

Monograph Nine:

Cosmic Warfare (3)

Institutionalisation and the Jesus Iconification

Institutionalisation is a powerfully-effective mechanism for controlling thought and belief, and trapping consciousness. As such, it is an essential component of the agenda of Darkness and has been employed as a primary tool of manipulation and control, very successfully, especially as a measure to counter the Ancient Wisdom. Furthermore, in the form of religious institutionalisation, it provides the Darkness with a valuable means of divisiveness and has been used masterfully to set us against ourselves.

A Powerful Weapon that has Turned the Tide of Battle

In the battle for human consciousness between the forces of Light* and the forces of Darkness*, institutionalisation has been wielded like a powerful weapon – one that, tragically, has turned the tide of battle in favour of the Darkness. Institutionalisation is, in fact, a supremely clever strategy because in its religious form it is, like fear, handed down generation after generation, passed on as a familial, cultural and traditional legacy.

And, it is all but impossible for an individual to break free of institutionalisation. It takes enormous courage and incredible faith to do so – faith in an inner guidance that invariably brings individuals into conflict with the institution's rules, dogma and authority with dire consequences. I know from very personal experience just how great a hold institutionalisation has, and how hard it is to break free from it, because I was brought up in a harmful Christian cult¹.

In terms of the weapons in their arsenal they use to fight the Light and, in particular, the Ancient Wisdom, institutionalisation is, and has been, as effective a strategy for the Dark Priests as any of their campaigns of eradication, and as powerful a weapon as that of the Roman Catholic Church. Indeed, the Catholic Church is an edifice of potent institutionalisation and is, accordingly, a master of this particular strategy.

The Ancient Wisdom

The Ancient Wisdom opens the mind, evolves consciousness, elevates the heart and soul, and paves the way for learning from personal experience. One of the primary ways it does so is through the resolution and healing of the deeply-held fear dynamics that run like veins of shadow through the psyche. Indeed, setting consciousness free of fear is one of its primary mandates, as is protecting all souls incarnate here.

And, very importantly, the Ancient Wisdom ensures consciousness and, with it, reality, are free to move and flow like water. It therefore caters for the unique evolutionary

journey of every soul by facilitating the movement, flow and fluidity necessary for the healthy, constantly-shifting, constantly-evolving inner belief that is *both* a natural by-product *and* an essential causal component of that evolutionary journey.

Institutionalisation: the Ancient Wisdom's Polar Opposite

Institutionalisation achieves exactly the opposite. It traps consciousness by locking thought and belief in place, rigidly, implacably, relentlessly, refusing to loose its hold, like Medusa turning her victims to stone. And, just like water, consciousness that is trapped, unable to move and flow as it should, stagnates, becomes polluted and, eventually, toxic.

The inverted nature of the two can be summarised simply. The Ancient Wisdom stirs consciousness *internally*, like tilling and fertilising the soil of consciousness to make it ready for the seeds of Yeheshua's⁺ famous parable, whilst institutionalisation imposes its will *externally*, trapping focus and dictating perspective, thereby trapping consciousness, rendering it like hard, unyielding, infertile, unfurrowed soil – soil wholly incapable of receiving, let alone nurturing, those same seeds.

Institutionalisation, by its very nature, negates the uniqueness of every soul and the individuality of every soul's journey and Destiny. Individuals become like items on a production line, clones, each with identical and exact specifications. So, just as items on a production line that fail to fit the exacting specifications are rejected, so, too, is it the same for any individual caught in anything that has been institutionalised.

What Exactly is Institutionalisation?

Institutionalisation is a condition whereby anything – schools of thought, sets of beliefs, ideas or concepts, theories, commands or *commandments*, decrees, statutes, lies, current trends, even proverbs – become inflexible rules, laws and dogma that are reinforced with judgement and punishment if not adhered to so that they become set-in-stone paradigms of mindset, thought and belief beyond which individuals fear to tread.

Inherent in the process of institutionalisation is the establishment of a self-proclaimed authority, usually, although not always, in the guise of a structural hierarchy, that is invested with the power necessary to maintain obeisance and strict adherence. So, together, the hierarchical structure, or the self-styled authority, and the laws, rules, strictures, and dogma form the bones and the flesh of the institutionalised edifice.

Institutionalisation is, therefore, a method of limiting, containing, restricting and, of course, controlling experiential growth and evolvment, and it is a means of preventing exploration. One particularly-effective way it achieves this is by dictating and determining *focus* and *perspective* – the twin pillars of true transformational change.

The Institutionalisation of Egyptology

Anything can be institutionalised, either fully or partially, and there are many things in human reality that have been so. Healing and health, and all the compartmentalised and segregated sub-components of these, as studies and practices, in the modern era have, unfortunately, well and truly succumbed.

Egyptology is another good example of a field of study that has become institutionalised courtesy of the physical and academic exile imposed on Egyptologists, and the criticism and ridicule aimed at anyone else, who suggest alternatives to the accepted orthodox view of Egyptian history. This has trapped Egyptology as a science, anchoring it in unhelpful, even harmful, paradigms of thought, to humanity's very great detriment.

Archaeological evidence that contradicts the accepted mindset or fails to fit the current paradigm is, then, either misinterpreted, misconstrued, or conveniently ignored, and hypotheses and theories that oppose the orthodox view are shouted down . . . very loudly, as it happens, or, rather, with much vitriol.

I mention Egyptology specifically because, as a science, it is being deliberately targeted and is, therefore, very much in the sights of the Dark agenda. Why? Because Ancient Egypt holds a key to unlocking the truth of human history *and* human consciousness.

If, for example, we believe unquestioningly that the pyramids of Meidum, Dashur and Giza are tombs of dead pharaohs then we cannot and will not ever know the truth of what they really are, nor of who built them. Then, as a consequence, we will not, and do not, know the truth of high initiation or the true cyclical nature of our history.

Religious Institutionalisation

In the case of religious institutionalisation, focus caught and held *externally*, especially by an external god, precludes an *internal* recognition, acknowledgement and honour of, and connection with, higher consciousness. So, individuals remain turned outward, away from the spark of their *own* divinity. Thus is Separation* easy to perpetuate.

In other words, religious institutionalisation has played a *very* major role . . . actually, a *key* role in the Perpetual Separation of consciousness that now characterises, and greatly harms, the human experience.

Ironically, whilst it ostensibly traps thought *as* shallow thinking, the particular effectiveness of religious institutionalisation lies in its ability to trap thought and belief *at deeper levels of consciousness*. I'm referring, in particular, to brainwashing and programming.

So, for example, individuals don't just fear *physical* punishments when stepping beyond the bounds imposed by the institutionalised laws and dogma, they also fear *spiritual* reprisals, like eternal damnation, which effectively puts the punishment in the hands, or the minds, of the individuals themselves thus saving the religious hierarchy the trouble of having to do so. It is, in fact, a self-perpetuating framework, based on a self-regulating psychology.

Once institutionalised religion takes hold it is all but impossible to dislodge. When and where institutionalised religion has got hold of human consciousness, there have come the Guardians to set it free by re-seeding the Ancient Wisdom, which is a measure of how great a hold institutionalisation has.

Gautama Buddha came to break the hold of institutionalised Hinduism; Mani came to

break the hold of institutionalised Zoroastrianism and Christianity; and Yeheshua (Jesus was *not* his name⁺) came to break the hold of institutionalised Judaism, which is why he pitted himself against their hierarchy, the so-called Scribes and Pharisees.

Religious institutionalisation has replaced wisdom, specifically the Ancient Wisdom, and transcendent Knowledge and Truth, with dogmatized lies, distortion and deceit. Physicalised dogma and transcendent Wisdom are mutually exclusive polar opposites of a continuum – where one exists the other cannot, like ignorance and knowledge. An 'eye for an eye', as merely one example, is a catch cry of institutionalisation, and it is a grotesque distortion of the *natural* Law of Karma.

Institutionalised religions are, therefore, naught but a set of rules and edicts and practices that dictate behaviour, belief, choice, mindset, thought, intent and motive to the extent that to refer to them as 'faiths' is a paradox with no possibility of resolution. Ironically, it takes true, authentic faith to go beyond them. But faith in what? Faith in one's own inner guidance, or inner *gnosis*, the very thing institutionalised religion is designed to negate.

The Seeding of the Wisdom in the Form of Christianity

The time and place of Yeheshua's incarnation was, of course, not merely random. With the demise of the Druidic Wisdom at the same time the Wisdom in Egypt was all but extinguished, both of which had an awful lot to do with the Roman Empire, the Ancient Wisdom was in danger of disappearing from the human experience in a form that was palatable and accessible to the general population. It did still exist in the form of Philosophy, but Philosophy is not easily assimilated by the larger majority (see below).

And that's not to discount, in any way, the Wisdom of the 'eastern' philosophies like the Vedas – ancient Hindu knowledge and scriptures – Buddhism, and the ancient Chinese philosophies. These were largely inaccessible to the populace of Europe and the Middle East at the time – the area being smothered, covered and conquered by the Roman Empire like a wet blanket – the region that was the core focus of the Dark Priests.

With the demise of the Ancient Wisdom in this region, it became necessary for the Guardians to intervene directly, hence the appearance of Yeheshua in the Middle East at zero point, and, following him just over two centuries later, Mani.

Early Christianity, or Gnostic Christianity, was the form the germination of the Wisdom took in the many decades following Yeheshua's re-seeding of it. And, like Catharism would nearly a millennia later, it gained a foothold and, despite persecution and executions, spread like wildfire in the Middle East, its ground zero, and beyond, into the furthest reaches of the Roman Empire.

Gnostic Christianity

For the first 150 years or so of its life, Christianity was not distinguished nor distinguishable by the distinction between the Gnostic and institutionalised, orthodox, manifestations of it. The early Christians *were* Gnostics who knew that true divinity resided *not* without but *within*, in that place of inner knowing, hence the term gnostic, or

gnosis, spiritual knowledge.

The early Christians knew Yahweh, or Jehovah, the god of the Jews, was false. He was, in fact, the Demiurge who became the adopted god of Catholicism (and Islam). Yeheshua spoke about him specifically with, as I said, the intention of breaking the hold of institutionalised Judaism, at the centre of which was this same judgemental, jealous, controlling god, his myriad of restricting, rigid laws and rules, and his false but binding covenant.

In fact, the Jewish religion is an ancient religious cult, one of the earliest monotheistic cults, the seeds of which had been sown almost a millennia and a half earlier in Ancient Egypt² and which has served as a blueprint for the Dark agenda, providing the model that forms the premise of all the modern institutionalised religions: Catholicism, Christianity, Judaism and Islam.

Yeheshua came when he did to set consciousness free from the falsities, and the rules and laws and dictates, that were so prevalent at the time, perpetuated in both the secular (Roman) and spiritual (Jewish) authorities of the day. Thus was he born in exactly the right place, where these two coincided, if not collided, at exactly the right time, and in exactly the right context.

So, both the Romans *and* the Jewish priests, the Scribes and the Pharisees with whom he quarrelled, perceived and recognised the threat of him, not just because his words, his parables, his teachings, and, indeed, his message, being of the Wisdom, were subversively shaking the foundations of their respective edifices, but also because of the way the people were responding to him . . . as people tend to do when they encounter authentic *Love*.

The Campaign of Eradication

The modern world is yet to witness it, but human consciousness responds to and absorbs the Wisdom in a way that is impossible to comprehend without direct experience of it. The authorities of his day struggled to counter and contain the spread of it once Yeheshua seeded it.

As such, the first couple of centuries or so of the Wisdom's existence in the form of early Christianity were characterised by persecution, executions, targeted attacks and martyrdom. The early Christians were, both figuratively and literally, fed to the lions, becoming a rich source of fodder for the blood-thirsty Romans who crowded into the theatres and colosseums, eager for their barbaric blood sports, spectacles and entertainments.

Thus was Christianity dealt with by the Darkness, with the Roman Empire as its tool, initially, courtesy of a well-honed and effective strategy: a campaign of eradication.

A Second Strategy to Counter the Wisdom of Gnostic Christianity

But no matter how many Christians they put to death, often en masse, nor how brutally and publicly they did so, the Dark Priests and their minions, could not eradicate the spread of the Wisdom in the form of early Christianity. It continued to resonate with human

consciousness, as the Wisdom does, and it continued to spread, gaining more and more of a foothold. So much so, in fact, that it became obvious the campaigns of eradication and, with them, the campaigns of fear-mongering, were not working.

It became necessary to employ that other very-effective strategy of theirs – institutionalisation. Ultimately, the two strategies, working in tandem, have, as is evidenced by history itself, successfully completed the job, but this has not easily been accomplished. The lives, or, more aptly, the deaths of millions and millions of individuals are a testament to the sheer effort involved in stamping out the Wisdom that resulted from Yeheshua's and Mani's re-seeding of it.

But the failure of the first agenda – campaigns of eradication – and the need for the second – institutionalisation – gave rise to that very great Si'il weapon, the Roman Catholic Church. The Church was built to accomplish both agendas. Indeed, the Church is the physical expression of both agendas, born directly out of the need to snuff out the Wisdom. So its very soul and its *raison d'être* encapsulate both, even to this day.

The Institutionalisation of Christianity

Whereas men like Caesar, Caracalla and Nero (Roman Emperors), Theophilus and Cyril (Bishops of Alexandria), and Justinian (Emperor of the Eastern Roman Empire) accomplished the first of the two agendas, it was men like Irenaeus and Tertullian who accomplished the second.

Both men were two of many who began to fashion a universal (catholic) church, with its authoritative hierarchy of bishops that could supposedly trace their spiritual lineage back to the disciple Peter, out of the chaos of persecution and martyrdom that characterised the existence of Christianity at the end of the 2nd century.

Irenaeus, especially, was one of the most effective proponents of the orthodoxy and dogma that have become the mainstay of the Catholic Church³. He was utterly and ruthlessly intolerant of what he deemed to be the nonsensical rubbish of the numerous and variant beliefs and teachings of the early Christians³. In fact, he wrote a detailed and personal attack on Gnosticism entitled *Against Heresies*⁶. Again, in Irenaeus, you see those now-familiar traits that characterise a Si'il incarnation: narcissism, psychopathy, cruelty, obsessive, single-minded focus in stamping out the Wisdom.

Yet, it was ruthlessly dogmatic men like him who became the filter through which the doctrine of institutionalised Christianity was passed. He, and men like him, determined what the orthodoxy and dogma of the emerging universal church actually was. What he agreed with, he allowed, and what he despised, he dispensed with. And, obviously, anything that did not fit his (Dark) agenda, anything that would truly have been of the Light, he reviled and revoked.

So it is this same rigid dogmatism that determined what constituted the emerging Catholic Church's canon, the so-called New Testament, because it is Irenaeus we have to thank for the Bible we've inherited today. He it was who decided which of the gospels were to be included in the canon, the New Testament, and he it was who decided to include the Old Testament of Jewish orthodoxy³.

It is not possible for us, in the modern era, to know what he did to censor those same gospels as he incorporated them into his new canon, because censor them he most certainly did. Only four out of many dozens in existence were chosen, although those four mostly regurgitate the same stories. All the other gospels, of which there were many, he discounted as rubbish.

Unfortunately for the Dark Priests, over fifty of those other (Gnostic) gospels survived and were unearthed and rediscovered in 1945 at Nag Hammadi in Egypt^{4,7}. The Gospel of Thomas, perhaps the most subversive in terms of institutionalised dogma, is believed to be the oldest of all the gospels⁴ and would, therefore, have been written closer to Yeheshua's actual life. It documents the secret teachings of Yeheshua⁷ and contradicts the synoptic gospels (Matthew, Mark, Luke) but blatantly opposes the Gospel of John⁷, casting doubt on the authenticity, or at least the accuracy, and, of course, the redaction of these.

Or was the Gospel of John written expressly to oppose, or counter, or refute, the Gospel of Thomas, as scholars have suggested and concluded⁷?

The Council of Nicaea

And then, add to this the Council of Nicaea in 325 CE, 125 years after Irenaeus, when the emperor, Constantine, sick of the infighting and petty squabbles over doctrinal differences, summoned bishops from the furthest reaches of the empire to decide, once and for all, the beliefs, doctrine and canons that would henceforth be upheld by the Catholic Church, and against which all contrary doctrines, beliefs and canons were deemed to be heresy³.

Any members who refused to accept the twenty canons decided upon were formally expelled³. This, the Nicæan Creed, became the universal creed of the universal church, and it was *this* Council and *this* Creed that proclaimed Jesus Christ the 'only Son of God'³.

Thus it was the Nicæan Council and its Creed that turned Yeheshua into the Son of God. He *never* made that claim himself, something made very clear in words of his that have survived . . . somehow slipping through the censorship net: *the kingdom of God is within you*.

At the Nicæan Council, the agenda of the institutionalisation of Christianity was finally completed, and the institutionalised dogma of the Church was set in stone, as it still is to this very day. Is it any wonder, then, that the gospels of Nag Hammadi paint an entirely different picture of early Christianity and of Yeheshua himself?

The Great Schism in Christianity

It was no coincidence that in the time of Irenaeus, that early proponent of institutionalisation, at the end of the 2nd century, a very great schism opened up in Christianity.

As time passed, the gulf between the two widened, and they became set, each against the other. They were, in truth, so different they were inversions, as is always the case with the Light and the Darkness, each the antithesis of the other, and the differences generated

conflicts between their adherents. They became enemies.

On one side of the schism were the Gnostics, the true inheritors of Yeheshua's Wisdom, who practiced inner *gnosis* or knowing, connecting with their own divinity within. On the other side of the schism were the institutionalised, literal Christians whose external god, through the auspices of the authoritarian hierarchy of his church, imposed his external rigid, implacable and unforgiving rules for existence and belief, and reinforced them with harsh, cruel, brutal and often fatal punishments.

In the name of this external god, the hierarchy of the Catholic Church did not hesitate to violate its own laws and dictates when to do so served its purpose, particularly its god's commandment, thou shalt not kill, as its campaigns of eradication illustrate. The new universal church did not just kill in the name of its Demiurge, it committed genocide, over and over and over again.

In Irenaeus' time, a century and a half after Yeheshua came to re-seed the Wisdom, that same Wisdom was deemed to be heresy by the newly-emerging Church, such was the success of the agenda of institutionalisation. This was cemented and certified at the Council of Nicaea just over a hundred years later, paving the way for the likes of Justinian and the Catholic Inquisition to conduct their campaigns of eradication in the centuries to come.

Official Religious Texts: Essential Components of Institutionalisation

The texts of the institutionalised religions are a vital part of the institutionalisation itself for three primary reasons, which is why Irenaeus and men like him worked hard to assemble the Bible and to install it as the Church's official text.

First, they knew the power of the written word would *overpower* oral traditions – the handing down of knowledge verbally from one generation to the next. Irenaeus knew the written word holds a power, particularly when officially endorsed by the institutionalised hierarchy, that overwhelms oral communication. Thus can the written word be turned into, and imbued with a sense of, authority against which oral traditions cannot compete.

Second, the written word can be implacably and rigorously controlled thereby becoming an extension and an expression of the institutionalised authority.

Third, the written word becomes set in stone, unalterable, as the religious texts of all the institutionalised religions are: the Talmud, the Koran, and the Bible. They become indisputable doctrinal law, studied, memorised, quoted.

But the Dark Priests are very aware of a fourth reason why it is important to assemble and endorse official texts like the Bible. They know such texts, if constructed in the right way, especially if deemed to be literal rather than allegorical or metaphorical, hold the power to lock individuals into intellectually-rigid thought and belief, almost like forming an impenetrable skin that renders deeper contemplations difficult, if not all but impossible.

And therein lies the true foundation of the Christian's Bible as we have it today.

The Jesus Iconification: A Construct of Christian Institutionalisation

Yeheshua had no trouble with his own humanity. And he *was* human . . . very human, meaning, when he was hot, he sweated, and when he was cold, he shivered. When he found something funny, he laughed, when he grieved, he cried, when he got a virus, he was sick, when he was hungry, he ate, when he was thirsty, he drank, and, as a consequence, like every other human, he had to go to the toilet.

Oh the sacrilege! Jesus Christ, Lord and Saviour, taking a moment from being utterly holy to go to the toilet. The gods forbid.

But the agenda of institutionalisation called for something, or someone, more spiritually clichéd, *and*, the Dark Priests themselves could ill afford to have humans realise they, too, were divine beings clothed in a human incarnation, as per Yeheshua's true message.

They needed to elevate him above the ordinary masses, *and* they needed to make it impossible for the ordinary masses to connect with his message and apply it to themselves, to emulate him. Or, more specifically, to attain the kind of spiritual enlightenment he espoused. In other words, they needed to negate his message and the power of his Wisdom and his Light, and they needed to fashion a god upon whom they could base their institutionalised church.

Two birds, one stone. And that stone was, of course, iconification.

The Mechanisms of Iconification

The mechanisms of iconification were, and are, many and varied, far too numerous to name here. Some are as simple as referring to him incessantly and rhythmically as 'our Lord, Jesus Christ' in chants and incantations that are erroneously labelled as prayers.

Another includes ubiquitous depictions of him hanging limply on a cross, or with a sickly-genteel expression on his face and a halo around his head. In the Dark and Middle Ages, the very-handly and extremely-effective mechanism of propaganda and mass manipulation – television – was not available, so the Catholic Church used art, especially paintings, as tools of propaganda. Image control, as any marketing campaign worth its salt accomplishes, hence the myriad of paintings and sculptures from this time depicting him and, especially, the crucifixion.

Like the proverbial magician's sleight of hand, this cleverly focuses attention on his death thereby drawing focus away from what truly matters: his life, his words, his teachings, his message.

That the iconification using these images has been supremely successful, too, is evidenced by the fact that so many people get so upset when anyone points out the fact that he is depicted in these iconic images as *European* when he was, in fact, *Middle Eastern* and thus would have had swarthy skin and dark eyes. Likewise, when the discovery of the Nag Hammadi texts raised the possibility that he had a lover (whom the Church conveniently turned into a prostitute), oh the outrage.

Another powerful and very-effective part of the iconification process was that of literalising some of his allegories and parables. That is, turning them into events that supposedly actually happened in real life, his life. Some other events were blatantly stolen from the mythological stories of older gods, like Osiris, Dionysus and Mithras, and then fused onto Yeheshua's life as if they were original and as if they were things he did.

Even his supposed age at death is a numerologically significant but distorted, twisted part of the iconification wrapped around him and his life, like mummifying bandages. Thirty-three is the number of the sub-stages of inner and upward transformation and transcendence, or transfiguration, like rungs on the ladder to heaven. Likewise, the numbers twelve and thirteen, *and* twelve around the thirteenth, are symbolically significant and, as such, encapsulate the secrets of the ancient mysteries.

Really, though, the iconification was accomplished at the Nicaean Council, and, ultimately, only four words were required to do it: *only Son of God*. The Council's declaration conveniently precludes anyone else from being a 'Son' (or Daughter) of God thereby implacably shutting anyone and everyone else out, forever locking 'Jesus' into an exclusive club of one. Clever. Very clever. And very, very false.

The Tragic Success of Iconification

So successful was the deifying iconification of Yeheshua, or the iconified deification of him, as Jesus, that even the great thinkers had enormous trouble reconciling his divinity with his humanity. The two, the deified icon and the human man, simply did not and do not mix, like oil and water, which always was the intention.

The struggle with this was exemplified in Origen, renowned in his own time for the brilliance of his intellect³. Being a soul of Light, as he was, he came at a time, the same time, as it happens, as Irenaeus, when the battle between the Wisdom inherent in early Christianity and the institutionalisation of it was well and truly being waged. It was, in truth, a battle for the very soul of Christianity, a spiritual tug of war, and, like any war, those of the Light, like Origen, were on the losing side, and, as such, became victims of it.

Irenaeus triumphed. Origen was tortured, and died barely a year later, defeated and broken³. His neoplatonic theology, a vain attempt to rescue the very soul of Christianity by trying to hold in balance the opposing dynamics of orthodoxy and Wisdom, was, of course, rejected by the hierarchy of the Catholic Church.

The problem for individuals like Origen, however, is, and always will be, the fact that the Wisdom and the Truth of Yeheshua can *never* be reconciled with institutionalisation, orthodoxy and iconification because they are opposing forces – polar opposites, actually.

The greatest tragedy of Origen and men like him, not just back in his own time but even today, is the fact that the battle between these opposing forces – the iconified 'Jesus' pitted against the humanity of him – wasn't just being waged externally, it was also being waged within, or internally. Origen's struggle is, therefore, a measure of just how successful the agenda of institutionalisation and iconification actually was, that someone as brilliant as he could struggle with Jesus being both divine *and* human.

Furthermore, is this not a measure of just how powerfully and effectively the Perpetual Separation that exists in this reality has been accomplished, that a human being cannot also be divine?

The Real Foundation Stone of Institutionalised Christianity

There is one other key player in the dissemination of institutionalised Christianity, a player who cannot be discounted. On the contrary, he must be recognised and acknowledged: the apostle Paul. Yeheshua is the *cornerstone*, yes, but so key a player was Paul that it is my belief it is *he* and not *Yeheshua* who has become the foundation upon which modern Christianity was built.

Was Paul of the Light or was he of the Darkness? I am ill-equipped to make that judgement call because Paul has always been special to me. Many years ago when I was going through the incredibly-painful process of coming away from the religious cult I grew up in, Paul was a powerful source of comfort to me, and I have never forgotten that. I want to believe he was of the Light, but the truth is he has become, whether willingly or unwittingly, an instrument of the Darkness.

He was certainly a religious fanatic, even by his own admission, and had been as a Pharisee, which was why he famously persecuted the early Christians whose beliefs, he thought, were an abomination to his Jewish god. Being a scribe and a scholar, he was a brilliant writer and, no doubt, orator, and he was highly charismatically persuasive.

His famous vision on the road from Jerusalem to Damascus – the defining event of his entire life and one that irrevocably changed the course and direction of it – is certainly reminiscent of those experienced by Mani, the Guardian who seeded the Manichaean Wisdom. But I think the Paul we have inherited courtesy of the Bible, who I will refer to as the biblical Paul, is an amalgam of Light and Dark. Thus I believe the biblical Paul is part authentic and part fabrication and manipulation. So it is impossible to determine the Truth about the real Paul.

Any organisation that defines itself as 'spiritual' must, by necessity, contain sufficient spiritual truths that, at the very least, lend it a degree of authenticity. Human consciousness is gullible but it's not stupid. This, too, was crucial for the newly-emerging Catholic Church. There had to be some justifications for its Creed, its dogma and its strictures actually *being* spiritual, *and* ostensibly being on the right side of spirituality. To this end it stole and then distorted many of the Truths contained in Gnosticism.

Also, critically, all of its founding personalities, whether Paul or Jesus or any of the others, are a cleverly-orchestrated amalgam of truths, distorted truths and untruths. The question for me is how much has Paul and his writing been manipulated, and so how much *is* truth, how much *is* distorted truth, and how much *is* untruth.

That his letters survived the stringent, rigid censorship of the Nicaean Council deeply concerns me. But then, did they? There is such a mix of Light and Darkness in his writings, and it's actually quite easy to spot the difference, but the mixture of the two makes for a powerfully-effective but cleverly-manipulative foundation for the institutionalisation of Christianity and the iconification of Yeheshua.

Did Paul unwittingly become the primary instrument utilised by the Council, upon which is based its Creed of Jesus being the only Son of God? And, how would he feel about that now?

Paul's Indoctrinated Jewishness

But even underneath the obvious mix of Light and Darkness in his writing, the biblical Paul was a fascinating mix of Jewish and Christian beliefs. How could he not be given his past history? That kind of indoctrination doesn't evaporate in the light of a single vision.

And, you have to remember, Paul himself never met Yeheshua, never personally heard him speak or interacted with him, and so was not a receptacle for Yeheshua's Light, as were those other disciples with whom Yeheshua Worked. So it is perhaps understandable that Paul would incorporate Yeheshua into his long-held and deeply-entrenched belief in his external Jewish god thus fitting Yeheshua *to* his belief system instead of allowing himself to go beyond it, to transcend it. Perhaps this is exactly why he was chosen.

He advocated freedom from the rules of his institutionalised Jewish upbringing, yet he struggled with those same rules himself, and, ultimately, failed to free himself from them. If he was an instrument of the Light then he was a flawed one, and as a direct consequence it has been easy for the Darkness to manipulate his message. If he was an instrument of the Darkness, then no subsequent manipulations would really have been necessary.

Whether or not he was, in his own lifetime, or has since been fabricated to be so, the biblical Paul became a perfect fusion of Jewish and Christian institutionalisation, and *this* is the filter through which Christianity itself was passed in its infancy. Ultimately, the biblical Paul took the cultish Jewish god beyond the bounds imposed by the genetic birthright of Jewish culture and tradition, and he used Yeheshua to do it.

It was the biblical Paul, amalgam that he was, who turned Yeheshua into the key that locked Christianity into the institutionalised system it still is even to this day.

The Messiah

Neither Yeheshua nor his iconic alter-ego, Jesus, was the Messiah. The Messiah is not a person, it's a movement, or, more aptly, a stirring. The Wisdom is messianic. It's the *Wisdom* that is the true Messiah. By making him the Messiah, the Dark Priests and their Church turned Yeheshua into both prison bars and lock, making it impossible for any Christian to look or go beyond the icon. Thus did he become the cornerstone of institutionalisation, the very thing he came here to smash to smithereens.

The Man Behind the Iconic Jesus

The man behind the iconic 'Jesus' wasn't just human for that one-off lifetime. Meaning, he didn't just take on the one incarnation. Yeheshua fell low into the human experience *to be identified with humans, to show them there is a way out of the quagmire of materiality – the True resurrection of consciousness*. Thus was identification key in his message, the very thing the Dark Priests and their Church negated.

So, given this as his Truth, why would he negate it himself by dying physically and then coming back from physical death – something humans simply cannot accomplish in their current state? Doesn't that one simple act undo everything he stood for? His sacrifice was not made by dying on a Roman cross, it was in coming here in the first place – into this abyss of Darkness and Separation that is the opposite of everything the Guardians *are*.

The mandate of his life was signalled right at the outset with his conception outside of wedlock. Even in being conceived the way he was, he broke the rules of institutionalised religion. But the Church took care of this with the so-called 'Immaculate Conception' (defined as a dogma of the Catholic Church in 1854⁶) thereby, conveniently, killing two birds with one swift stroke: strengthening their claim of him as the Son of God *and* satisfying the human need to venerate the sacred feminine, something their religion decidedly lacked.

As a Guardian, Yeheshua *was* the Wisdom incarnate, made manifest in human form, so, like Socrates and Gautama Buddha, he lived and breathed it, and it was every word that was upon his lips. He did ascend into heaven, absolutely. Not as the 'Son of God', *but as one who made the Metaphysical Transition*⁵, *within himself*. Ascension is the third stage of the Transition, and, as such, anyone capable may do it as he did. As I am doing. Which is his message and mine.

Courtesy of the Work* he did to make the Transition, he was *a healed and whole consciousness*, and, as such, he was a beautiful synergy of multiple higher dimensions, as many human souls are, like white light which comprises seven different wavelengths of radiation. Yeheshua radiated the Light of, and expressed the characteristics of, those dimensions, including the Elohim, the archangelic realms, and the Fae realm, which is why he was a master story teller.

His legacy is the collection of beautiful allegorical stories he told that are able to so powerfully and effectively penetrate the layers of consciousness thence to strike at and stir the very core of consciousness. The language of allegory and parable, which he spoke so beautifully, is a way of making the Wisdom so palatable to consciousness it's like wrapping vegetables in candy. It feeds and nourishes, and people want more without necessarily knowing why.

The Essence of Powerful Light

And when they come in their True Form, the Guardians invariably Work with a group of disciples who are themselves powerful beings of Light, even Guardians themselves. Gautama Buddha, Mani, and Socrates all Worked with disciples who, then, promulgated their message and their teachings.

Plato, disciple of Socrates, was as much of the Light as was Socrates, and so Plato played as vital a role in the establishment of Philosophy as that discernible flame of Wisdom that has been carried through the aeons of human existence from his day to ours. The disciples are, in fact, the fertile soil into which the newly-seeded Wisdom is planted. And in that soil, it thrives and flourishes.

But the disciples take far more than just words of Wisdom out into the world. They also

take the essence, the Light itself, because they become infused by their own *and* that of the Guardian with whom they've Worked – Light capable of awakening consciousness. So it was with the disciples who Worked with Yeheshua. They took his message *and* the essence of his Light with them.

This the early Christians knew. The Cathars believed the Light essence, a spiritual legacy, had been passed on from Yeheshua to his disciples directly, and then from them down through a long line of *Perfecti* (priests). *This* is why it became so vital for the Catholic Church to trace its origins back to Peter, so it could successfully set itself up as a believable rival, albeit a counterfeit one, to Gnostic Christianity as the true inheritor of Yeheshua's legacy.

Furthermore, the early Christians knew that anything written, or recorded, by the disciples gathered around Yeheshua was inherently trustworthy for the same reason, which is why much has been written in their name – much that is false, much that is true, much that is sliced and diced and censored, and much that is a distorted, half-baked version of the truth.

Did Yeheshua die on the cross?

It is a trick of the iconification of him that Yeheshua's death, and the nature of it, have become the defining aspect of his life. *Whether or not he died on a cross is entirely irrelevant.* That's the Truth of his life. And to focus on it is to miss the point . . . entirely.

The Church has made a big deal of the 'crucifixion' for multiple reasons. First, it needed to negate the concepts intrinsic in the resurrection of consciousness as per ancient and very powerful rites of initiation. That Yeheshua supposedly died on a physical cross and then resurrected physically automatically negates the truth that he did so *metaphysically*. Only, in high initiation, the symbolism is reversed.

So, for example, being nailed to a cross or a tree symbolises entrapment in the quagmire of materiality – a form of death for the higher-dimensional Self. Furthermore, in high initiation and, especially, the Metaphysical Transition (the latter is a specific version of the former, undertaken in three primary stages, and Yeheshua made it in that life he lived) the death of the initiate is not at all physical.

On the contrary, the lower-dimensional, incarnate egoic identity 'dies' in powerful and profound Processes of deconstruction, disempowerment, transformation and transcendence whilst the initiate is still in a physical body. The Metaphysical Transition transitions the conscious identification *from* the egoic identity *to* the metaphysical Self which is the resurrection of consciousness.

The second reason the Church has made such a big deal out of the crucifixion is that of needing to resurrect Yeheshua *physically* to validate its claim that he was the only Son of God, at the same time separating him from, and elevating him far above, the ordinary masses. Negating identification, in other words, and nullifying his humanity.

Third, it needed to draw focus away from his life and his message.

Fourth, it needed to reinforce the concept of 'sin'. Sin is a construct of Catholic orthodoxy, albeit a clever one, specifically designed to instil in humans the poisonous and extremely erroneous belief in their inherently sinful nature and, with it, their innate unworthiness to look upon the face of God. It also conveniently and lucratively fosters dependence on Church absolution, intrinsically linked, as it is, to the concept of hell. As sinners, individuals need the Church to avoid this fate that is worse than death. It's a paradox of their orthodoxy, actually. As 'sinners', people need the absolution granted by the confessional, conferred on them by the clergy, and yet, 'Jesus' died for the forgiveness of *all* sins.

Fifth, although the Romans, technically, crucified Jesus in the biblical account of the crucifixion, the blame was placed directly on the Jews, who rejected him, thereby laying the foundations for supposedly-justifiable persecution and vilification.

The sixth reason crucifixion is important to the Church is that of forming the premise, courtesy of the dynamic of sacrifice, of communion and mass, which, in turn, has meant much of the world's population has engaged in black magic rites under the guise of religious ritual (see below), systematically and consistently, every week for centuries.

The seventh reason concerns the Si'il (Dark Priests) directly. They needed a symbol of death and entrapment, because they speak the language of consciousness supremely well. A symbol of death and entrapment like that of Jesus nailed to the cross, as powerful and ubiquitous as it is, has entombed and entrapped consciousness, and will continue to do so whilst ever the symbol has power over humans. Human consciousness has, therefore, been nailed to the cross of physicality every bit as much as has the iconic Jesus. It's clever. It's sinister. And highly manipulative.

The Ancient Myth of the Dying and Resurrecting God

Yeheshua *was* resurrected, *metaphysically*. His resurrection was identical to that experienced in the great pyramids of Egypt, or that experienced in high initiation, which is a resurrection of *consciousness*, the reason why the function of the pyramids as tombs is such a deliberately-fostered misconception. The Dark Priests can't have humanity knowing about the power of initiation and the changes it can engender in consciousness. There would be no greater threat to their systems of control than initiation.

The ancient myth of the dying and resurrecting god has been regurgitated in many different cultures, in many different contexts, with many different gods in the lead role. So the Church did not have to look far to find it, and then it was an easy step to simply lay the myth over the top of the man, a fusion of man and myth that negates the power and the message of both.

Communion: an Institutionalised Cornerstone of Evil

We cannot leave the institutionalisation of Christianity without speaking about one very particular aspect of it – a cornerstone of manipulation that is pure evil and has affected humanity and the human experience accordingly.

Intrinsic in black magic and satanic rituals is the consuming of flesh and the drinking of

blood. Animals are often used, but to heighten the power of the ritual and the energetic effects of it, humans are used. And it is worth knowing that different victims with their different bloods have different effects. So, for example, consuming the flesh and drinking the blood of an adult male stirs up negative masculine energy thereby stirring up violence, aggression, abuse, domination, exploitation, conflict, confrontation, war, all of which cause the brutality and laceration of souls that trap individuals in the quagmire of materiality courtesy of the burden of karmic imbalance and obligation.

Now that you know this, have a look at the religious rituals of mass and communion with opened, knowledgeable eyes, and knowing, too, that the Catholic Church was only ever a powerful arm of Darkness.

Communion uses bread and wine to symbolise the eating of male human flesh and the drinking of male human blood. Given the more-pure intent of most people who participate in these rituals every week, the power of them is but an echo of the power generated by true black magic rituals. Yet, barely-disguised black magic ritual communion still is, and look at the world around us. Has not negative masculine energy and its effects of conflict, violence and war characterised the last two thousand years of human history?

The Divisiveness of Institutionalised Religion

What happens when one rigid, set-in-stone institutionalised system butts heads with a different one, particularly if they are both claiming the moral high ground in relation to the same thing? It's very much like two stone statues smashing against one another. Neither gives in because neither *can* give in.

I cannot make any categorical comments about Muhammad because I don't know enough about him, but given the violence that is both the fruit of his life and his legacy long after he lived, I strongly suspect he was either a Si'il incarnation or one of their minions. Either way, what I do know is that Islam was conceived to directly oppose both the Jewish and Christian religions. Divisiveness, in other words.

Over the last two thousand years of our history, the institutionalised religions have been used to perfection by the Dark Priests to incite violent conflict, polarisation, hatred, vitriol, persecution, and brutal suppression with lasting and devastating consequences. From the edicts and decrees of Roman emperors to modern terrorism, institutionalised religion has been and is being used against us, masterfully.

Philosophy and Hermeticism: Insitutionalised-Proof Flames of Light

Philosophy is unique, even as a study or a school of thought, because it cannot easily be institutionalised, and there is no limit to the depths it can plumb. *And* imposing any kind of authoritarian hierarchical structure on it is all but impossible, as is creating a framework within which philosophers and, perhaps more importantly, *potential* philosophers, or seekers of Truth, may approach it and work with it.

The vast majority of individuals incarnate in the human experience now are *not comfortable* with such a lack of infrastructure around their belief systems, which is exactly why the institutionalised religions are so prevalent and work so well. And as with

Philosophy so, too, the same can be said for Hermeticism.

Both Philosophy and Hermeticism are, ultimately, a deeply personal and an individual thing, perhaps the primary reason why they cannot so easily be institutionalised. And this makes them the antithesis of institutionalisation and the institutionalised religions.

In fact, Hermeticism is the absolute antithesis of institutionalised religion, its extreme polar opposite. So, while institutionalised religion has very obvious and overt physical expression and manifestation, Hermeticism is not and cannot be seen physically. Only the ripple of effect and influence of it can be perceived in physicality, which is exactly what we can see in the Renaissance.

While Philosophy cannot be controlled, though, it can be contained, as we saw in the Dark Ages, unlike Hermeticism, which cannot be controlled or contained but which can only be grasped by a select, specialised few, hence the deeply esoteric nature of it. The Dark Priests cannot touch Hermeticism in its purest form, which is why they don't even try. It is, however, absorbed and assimilated into Philosophy making Philosophy one of the most powerful and enduring flames of the Light in the human experience.

So powerful are these two, in fact, that they effectively ended the Dark Ages, ushering in a new enlightenment or Renaissance. And ever since, the power of that edifice of institutionalisation – the Catholic Church – has been on the wane, although its legacy endures, not just in the institutionalised religious systems and their false and harmful beliefs that still predominate to this day, and in the 'Jesus' iconification, but also in the form of deep and powerful wounds and scars in human consciousness and reality that are still felt today.

* Author's Note: I deliberately use capital letters to denote higher-dimensional concepts and to distinguish these from the common, lower-dimensional use and definition of the words.

+ The letters 'I' and 'J' were used interchangeably until 1524 when Gian Giorgio Trissino, a Renaissance grammarian, made a clear distinction between the two, identifying the Greek “Iesus”, which was a translation, or corruption, from the Hebrew “Yeshua”, as the English “Jesus”. Thus was the letter 'J' the last letter to be added to the English alphabet, and the modern, iconic name 'Jesus' was used for the first time (reference: <https://www.dictionary.com/e/j>).

1. *Let's Talk About Sects*, Sarah Steel, 2017-2020: <https://www.Itaspod.com/episodes> [podcasts: Season One – Outreach International (Part 1); Season Two – Outreach International (Part 2)]; and, *Do As I Say*, Sarah Steel, 2022, Pan Macmillan Australia.
2. *Altira*, Jennifer Wherrett, 2019, Publicious.
3. *Dominion The Making of the Western Mind*, Tom Holland, 2019, Little, Brown.
4. *The Master Game*, Graham Hancock & Robert Bauval, 2011, The Disinformation Company, Ltd.
5. *The Metaphysical Transition*, Jennifer Wherrett, currently unpublished (expected publication 2021).
6. Oxford Dictionary of English, Second Edition, 2003, Oxford University Press.
7. *Beyond Belief The Secret Gospel of Thomas*, Elaine Pagels, 2003, Random House.

Jennifer Wherrett

<https://www.thelady.com.au>

© The Monograph Series, Jennifer Wherrett, 2020. All rights reserved. This article is protected under international copyright laws. No part of this article may be copied or reproduced without permission from the author.