

synthesis
REMEMBERED

Awakening Original Innocence

Charles L. Moore, JD, STB

ΣΥΝΘΕΣΙΣ

Charles L. Moore, JD, STB

Jacket and Book Design: Suzanne Wright
Back cover photo: Charles D. Robinson

Copyright 2006 Charles L. Moore

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the author, except in the case of brief quotations in critical articles of review.

Printed in the United States of America.

ISBN-10 1-60145-070-2
ISBN-13 978-1-60145-070-8

Mooredune Publications, LLC
PO Box 476
Soquel, CA 95073

NOTE TO READERS

Each Canto in this book taps into a mingled or shared dream held by visionaries throughout time, people who have guided us to self-evident truth. Each of the designated speakers in the dialogues or poetic writings speaks of their observations and concerns, while historical facts are intertwined in service of activating essential questions.

Some spelling and use of words and phrases may seem unfamiliar, or inconsistent with our current custom and practice. This is intended as a means to enrich our experience. All language is representative of and filtered through the multifaceted lenses of culture and context, as well as numerous editors and publishers. To have a sense of the origins and early spellings and meanings of our words expands our understanding of how we arrived here in our current world.

The Glossary and Chronology are merely a beginning. You are enthusiastically encouraged to continue your own lines of inquiry and discovery.

Acknowledgments and Bibliographic References

Though many seem to work alone, no one ever does. We are all connected to the same source and come to original realizations in the company of many others. I first wish to acknowledge in alphabetical order people who have taken the trouble to write their vision of the imminent unanimity that we perceive in common.

Thomas Aquinas	Henry Lincoln
Sir Francis Bacon	David Loy
Michael Baigent	Malachi Martin
Dorothy Bryant	Thomas Merton
Tony Bushby	John Michelle
E. A. Wallis Budge	Sir Isaac Newton
John P. Dourley	Plato
Albert Einstein	Pope John XXIII
Riane Eisler	Pythagoras
Father Newman Eberhardt	Eleanor Roosevelt
Dion Fortune	Franklin D. Roosevelt
Benjamin Franklin	Carl A.B. Ruck
Laurence Gardner	Acharya S
Manley P. Hall	William Shakespeare
William Henry	Zecharia Sitchin
Graham Hancock	John Steinbeck
Thomas Jefferson	Michael Talbot
Carl G. Jung	Mark Twain
Olga Kharitidi	Eleanor Wasson
Richard Leigh	Paramahansa Yogananda

In addition, I wish to acknowledge those who have provided symbolic inspiration and living participation in the dream, in forms other than writing:

Acevia A. Bennett	David and Anne Jevons
Geoffery Ash	Katherine Maltwood
Gerald Askevold	Marsha Morgan
Shelley Ipimi Brown	Andrew Mount
Pim Chavasant	Daniel O'Conner
George S.J. Crain	Al Olsen
Mary & Larry Delaney	Rudy Proctor
Eleanor of Acquitane	Mona Schoenwisner
David Cushing Feuss	Siddartha
Robert Graham	Socrates
Daniel S.J. Harkin	Thomas Nason (LittleBear)
Steve Hildebrand	Jaques Verduin
Hildegard de Bingham	Jack West
Homouk	Bishop Aloysius Willinger
Peter Hueber	Mary Yavner
Michael Taylor Jackson	Eleana Young
Jesus, the Nazarite	

I wish to acknowledge with gratitude those whose names I may unintentionally have omitted. Also, I wish to remember with compassion all those who have risen in outrage to defend the truth.

Many people have worked to bring forth this book and must be specifically acknowledged for their talents and passion for this material. I wish to extend hearty thanks to: Marcos Warshaw for the ongoing dialogues, for bringing the initial manuscript into a unified form and reviewing my references to math and science; Gary Don Blevens for his concept for the cover; Dawn Griffin for her concepts for structuring the material presented here; Joyce Diamond for her thoughtful editing of the whole manuscript as well as thorough research for the glossary; Denise Renee O'Connor for her meticulous wordsmithing and copyediting; and Shams Kairys for his insightful reflections and final editing. Susan Kinsey Smith provided invaluable ongoing support and guidance for the project. Special thanks to Patricia Carney for her loving and skillful attention to myriad aspects of producing this book, holding the overall vision for it while marshalling all the parts that needed to be refined and joined to bring it into your hands.

Contents

Introduction	1
Canto I The Dragon	10
Canto II Bonding	17
Canto III Stranger in the Sky	20
Canto IV Primal Parenting	24
Canto V The Observer	32
Canto VI First Contact	39
Canto VII Sir Leonard Speaks of Ur	43
Canto VIII Ziggurat of Ur	51
Canto IX From Avalon to Eridu	55
Canto X Granting of the <i>Meh</i>	59
Canto XI Delphi: Course of Empire	63
Canto XII A Good Use of Time	67
Canto XII Spin–The Vortiginal Nature of Manifestation	80
Canto XIV Community!	86
Canto XV The Greatest Vice	93
Canto XVI Empire’s Destiny	95
Canto XVII Astrology, Astronomy and the Roots of Origin	98
Canto XVIII Legacy and Betrayal	116
Canto XIX And Jesus Said	120
Canto XX Soliloquy	127
Canto XXI The Master Dialogue	132

Canto XXII	<i>Sol Invictus</i>	137
Canto XXIII	The Tao	146
Canto XXIV	Into the Age of Darkness	151
Canto XXV	Merlin, Slayer of Dragons	156
Canto XXVI	<i>Summa Theologica</i>	160
Canto XXVII	And The Truth Shall Set You Free	166
Canto XXVII	Original Innocence	171
Canto XXIX	The Venetian Oligarchy	177
Canto XXX	Primal Encounter	182
Canto XXXI	The Long Voyage Home	188
Canto XXXII	Do Indians Have Souls?	197
Canto XXXIII	At Last!	201
Canto XXXIV	The Pope's Order	203
Canto XXXV	Buonarroti's Code	206
Canto XXXVI	Concordat	210
Canto XXXVII	Democracy and Empire	214
Canto XXXVIII	Priestly Power-The Forbidden Secret ..	219
Canto XXXIX	The Illness That We Are	226
Canto XL	<i>In Hoc Signo Vinces:</i> In This Sign You Will Conquer	232
Canto XLI	Self-Evident	237
Canto XLII	Supercalifragilistic Androhermaphrogenous Expialidosious	243
Canto XLIII	Myth and Spirituality	250
Canto XLIV	Innocence and Infallibility	255

Canto XLV	Gift of a Name260
Canto XLVI	Merkabah263
Canto XLVII	Sacrifice267
Canto XLVIII	May The Heart of Earth...271
Canto XLIX	Confession274
Canto L	Summation of The Course of Empire	..277
Canto LI	Remembering Original Innocence284
Canto LII	What Kind of Fool Am I289
Chronology	294
Ancient Mesopotamia	297
Anunnaki Genealogy	298
Glossary	299
Further Reference	325
Index	330
Invocation	324

Introduction

In the spring of 1957, after 30 years as a Presbyterian, I was baptized as a Roman Catholic at Old St. Mary's Church in San Francisco's Chinatown. I received my first communion at St. Francis Church in North Beach, and went shortly thereafter to Santa Cruz, where I had been District Attorney, and visited Monsignor Phelan at St. Joseph's Church in Capitola. After mass he motioned me back to the sacristy. His greeting was, "Well, Charles, so you're a Catholic now! Why don't you become a priest?" "But Monsignor," I replied, "I've only been a Catholic a week!" "Oh," he said, "that's nonsense. I'll write the bishop today."

It wasn't long before I was on my way to see the bishop in Fresno. I took back roads, enjoying the hillsides of poppies that were like sunlight emanating from the California earth. When I arrived and entered the office of the first bishop I had ever met, he greeted me with a gruffness covering a genuine gentleness, and said, "So you want to be a priest, huh?" I replied, "I don't know whether I want to be a priest or not, I just want in, that's all, and I'll scrub floors the rest of my life if necessary!" The bishop said, "That's good enough for me; I'll put you in the seminary tomorrow! It's a Jesuit seminary, and I would like you to go see the Jesuit provincial in San Francisco, if you don't mind."

I knew little of the Jesuits, except that they were controversial. I would later learn they are also scholars in dedicated pursuit of knowledge. Upon my arrival the provincial received me with elegant decorum, yet without formalities. He asked, "Are you familiar with Thomas Aquinas?" I replied, "A little bit." He said, "You will become more familiar. As you study, remember that we have followed the synthesis of his *Summa Theologica* for eight hundred years. It's out of date." I took that to be a commission from John XXIII's Vatican to write this book, although it is likely the present Vatican administration would be horrified.

Since that time my studies have made it clear to me that any "synthesis" must extend into our origins, and that the entire Christian religion was out of date long before Thomas Aquinas, starting with the Council of Nicea in 325 CE. This is when the Church of Constantine presented us with a Jesus as God who gave us commandments to be obeyed under threat of hell at the last

Synthesis Remembered

judgment. But Jesus never claimed to be God; nor did he speak of hell, or issue commandments, or require beliefs. Jesus only gave us himself as a master of truth. Like any true master, his purpose was to stimulate a memory of what is already known in our heart-minds.

My hope is that this book will be a catalyst of such memory, the memory of the self-evident truth. To those who may find that suggestions in this book seem contradictory to their convictions, remember that Jesus is not made less real by what I have stated. For the Bible, like all books, has a bibliography of some kind, whether referenced or not. And no human instrument is infallible, including you and me!



This book is by nature oxymoronic. It attempts to express in language what may only be comprehended by spontaneous individual memory. That said, I make this offering in the hope that the words will elicit your own memory—not of the mind alone, but something much larger that is common to us all.

My inherent curious nature came to full bloom as a student at Grant High School in Portland, Oregon when I first read the words inscribed on the marble plaque at the entrance: “All ye who enter here, never abandon persistent curiosity.” This maxim has guided me throughout my life. I have never allowed any doctrine or teaching to supplant the curiosity which always urged me to go deeper.

Although my curiosity is broad, I focused my pursuit of knowledge on the twin pillars of the archeology of Earth and the archeology of language. My guide in the archeology of the Earth is Zecharia Sitchin, who led me to remember who the gods of Israel, Greece, Rome and India really are. My initial exposure to the archeology of language began in Latin class at Grant High School when our stern instructor shocked my pubescent mind by declaring, “There are three genders of Latin nouns: feminine, masculine and hermaphroditic neuter. If you don’t know what that word means, look it up!” A rabid Protestant fundamentalist at the time, my religious convictions were shaken and my curiosity awakened.

Introduction

Religion and Bonding

This book examines organized religion to discover its relationship to our personal spirituality, and our quest for a sense of the meaning of life.

I am an ordained Roman Catholic priest as well as an attorney admitted to practice in California. In my quest for my spiritual life I find that the principle obstacle in my way has been my own conformity to received doctrine. Beyond confessing that this conformity is my own responsibility, lie these questions: 1) From whom did I receive the doctrine? 2) What doctrine did I receive? 3) How is it that this doctrine becomes an impediment to the understanding it is intended to facilitate?

I'll return to these questions in a moment, but first it seems important to also ask: What is religion? The archeology of language helps us to understand. The word comes from the Latin verb *ligo*, meaning to form a bond. *Religo*, therefore, means to re-form a bond.

As a law student at Stanford my principle course was contracts. A contract is defined as "A promise or set of promises that the law recognizes as legally binding." Therefore, a contract is also about bonding.

We can talk about bonding from the perspective of chemistry as well, which teaches us that salt occurs when sodium bonds with chlorine. Actually all of life is made possible through the bonding of elements.

Patriotism is also about bonding, as described by the word allegiance, derived from *ad + ligo*, to bond to.

In Catholic seminary I was told that Moses made a covenant with the burning bush, from which sprang Judaism, Christianity and Islam.

A covenant is a bond between heart-minds. A contract is a bond between minds. Religion in its purest expression is about covenants; however, in its role to enforce doctrine it is about contracts.

Of all bondings, of course, the most important is a recognition of the bond that can never be broken—a bond with the living universe—the mysterious, nameless essence of all that is. It is through the celebration of this bond that the heart is filled with ecstasy and awe. Love is after all the ecstasy of a deeper bonding between spirits. Shall we then, like Homer, be bards in praise of the odyssey of bonding?

Synthesis Remembered

Received Doctrine and Schizophrenia

As to the question raised earlier, "From whom did I receive the doctrine?" the answer is both simple and complex. The simple answer is the Church, which in my case included both the Presbyterian and Catholic Churches. I remember sitting in the pews of the Mt. Tabor Presbyterian Church in Portland, Oregon, at the age of eleven, reading along as the "Creed" was recited. The part that struck me was, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church." I was shocked and said to myself, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church?! Then what am I doing here in the Presbyterian Church?" I've really never recovered from that shock of realizing that all Christian churches are based on the same doctrine.

My religious education, however, began at a much earlier age. I had read the Bible by the time I was five under the influence of Ailla, our housekeeper. She was a "holy roller" who took me to Sunday school at a small Wesleyan Methodist Church. Sometimes she took me to Wednesday prayer meetings. I remember going to such a meeting when I was five with Ailla and her boyfriend, Kermit, who was frequently "possessed by the spirit" and "rolled" very convincingly. At the end of his sermon the minister cried out, "Which of you will come forward now and confess Jesus as your personal savior?" Expecting a great rush of confessions, I was puzzled when no one made a move. Being the precocious child that I was, I confidently walked to the front to confess. The minister looked down at me from what seemed a treetop height and said, "Little boy, who brought you here? Did your mother bring you?" "No," I said. "Did your father bring you?" "No," I said. "Well, who sent you up here?" "God did," I replied, at which the minister became appallingly confused and could not speak. I glanced up at him with what I am sure was ill-concealed contempt, and went back to sit with Ailla and Kermit.

I suppose that was the beginning of my life-long inquiry into the lack of intelligence, compassion and connection in the teachings of Christianity. As scholar and psychologist Carl Jung said, "The collective unconscious has a thousand ways of killing those who lack the sense of the meaning of life." My quest has led me to conclude, in agreement with another reflection from Jung, that "Christianity is the illness that we are" (and I don't think Judaism and Islam are far behind). When I read this statement, I was moved deeply that Jung included himself in "the illness that we are," and I became convinced that I should look for that illness in myself. So I asked, "Does

Introduction

that illness have a name?" An analogous name appeared at once: schizophrenia—the most terrible mental-emotional illness. What is schizophrenia? It is a disassociation of sensory input, feelings and emotions on one hand and thoughts on the other. In other words, it stems from the conflict that occurs when one denies what is sensed, felt, or remembered in his or her own heart-mind in order to conform to a conflicting set of beliefs.

I co-authored a book titled *A Schizophrenic's Spiritual Search* with the late Margaret Ingram, in which she tells the story of having adopted a young man from Philadelphia who was a diagnosed schizophrenic. When she was consulting with one of the psychiatrists on the case, he warned her, "A schizophrenic can kill you." History holds multiple examples of this, a prime one being the perpetrators of the Inquisition.

Why would Christianity be likely to induce such daemonic consequences? The real answer is subtle and frightening. It goes back to the Apostle's Creed, the summary of required beliefs I was taught in the Presbyterian Church, which relates back to the Holy Catholic Church, the source of so many problems and sorrows:

"I believe in God the Father Almighty,
Creator of heaven and Earth,
And in Jesus Christ his only son, Our Lord,
Who was conceived by the Holy Spirit,
Born of the Virgin Mary,
Suffered under Pontius Pilate,
Was crucified, died and was buried.
He descended into hell.
On the third day he rose again from the dead.
He ascended into heaven
Where he sits at the right hand of God the Father Almighty.
He will come again to judge the living and the dead.

I believe in the Holy Ghost,
The Holy Catholic Church,
The Communion of Saints,
The Forgiveness of Sins,
The Resurrection of the Body,
And the Life Everlasting."

Synthesis Remembered

The trouble with the beliefs stated above, or similar ones, is that they are totally unbelievable. Individuals are threatened with hell not only if they don't believe them, but even if they question them. Yet, most of the required beliefs, if not all of them, go directly contrary to the self-evident truth in one's own heart. These beliefs induce conflict that disempowers people, causing them to either tergiversate (turn their backs and walk away), or worse yet, to surrender their freedom, slowly sinking into schizophrenic denial, despair and aggression. The only real survivors are those who don't take them seriously in the first place.

One day in France, years ago, I was talking to a French matron about my concerns with Christianity. She said, "Oh, you Americans. You take it all so seriously! We stopped listening long ago!"

One might argue that there is much truth in the Christian religion and that Christianity has done a great deal of good, especially in its care of the poor. These things are true. But has the damage Christianity has done been dwarfed by its good deeds, or is it the other way around?

Founding of Christianity

A key question is, who founded Christianity? Without thinking, one would answer, "Why Jesus, of course!" The Catholics will add, "Upon the Apostle Peter at Caesarea Philippi."

Research clearly indicates that Jesus never founded the Christian church at all, and certainly not upon Peter. The New Testament leads one to believe that Paul of Tarsus fashioned the Christianity we know, inventing several important doctrines including the Divinity of Christ, Original Sin and the Eucharist (the "body and blood" of Christ consumed at Communion), but most particularly the idea that Jesus Christ died on the cross for our sins. No quotes attributed to Jesus in the New Testament support any of the above. Further research shows that it was neither Peter nor Paul who founded Christianity. The Christianity we know was founded by the Roman Emperor Constantine for the purpose of ruling the Roman Empire. He was assisted by Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea, who formulated the accepted Creed of the Church at the Council of Nicea in 325 CE based upon the work of Irenaeus of Lyon, France 189 CE.

Constantine and those who followed him had their own religion based on the Solar Hero named Mithra by the Persians. Those who

Introduction

had been influenced by Christ and continued to spread his teachings were considered a radical element that threatened to undermine Constantine's power. So Constantine founded Christianity as a religion for his army by selectively adopting Jesus' teachings and turning him into a Solar Hero, like Mithra. Ultimately, Theodosius (379-395 CE) proclaimed Christianity the religion of the Roman Empire.

All of the above was known but not hotly disputed until 1945, when a group of local farmers found the *Gospel According to Thomas*, together with a group of "Gnostic" writings, at Nag Hammadi, a small desert town in Egypt. Carl Jung was there at the time. Thomas' gospel gives us a Jesus who sounds a great deal more like Siddhartha the Buddha than like the founder of Caesaro-Papist Christianity.

The history of western civilization is really the history of Empire, continued in the form of the Holy Roman Church. The Pope historically shared the role of Emperor, as the Church representative in the Church-State partnership, beginning with the Holy Roman Emperor Charlemagne in 800 CE, and continuing until the end of World War I. Although the Holy Roman Empire vanished from the map at the Treaty of Versailles in 1919, at least in its "state" function, that influence still exists today, in spite of the seeming separation of church and state.

From the Roman Catholic Church sprang Protestantism headed by Martin Luther who had been a Catholic priest who suffered the full rigors of the Augustinian Order. The final event that prompted his leaving was witnessing the paedophilic behavior of Pope Leo X at a birthday party in Rome. Luther declared, "There is nothing spiritual about the spiritual practices of the Christian Church." Unfortunately Luther's protests strained out the gnat and swallowed the camel, as the saying goes. He accepted too much and denied too little. But to his credit, he opened the door to finding a Jesus closer to the portrayal in the Gnostic *Gospel According to Thomas*.

The Gnostic teachings imply that Jesus grafted a Buddhist shoot on a Jewish root. Gnosticism is still considered by adherents to orthodoxy to be the greatest heresy. Gnosticism leads one to finding the self-evident truth in his or her own heart-mind rather than memorizing the opinions of others as orthodoxy requires. Gnosticism is the true basis of democracy and freedom, whereas orthodoxy is the support of hierarchy, obedience and slavery. That

Synthesis Remembered

is why for centuries the Roman Catholic Church worked to eliminate all Gnostic writings.

Prehistory and History

Prehistory is based on archeology—the excavated ruins of cultures and cities, along with skeletal remains from thousands of years ago.

The word *history* means a story, any story. As an event, history is whatever happened, but as a fact it is a written account of what witnesses say they remember. Intentionally or not, all stories are fictional to a degree, no matter how “objective” the historian tries to be. It is like quantum physics—the subjective state of the physicist alters the process of observation making the experiment unrepeatable, at least in part.

The earliest written records we have are Sumerian clay tablets that contain accounts of the history of our species, including the creation of our Earth from a planet then in the orbit of our present asteroid belt called Tiamat (Tohu in the Book of Genesis). The *Meh*, the *Tablets of Destiny*, describe their sciences of both the mind and heart-mind and contain an amazing amount of advanced mathematical and astronomical detail. These tablets describe events in literal detail with no supernatural overlay, portraying a pragmatic, hard-working people. Therefore, their accounts do not seem to have any ideological agenda, and I accept them on their own terms. Parts of the Old Testament are clearly derived from the Sumerian tablets, though the material has been manipulated and the tone altered.

The dividing event between prehistory and history described by the Sumerians is the coronation of the first human emperor, Enme-dur-an-ki in Sumerian, or Enoch in the Old Testament. This date marks the beginning of the Jewish calendar, and the beginning of time for Christian fundamentalists (5766 years ago as of 2006).

Remembered Truth

This book has much historical data woven into the fictional form. Its metaphorical nature is intended to elicit deeper truth. This brings up the question, what is fiction? Fiction comes from the Latin verb *facere* that means to make. A fiction novel is said to be a story constructed by the author, but in many cases such stories are based on actual experiences combined with the interior processes of the author. Stories are also about dreams—whether waking or sleeping—one’s unconscious or alternate experience of “reality.” It

Introduction

is often in a dream-vision state that deeper meanings are revealed. To paraphrase Shakespeare, "The dream, the dream, the dream's the thing, in which I'll catch the conscience of the king." How is reality a dream? Well, if we are together, you think you see me, and I think I see you. But actually I don't see "you," I see the light reflected off of you. But is that what I see? No, it's the effect that that light has upon the retina of my eye. But is that what I see? No. It is the code that the retina sends to my brain via my optic nerve. But is that what I see? No, it is what my brain makes of the code. The analogy of a television set decoding a TV signal is very close indeed.

So you, as a reality, actually come to me from a four-step visionary experience, even though my perception appears to come from the direct experience of standing in front of one another. Reality really is a dream or illusion! As I write my dream, you interpret it based on your dream. So, you may be asking, how can the truth ever be known? The answer is always only through what Buddhists call your own heart-mind. When you find that self-evident truth, there will be no need to confirm it, nor to convince others that what is true for you is also true for them. So I offer this book to assist you in breaking free from any doctrine that keeps you from knowing what was always yours to know.

By the way, I do believe this process, as challenging as it may be, should be lighthearted. As Lao-Tsu might put it: Lightness of heart is the fountain of youth and the doorway of eternal life. Nothing is more serious than lightness of heart and nothing is more frivolous than unrelieved sorrow.



It is time to remember a deeper synthesis. I begin with stories and verse to spark your memory of your origins and your ancestors as we begin a journey of discovery. I invite you to relax into what follows and see where it takes you.

Canto VII

Sir Leonard Speaks of Ur

Time: 1927 CE

Place: British Museum, London

Personae: Sir Leonard Wooley
A *London Times* correspondent

Corr: Good afternoon, sir! Sir Leonard, I presume?

Sir L: And I presume you are the *Times*?

Corr: Thank you for receiving me and being so prompt!

Sir L: My mother told me that to be early is noble, to be late is common, and to be prompt is royal. Though I have only attained nobility, I like royalty!

Corr: I understand that Oxford has published your findings at Ur?

Sir L: Yesterday. Glad you noticed!

Corr: Do I detect, Sir Leonard, that you are very fond of the ancient city of Ur?

Sir L: Yes I am.

Corr: Could you tell me why?

Sir L: Because it is there, and because its ruins tell a story that clears up the history of civilization, not to mention our religion.

Corr: I understand you financed the expedition yourself?

Sir L: At this stage, at least. I had my predecessors, other diggers at the site, as you know. And the University of Pennsylvania helped.

Corr: This emergent science of archaeology, how long have we had it?

Sir L: As to method, the first to keep meticulous notes was Schliemann. He died in 1890.

Corr: German, I presume?

Synthesis Remembered

- Sir L: Yes, but also, by happenstance, an American. He was in California on July 4, 1850 when California became a state. His methods emerged as he excavated at Troy, the scene of Homer's *Iliad*.
- Corr: In public school I learned a quote about Troy when memorizing Virgil: "...from the flaming walls of Ileum."
- Sir L: Yes. "Pious Aneas who from the flaming walls of Ileum did the old Anchises bear." Before Schliemann it was all sort of hit or miss. Interest in ancient ruins is rather recent, you know. The dark ages pretty well squelched interest in antiquities for a thousand years.
- Corr: I suspect the Church and its fondness for burning all records except their own.
- Sir L: That has always troubled me. Since when do people who tell the truth try to conceal the evidence?
- Corr: My sentiments exactly. But wasn't it Schliemann's discovery that got those Form Criticism theologians interested in Nineveh?
- Sir L: I think so. Form Criticism started in Germany when Queen Victoria was young, 1830 or so. Theologians began to question whether the Bible was a true account of real facts or just mythological, but nobody was courageous enough to find out. It wasn't Iraq yet, you know. Winston Churchill made Iraq.
- Corr: But why did the early archeologists go to Mesopotamia first instead of Palestine?
- Sir L: Because the story of Abraham starts in Mesopotamia and that is the beginning of the story of Israel.
- Corr: But why Troy?
- Sir L: Most are not aware that Troy and Moses are probably contemporary. The work of Homer was effectively "lost" until the end of the low Middle Ages and his "rediscovery" had a lot to do with the coming of the Renaissance in Italy, the rebirth of learning. Many call it the "Greek Revival."
- Corr: I never really noticed that before!
- Sir L: You see the Form Criticism people made comparisons. They said: "It is clear that the *Iliad* is metaphor and so it is probable that the Bible is too."

Canto VII

- Corr: And Schliemann disagreed?
- Sir L: In a very scholarly way. He learned Greek well enough to read the *Iliad* in the original and it sounded like real history to him. So he went to the Dardanelles, the *Hellas-pont* whose southern entrance Troy guarded, checked his reference points, found a tel, a mound that forms over an old city, and started digging. He made a vertical trench across the tel and kept precise notes at every step.
- Corr: Was the discovery of Troy widely accepted as the true home of Homer?
- Sir L: Of course not. Schopenhauer says: "When an ancient truth is rediscovered it is at first greeted with ridicule, then with violent opposition, and finally it is held to be self-evident. Archaeologists of that time were no exception.
- Corr: So, where did they go next?
- Sir L: Greece, of course, is where the other heroes of the *Iliad* came from. The Trojan War was really a struggle for control of the Dardanelles. Helen was just an excuse.
- Corr: Where did our proto-archaeologists go after Greece?
- Sir L: Nineveh.
- Corr: Why Nineveh?
- Sir L: Because it was the Assyrians who started the second captivity of Israel by taking away the northern tribes, according to the Bible. Babylon did the third captivity by taking away the southern tribes. The Israelites became the Jews while captive at Babylon, where they learned banking. They had been landowners prior to the Babylonian captivity. The first "captivity" was in Egypt, but it wasn't really captivity as they went there on their own.
- Corr: So where is Nineveh?
- Sir L: At modern Mosul on the Tigris river, Kurdish country now. In those days there wasn't much there. There were several tels near where Mosul now stands. So they asked the natives: "Which one is Nineveh?" They replied, pointing, "That one." They dug it up and the natives were right.
- Corr: What kind of evidence did they find?

Synthesis Remembered

- Sir L: Temples, statues, libraries, inscribed clay tablets, king lists, cylinder seals. In the king lists they found Jehu, King of Israel. He is listed by name as one of the captive kings, confirming the Biblical record.
- Corr: So where did they go from Nineveh?
- Sir L: A word of explanation: The records were in Assyrian mostly, in a lost language, not known, like Aramaic. They found a stone similar to the Rosetta stone in Egypt, but in parallel columns of Assyrian and Aramaic. So far so good, but there was a problem. The Assyrian proper names did not mean anything in Assyrian. They guessed that their proper names were from an older language to the south.
- Corr: So they looked farther south?
- Sir L: Exactly, and they found Akkad and records in Akkadian that told them what Assyrian proper names meant. But the Akkadian proper names meant nothing in Akkadian. So, south again.
- Corr: One more time?
- Sir L: Yes. This time they found Sumer, the Biblical Shinaar, which means land between the rivers, and in Sumerian both Akkadian and Sumerian names meant something.
- Corr: So they knew that they were home and had finally resolved the puzzle?
- Sir L: Not only that, they later found tablets in Sumerian cuneiform, not only in Akkad but in Assyria and Babylon. These turned out to be the ceremonial tablets used especially for the New Year festival proving that all of them, including the Akkadians and Sumerians, had conducted their ceremonies in Sumerian down until Babylon II, the period when the Jews were in their third captivity.
- Corr: That brings you to Ur, doesn't it, and to your work published by Oxford University this year?
- Sir L: Yes. 1927, a most amazing year this has been, with Lindberg flying the Atlantic from New York to Paris. Remember, Ur was the first commercial center of the world just as New York is now the commercial center of America.
- Corr: Is that why you spent a fortune excavating Ur, because it was the commercial center of the world?
- Sir L: No. I didn't know that when I first started excavating, but I know it now.

Canto VII

- Corr: What was the religion of Ur?
- Sir L: Ur was a city of at least 500,000 people. Its temple in the southwest corner of the city is a ziggurat, a spiral step pyramid. The name of its god was *Nannar Sin*. Nannar Sin has his markers on our modern map today. Sinai is named for him and so is India which was once known as Sind.
- Corr: You mean that Nannar Sin is the god of Abraham?
- Sir L: That would startle a few people. No, Nannar Sin is the god of Abraham's father, Terah. If you read Genesis carefully you will see that Abraham's god who spoke to him in Phadan Uram is not the same god as the god of his father. The one who spoke to Abraham is Nannar Sin's brother *El Hadad*, the god of Is-Ra-El.
- Corr: So we shouldn't be capitalizing the word for god in the Bible?
- Sir L: Exactly. You see we know the name of the father of Nannar Sin and El Hadad, who are brothers. Their father is Enlil, Lord of the Command. He, in turn, has a brother, Enki or Ea, Lord Earth or Lord of Water. Their father is Anu, who bore the title of Father in Heaven. None of these beings are the makers of the universe.
- Corr: That would seem to be very damaging information for Judaism, Christianity, and Islam.
- Sir L: Yes, and *very* dangerous, too. You need to be very careful when you offend somebody's prejudices, perhaps especially if they are afraid to be wrong.
- Corr: So you think our newfound knowledge from Ur will ultimately revise all of our western religions?
- Sir L: I am not sure. But if it doesn't cause them to revise themselves, it will surely contribute to their demise. It is paradoxical that the discovery of Ur makes Abraham's story move toward the factual, and, at the same time, it undermines the theologians who have constructed religions around his story.
- Corr: For instance?

Synthesis Remembered

- Sir L: The story of Abraham's journey to Chanaan follows a sort of tale of three cities, Ur, Phadan Uram, and Ugarit. Ur was on the Persian Gulf in its time, Phadan Uram was the transfer point of commerce from the Euphrates River to the camels, and Ugarit is the place on the Mediterranean where the camels were taken. All have been found and all contain the name Ur. The foundation of all three faiths is a conversation at Phadan Uram between Abraham and the god of that place. All the monotheistic religions assume that that god was God, the one and only.
- Corr: I see what you mean by a problem.
- Sir L: One might say that the fullness of the Divinity is in all beings, so it may speak through any one of them. No problem there, but that is a very different idea than having God show up without a mask. The gods may be seen as masks of God, as all beings are masks of God. The gods are no more or less God than you are!
- Corr: You mean god with a small "g?"
- Sir L: Yes. We have made God with a big G in the image of god with a little "g," not the other way around! It turns out that the temple at Phadan Uram was a temple of the god of Abraham's father at Ur, Nannar Sin. Nannar Sin had left Ur at the time and gone back to his planet. Phadan Uram is in the territory of his brother, El Hadad. It is plain that El Hadad, El, the god of Is-ra-el, is the one who spoke to Abraham. The question is, why? The answer is that El Hadad had a big problem: being only a god with a small "g," he had a wayward son called Baal who was trying to take Chanaan away from him.
- Corr: Baal? Isn't that a big name in the Old Testament?
- Sir L: Very big. The entire Biblical struggle in the region of that time, the war, is between Baal and his father, El. El Hadad was trying to set up an army in the desert to take Chanaan back if Baal should win. The story of David and Absalom in the Bible is a look-alike, and you don't have to read much Old Testament to find out that almost the whole thing is a war between Baal and the god of Israel.
- Corr: Why do you suppose the monotheistic religions do things like that?

Canto VII

- Sir L: You mean like promoting some god to be God? This occurs because they are all trying to inherit the Empire, and to inherit the Empire, God has to be on your side.
- Corr: And that is the reason for that conundrum—a religious war?
- Sir L: I'm afraid so. Those warriors will surely be displeased to find out that their god is no better than the other guy's!
- Corr: Be not the bearer of bad tidings. Thank you, Sir Leonard. You are surely a man of courage. And if I may be so bold, a man of God, the true God that is!



Interlude



First City of Earth

Eridu

Translation: City in far-away-built,
far away from the home planet of the gods.



Who art thou, o Eridu?
A buried city on a buried sea?
Waterborne
Thy dust has lain
Dreaming in the mists of time.

But who hath waked thee Eridu, with memory of gods
As familiar to us
As ourselves
As comfortable
And as mysterious?



Canto XXIV

Into the Age of Darkness

Time: Circa 527 CE
Place: Isle of Avalon
Personae: Merlin (Emrys Merlinus Moordune)
Lancelot, The Best Knight in the World

Lancelot: The mists cling to the lake this morning as messengers of the sea.

Merlin: So early in the morning for a knight! May I ask what draws you at such an hour?

Lancelot: I am called to this mountain often, *always* at midnight when the sun wakens me in the moment of his most distant absence, there where I sleep beyond the river Bru in the fastness of Camelot.

Merlin: A long ride through the enchanted forest then?

Lancelot: Yes. The forest so dark and yet so light to the inner eye. But the barge always awaits me by happenstance on the marge of the River Bru.

Merlin: Does the guardian of the Tor, Gwyn Ab Nud, who is the child of Nud, the Night Sky, not trouble you to set foot on his holy mountain, unguarded by the light of day?

Lancelot: I am often aware of the presence of Guardian of the Gate of the Heavens.

Merlin: There is another gate, you know. It is at the mountain at the end of the world, where the sun bids farewell to the land and to the day before he presses on to the land of the rising sun. There, a whole nation guards the gate they call a window. It is the last earthly entrance to that unmanifested world from which we come forth as travelers into our mothers' wombs. It is also said to be the window through which we pass after our sojourn in this illusion of time. That nation is called Ixtlan and they remember that all men are brothers past all pretense and arrogance. They are the "people of the window" to the present that is aeternal.

Synthesis Remembered

- Lancelot: How do you know such things, Merlin?
- Merlin: We all know them, Lancelot. It is just that some of us have learned how to remember them. Consider the mountain here, the Tor. Do you remember the secrets of its power?
- Lancelot: Remember? Perhaps not. I have heard it has to do with water flowing underground.
- Merlin: So you've *heard it*, but do you *feel it* flowing, Lancelot? One can *feel it*, you know. This relates to dowsing, and sensing the uses of the force it creates. This same power can waken a healing experience in an ailing person at a great distance in time or space.
- Lancelot: Is it the power of the deva?
- Merlin: Yes, Lancelot. The word deva is the root of the word devil, and the root of the word divine. For the Divinity is the root of all that is, whether we regard it as nurturing or threatening.
- Lancelot: Is it a vortex? Like the one that spoke to Job: "And God spoke to Job out of the whirlwind?"
- Merlin: Yes. Everything in the visible universe spins.
- Lancelot: So, these rivers beneath the earth are creating a vortex, a sort of breathing?
- Merlin: A breathing of the voice of Earth that flows, spinning up toward the night sky. It rises from the crossing of water streams flowing under ground.
- Lancelot: Does the same thing occur at Stonehenge?
- Merlin: Precisely, but there it maximizes only on summer solstice day. We all walk in such a helix, emitted by the blood flowing in our body where the vessels cross. If we stand together in a circle all our helices join to make a greater one rising from our communion. When I am at Stonehenge my task is to be first among equals as the deva sweeps our combined power up toward the heavens. It is known as the "ladder of lights."
- Lancelot: But this mountain, the Tor, is sculpted into a helix by the ancient ones. Is it also such a deva?
- Merlin: Yes, Lancelot, it is what draws you here at the midnight hour when the new day is born in your heart beyond the turning of the night sky. Indeed you are awakening to the use of "the power."

Canto XXIV

- Lancelot: Is that what a holy place is? A helix that raises your spirit when you stand in it?
- Merlin: Yes. Many of our menhirs, our standing stones, are placed to mark them. And many of our ancestors have chosen to remain behind, in them, to speak the Voice of Heaven and Earth to us, their descendants.
- Lancelot: Is this the meaning of All Hallows Eve, as the Christians call it?
- Merlin: That day was sacred long before there were Christians. It is the eve of the sign of Scorpio, when winter begins, a time of the severe falling of the life force, when all are in need of help and encouragement against the failing of the light. Thus it is a time to call upon the ancestors.
- Lancelot: Don't the Christians attribute such places and thoughts to the devil?
- Merlin: Yes, I am afraid the Christians, as we know them, are far from true to their Christ. They are dualistic, and surely there is no religion more dualistic than the one Christians profess. The Christians are afraid our holy places are works of the devil and dedicate them to St. Michael, the warrior of their god. Such a church will surely be built upon our Tor one day.
- Lancelot: It seems they will regard our Gwyn Ab Nud, son of the night sky, as a demon.
- Merlin: They already do, Lancelot. They liken him to Lucifer, the light bearer who was cast out of heaven for disobedience and for proclaiming, "This above all I will not serve."
- Lancelot: So disobedience is the greatest "sin."
- Merlin: Indeed. Christians have their god, who is most capable of being offended, giving commandments and requiring absolute unquestioning obedience on pain of eternal hell-fire.
- Lancelot: But where is freedom then?
- Merlin: Nowhere, Lancelot. Like the Emperor of Rome their god has no use for freedom or allegiance and only approves of slavery and obedience to himself.
- Lancelot: Is their god always a "he" then?
- Merlin: Yes. Any suggestion to a Christian hierarch that their god may be also feminine is greeted with arrogance and rage.
- Lancelot: That is the exact opposite of all that our own culture tells us.

Synthesis Remembered

- Merlin: Exactly! For us darkness is holy, feminine is holy, low is holy. Not that light and masculine and high are not holy, it is just that they are equal and we place darkness, feminine, and low as the first mentioned among equals.
- Lancelot: Will we heathens who dwell in the heath ever get along with these Christians?
- Merlin: I'm afraid not. Their only interest is in having us become their slaves and keeping our mouths shut.
- Lancelot: It seems the Christians are custodians of an Age of Darkness—even the word darkness they do not see as we do.
- Merlin: If I were a prophet, I would say that it is so.
- Lancelot: Will there be an end to this oppression?
- Merlin: Again, if I were a prophet, I would say yes, but not for two thousand years. When the Romans killed twenty thousand of our Druids on the Island of Mona our day was ended. As they died some Druids were heard to say, "You may kill us all, but we will return in a hundred generations as your descendants."
- Lancelot: What do the Christians say about such an event?
- Merlin: They speak of it as the "second coming" of their Christ; when he will come as the judge of the living and the dead, send all the "sinners" or "goats" to hell and take all of the sheep to heaven that they might obediently stand on streets of gold and sing the praises of their god forever.
- Lancelot: What do you foresee in this regard?
- Merlin: There will be a sudden change someday, and it will be a day when at the same moment in the darkness of the night, or in the light of day, all will transform miraculously, simultaneously, like blades of spring grass. The awareness of self-evident truth will arise in the heart of every being and each of us will recognize ourselves as one with all the others in our unity with the source of being, the source of all that is.
- Lancelot: But is that not always true, even now?
- Merlin: Of course, Lancelot, we need only recognize it and help others to do the same. Do so, however, only if they ask.



Interlude



Merlin is within the stone, waiting for the call.



A myth is not a lie, but a metaphor.
It only becomes a lie when taken literally.



Masters never grant authority to anyone.
Emperors grant authority.
Authority is never needed when the author is present.



Canto XXXVII

Democracy and Empire

Time: Autumn, 1775 CE
Place: Philadelphia
Personae: Benjamin Franklin
Thomas Jefferson

Franklin: Had a frost yet down in Virginia at Montecello?

Jefferson: Not yet, but the nights are cool.

Franklin: Are there still slaves at Montecello?

Jefferson: Yes. But like Bartolomeo de las Casas, I consider them my equals and we have Sunday dinner together.

Franklin: How about your neighbors?

Jefferson: They do not approve of my egalitarianism, but neither do they reprove me as the conquistadors reproved Bartolomeo.

Franklin: Egalitarianism's the right word, Thomas. I left Boston because my egalitarianism was more radical than my neighbors'. In Boston you are a peer if you own your house, though it be small. The only true egalitarians are the Indians we dispossessed.

Jefferson: Yes. I remember how the French we drove out of Canada took ideas they learned from the Indians back to Paris. Rousseau honored our Indians as the "Noble Savage."

Franklin: Yes, Thomas. The French are closer to their Druid roots than we of English parentage. They remember better the true egalitarianism of their ancestors before the Romans came with their Empire, their hierarchy, and their male gods.

Jefferson: I noticed the ferment in the soirees; even the aristocrats feel the pressure to abandon hierarchy.

Franklin: Yes, unfortunately the merchants, who are the greatest force for change, believe equality means substituting commercial property for real estate as the basis for aristocracy.

Canto XXXVII

- Jefferson: I noticed that. At least the landed aristocracy have some sense of *noblesse oblige* which inclines them to want to relieve the plight of the disempowered. There is little sign of this sense of obligation among the merchants. I fear the immanence of a wave of indifference among the emerging ruling class toward those less fortunate.
- Franklin: My point exactly. In my opinion the Boston Calvinists are not better, but worse in this respect.
- Jefferson: Isn't it ironic that both Rousseau and Calvin are Frenchmen? Yet they represent polar opposites—what we feel is best and what we feel is worst in human nature?
- Franklin: Unfortunately, Thomas, you and your adversary Hamilton seem to be similarly contrary in your positions.
- Jefferson: Thank you, Ben. I never saw that so clearly before!
- Franklin: For Hamilton, greed is a virtue. For you and me, greed is the mother and father of all vices. I fear his influence on the future of this nation, which is aborning in our hands.
- Jefferson: Isn't it coincidental he bears the name of Alexander the Great, who brought the Empire over the Hellenic world from Persia?
- Franklin: I understand that Julius Caesar, as a young man in Spain, adopted that same Alexander as his "Patron Saint." And it was that very Julius Caesar who brought that same Empire westward to Rome?
- Jefferson: Wouldn't you say we face that same Empire in our struggle against England and the tyrannical majesty George III?
- Franklin: Well, as Plato said, the republic follows democracy, aristocracy follows the republic, oligarchy follows aristocracy, and tyranny follows oligarchy.
- Jefferson: Then comes the revolution!
- Franklin: We stand upon that threshold. I fear democracy is a fragile flower in a world where Empire is rampant.
- Jefferson: And Christianity founded by a Roman Emperor is no help. It is clear that Constantine founded Christianity entirely for his own benefit, with little concern for the followers of the true Jesus.

Synthesis Remembered

Franklin: I agree with you. Haven't you written a book about that? I am sure the true Jesus was an egalitarian who never claimed to be the only one. And I am also sure that Paul is the hierarch in the lot who gave us the Church we struggle with today. That is why I am a Deist and believe all being comes from the Divinity. We do not confuse the Divinity with the god the Christians have made in their own image.

Jefferson: Ben, do you really hold that the Divinity is fully present in all men, no matter how great or small?

Franklin: I am much more of a radical than that. When I was last in Paris I met a Frenchman just back from Pondicherry in India. He told me that an old Indian master called Buddha proclaimed that the fullness of the Divinity, which he called "the Nameless," is fully present in every sentient being in the universe, and all beings are sentient.

Jefferson: Well, that makes my head spin! I am afraid we will find few takers among the Christians, and certainly none among the addicts of Empire, that is if there is any difference between the two.

Franklin: Tom, I think the only real difference between any of us is the degree to which we realize the presence of that ubiquitous Divinity in every being, especially humans. Perhaps all true education should be directed to realizing that end.

Jefferson: Ben, I think there may be a lot more to this. I read the Bible a lot and I have found several quotes in there I like.

Franklin: Just so you realize that you are dealing with three people: the author, the editor and the publisher, and you try to figure out who each of them are, and what the differences are in their agendas. I am a printer and publisher, after all.

Jefferson: Those things considered, one quote goes like this: "If today you should hear the voice, do not harden your heart against it as did your fathers in the desert of bitterness."

Franklin: We all hear voices—it's just a matter of which ones to listen to.

Jefferson: My Iroquois friends say all voices are the voices of your ancestors, but you have to watch out for the horse thieves.

Canto XXXVII

Franklin: Well, since we started out here listening to the Iroquois, maybe we should listen to all of their ideas. They are surely a lot better than Hamilton's.

Jefferson: I am sure the merchants would never agree to that.

Franklin: Merchants, it seems, have never heard of *noblesse oblige* and are therefore dangerous candidates to become the ruling class.

Jefferson: Do you really believe that the self-evident truth is present in the heart of every person?

Franklin: Yes, I do, Thomas.

Jefferson: I see now why the French love you so! Are there any people on Earth so jealous of personal freedom as the French?

Franklin: Not that I know of, and I suspect the reason is that seldom has a greater tyrant emerged on Earth than Louis XIV. Next to him, our George pales in comparison! Nothing makes a better democrat than life under the heel of the Empire.



Interlude



Instead of a Deist, was Franklin perhaps a true Gnostic?
Or is Deist a synonym for Gnostic?
Did he choose to live in Philadelphia rather than his native Boston
because the Quaker Meetings of that City of Brotherly Love pro-
ceed by unanimity as opposed to the tyranny of the majority?

*... and that government of the people, by the people and for the
people should not perish from the Earth.*

~ Abraham Lincoln

*We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created
equal, endowed by their creator with the inalienable right to life,
liberty and the pursuit of happiness.*

~ Declaration of Independence

*When an ancient truth is rediscovered, it is first greeted with
ridicule, then with violent opposition, but finally it is held to be
self-evident.*

~ Schopenhauer, courtesy of Noam Chomsky

*All government should be exercised at the lowest possible level.
Only thus can it serve first the needs of the governed.
At other levels it serves first the needs of the Governors.*

~ Principle of Subsidiarity, John XXIII

