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Invocation: *Dear Heavenly Father, Creator of the universe and all the marvelous beings in it. We are most grateful for your creation of our Michael Son, whom we love and admire beyond words. Our intention today is to meet with one of the members of the Triumvirate or their staffs, in our service to our planet, Urantia. We ask for the presence of Christ Michael and Nebadonia to be with us and to guide us in their plan for the correction of our world so it will be worthy of entering into the Days of Light and Life at some future time. Amen.*

**CHARLES:** This is Charles, here to answer questions, and hopefully my responses for the Triumvirate and others will be clear enough to understand and integrate into your thoughts. This format, this forum for discussion, has me present and at attention. I am connected with you consciously and thoroughly. I am, for all intents and purposes, here with you. The circuits are open always from your consciousness, your thoughts and through your intention in this forum that connects to Christ Michael and his Administration, and all of those who are concerned with this topic, and this forum. Many have the capacity to receive from millions and billions of individuals, depending upon the development of their inherent spiritual maturity and divinity. You do not need to worry that this forum is attended, but it is heard and thoroughly understood by those who receive it.

We are open for your questions at this time. Please proceed.

### An idea for unifying a small community

**Susan:** Good morning, Charles. I was thinking about the numbers that Machiventa talked about in our last session. He said that less than 10,000 people would determine the course of our world in the next 50 years. If so few, are actively engage in any given community of people, I was wondering how so few can make a difference. How does someone like myself—maybe the only one in my community—unify people who are so separate; separate socially, politically, and religiously and teach them how to engage in positive, constructive discussions?

So, I had an idea, and I have questions around that idea. I was thinking of a series of dinner groups where a small committee of us, perhaps a design team, could set up a series of topics or issues important to our community and pose questions around those topics. Then we would engage as many people as we could in our community through a dinner group series.

We would invite people in the community to become hosts of a series of dinners in their homes. These hosts would gather 8-10 people to have a meal together and discuss the questions. Then the hosts, as well as anyone interested, would gather at Town Hall meetings where the summaries of the dinner groups are discussed and facilitated again, and then these thoughts and ideas are shared in the local news and across our social networks. This all sounded fine and good—I know this has been done before in other places—but then I thought, well, does this really have the potential to unify people who are so independently minded? So that’s my first question: Does forums like this have the potential to help small communities come together to ultimately discuss the issues of social sustainability?

**CHARLES:** The short answer is yes. It is a wonderful means by which neighbors and friends in community can come together to become acquainted. As you know from this process, there is a certain dropout factor that occurs, and you should be prepared for that. So, as you have your first dinners—as there would be numerous dinners that occur simultaneously or close together, there will be individuals who will drop out, and if those who remain are not sufficient in number to reconstitute them to become a functional dinner party of discussion, then all will be lost for the whole team. What you will need to do to think ahead and to have a means by which those who continue to be interested, become members of other dinner teams, who in the future can have enough individuals to continue the discussion. It is important that you provide this awareness in advance to invitations to those who are invited, so that they can be prepared ahead of time with the thought that they may be joining another team or group that they may have not met. Are you with me so far? (**Susan:** Yes.)

This is one of the major problems of these movements and these organizational processes that lead to failure, and if you do not anticipate that, then you will have a failing program. What happens for those people who go to the second dinner party or to a larger forum, is that then you have people who are totally committed, or fairly well committed, to discover what is to occur and who are curious enough to pursue that. This helps greatly in developing the strength of those who remain. It is important that you have a facilitator at each dinner party, so that each dinner party can function and move ahead. This facilitator should not be regarded as the authority figure, but someone who simply facilitates the discussion of the topics, and someone who as well can record briefly the outcomes and developments and product of that meeting. Keep it very, very simple and have the people enjoy the conviviality as much as they can, without becoming too serious over the discussion.

**Susan:** Thank you. That was my thought to start with simple things that would engage those of the community that are gathering, and then if it begins to work, to start to pose those questions around the topics of social sustainability. Would this provide the celestials with an opportunity to work with us more effectively?

**CHARLES:** Yes, it would; it would help them greatly. The other thing I would ask you to do, as you begin this process, is to consciously and intentionally engage the angelic realm to assist you and to give them the direction to project the consciousness of community oneness, of coming together, where people actually leave their home, get in their car and drive to someplace to meet with other people. This is preparatory to creating those people who are connected in consciousness for the benefit of the community and themselves. This is the subtle aspect of you, as the originator of this project to do. Your work is energetic in many ways, and to energize each aspect with angelic assistance and to ask the angels, those involved, to fill-in the gaps where your thinking does not, in a way that supports the project. Is this clear?

**Susan:** Yes, it is; it is very helpful. Thank you.

**Roxie:** I hope you can understand me, Charles; I have a bad cold.

**CHARLES:** Your mind is clear; your voice is very froggy/croaky.

### The 3 moral imperatives

**Roxie:** We have been given the 3 core values, the 3 pillars, the 3 economies, and the 3 moral imperatives. I know some of our readers are having trouble keeping them all straight, particularly the last one, the 3 moral imperatives. Are they interrelated? Can you tie them all together, or are they to be separate?

**CHARLES:** They are all integrated, as one single imperative. Fundamentally, that imperative is that no harm be done to another, that no one does any harm to another that impedes the other to achieve their own interpretation of those 2 values. That’s it!

**Roxie:** I’m still a little confused on them.

**CHARLES:** That is why we have developed it into three parts, that individuals would not do harm to another individual, or do harm to an organization, or do harm to your civilization. Individuals also exist within organizations, and there is always an organizational identity that has its own means of empowerment that is social, economic or political, and that organizations have an imperative to do no harm to individuals, to other organizations, or to the civilization of the world. There are also individuals who exist in global organizations and international and transnational organizations that, as an organization, can do “good” or do harm to individuals or to other groups, other organizations or an international/global situation. Transnational/international organizations do no harm to individuals, to organizations or to other global entity’s organizations.

I want to make it clear that ultimately, the individual, as an individual or an employee or executive in an organization or global entity, such as the United Nations, or an international corporation, is personally and collectively responsible for the actions as an individual, and as a representative, and an “actor” within that organization. Social responsibilities in a socially sustainable society are inescapable. There is no hiding for individuals within a corporation to hide from personal responsibility, as well as corporate responsibility, to the actions that they take, whether that action is detrimental to an individual, to an organization, or another international global organization. It is ultimately responsible in social sustainability that the individual be held accountable and responsible for their actions and decisions, and that it would repercuss personally to them. In a socially sustainable society, if an executive used their company for the advancement of their company or for the detriment of another company, individual or organization, that executive would be held personally responsible and accountable for that decision, and that they would lose their position and financial supports that they had accumulated, as well as a punitive penalty against the corporation.

It is important that socially detrimental actions by individuals in corporations be seen as ultimately harmful, not to one person, but to all people of the world. You recall from 20 or 30 years ago that there was the Lincoln Savings and Loan debacle, and that one individual was responsible for the course of their corporation and Trustees, to bring great harm to the financial community of their investors, and as the individuals that had accounts with that organization. When an individual is in such a position that causes harm to hundred thousands or even millions of individuals, then the punitive treatment in response must be exceptionally difficult for them. We do not specify what that should be, as that comes within the realm of human decision-making for the social adjustments of their society.

**Roxie:** Are all of these encoded in our DNA like the 3 core values are?

### The two sides of human nature

**CHARLES:** No. I may comment that “human nature,” as you call it, is expressed in two forms and other sub-forms as well. It is human nature to do good, to be kind, to be gentle, to be forgiving, to be altruistic and to express those ennobling qualities and values that a human being is capable of for the benefit of others. On the other hand, human nature also expresses as the most difficult, despicable behaviors that can result even in genocide of hundreds of thousands of individuals—or millions—and that individuals who support that, or who are of like mind in that human nature, are despicable in their behaviors, and that they are held accountable and responsible for that. Human nature is a decision by the individual how it expresses; the values are innate, but how they are interpreted can express as positive or negative behavior towards others.

**Roxie:** So the punitive actions then are to take place on our world, with the individuals that are harmed by it, rather than on the mansion worlds?

**CHARLES:** In a socially sustainable society, yes. This must be dealt with on the material mortal level. There is also reconciliation or an adjustment made on the morontial level, either in detention or in the schools, by those individuals. It is important that mortals in society see that harmful behavior is also detrimental to the individual who acts out in those negative, harmful ways, and that it be such that they would be convinced never to do that again. We see it as most unfortunate, very immature and child-ish for your society to allow individuals who have such egregious behavior, to then return to business as consultants and advisors, or to like positions within other organizations and corporations. Treatment of Adolf Hitler was appropriate; he was sent to the morontial prison world where he could not re-enact his immoral, illegal behaviors against the welfare of millions of individuals, and reparations have been made somewhat, to compensate those who have lost greatly in some form. This is a good example of appropriate treatment for gross, societal misbehavior.

**Roxie:** Thank you very much, Charles; I appreciate your comments.

### Religious and social conservatism and fundamentalism

**MMc:** Good morning, Charles. An audience member writes me that during times of stress and chaos, people want to circle their wagons, to return to pure, earlier ways of thinking and acting, but these seem always restrictive—sometimes violently so. I would like to hear your thoughts on religious and social conservatism and fundamentalists.

**CHARLES:** What is the question?

**MMc:** What do you think of religious and social conservatism?

**CHARLES:** Thank you. You have stated the conclusion already; it is a circling of wagons, a return to old state processes, and means and methods of reinstilling the fundamental thoughts of that philosophy, or that creed. It is a holing-up, as a badger would back into its place of safety that is conservative, which is familiar and comfortable to them. On the other hand, this is not a productive means; it simply puts them further, deeper into their conceptual and cultural box of thought and familiarity. It is a bulwark of their walls to protect them against that which is outside. This is the least productive position that any individual or group can take. It does not allow for creative thought; it does not allow for divergent thought, alternative thought, or parallel thinking. It is the uncreative position of conservatism that condemns them to eventual failure.

**MMc:** How do we help people let go of the old ways and values, and embrace the faith that Jesus lived?

### There is no convincing a person with such conservative thinking

**CHARLES:** As we have said numerous times in the past, there is no convincing those individuals who have such conservative thinking. We cannot tinker with their minds so that they are forced to make other decisions. We can provide them with other options, which we already have begun to do, to broaden their options to see other possibilities and opportunities. Individuals oftentimes see those options as threatening to them, and abhorred and to be rejected. They take into consideration the acceptance of their familiar social or creedal group, which is a protection for them, yet it condemns them to linear thinking and cause and effect thinking, which is unproductive. There must be other alternative means to do that. So, my friend, it is up to you to move ahead within the course that you can affect, that you can bring about changes for those people who do think as you think, who do think in terms of socially sustainable options. These options do not threaten creedal thinking; it simply provides a sustainable alternative to conservative thinking. We are not in the process of marketing or advertising what we do. We use the process of original thinking within the individual, that spark of insight that there are other opportunities, other possibilities to the course that they are living. Even in terms of extremely difficult situations, many people would be willing to die for their creed, no matter how erroneous or despicably errant it may be.

The position we take concerning this is non-confrontational; it is non-aggressive; it is simply those who want to follow in the constructive, positive opportune way can do so liberally and freely. They come of their own accord, of their own will, and that is the whole crux of the concern of your question, is it not?

### The subjective interpretations of the Islamic State on the 3 core values

**MMc:** Yes, it is. Thank you. I’ve been told that the 3 core values are operative 24/7 in every individual. And the group known as the Islamic State is operating under their interpretation of the 3 core values. When I was first introduced to the 3 core values, I felt that they might be used objectively to provide a level social playing field for every individual in the world. The Islamic State’s subjective interpretation of the 3 core values may enhance their group’s quality of life and growth, but it does not provide equality for every individual. When these 3 core values are linked to a sustainable society and become more widely known, will there be a way of securing a quality of life, growth and equality for every person on the planet, rather than multiple groups whose subjective interpretation of these values fit their own needs?

**CHARLES:** The short answer is no. Humans will always interpret these 3 core values in their own way. It is the interpretation of these values that gave such wide variance to groups as the Nazi regime of Hitlerian Germany. It is the interpretation from people as Pol Pot, and the Ugandan dictator, Edi Amin, who killed many hundreds of thousands of people. It is the interpretation of those people who have tribal rivalries to eliminate other tribes. This continues on throughout life, and it can be as simple as one child stealing another child’s sandwich in the lunchroom in their grade school. One person wants to dominate over the other.

### Beginning a seed organization to create sustainable societal structures

The process of which you speak of, the eventuality is incredibly slow and tedious; it is a means by which individuals and organizations, governments and nations learn that social sustainability leads to further peace and social stability, rather than aggression, hostilities and wars. It is an extremely slow process, particularly in a world as this, where aggression is the dominant interpretation for improving ones quality of life. The only possibility that social sustainability is to become the dominant culture in the world is through the beginning of the seed organization that begins to use these principles to create a positive, constructive, sustainable education and healthcare, family dynamics and community development, which later develops into regional stability and national stability.

This is a seed project by which the small can overtake the large through the process of time and the earnestness and truth of those 3 values as basic principles for individual and group social behavior. It is a means by which the resources of the society can be focused on the positive, rather than sequestered into war preparations, equipment and material, and training for soldiers, and so on. As you see in some of your neighboring European countries that do not even have armies, and are not involved in other nation’s behavior and stability that they prosper greatly. The difference between these nations on a per capita basis, and when you take into consideration healthcare, divorces, educational literate levels, and so on of their citizens, it is immensely different. A nation could be termed as one that is very third world in terms of social sustainability, but it is only one of many dozens in such condition.

**MMc:** You are telling me that there will always be interpretations of the 3 core values such that they will never be used to provide a quality of life, growth and equality for all?

### Some individuals will always create their own interpretations

**CHARLES:** Your hinging words are on “for all,” the last two words. Yes, of course there will be interpretations that lead to the improvement of the quality of life, growth and equality of individuals, but not “for all.” You have read in *The Urantia Book* where even on worlds that are in Days of Light and Life, individuals have their own individual interpretations of what that means, and even though they have obvious, objective social evidence of the form of an Avonal Son, and through the Temples of the Father on that world, individuals, nonetheless, choose to have aberrant behavior, which is contrary to the quality of life, growth and equality of themselves. It is important that individuals begin on your world now, at this time, even in such difficult times of the cataclysms, that they begin to strive to improve their quality of life and to grow—not as everyone else, but to far exceed that—because there are so very few people who are attendant to these values and want to grow. You must remember and think that individuals such as yourself who strive to improve their quality of life—as they interpret it—and to grow as they interpret it, are the ones who are exceptions to your world population.

### We are the “seed” individuals who will implement the process

The thought of 10,000 or 1,000 people who are striving consciously to achieve this in accord with how these have been described to you in the text, are very few. You are all exceptions, yet, you are the “seed” individuals who we hope will propagate in your lives right thinking to support a positive quality of life that also takes into account the quality of life of others. It’s not just a philosophy, but a philosophy to be implemented at the individual level, for the truth, beauty and goodness in its fullest expression in your societies. If you do not become living examples of this, how will your world ever be healed? It never will be. So, we have solicited you and others like you, and as you, to be here with us in this development on your world. We again say that this is a co-creative process, a co-creative endeavor, and you cannot do this by yourself, and we as a mandate from Christ Michael will not leave this world in darkness, but will bring it into light. To do that, we must do that through individuals who make a meaningful contribution to God the Supreme, at the individual level—and the societal level, and the global level. You are important! We have not forgotten you, and we will continue to invest ourselves in you, so that you want to grow, to improve your life and improve the lives of others.

 **MMc:** Personally, I’m somewhat confused by this. I’ll think about it and see if I can come up with some questions that are phrased appropriately.

### The “absence of universal equality”

An audience member writes me: We are told that the 3 core values have guided our species through the whole of our existence. I can see the action of wanting a quality life, and wanting growth in the actions of our species, but granting equality between individuals and groups seem to be absent. This can be seen in the great divide between the “haves” and the “have nots,” here on Urantia. Why do we see this absence of universal equality?

**CHARLES:** “Absence of universal equality?” Please define “universal.” In the total universe, or…

**MMc:** I think it’s when you define the 3 moral imperatives, there is a feeling that the individual will not harm organizations or society, and that organizations will not harm individuals or society. The society will not harm organizations or individuals. That feeling of “will not harm” also equates somewhat with the equality of individuals having a basis for a quality of life and the potential for growth. There are people in our society today who have lost the ability to have a quality of life, basically because they are living on the ragged edge starvation, and they have no potential for growth, and certainly they are not equal to… they are not considered the “equal of” some other people. This presents a definite problem. So, in a sense of what is “universal” equality is seen here as every individual has the ability to have a quality of life and the potential for growth.

**CHARLES:** I appreciate your thinking, and you have done a good job of that, of explaining that very thoroughly. It basically comes down to this, my friend, is that “you”, you yourself as a doctor, can have the same respect for everyone else as an equal to you—not as a social equal, not as an economic equal, not as a cultural equal—but as an equal as an individual. That you see others as of the same worth as you hold yourself and this is the key to the word “equality.” It is not political equality—none of those measures of equality, but the total, intrinsic value of each individual as being valuable as they are, to everyone else in the same way, in the same evaluation. This is irregardless of whether they have an IQ of 85 or 185, that they are still valued and they have an innate potential that they can express in their lives for their own improved quality of life, *and* make a contribution to the quality of life of others. This is the universal value of individuals. The one who gave you the measure of that is Christ Michael as Jesus. You have other Avatars on your world as well, who have expressed the same sense of equality of each individual, no matter how humble their circumstance, no matter how worthy they are, deserving of what they have done or not done. They see the individual as God would see them, as an individual who came into existence with the same possibilities of growth and to improve their life as anyone else.

### Jesus totally accepted others as his equal

The life of Jesus, as you have read in the fourth part of *the Urantia Book*, fully explains his life and how he came to have such a high regard for others, and that he did not have an embellished sense of valuation for himself in comparison, for he did not compare. He accepted. He did not “tolerate;” he accepted. He did not have a need to forgive because they were already forgiven in his mind. He totally accepted others as his equal, as they have the potential to become equal to him. He valued them for the potential that they had. As individuals, how you develop your potential is a decision you make. If you compare yourself to others and see yourself as superior, and you are condescending in nature, then you are truly fully less worthy and deserving of these values being fulfilled in your life, compared to them. It is the essence of equality in these 3 values that makes your world a potentially socially stable and sustainable world of a global civilization. This is a slow, slow process to bring other people to value others as truly equal to themselves. It is human nature, particularly in developed societies, to compare one to another, as you have more and more material as comparisons to measure a person. This is inappropriate; it is quite immature in nature.

Have I answered your question, sir?

**MMc:** Yes, I believe you have.

### Caligastia tinkered with our DNA to maintain our animal nature

Another audience member writes me: “We’ve been told that Caligastia messed with our DNA. Did he mess with our interpretation of the 3 core values so that we would actively seek out a quality of life and growth for ourselves, but maintained our animal suspicion of outsiders, of granting them other than equal status?

**CHARLES:** Yes. He did not change the 3 core values, but he embellished the animal nature of your species.

**MMc:** I’m sorry, would you repeat that please?

**CHARLES:** Caligastia’s laboratories did not change the 3 core values in your DNA, but the animal nature of your species was embellished.

### The 3 core values: Subjective vs. objective

**MMc:** Thank you very much. It seemed to me that because of the necessity of interpreting the 3 core values by each individual that they would be more subjective than objective. Is there an objective way of looking at the 3 core values so that at some point in our future, they might provide an objective quality of life, growth and equality for all? Considering what you have told me, I’m not sure how to phrase this question.

### The enculturation of the 3 core values

**CHARLES:** Let me join you now, then. As we said, this is a very slow process of bending the culture of a global civilization to accept these simple values and principles of social sustainability, yet every culture and every society, every belief system accepts the Golden Rule of doing unto others as you would have them do unto you. This is enculturated at the family level. So too, will the three values of social sustainability become enculturated by the family, by the parents of children. It is a means for instilling those principles and values that support social sustainability for the individual and for the family, community and society. This is how it is done, and that is why we are so energetic to begin retraining individuals and young couples and young individuals to accept the 3 core values, and to apply them to their lives as they age, so that they are able to enculturate these values into their children.

Eventually, these individuals will become members of organizations; they too will become doctors, attorneys and accountants and CEO’s and financial advisors and so on. It eventually becomes a way of life, just as there are individuals who are vegan in their eating habits—it is a choice. So too, it is a choice to accumulate great amounts of money when only a smaller amount is necessary for a life and living. It is a personal choice to “live simply, so that others can simply live,” as you have heard or read on a bumper sticker. This is not nonsense; it is not idealistic; this is pragmatic social architecture and culture bending at its very best and very simplest. Enculturation has been used repeatedly in harmful regimes, to the benefit of their leaders and the domination of weaker nations and cultures. It can be used just as effectively, and more so, for the benefit of all when it is begun at the individual level, and enculturated in children, who then become operational members of society and organizations to form those policies, goals and objectives and visions and missions for organizations.

### The future disparity of wealth will not be allowed

You talk about the tremendous disparity of income and wealth among individuals. It is a process by which your society, as it is currently organized, allows for. In future societies it will not be allowed for. The profits will accrue to an individual in the form of social benefit and social recognition, as they make contributions from their organizations, from their corporations, to their employees and community organizations, which are not connected. Some of your corporations do this already, where they have a large store in a community and some of the profits from that local store go to benefit local organizations and individuals, as there is a needed basis to do so. This will become more and more a part of your future organizations.

The idealism you speak of is untenable and unobtainable at the present time, simply because of the huge cultural difference that is involved in moving from your primitive culture of profit for all reasons and without limit, compared to societies in the future, which do not have those values, do not value extreme individual wealth, but the shared wealth of others. The transition from where your culture is now, to that eventual more idealized social existence, is a process of transitions, which will take time. It will take creativity of how to maintain corporations financially without breaking them to become unprofitable. The process is known, it has been done and it will be repeated again and again. We do not necessarily offer any insights or ideas at this moment into that process, but we hope to do so in a much more intimate way in a design team that has that at heart.

**MMc:** I am wondering about the subjective nature of the three core values within a design team. If a particular design team uses their interpretation of the three core values, then their plans for an organization will not necessarily be the same as another design team putting together plans for the same organization. We have been told that the work of a design team once done can be used anywhere in the world. But if the three core values are open to the interpretation of each design team I cannot see how that is possible. Can you explain this for me please?

The 3 core values are valid, *always*

**CHARLES:** You have made a simple topic quite complicated. The 3 core values are valid — always! They are the penultimate validators of what works and what does not work in the social level. The interpretations are not valid if they are not supported by those 3 values. The instrument to use to validate social topics is the “Schematic for Validating Social Sustainability.” What may come out of one team for one topic may be different for another team, concerning the same topic. The difference may be that it would be a more evolved solution to the problem. Nonetheless, they must be validated. Please remember that these three values are consistent, always. As well, beliefs and subordinate assumptions within beliefs are the interpretations. These, too, must be validated by the 3 core values.

If, for instance, there is a group of individuals who value the dominance of men over women, and interpret these values as “women are less than,” then it is erroneous because these values are universal to your species, irregardless of gender, irregardless of race, ethnicity, culture, nationality, community or language. The interpretations, themselves, must be validated, as are the expectations and eventually the criteria of fulfillment. In a society that values dominance of men over women, the end result in the final column is the criteria for performance is that no women go to school. If you check against the 3 core values, that conclusion is totally invalidated by all three values, because women are of equal value as men and have an equal need to approve the quality of their life through growing, and that they are equal in value to men across the board. Therefore, beliefs that men are dominant are erroneous interpretations of the quality of life because those belief-interpretations are not consistent with these three timeless and universal values.

What you will find, and which will be discovered eventually within specific ethnic, cultural and religious groups, is that their fundamental beliefs are erroneous; they are not supported by the 3 core values, as they are interpreted by contemporary societies. This will become a great “ah-ha” to those groups and those religions as they see this inscrutable situation: “We know that men are dominant over women, and of more value than women. How could it be that the values do not support that?” Well, they simply do not. You will know that the interpretation and application of these values to a specific social topic are accurate when one team validates them similarly as another team validates them. The difference of what you speak of has become political when you see differences between groups.

**MMc:** I understand. Within the design team the three core values become objective, rather than subjective.

### Subjective interpretations lead to war, prejudice, bias and bigotries

**CHARLES:** There has been no prior thought that these values are objective in nature. They have always been seen as subjective to the individual, to the family, to the community, to ethnic groups, cultural groups, and that has led to wars and prejudice, bias and bigotries.

**MMc:** What you are saying is at the design team level they become objective?

**CHARLES:** They are always objective, at any level. It is the choice of a person or a family, or a state or nation to interpret them for political reasons, for economic reasons, and for social reasons. That is an interpretation that is not objective, but always subjective.

**MMc:** I see. So the 3 core values are both subjective and objective?

**CHARLES:** No, they are always objective; measurable and objective. I will go on to say that how one society interprets quality of life, may be quite different from another. In your nation, quality of life for housing may be a house that is, on average, worth over $250,000, but in another nation, a superior quality of life may be a domicile that is worth only $25,000—at most! This does not really matter. It is not essential that mortals have the same type of home; it is how satisfied they are with their home and whether they think it is of equal value of those who are similar to them. If a person has no education, should they be denigrated to the alleys of a city to live? Most certainly not! This is not equal value of individuals, and the potential that they hold to make a contribution.

The over-population problem on individual values

Now, I hope you are beginning to see the ultimately difficult situation that over-population has caused in your world. It has caused people to be seen as different, as of less value or more value to society. You will find in survivalist situations where two people in a plane that has crashed, one may be an engineer and one may be a janitor: Are they of value to each other? Yes, certainly they are, because they value each other for the potential that they can contribute to the survival of both of them, and that one could not survive by themselves, but with two there is a possibility of survival and even continued existence, and perhaps even finding their way out of the wilderness. So, it is very similar as almost a metaphor for your current civilization. You *need* each other to survive.

**MMc:** I have no further questions. Ladies? (None.)

**CHARLES:** We thank you for your attention today, and the curiosity of your minds to ask such penetrating questions. It is through such thoughtfulness that you will begin to interpret these values and to get to know them, become familiar with them, and see how they apply to you as individuals, as families and as societies. Further discussion of this is a valuable means by which we can educate thousands of individuals to become those “seed beds” of thought and development of social sustainability, and from that seed bed will come vast fields of sustainable societies, and eventually a fertile world of sustainable civilization, a world that will be ready for the Days of Light and Life. Thank you for this today, and we wish you well and look forward to our next meeting. Good day.
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