

A Blank Day

06 May 2017

Sometimes but not often the time & chance to channel do not meet up with a subject & questions; this is one of those times. The Committee says "blank days" do not exist and so I am going to ask Gabrianna, Herman and Matthew to fill it. The empty spot.

Q: OK, folks, about what shall we talk? You, me and the readers. What shall be discussed?

C: We suggest categories, the subject from within we shall choose.

Q: Give me the categories, since you have the subjects. In other words, y'all organize the raw material I don't have. [Am I lazy or what?]

C: We saw that comment and we say no. The categories are science, social science, art and war.

Q: Except for the last one, those read like a university course catalog. I will not question, so I accept and choose science, but an applied science, not social. Chemistry. [I thought about geography for a moment and decided it would become too grounded.]

C: Very well.

Q: Since it's a blankin' day, I will not supply questions, only pass through the answers. In other words, y'all lecture us, classroom style.

C: Notebooks out, everyone. Let's begin.

In the beginning God created the Earth, the sun, moon and the planets and then soon did He create man. So we repeat an often told tale that has gained great traction & purchase among many humans, with good basis in fact, erroneous as it might be.

We wish to address God as it relates to chemistry, to which we expect a fair number of humans would say there is no overlap or connection between them. To this point-of-view we do say, there is but such ideas are not worth stepping over at this time, for you, those of you among you, who believe in this separation. We recommend retreat into the comfort of established belief, for we wish not to disturb. A safe haven inside a safe space is to be found, far from the crossroads and intersection of God and chemistry.

Q: Allow me to interject, this sounds political. "Safe space"? That's a hot topic, a controversial subject at the moment.

C: It is always the moment, and in the absence of time.....we know you all know. The idea of a safe space we find deplorable. This is regression, decay and retreat. It is not the way of the universe, or mankind. It is an erroneous choice that will fall from favor as soon as its believers discover the damage they wish to avoid has been accelerated unto them by their attempt to reduce it.

Q: What might bring that about? I can't see how this latest attempt to recreate the Middle Ages is going to stop. If anything, it seems to gain steam.

C: The vessel requires pressure to burst, just as pressure and power were needed to first create it.

Q: *Understood, but why did the notion of eliminating unpleasant opinion become attractive? As soon as that idea is floated, it's censorship by a different name. History has taught us well what censorship represents, the beginning of oppression.*

C: We shall say, censorship is a symptom, a trailing one. Once exclusion of ideas has become the physical attempt to eliminate them, the problem is at hand.

Q: [This isn't chemistry, is it? Let's follow along anyway..] *Is the "problem" already that? I don't see this. What I do see is a movement among college students, in the USA at least, to eliminate diversity while preaching it. I don't see the problem extending beyond these localized infections. I don't see the malignant tumor metastasizing.*

C: It already has and its spread to colleges and universities is the evidence, the proof if you like.

Q: *Where did the idea begin, either physically or conceptually?*

C: These are the same. You see a difference and we shall explain. The physical beginning of anything begins with thought, which can be performed, achieved or maintained anywhere the conscious or asleep mind is. Your dreams are thoughts. Where do you dream? Your body might be in bed but your mind is not. Physically you are far from your brain when your mind thinks as you sleep.

The idea for thought withdrawal came from the appeal seen in agreement and in being a bully. The rise in the occurrence of these events among the young are connected and from the same source. The bully has long been analyzed, correctly, to be a person attempting to balance sensations of weakness and inadequacy by physically forcing him- or herself upon a target.

This is somewhat limited and individualistic in the young. Often near supervision when targets appear, bullies are curtailed from the natural expression, a restraint which prolongs the process. Allowance to display physical aggression unchecked would develop the effect to resolution quickly.

This same effect occurs with the social bullying, of groups focused upon a single target, most often.

Q: *How did bullying develop into censorship?*

C: A large number of youngsters shielded from challenge, consequence and requirement to decide and face outcomes.

Q: *What I've read, it's called helicopter parenting.*

C: This can be included as one type, however the effect comes from beyond parenting style, which receives the influence.

Q: *So connect the dots for me; how do shielded, coddled children become bullies and then create censorship, renamed as safe spaces?*

C: The relative absence of challenge directs the mind to seek it elsewhere. The mental protection in which many young people are raised frustrates their development, in many cases even distorts it. The inability to confront aggression because it has not been faced during the formative years, combined with a perception of entitlement regarding one's place and expectations, set the table; prepare the platform. The effect begins with heartfelt, noble and good intentions which focus principally upon the ideal outcome, ignoring the process required to achieve it. This occurs with relative ease because the process for many things in life has been simply to agree and go along. When resistance to the embraced idea is encountered, it is easy to overcome the obstacle with shame, guilt, condemnation and criticism, simple to generate, The majority of good people will agree with the objective, the goal, the destination thus will not oppose the offerings of shame, guilt, condemnation and criticism.

As this process gains momentum, as other like-minded believers also raised in an environment of easy expectation and compliance, become attracted to the effort, the process becomes more aggressive. It ignores the basic element required also for itself; the ability to express ideas. To allow preferred ideas means to allow also disagreement which the concept has already decided must be eradicated.

Q: This effect seems to be most pronounced in certain groups, and is not society-wide.

C: No, however the groups within which it manifests have a disproportionate voice in many media, what you call your press.

Q: Can we who feel we're outside the process of social censorship remain indifferent? In other words, is the problem of excluding unpopular ideas going to expand?

C: The risk is low, however never zero. We suggest all to whom our words come, watch this effect for growth and shrink. It is always expanding and shrinking, never static. Retreat of the idea simply means expansion awaits. Overflow by loss of balance is good to avoid, although great lessons are also learned from the imposition of censorship.

Q: Moving on to chemistry and...what was the other thing? Right...God.

C: Yes.

Q: We've gone over the definition of God, many times. The collective matrix of all beings and essences (same thing, really) in other words, our huge collective of existence.

C: Yes, this is good.

Q: Chemistry is.....atoms. Interaction. Combinations and mixtures, new substances.

C: Yes, and on Earth where you are, chemistry is society. Do humans not do just what you said?

Q: We interact, combine and mix, yes, but it's a little different from chemical compounds.

C: No different. Sodium will not remain separate as does gold, even when mixed with most elements or compounds. Sodium will find a substance and combine with it, often violently. Chlorine is likewise dangerous to living beings, if unlikely to combine immediately with nearly any other element. Mixed, sodium and chloride produce a natural, stable compound necessary to the function of many physical beings on Earth.

There are many human being examples of combinations deemed beneficial, the separated parts dangerous or volatile, or combinations.

Q: Like a man + wife = good for the two of them. Man + girlfriend = good for the 2 of them. But suddenly mixing the girlfriend and the wife can set off an explosion; makes sense. What is the physical connection? Chemistry and God?

C: First, discard the concept of God as separate and apart from you, just as many of your readers like and use the word, thus concept, of oversoul, an intermediate God step which does not exist.

Q: That's going to reignite the flames of a campfire which died down. I think.

C: We shall address questions directly, if and as your readers present them. Too easily might you be drawn to debate the concept. We step in front of you, for this subject.

Q: Telling people God is us, and that we are all God's children - not just Jesus - could get me excommunicated pretty darn quick.

C: Humanity has often and again now, with safe spaces, tried to halt ideas. This will not you affect.

Q: OK, so....how do humans' idea of God become chemistry, or vice versa?

C: Combinations of atoms achieve balance, as do harmonious sounds. Where no equilibrium can be reached, no new compounds form. This operates the same with humans, who form a part of the God concept. We say God concept, because it is easy to perceive the human condition of physical awareness as limiting, restricting thus excluded. Once the concept of a separate, thus superior God is altered to include each soul as a piece, with equivalent value, contribution, effect and voice, then it becomes easy to see all of us, all souls, as God. The human word is heavy with authority and power the human belief says the human individual does not possess.

This is the same with many chemical processes, until the processes to combine and separate them were discovered. There remains much more to come. In chemistry and in life.

Q: Will humans be able to create gold, for example? Or platinum or silver or lead?

C: Yes, however you would no longer be a human to do this. Gold has no value to whomever can create unlimited quantities.

Q: Electricity and heat and the main methods we use to create compounds, or to separate components. How do these relate to God?

C: You are electricity; your nervous system uses it, your aura is magnetism which creates electricity, itself formed from the electrical energy of your soul. Your feel and create heat, simply a speedometer of atomic movement.

Q: The interaction of humans is chemistry?

C: Yes, the same forces operate, with different effects.

Q: *The crossroads of science and religion.*

C: Be well one and all, do return again.