not political struggle, it is spiritual advancement. And even if you believe that it is unjust for one country to invade another, and conclude that the strong ultimately take over the weak, you must realize that the invaded of today may be the invaders of the past who are now living through what they put them through. Review history and you will see that struggles between peoples have been a constant in human history and that the position of oppressor and oppressed has changed over time. Peoples who were oppressed become oppressors very easily, because if they were not oppressed before it was not because they did not want to, but because they could not. And this is because in all peoples, in all races, there embodied spirits with a very primitive selfishness, full of ambition, greed and avarice, who fought among themselves to see who would become the richest and most powerful. This is what has driven and drives human beings to fight against each other, ambition, greed, avarice and fanaticism. But all empires, however mighty they may have become, have crumbled over time, because what is not based on love is ephemeral. What is to be learned from all this is that selfishness in the form of ambition, greed and avarice generates much suffering, and that no one is happy to experience such suffering, so each one must strive to eliminate such selfishness from his or her heart. When this lesson is learned, there will be no more strife between countries, peoples, races or religions, for the spirits who incarnate will be very clear that no motive justifies harming one's brother, for that would be like harming oneself.

JESUS' MISSION ON EARTH II

I find it surprising that, if reincarnation is so important to the process of spiritual evolution, Jesus did not speak clearly and directly about reincarnation.

Yes, he did. He also spoke of the Spiritual Laws and all that pertains to spiritual evolution in a clear and simple manner. Whether the information you have from him is correct and complete is another matter.

And is there documentary evidence of this?

The whole truth about Jesus, about his personality and his work, no one in your world knows. Barely a few scraps have remained of some of his thoughts, his personality and the message he came to convey. And of the little good that has remained, most of it has been modified, manipulated or hidden from the people by those who have ruled and have ruled your world ever since. And so they continue to maintain it, for it is their intention that none of it should be known, for they consider the truth to be detrimental to their selfish interests.

So all this information is not new?

Of course not! This is the same message that has been given throughout history in different parts of the globe. The transmitters were, in reality, always the same spiritual envoys, with a higher level of evolution than the average person on the planet, knowledgeable in the law of love and the rest of the spiritual laws, but known by different names according to the historical epoch in which they lived.

And why have we not been aware of this?

We have already said this. When the spiritual envoys disappear and the message is left in the hands of less advanced spirits, they infiltrate their selfish ideas into the original message, and this cannot be prevented, for the original transmitters are no longer there to rectify the deviations. In the specific case of Jesus, the same thing happened. Over the centuries, the message Jesus gave was adulterated, always to favor the powerful, or not to

harm their interests. The true teachings were consciously modified by hiring scribes who removed what the powerful did not want to be known and added what they wanted to be there.

And what kind of teachings were omitted?

The same that we are now making known. The knowledge about the reincarnation of souls and the law of evolution. The right of each being to decide for itself about its life and its feelings. The call for the protection and respect of life and the rights of the weakest and most defenseless beings, including animals. All those messages that condemned and denounced selfishness in all its manifestations, such as greed, avarice, hatred, abuse and exploitation of some beings by others, were consciously eliminated or modified so that their original meaning was no longer recognizable.

And why didn't Jesus prevent his teachings from being manipulated once he was gone?

For neither Jesus nor any other envoy from the spiritual world can force the world to do what they want, for that would be an infringement of free will. The only thing he can do is to incarnate again to remake what human selfishness undoes.

Do you mean that Jesus will be incarnated on earth again? That is to say, will he come back a second time?

Yes. But it won't be the second time, just one of the many times he's been here.

So are the prophecies of a second coming of Christ true?

We have already said that the Christ does not incarnate, for he is an evolutionarily very advanced entity, having passed the human phase of evolution many eons ago, and that what he does is to influence spirits in the human phase of evolution when they incarnate with a spiritual mission. But it is certain that Jesus will incarnate again. Although, as I said, it will not be the second time. But he will not come to head the Catholic Church, as some expect. Nor will he be welcomed by many who consider themselves Christians, especially 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 is it that when I asked you before about whether Jesus would incarnate again on earth you answered me by talking about Christ, and now when I ask you about Christ you answer me by talking about Jesus, if they are two different entities?

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

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

Of course.

And can this Christ inspire less evolved beings, even if the incarnation of the Messiah has not taken place?

Of course, for the Christ in particular, and advanced spiritual beings in general, are not limited to inspiring only one being at any one time, but all beings who act out of unconditional love, even if they are not of such a high level as Jesus. Whether the connection with the Christ and other evolutionarily advanced entities is more or less intense will depend on the degree of evolution of the incarnated being. Many desire to be "chosen" in order to feel important, and appear to want to love, but are unwilling to give up their selfishness. The spiritual world helps those who wish to advance on the path of love. But one who acts out of selfishness cannot expect the advanced spiritual entities to second him in his goals. The choice, therefore, is one's own, and it is a choice between selfishness and love. Depending on which you choose, you will attract one influence or the other.

How are we to understand this Christ-Jesus combination? As a state of Christ consciousness?

The Christ is a highly evolved spiritual being who exists just as each

of you exist, with your own will and individuality. It is therefore much more than a state of consciousness, for a state of consciousness is not a being, but a manifestation of a being. Certainly the connection of a human being with the Christ allows the human being to expand his consciousness to far greater limits than he could possibly encompass on his own, and being under the inspiration of this super-evolved being allows him to act with far greater clarity, courage and decisiveness in pursuit of his mission than if he had only his own capacity.

What is the most advanced being after God, is he incarnated, and what is his specific and general mission?

If you are asking if the Christ or Jesus are the beings immediately below God in evolution, I can tell you that they are not. The spiritual Universe is very large and there are an infinite number of very advanced beings, more advanced than the Christ and Jesus. The birth of these beings is so far back in time that it would be impossible for me to explore that far back in the history of evolution, which has no beginning, for God has always existed and never ceased to create. You believe, in your limited conception, that the most help these beings can give is to come down to the planet in incarnation in a human personality. That is why you even think it normal for God himself to incarnate in a human, when you consider Jesus to be the incarnation of God himself. With your small-mindedness, you cannot even imagine the extent of the capacity of these super-evolved beings. They are charged with far greater responsibilities than you can imagine, as creators and directors of infinite worlds and humanities; an incarnation in a human personality would be to restrict their capacity to act to an infinitesimal part of their potential. Therefore, they do not incarnate in human personalities, for it would be akin to expecting a human being to incarnate in the body of an ant in order to lead the life of an ant. So, it is beings evolutionarily closer to you who take on this type of mission, though they are assisted by beings of higher evolution.

And why, if Jesus was not the direct incarnation of God or the Christ, did he say of himself I am the Way, the Truth and the Life?

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

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

Of course. He was previously incarnated on Earth, in times of antiquity that your official history neither records nor admits.

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 he came as Jesus, I suppose he also did similar missions in the past. Is there any historical record of what he did?

Missions are spiritual works which leave their mark on souls in every age of history. And though the history books do not record it, or record it in a distorted way, the work is not fruitless, for the spirit that is touched within by the spiritual message never forgets this teaching and will manifest it in its subsequent incarnations. When Jesus came to leave His message of love, He did so in different times and places in the world. Jesus' great endeavor was to find a way to convey to the people of those times that all the evils of the world were the result of selfishness. And also to be able to convey to them the basic spiritual notions so that they would understand the process of spiritual evolution and the spiritual laws in the simplest possible way. But the world of the past did not recognize him, nor was it willing to implement the changes he proposed, since most people of that time, compared to today, were very limited in both intelligence and sensitivity. They were therefore very fascinated by the acts, supernatural for them, that Jesus performed, but they did not understand the profound spiritual message that he conveyed. They knew he was an exceptional being, but they did not understand him. Only a few, his closest disciples, came to understand him.

That is why it is necessary to continue that same work. And those

who understood him in the past are responsible for continuing his work in the present, to help in the present those who, for lack of evolution, did not understand his teachings in the past.

Does the salvation of mankind depend on the new incarnation of Jesus, or can mankind be saved without his incarnation, since he was already incarnated in the past?

“Salvation”, if we understand it as a spiritual change towards love of the human being, does not depend on the incarnation of any particular advanced spirit. If many people come to make a change simultaneously, this will bring about a positive change towards love on a collective level, let’s call it “salvation of humanity”, but it does not depend on anyone in particular, but on everyone in general. We have already said that spiritual advancement depends on what each one does and decides for oneself. Jesus, or other highly evolved beings, cannot be burdened with the obligation to evolve other less evolved brothers and sisters. Advanced spirits can by their example help other beings to awaken, but evolution is individual and voluntary. Even God, who is omnipotent, does not force you to advance.

Perhaps one of the consequences of this lack of understanding of Jesus’ mission is the fact that we have believed that his coming would redeem our sins.

That is right. For if he could save all mankind by his sacrifice, it would mean that human beings, whether do good or evil, will be saved even against their will and merit. And this would be against free will. The coming of advanced spiritual beings to the planet is always for the purpose of instructing humanity to become conscious and to evolve. Whether it does so or not is up to humanity itself.

So if the salvation of mankind did not depend on Jesus dying on the cross, I don’t know how great a sacrifice was necessary.

You see, Jesus’ choice was to come into this world to deliver a message of love to humanity, knowing that as a consequence he was at risk of being killed. At a certain point in his life he was clearly made aware, through visions, that as events unfolded he

would be killed by crucifixion and was given the option to withdraw, since the higher spirit world fully respects free will, and never compels anyone to do anything, even those it knows to be totally in sympathy with it.

And if he knew he was going to be killed, why didn't he avoid it? Wouldn't this be a kind of suicide, which, you say, is contrary to spiritual law?

It is not that he wanted to be killed, nor that he had a special predilection for dying by crucifixion, if that is what you mean. But because of his personal courage and because of the example he wanted to set of carrying his message of love to its ultimate consequences, he decided to continue. I have already said that Jesus' merit was not in having died on the cross, but in the courage he had to fulfil his mission as God's messenger, for despite knowing that it would cost him tremendous suffering that would end in his martyrdom and murder, he accepted this sacrifice in spite of everything.

So, if Jesus did not come to redeem our sins, is Jesus the Savior announced in the Old Testament or not?

Jesus is indeed the envoy announced in the Old Testament. Whether he came for the purpose for which the Catholic Church has led you to believe, or for which the people of Israel expected him, is another matter. Israel expected a political king, like their King David, who would deliver them from foreign rule and make them a conquering people. But Jesus did not come for that purpose. His mission was to all mankind, not as a material ruler, but as a messenger of God, a conveyor of the truth of the spirit world, who came to lead confused humanity out of darkness, lost in misunderstood, absurd and erroneous beliefs. He came to show the true path of spiritual evolution to a humanity utterly confused as to its concept of God and human evolution, and totally trapped in selfishness.

And could it be that some of the great avatars or prophets recorded in history - I am thinking of Moses, Krishna or Buddha - were earlier incarnations of Jesus?

None of those you mentioned was Jesus. But they were messengers of God, that is, envoys from the spirit world, with the same mission as Jesus. They all served the same cause and their work was more or less fruitful, according to the receptiveness of the mentalities of the people among whom they incarnated.

Could we then say that Jesus and Buddha are the most evolved beings ever to have been on planet Earth?

Of those you know, yes.

But isn't it true that the Jewish people rejected Jesus because they saw his ideas as contrary to the law of Moses?

Not the entire Jewish people. It was the Hebrew clergy and those who were influenced by them. And it was not Jesus' ideas that were contrary to the law of Moses, but to the laws that the Hebrew clergy had 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 originally given, stripped of the lies and manipulations to which it had been subjected, and to fulfill it.

You mean the Ten Commandments?

It turns out that the Ten Commandments are among the few things that have been kept, even if some of them have been altered to change their original meaning. We have already discussed this at length and will not repeat it. The true writings of Moses were brief, simple but spiritually true. Nothing like the so-called Pentateuch, attributed to Moses, which was written well after he died and is full of altered, fanciful accounts and abominable acts ordered by the leaders of the Hebrew people, which, in order to justify themselves and silence dissenters, they attributed to God or to Moses.

Let's go back to Jesus. Was the last time Jesus was incarnated on earth two thousand years ago or has he come some more times since then without us recognizing him?

He last incarnated as Jesus 2000 years ago and has not incarnated on Earth since.

Is Jesus currently incarnated on Earth?

No. Not yet. But it won't be long now.

Is the decision to incarnate, and when that incarnation will occur, made by him or by another higher entity?

He decides on his own free will, knowing what the evolutionary needs of the planet are and what are the most favorable moments to achieve a greater impact of the message.

Exactly how long before he will be incarnated again?

I cannot answer that. He will come back in the not too distant future, depending on how events develop. But not yet in this generation. But those who will pave the way for him have been incarnating for some time now.

What do you mean by those who will “pave the way”?

For spiritual missions are not individual and isolated works, nor are they improvised, but are thoroughly and painstakingly prepared long before they are carried out. They are collective aid missions in which many beings participate who, though not as highly evolved as Jesus, act in harmony with him for the purpose of advancing humanity spiritually. Some assist and cooperate from the spiritual plane, and others on the physical plane, incarnating before, during and after the main messenger does so.

What does this preparation consist of?

In making the message known, on a small scale, so that there is already a good predisposition in the people to the spiritual message, so that when the avatar incarnates, his message will have greater penetration.

What characteristics does the planet have to have in order for a greater number of evolved beings to manifest?

We have already said that the missions of spiritual aid are not new now, but are linked with work done in other ages. The same spirits incarnate in different ages for the same purpose, the less advanced ones attempting to learn the basic notions of love, and the more advanced ones with the responsibility both to

develop further their own capacity to love, and to educate in love those who know less of it by their example.

As the “educating” spirit progresses, its missions take on greater depth. As the less advanced spirits also evolve as a result of this work, the number of spirits who understand more deeply the meaning of the spiritual message and who choose to put it into practice increases, and they themselves also become transmitters of the message. With each wave of spiritualization, more and more spirits progressively join the evolutionary bandwagon, and this increases the number of advanced spirits. Therefore, the incarnation of more advanced spirits is a reflection of the increasing spiritual level of humanity.

What you just said about more advanced spirits being incarnated brings to mind a passage in the Gospels where Jesus supposedly says: “Greater things than I will you do!” You will agree with me in acknowledging that to this day, those he did have not been equaled by anyone and two thousand years have passed. Was Jesus wrong in saying this or is this statement also misunderstood?

He is making reference here to something we have said before, and that is that when human beings evolve sufficiently, they will be able to reach the level of evolution that Jesus had when he incarnated on this planet. And since there is no limit to evolution, they will also be able to achieve higher levels of evolution. This means that in that state of evolution they will have the same or greater capacities than Jesus had when he incarnated on this planet. If there is still no one on your planet who manifests as great a capacity to love as Jesus did, it is because there has not yet been enough time for even the most evolved beings on your world to have reached that level. Although it may mean a long time to you, spiritually speaking 2000 years is a short space of time. So neither was he wrong, nor is the message manipulated, it is just that the time has not yet come for that statement to be fulfilled.

There are many people who consider themselves spiritually advanced and claim to be messengers of God. Are they right?

Most do not. They express a desire for notoriety that they have, fueled by their desire for prominence, which is not a reality. The advanced spirit is recognized by its capacity for love and

humility, and by respect for the ideas and beliefs of others. Many people who claim to be God's messengers flaunt this supposed status and use this supposed superiority to impose themselves on others and to profit from it. Those who boast of being more than others and also want to impose themselves on others lack humility and lack respect for free will. In that they are known to be not what they say they are.

When talking about a new incarnation of Jesus, it came to my mind that the Apocalypse seems to announce this coming. Is this interpretation correct?

Yes.

But the Revelation makes a prediction of events regarding the future of the Earth, many of them of a catastrophic nature. Are these predictions true? Can you shed some light on this subject?

Revelation, 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 might occur on Earth in the future, some human-made and others the result of natural geological changes, which he tried to convey, to the best of his ability, to the people of his time, and also the events and transformations that humanity would experience during that period. It may give the impression that, by telling it all at once, it was all going to happen very quickly, but in reality these events span a fairly long period of time, thousands of years, at the end of which there will be a spiritual breakthrough in humanity. The human being will then become aware of his origin, of his destiny, of the existence of a spiritual world and of the discovery that there are entities above him, beginning with God, Christ, Jesus and other beings unknown to you or to those of you who have no name, who love him, watch over his spiritual development and his happiness.

Just as Revelation speaks of the coming of Christ it speaks of the reign of the Antichrist. My question is, does the Antichrist exist? Is he going to incarnate? When?

We have already said that there is no omnipotent being in evil, nor does any spirit incarnate for the manifest purpose of doing harm. If it ends up doing so, it is not because it carries this purpose

as if it were a spiritual mission. No spirit incarnates with a negative purpose beforehand, but because of his lack of spiritual evolution he is inclined to evil by the impulse of his own selfishness, once incarnated. Therefore, if you expect the Antichrist to be a powerfully evil being, who incarnates for the purpose of destroying the world, or of destroying Christ or His followers, I tell you, he does not exist.

And if he does not exist, what is the meaning of this word used in Revelation, or is it just another manipulation of the scriptures?

The evangelist saw in the events of the future that there was great selfishness in humanity, that it was governed by selfish values contrary to love. In addition, part of the message was given in encrypted form so that it would be more difficult to manipulate it later. In this context, the Antichrist is a symbolic figure, representing the selfish, ambitious and ruthless facet of the unevolved human being, who as a consequence acts in a way that causes great harm to his fellow human beings. It is selfishness personified. And the reign of the Antichrist represents the world ruled by selfishness. If we assume that the message of Christ is unconditional love, the antichrist is one who acts contrary to Christ, that is, who is strongly opposed to love.

So were the likes of Nero, Napoleon and Hitler, who did so much damage to humanity, the Antichrist or not?

The historical figures you mention who have been identified with the antichrist were extremely selfish people who, driven by ambition and the desire for power, have caused great harm to humanity. But there have been many like them in history, there are and there will continue to be as long as selfishness reigns supreme in the world. What you call them does not make them better or worse, though perhaps more important and more terrifying in the eyes of the world.

The end of the world, the Apocalypse, also reminds me of the Mayan prophecies, which place catastrophic events for humanity in the year 2012.....

You mean that Westerners have wanted to see that in the Mayan scriptures, because if you ask the descendants of the Mayans

they will tell you that this is not the case.

But is something apocalyptic going to happen, like a planetary cataclysm, or the outbreak of a third world war that destroys humanity in 2012 or not?

Nothing of the sort will happen in 2012. Natural disasters will continue to occur in roughly the same proportions, but none will be so severe as to cause planet-wide destruction. You worry a lot about natural disasters, which you cannot avoid, and little about the ones you can avoid, which are wars and barbarism, the work of human beings. The conflicts of war, unfortunately so frequent in your world, will continue to develop more or less along the lines of those that currently exist, and will continue to do so as long as there is no change of consciousness towards love. But nothing that will destroy the Earth or Humanity, for the time being. If you remember, at the end of the last century there was a similar psychosis predicting different catastrophic events for the end of the century or the beginning of the next, supposedly based on the prophecies of Nostradamus. And the year 2001 passed and nothing of the sort happened. It is the fanaticism, fantasy and ignorance of many people that have made a mountain out of a molehill. People who buy into these bad omens are trapped in a psychosis of fear or hallucination that prevents them from focusing on what is important, which is spiritual evolution. We have already said that the fundamental change that is coming is of a spiritual nature and is not limited to a specific year or date, but spans an epoch that may be hundreds of years in the future. Anyone expecting the end of the world in 2012 is in for a tremendous disappointment.

In different parts of the world there have also been supernatural manifestations with a certain apocalyptic air that have had a lot of repercussions. I am referring to the so-called Marian apparitions of Lourdes and Fatima. Is there any truth in this, if there is any?

What is true is that there are spiritual beings who communicate directly with people with mediumistic abilities, with the purpose of transmitting messages, some of a more personal nature and others of a collective nature. In general, these manifestations do

not usually have great repercussions because the people who have them are usually discreet and do not give publicity to these events, because they know that they are most likely to be branded as mentally unbalanced. The cases of Lourdes and Fatima gained notoriety for the fact that they were seen by children and the children naturally told of what they had seen.

But in the specific cases of Lourdes and Fatima it is said that it is the Virgin Mary who manifested herself. Is this true? What was the message she conveyed?

No, it was not Mary who manifested, though this is of no great importance. It is true that they were advanced spirits who appeared in the guise of a woman. But they never said they were Mary. They do not usually give names, or if they do, they are generic names. The identification with Mary usually occurs because the children identify her with the characters of the religious beliefs in which they have been educated, or because after the visions they have been conditioned by adults to identify her with Mary. The message they give is usually very clear, along the lines of what we are talking about, that human beings are in the world to evolve, that to do so they have to develop their capacity to love and detach themselves from selfishness. Sometimes they warn about the future risks that individual and collective selfish attitudes may entail at the collective level, such as future armed conflicts. But then the Church comes along and manipulates all the messages to suit itself, and keeps quiet about what it is not interested in making known because it harms its interests. Above all, it makes people believe that the appearance of the supposed Virgin Mary is a call for the conversion of humanity to its religion in order to gain more followers or to secure the ones it already has. Fanaticism and superstition do the rest, turning these places into pilgrimage centers, which bring in huge profits at the expense of the fanaticism and ignorance of the faithful.

And what is the third secret of Fatima, if it can be known? Does it have something to do with the end of the world?

If the spirit world wanted to keep a secret it would not have

revealed it to the world. It is the selfishness of mankind, especially those who wield the material power of the world, that keeps the revelations of the spiritual world under lock and key and does not want to make them known for fear of being exposed. In any case, do not rack your brains over it, for what was said there has already been revealed in other ways.

THE FAREWELL

One of the times when I was relaxing talking to Isaías, he said to me:

-HELLO BROTHER. TODAY I WOULD LIKE YOU TO COME OUT OF YOUR BODY BECAUSE I WANT YOU TO SEE SOMETHING.

And immediately I was out of the body catapulted at full speed into one of the glass pyramids that were part of that beautiful place Isaías used to take me to. He took me to a place that looked like some kind of circular exhibition hall. In the center there was like a small circular stage surrounded by bleachers all around it. In the center of the stage there was like a stand holding a crystalline stone that looked like quartz, very big and well cut.

-SIT WHEREVER YOU WANT AND WAIT - he said.

After me, the bleachers began to fill with other people who were also accompanied like me. I understood that those people were incarnate like me, and I deduced from the way they were dressed, in robes, and from the light they gave off, that they were their spirit guides. They sat down as I did while the spirit guides, like Isaías, moved to the center, forming a circle around the stone stand. They all held hands. At a certain point the light in the room dimmed to almost extinct. Then we began to see how the quartz crystal gradually lit up, and suddenly we saw how the light from the crystal hit the ceiling and activated some unknown mechanism that made the whole center of the circle light up, as if forming a kind of luminous cylinder. Then the luminous cylinder expanded until it encompassed all of us in the room, as if it were putting 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. Little by little the light faded and we began to see images. It was like a 3D movie but much more real, because it was as if we were inside, with total realism. The images were so perfect that I would have said I was really in that place. We started to see men who looked like politicians making speeches in front of a crowd of people and the crowd was

cheering and roaring. Although I couldn't understand the words, I could perceive the thoughts. The politicians were obeying the orders of other beings whose physiognomy we did not see, but who were dark and who transmitted streams of darkness to the politicians who were speaking. They were inciting them to wage war. As the politicians spoke, the stream of darkness spread like a fog over the audience and penetrated them in such a way that they were as if impregnated with this dark fog. I felt a great current of fear, hatred and fanaticism that had a deep impact on me. Then the images disappeared and other images appeared where we saw armies parading. Then we began to see images of planes, tanks, warships, missile launchers in full activity. We saw soldiers with machine guns getting ready for action. Then we began to see bombs falling and explosions destroying everything in their path. We saw how so many people died, men, women and children, some riddled with bullets, others blown up by bomb blasts, others burned. We also saw how soldiers took women and raped them without any regard and then killed them without any contemplation. We saw prisoners beaten and tortured to death. Cities, towns, villages, fields totally destroyed, lots of corpses scattered everywhere. It was the most horrible thing I have ever seen in my life because it was happening as if I was there. I was in shock, we all were. At one point it was as if we were suddenly ascending in an aircraft and we saw all the destruction from above. We started seeing missiles in the sky and we saw what was happening when one of the missiles hit a very big city. There was a huge roar, at the same time as a blast wave of fire was spreading out at high speed and sweeping everything away with an impressive destructive power. A huge cloud of gigantic dust was formed. I can't estimate the extent of it, but it was enormous. In a moment we descended back down to ground level at quite a distance from where the bomb had exploded. I saw the shape of the cloud. It was similar to the mushroom cloud of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki atomic bomb explosions, but the feeling was that they were much more powerful and destructive detonations. We saw several similar atomic bombs explode in different places. The spectacle was Dantesque. In some places there was nothing left standing. Nothing. Everything completely razed to dust and ashes. In other

places there were ruins where you could see mangled corpses everywhere. In some places we could see emaciated, ragged survivors wandering aimlessly, trying to flee the most devastated areas. That vision passed. And then we began to see another vision of a place where the earth was beginning to shake and split open in many places. There were very strong earthquakes that were shattering what little was left standing. Volcanoes also formed in many places, and lava was flowing everywhere, washing away everything on the surface of an already devastated earth. At another time we experienced a much greater rumbling, which I have no words to describe. The earth in that place was sinking. We simultaneously saw images of different places, all undergoing a similar cataclysm. The sinking of the land caused gigantic waves to form in the surrounding seas, like gigantic tsunamis that when they reached the coasts of the continents that had not sunk, they swept everything away in a huge, hard-to-determine expanse. The sudden contact of the lava with the water caused an enormous evaporation of water. The sky was completely covered with very thick clouds. Huge storms and tempests were raging and the sunlight was no longer visible. Then we moved further and further away from the earth's surface until we could see the entire earth sphere from space. It looked bleak. We could no longer see the blue of the sea and the brown and green of the continents, nor the white of the clouds. We could see a sphere completely covered by a gray and dense atmosphere, which prevented us from seeing the surface. What a sadness to see what had been the fate of our world! That was the end of the vision. The cylindrical screen dwindled back to the centre of the room and then went out. The light in the projection room became bright again. All of us in the audience were in shock. We watched as one of the guides approached the centre of the room and removed the quartz crystal, replacing it with another. Before we had time to react, the cylinder was reactivated in the same way as before, and again the cylindrical screen of 3D images enveloped us. We saw again the same politicians of before, the ones who made speeches in favour of war, with the dark entities transmitting negative influences to them. But this time they were doing it on television sets. They were communicating through television the

decision to go to war against other countries. But the people reacted differently from the previous vision. They also formed crowds, but this time it was not to support their warmongering rulers, but to protest against them. The demonstrations were massive. The rulers tried to quell the protests by ordering the army and police to act against the people. But the soldiers and police themselves refused to obey the orders to attack their fellow citizens and joined the protest. We saw the fall of these rulers in the face of the momentum of popular rebellions and how they were arrested and imprisoned. This was happening simultaneously in all the countries that were about to go to war. We then saw the appearance of other people who conveyed very different sensations from those of the politicians. They were accompanied by luminous beings who transmitted luminous flows to them, and they spread them over others. They exuded humility, serenity. We saw how a halo of light spread from them to the people, transmitting peace and love. These new leaders decreed the cessation of all violent activity and formed a kind of world congress to decide what the new direction for humanity would be. We saw another vision where all the war machines were dismantled and melted down, armies were dismantled and all those who had contributed to bringing the world to the brink of war were brought to trial. The vision disappeared. We were told mentally that we were going to see the changes that had taken place in the world after this decision, after a time that I could not specify. Everything had changed for the better. We saw people going about their daily activities. There were no wars, no conflicts, no poverty, no inequalities. Humanity lived in harmony. You could see people's faces and they were happy. The vision ended, as before, with an image of the Earth as seen from the outside. What a contrast to the first vision, how beautiful it looked now, compared to the previous vision! The luminous cylinder shrunk back to the center of the ring and then went out. The lights came on. I was extremely moved and excited. I looked at the others and saw that they were also as impressed as I was. There had been a lot of very strong and contradictory emotions in a very short time. The guides dispersed from the circle they had formed and rejoined their protégés. I could see them transmitting waves of energy to help them recover from the impact of their

experience. In a short time they had all disappeared from the room. "IT'S TIME FOR YOU TO COME BACK TOO". It was Isaías who spoke to me. I felt a strong tug and a free fall that took me straight into my body. However, I did not wake up immediately, but remained in a state of paralysis.

-LET'S TALK A BIT BEFORE YOU WAKE UP. WE DO IT THIS WAY SO THAT YOUR MIND REMEMBERS BETTER.

-Who were they?- I asked.

-THEY ARE PEOPLE LIKE YOU, INCARNATE SPIRITS FROM YOUR WORLD- said Isaías- THEIR COMPANIONS WERE BROTHERS FROM THE SPIRITUAL WORLD HELPING THEM.

-They looked very affected- I said.

-YES. YOU TOO. MANY OF THEM WILL NOT REMEMBER THIS EXPERIENCE CONSCIOUSLY. IT WOULD BE TOO STRONG AN IMPACT FOR THEIR EARTHLY MIND. BUT THEIR INNER SELF WILL REMEMBER IT AND TAKE IT INTO ACCOUNT.

-What did we see?- I asked.

-WHAT YOU HAVE SEEN ARE TWO DIFFERENT POSSIBILITIES FOR THE FUTURE OF YOUR WORLD. THE FIRST IS THE FUTURE THAT IS POSSIBLE IF HUMANITY IS DRIVEN BY SELFISHNESS AND THE SECOND IS THE FUTURE THAT AWAITS IT IF IT CHOOSES LOVE.

-So none of that has happened yet, nor does it necessarily have to happen. I mean I wouldn't want the first possibility of the future to happen.

-EXACT. NONE OF THIS HAS HAPPENED. YET.

-And there are more future possibilities, apart from the ones we've seen?

-YES. WHAT YOU HAVE SEEN ARE THE NEGATIVE AND POSITIVE

EXTREMES. THERE ARE INTERMEDIATE SITUATIONS. BUT BASICALLY ALL THE POSSIBILITIES CONVERGE, IN A GREATER OR LESSER TIME OF DEVELOPMENT, TOWARDS ONE OF THESE TWO. THESE ARE THINGS THAT ARE NOT GOING TO HAPPEN OVERNIGHT. BUT IT'S GOOD THAT YOU HAVE A LONGER-TERM PERSPECTIVE, BEYOND THE DURATION OF AN INCARNATION.

-And who is seeing these possibilities about the future?

-THOSE INCARNATE ONES WHO WANT TO MOVE FORWARD SPIRITUALLY. LIKE THOSE OF YOU WHO HAVE BEEN HERE TODAY, MANY INCARNATED HUMANS ARE BEING LED BY THEIR GUIDES AT NIGHT, IN THEIR SLEEP, TO WITNESS THESE KINDS OF PROJECTIONS ABOUT THE FUTURE.

- And for what reason?

-IT IS PART OF A PREPARATION OF YOUR INNER SELVES, TO BECOME AWARE OF THE CONSEQUENCES OF YOUR ACTIONS ON A GLOBAL LEVEL, SO THAT YOU CAN MAKE AN INFORMED DECISION ON WHICH SIDE OF THE SCALE YOU WANT TO BE ON, SELFISHNESS OR LOVE.

-I don't think anyone wants to live in the situation of the possible first future.

-OF COURSE. NOBODY WANTS TO SUFFER. THE ONE WHO ACTS SELFISHLY ALWAYS THINKS THAT HE WILL NEVER SUFFER THE CONSEQUENCES OF HIS ACTIONS. WHAT WE ARE TRYING TO MAKE YOU UNDERSTAND IS THAT EVERYTHING IS INTERCONNECTED AND THAT WHAT YOU DO TO OTHERS WILL SOONER OR LATER HAVE REPERCUSSIONS ON YOU. ON ALL OF YOU.

-But why this particular vision? It is very disturbing.

-BECAUSE A PART OF HUMANITY ON YOUR PLANET IS REACHING SUCH AN EXTREME OF SELFISHNESS AND DESTRUCTIVENESS THAT IT IS ENDANGERING THE SURVIVAL OF ALL HUMANITY. ARE YOU

GOING TO COLLABORATE IN THIS DESTRUCTION, OR ON THE CONTRARY, ARE YOU GOING TO COLLABORATE IN TRYING TO PREVENT IT? BECAUSE IT ALL DEPENDS ON YOU, ON YOUR FREE WILL. AT SOME POINT IN THIS OR OTHER LIVES, IT WILL BE UP TO YOU TO CHOOSE WHICH SIDE YOU ARE ON. THE FATE OF THE WORLD IS IN YOUR HANDS.

-Wow, the fate of the world is in your hands. What an enormous responsibility! it's too much for anyone!

-UNDERSTAND THAT THE FATE OF THE WORLD DOES NOT DEPEND ON THE ACTIONS OF A SINGLE PERSON, BUT ON THE SUM OF MILLIONS. EVERYONE CONTRIBUTES A LITTLE BIT WITH THEIR LOVING OR SELFISH ATTITUDE TO MAKE THE WORLD A LITTLE BIT BETTER, OR A LITTLE BIT WORSE. ALTHOUGH SOME MAY DO MORE OR LESS HARM, OR CONTRIBUTE MORE OR LESS LOVE THAN OTHERS, DEPENDING ON THEIR ABILITY AND WILLINGNESS TO DO GOOD OR EVIL. IT'S LIKE ONE OF THOSE COMPETITIONS OF STRENGTH WHERE TWO TEAMS FACE EACH OTHER, EACH PULLING ON ONE END OF THE ROPE TO TAKE THE HANDKERCHIEF TIED IN THE MIDDLE TO THEIR SIDE. YOUR CHOICE IS WHICH END OF THE ROPE YOU WANT TO PULL, THE SELFISH END OR THE LOVING END. THE HANDKERCHIEF IN THE GAME IS IN THIS CASE THE FATE OF YOUR WORLD. THE MORE PLAYERS PULL ON THE SIDE OF LOVE, THE MORE LIKELY IT IS THAT THE FATE OF THE WORLD WILL BE IN THE DIRECTION OF LOVE.

-And how is the competition going so far?

- IF I TELL YOU IT'S GOING WELL YOU MIGHT RELAX, AND IF I TELL YOU IT'S GOING BADLY YOU MIGHT DESPAIR, HOW DO YOU THINK IT'S GOING?

- Okay, you're not going to tell me anything. I thought so. I think selfishness is winning at the moment. But I see that people are changing sides, because they are realizing that things, the way they are going, are not going to end well. I mean, they used to take the extreme of selfishness but they've changed and now they're taking the side of love.

-AND THERE ARE MANY OTHERS WHO PULL ONE WAY FOR A WHILE AND THEN THE OTHER, DEPENDING ON WHAT SUITS THEM, HA, HA...

- I don't think it's a subject to be taken as a joke.

-I'M NOT JOKING. I'M JUST TRYING TO TAKE THE HEAT OFF THE MATTER, BECAUSE I SENSE THAT YOU'RE SCARED AND SHOCKED BY WHAT YOU'VE BEEN THROUGH. BUT YOU'LL GET OVER IT. WELL, NOW IT'S TIME FOR ME TO SAY GOODBYE.

-Leaving so soon?- I said.

- IT'S TIME FOR ME TO GO HOME. I'M FINE HERE WITH YOU, BUT I'M BETTER OFF THERE. DON'T WORRY. WE WILL SEE EACH OTHER AGAIN SOON. LOVE, BROTHER. A HUG FOR ALL THE FAMILY. YOU KNOW, OUR DEAR HUMANITY.

THE END

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS BY THE AUTHORS.

It is our express wish that the message expressed through this work may reach everyone in a completely free and disinterested way, in line with the philosophy of unconditional love that we have set out, that is, giving without expecting to receive anything in return.

We therefore support and allow the free dissemination, total or partial reproduction of this work by all means currently available, on the condition that this is not done for profit and that its content is not modified.

It is our intention that this work will continue to grow with everyone's contribution. If you have questions about the subject of the book, that is, about spirituality and love, be they personal or general, please feel free to ask them and send them to us by e-mail, and we will be happy to answer them as soon as possible. Those questions that are considered of general interest and represent new and valuable contributions to the objective of the work, will be included together with their answer in future works. In this book, THE LAW OF LOVE (THE SPIRITUAL LAWS PART II), some of the questions asked by some readers of THE SPIRITUAL LAWS PART I have been incorporated. We also ask for the collaboration of people interested in translating this work into other languages, so that its message can reach as many people as possible.

If you are interested in having us come to your city or town because you think there is a sufficient number of people interested in listening to a talk on the subject of this book, please let us know. It doesn't matter if your city or town is in another country or on another continent, we will do our best to meet your demand. The realization of the talk will not involve any financial cost for applicants, as we do it completely free of charge and disinterested, and travel and accommodation expenses are on us. The condition is that the entrance is always free for all those interested.

Address your request to:

Vicent Guillem Primo

E-mail address: lasleyes.espirituales@gmail.com

On the website: <http://lasleyes.espirituales.blogspot.com> you can download the book free of charge in electronic format, request a paper copy and consult the agenda of talks about the book.

With all our love, for you. See you soon.