

THE TOTALITY OF GOD AND CHRISTIANITY

An excerpt from



Unlocking the Secret to the Riddle of the Ages

Al Leone

© 2005

*Author's Note: The following excerpt is actually the first half of the **EPilogue** to the Fourth Digital Edition. (The second half exists in its own article, **QUADRALITY AND THE HIDDEN MESSAGES IN WATER**.) It was written, as you will read, to be a rebuttal in advance of any accusations of **The Totality Of God** being a cult, and is a strong statement of my position that what I have done should not be considered in that sense, particularly as regards a cult's negative associations. I made my case in part by detailing the biblical contradictions found among the various branches of Christianity itself. But in doing so, in retrospect I realize the subtext of the passage may be overlooked. It is that my philosophy was presented in love to offer to the divergent faiths that compose humanity a context whereby they can unify to accomplish their common Divine Purpose – the creation of a Paradise on Earth. I therefore offer this as a stand-alone article in the hope it will be read with that intent in mind.*

EPILOGUE

At various times throughout my work I've expressed concern over how it might be perceived. In the summary that concluded the final essay I once again posited that scientist and theologian alike may not be pleased – though certainly for different reasons. Of course, I've also reminded my readers many times that what I've written are merely my thoughts on things, so, please consider them as such. Nonetheless, these thoughts when taken together become what I must acknowledge to be a pretty powerful statement on the energetic nature of existence and a comprehensive worldview in that regard. And as I now prepare to release it in this complete version to the world, I am particularly aware of the attacks it, and myself, may soon face.

Though it can certainly bruise one's ego, scientific rebuttal is not the issue, as that is to be expected. Actually, the scientific community may choose to simply write this off until evidence is found. I'm fine with that, and believe eventually some will. My main concern is over those on the religious side of the fence. Even when I had finished the *First Print Edition* I knew I had put forth views that would be considered controversial on both sides. This has continued into these essays, though I actually feel that what I've written in them will give scientists a greater appreciation of the *System of Quadrality* and its academic credibility. However, the essays may have the opposite effect on the religious community, particularly that of Christianity, with controversy in my work escalating in the direction of heresy. Then, something that from the outset has been intended as a worldview to benefit Humanity and to help create a better world, could take on the association with and stigma of a cult – and one directed by forces less than beneficent. So, I would and should be clearly concerned about how this effort will be perceived, and I need to pose my rebuttal now as part of this publication.

Before I address if what I've done represents a cult, let me state what I know to be true about my work. It is certainly philosophical, as the first half of my lightheartedly proposed course title for it – *Philosophysics* – would indicate. Often, a set of beliefs or practices is given a name with the suffix "ism" attached, such as Feudalism, Socialism, Darwinism, etc. So, perhaps ***The Totality Of God*** philosophy will become known as *Totalism*. That would be appropriate, since its philosophic vision of God and the Universe is as all-encompassing as one can get. And my work is likewise scientific, as the second half of my above title affirms. Perhaps that aspect of it will be referred to as *Quadralism* – likewise appropriate, since its understanding of energy as a range of values with four divisions has provided a scientifically substantiated basis for study.

But is ***The Totality Of God*** a cult, and to which force in the Universe does it owe its allegiance? I'll deal with the second half first. In the previous essay I spoke of the *Unholy Quadrality*, the oppositional balance to the *Holy Quadrality* and clearly a reference to divine beings in tangibly manifest personality but all in allegiance to the universal force of Evil rather than Good. This is more easily thought of as God vs. Satan, as I several times have. But we must be really careful in our perceiving what another person's or group's allegiance might be toward one or the other. I first alluded to this in *Footnote 69*, p. 199. I there noted that it would be inaccurate to associate Thelema with Satanism (or thus to infer that Thelemites uniformly worship Satan, though one could if so inclined), simply because their philosophic roots can be

traced to the same person. It goes to show how a set of ideas can take two radically divergent paths to practical application – even in the individual who originated them – when care isn't exercised to stay true to the Light. And this can happen to anyone, including myself if I let it, or any group. While it may promise eternal reward to those who defend their faith, I dare say that suicide bombing isn't advocated in the Koran!

While doing research into cults I became aware of a larger issue covered by what some refer to as Satanism. It doesn't have to imply the worship of Satan as a spiritual being in opposition to God, but can indicate an overall allegiance to the *Forces of Darkness*. Satanism as such is understood to exist in a variety of forms, and in that sense it can be placed into the quadralitic range of values upheld by the *Unholy Quadrality*. I said in the last essay I wouldn't speculate on who they are, and I still won't. But we can understand how Satanism, an extreme allegiance to the *Forces of Darkness*, applies to each of their paths.

Rather than rely on a formal definition for Satanism, I will offer my own so that we have a "total" perspective from which to pursue this. Let us think of Satanism as any practice that owes its spiritual allegiance to the *Forces of Darkness* in either a personal or impersonal sense, and thus in direct opposition to any that owes spiritual allegiance to the *Vibrations of Light*. I qualify it as spiritual allegiance since there are many satanic practices that without such allegiance would be considered by society merely as being excessive or self-indulgent behavior. I also qualify it as personal or impersonal since a worship of Satan is common but not required for a practice to be considered satanic. And since these practices are opposed to a spiritual allegiance to the *Vibrations of Light*, it is often organizationally directed at Christianity, a 2000 year mainstay of such allegiance, and its beliefs and rituals. But again, this is not required.

Satanism in general is ritualistic, and as such is primarily focused in the South – where *Rituals* are the *Physical Treatment* in [Figure 2](#). But within the quadralitic range of values, a South alignment would involve rituals in opposition to the laws of nature. Animal sacrifices either as a form of worship or for the acquisition of their power is often involved. Taken to extremes, these acts of violence can be directed at a human animal – person or group – and can even be self-directed as pain sacrifices. (24)

Satanism as a North alignment becomes more an expression of satanic ideas, either through written teachings, oral invocation, or ego-indulgent practices. These include acts that would be considered hedonistic or libertine in and of themselves, as mentioned above, but in this context assume the added dimension of tapping into and fostering a connection with a negative spiritual source. Taken to an extreme here, it can lead to severe mental aberration – and commensurate actions.

In the West, Satanism I feel manifests its greatest personal form, with Satan as a spiritual being coming into direct confrontation with God and Jesus His Son on Earth. The rituals, such as the Black Mass, are intended as a defiling of Christianity. In its extreme, the anger felt toward the established church, its ministers and members, becomes actualized in criminal behavior against them.

24 (*I must note that ritualistic blood sacrifices, animal and human, were common in ancient civilizations throughout the world, in the worship or appeasement of gods that by those civilizations were generally considered sources of Light and Good, not Darkness and Evil. In fact, god-associations with celestial sources of light – the Sun, Moon and Stars – were drawn and connections made to their kings as personifications of such deities. So, it is easy to question where they may have perceived the line between their versions of God and Satan to be, since non-beneficent deities were also intrinsic to such belief systems.*)

All of the above, naturally, is my own brief generalization of a serious and complex subject. And much of this was brought to my attention in a book that served as an excellent reference on cults while I was doing this research. It is "The Challenge of the Cults and New Religions" by Ron Rhodes, and I'll speak more on it in a moment. (25) But given what I've said re Satanism, you may wonder why I would even bother bringing it up or why it would cause me concern over any association. Clearly, the reverence I've shown to Jesus would preclude that. But Mr. Rhodes considers Satanism not just in terms of the abject worship, allegiance to, or ritualistic accessing of the *Forces of Darkness*. The Bible refers to Satan in many ways, one being the god of this age – the evil age of today with Satan as its head – responsible for the cults and pseudo-truths in opposition to church teachings. It is then when Satanism becomes aligned with the East, and it is also the point at which I become concerned, since one of the falsehoods mentioned is the Satanist's dualistic view of God and Satan being equal and opposite energetic entities. In fact, the whole idea of God as energy – common in the New Age movement – is considered heretical. In other words, it is taught that without even realizing it a person could be under the influence of Satan and his *false wisdom* in coming to that conclusion and writing about it.

I first began reading "The Challenge of the Cults" because I wanted to learn more about the subject in general, and was immediately struck by the number and diversity of the groups that were considered as such. I had a basic understanding of the Christian position on false religions as being any that didn't accept the fundamental precepts of Christianity, and that would include all non-biblical major religions. The Bible repeatedly warns the believer to be wary of false gods and their prophets, since they come from Satan. But what did it mean to be considered a cult? The definitions for cult in *Bookshelf* are diverse, with one being simply "a system or community of religious worship and ritual." But any religion, including Christianity, could be considered a cult by that definition. Two others, though, were definitions more in keeping with the image one usually has of a cult: "a religion or religious sect generally considered to be extremist or false, with its followers often living in an unconventional manner under the guidance of an authoritarian, charismatic leader," and, "obsessive, especially faddish, devotion to or veneration for a person, principle, or thing." Immediately one conjures up memories of Jim Jones and David Koresh; and both are mentioned in the book, but only in passing. The focus of study is more on formal movements, and some are extensive in scope, with Satanism as the only anti-God worldview discussed at length. Again, you might expect to find Reverend Moon's Unification Church or the Hare Krishna sect; the New Age movement is also not a stretch as being non-Christian, though I hadn't thought of it as a cult. Then there were chapters on Scientology, Freemasonry, Transcendental Meditation, and so on – the entire gamut of spiritualities covered by ***The Totality Of God***. While not professedly Christian, they're hardly what I would consider cults. But quite surprising was the inclusion of major spiritual movements like the Mormons and Jehovah's Witness, groups that profess a belief in Jesus – though not the strictest Christian view of Him – and with at least some biblical roots in their history.

Now, I am not criticizing Mr. Rhodes or his book, and in fact found it very useful as a resource to learn more about the core beliefs of all these groups. But it made me acutely aware of two things in particular. The first is that ***The Totality Of God*** – and as however you may wish to consider it: *Totalism, Quadralism, Philosophysics*, or whatever – by Christian standards is a cult. Perhaps I should wear the association as a badge of honor. I certainly don't feel worthy of being condemned for it. I can't help

it if this is the understanding I believe with all my heart and mind God has lead me to. And Ron notes that many cult founders have claimed the same. But it is the second thing I became aware of that truly has me concerned. It is just how far apart we all are – and how much we will have to overcome – if we ever hope to heal and unify the world. How in this state can Humanity ever create a *Paradise on Earth*?

Perhaps the greatest blocking core belief comes as a form of separation. It is the idea that if my belief is right and yours is different, then yours has to be wrong. Only one can be right. It is all or nothing, no middle ground or room for compromise. In fact, one of the most serious ideas to undermine Christianity in the area of education is noted by Mr. Rhodes as being Relativism – all truth is relative; there is no absolute truth. This completely contradicts the Christian position that its Holy Bible is the one and only divinely inspired bearer of Absolute Spiritual Truth. But if that were the case, how is it that theologians are able to argue oppositional interpretations of key matters of belief and practice using different passages of the same Bible? And often such debates involve representatives from the two major Christian movements – Catholic and Protestant. I've seen several such debates televised, as you likely have, and a single night of Internet research could leave a believer thoroughly confused.

Now, I know this is a very sensitive subject, and I don't have a theologian's expertise. But let me share what I've learned from various sources available to and understandable by practically anyone on the history of the Bible – chiefly being, as usual for me, *Encarta* and *Bookshelf*. (26) The essential canon of 27 books that we are familiar with today was finalized by St. Athanasius in 367 A.D. To arrive at it, the early Church Fathers eliminated numerous texts that similarly professed to be divine revelation concerning Jesus and His ministry. These include the Gnostic gospels that gained attention when 50 Coptic writings were found by an Egyptian peasant in 1945. All this was done to provide a uniform Church position purified of all potential heresy, with those eliminated perhaps deservedly so. I'll pass no judgment on it. And a similar purification and structuring of texts was done for Buddhism more than half a millennium earlier. The difference was the latter process resulted in two divergent categories of true Buddhist traditions, whereas the Bible produced one unified Catholic Church, with other sects persecuted as heretics. No major change in the Church occurred until the great schism between the Eastern and Western churches in 1054. The issue was largely over the papacy, as the Eastern Church had its own patriarch, with only one, albeit significant, doctrinal deviation being over the procession of the *Holy Spirit* from the *Father*. But the basic beliefs and practices of the faith remained, including the seven sacraments that some years later would be officially proclaimed as such. That, however, changed with the Protestant Reformation, and in particular as it was molded by Martin Luther. Not only was an allegiance to Rome disavowed, but any papal authority at all. Moreover, a restructuring of beliefs and practices occurred in keeping with his theological position on justification by Grace through faith alone.

25 Ron Rhodes, *The Challenge of the Cults and New Religions* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 2001).

26 (Numerous articles were reviewed. These were the most significant:

Charles P. Price, "Eucharist," "Grace," "Justification," and "Sacrament."

Gene M Tucker and Fred B. Craddock, "The New Testament."

John W. O'Malley, "Schism, Great."

"Protestantism." Microsoft® Encarta® 98 Encyclopedia. © 1993-1997 Microsoft Corporation.)

Please realize, Martin Luther was a remarkably learned theologian and deeply devout cleric who practiced a level of devotion to faith I can barely comprehend. So, this is not meant to reprove. In fact, I can empathize with his reaction to the true errors that seemed to be plaguing the Church and which the Church itself recognized and attempted to address in future councils. His separation was a required purification for Christianity as a whole. I only mention this so that we can discuss what happened theologically as a result. Perhaps the most talked of debate concerns a core disagreement – the issue of faith vs. works and how they relate to salvation. Faith in Jesus is required by both Catholics and Protestants, but whether or not works are required is the issue. My personal feeling is that you have to live your truth – your action bears witness to your intention. And I can't imagine anyone would insist that if you asked Jesus to forgive on one day and then committed murder on the next you would go to Heaven. So, wouldn't, then, works be involved? Again, this is a fertile subject for contention, and I don't have a theologian's training. Some may say the issue is whether works are required to receive God's Grace freely given. And the role of free will also then becomes part of the discussion. But regardless, it is a fact that the 16th century Protestant reformers eliminated five of the seven sacraments and only practiced two, those that Jesus Himself instituted – Baptism and Eucharist. And among those missing is Penance, a core sacrament in Catholicism required for salvation. A Catholic must confess his or her specific sins to an ordained priest to be absolved of the stain of sin, whereas a Protestant needs only to confess a sinful nature to Jesus to be forgiven and be assured of salvation. Huge difference, same Bible.

But perhaps the greatest theological discrepancy comes in one of the sacraments these two movements have in common – Eucharist. For the Protestant it is an act performed in memory of Jesus, as He so requested at the Last Supper. The various denominations have different views on what that entails. But for the Catholic, Jesus' invocation whereby the bread and wine at the meal were transformed into His body and blood becomes real. And when this act is performed anywhere in the world by an ordained priest during a Holy Mass, the offered bread and wine become Christ's body and blood in actuality, not just symbolically in reverence. It is referred to as transubstantiation and it is an enormous difference. Same Bible.

The point I'm making should be evident. If the Bible is that absolute, how can such drastically different relative interpretations exist and be considered the path to the same ultimate goal of salvation? Mr. Rhodes doesn't address this, and he doesn't need to in analyzing cults. He establishes a true Christian faith on a few simple requirements, chief being a belief in Jesus as God and Savior, and a complete acceptance of the Apostle's Creed. But the differences that I've mentioned, and I'm aware of others, are not in an understanding of the historical facts of the Bible as being relative or absolute, such as Adam and Eve and the *Book of Genesis*, though a fundamentalist will claim those as absolute, as well. I'm referring to core differences in faith. But I find it important to note in this discussion of absolute vs. relative truth in the Bible that not all its legends are the exclusive property of Christianity. One of its most revered fables, that of Noah and the great flood, has parallels in ancient civilizations covering the same world the flood is said to have. Numerous web sites are devoted to the subject and speak of the fables not just as folklore but as founded in real archeological evidence, and with a contextual relationship to the Bible. The 12 Assyrian tablets discovered by George Smith in 1862 are the most famous. They contain a Babylonian poem, "The Epic of Gilgamesh," which details a story remarkably similar to that in the Bible. There are some differences, which indicate, scholars say,

the two stories come from a common earlier source. Yet, the tablets themselves predate the Bible. So, while the parallel story would lend credence to the reality of the flood in the Bible, it indicates to me another realization important in our view of the *Big Picture*. This was not necessarily an act done by the God of the Hebrews in retaliation for Humanity's wicked ways and to purify the world of us. That's the interpretation the writer of Noah's Flood gave to the earlier flood fable to provide a moral lesson for his audience. This doesn't mean the writer wasn't divinely inspired to make such a change and thus the text itself should not be considered the inspired Word of the Judeo-Christian God. But it is relative in that sense.

So, is anything on this side of the Veil, even something that is clearly divinely inspired as the Holy Bible, truly absolute? It is all relative. But that doesn't mean it is all the same. The balance of Absolute and Relative is a range of values, and indeed within that range the Holy Bible is on the absolute side. But it's still relative, and if we admit that then the world can begin to learn and live by the truth in all its holy books. Moreover, within each book the range of Absolute to Relative likewise applies. For some portions to be relative wouldn't negate the absolute nature of others. Of course, all this would require interpretation, something Mr. Rhodes feels would be incorrect for any non-Christian to do with the Bible. Interpretation is best left to the theologian, from whom the believer then learns. Some Christians do allow for a more personal pursuit of biblical truth. But it is still accomplished from a true Christian perspective. Ron queries how a person committed to and knowledgeable in a particular book's view would feel about a Christian putting their spin on it. But I think he has overlooked a truth in his own point. Each holy book is meant to be interpreted, and is best done by someone in alignment with that path's truth. Yet, that doesn't mean a relative insight wouldn't be of use to a person from another path. Allowing for that is the first step to unifying the world. I said before that Jesus died for all Humanity, not just the Christian portion, and His teachings were meant to benefit everyone irrespective of one's theology. All I'm asking us for is to allow one another the freedom to learn through personal interpretation from each other, and to not judge it. It is nothing less than what the Buddhist and Christian theologians previously noted have allowed within their particular paths for themselves. The veracity of your interpretation will be evident in the results you manifest. And to those Christians who feel that anyone not beholden to a theological belief in Jesus will not be saved, and thus they have the responsibility to do something about that, I remind them that the Buddhist probably will not care. Christian salvation is not what they're looking for. They don't naturally resonate to it at the deep, cultural level from which they're aligned to Eastern belief. Does that mean a Christian shouldn't share their faith with a Buddhist, or visa versa, or that either cannot cross paths to realign in the light of that sharing? Of course not! Each person has a unique place in ***The Totality Of God***, and a right to find and live it.

There's a wonderful web site, "World Scripture – A Comparative Anthology of Sacred Texts" [<http://www.unification.net/ws>], dedicated to scriptural commonality; the parallels are profound. And comparisons are more than at the mythic level Joseph Campbell was noted for teaching, but at the scriptural – the words of God. Of course the specifics differ, but not the general truth they all serve. Moreover, we should also consider that the Christian Bible is most absolute for the path to which it aligns. My book began with the delineation and association of spiritual truth as *Four Pathways* in accord with the *Spiritual Principle of Harmonic Alignment*. Humanity had arrived at those four basic understandings of spirituality as a result of energetic proclivity. And the holy books then written for each of those paths were in accord with that energetic

alignment, and thus most absolute for it. The diagram for Actuality and Potential on p. 696 can be adapted to reflect this. So, we shouldn't think of the range from Absolute to Relative as being an evaluation of a decline in merit or truthfulness. Moreover, there is another range we should be mindful of – its behavioral reversal! From the perspective of physical truth – Relative to Absolute – the South is the most absolute, and should a person wish to make use of the inherent powers of nature, particularly those in its material elements, the best source of that information is the South. Similarly, the East may be most absolute spiritually and the best source of wisdom devoid of personality, but it is the most relative physically due to that lack.

Consider also that such alignments are not only horizontal, but vertical. Then we can account for the range from True to False within each path. Horizontally, since these are all *Pathways to Light and Truth*, we will not qualify True and False in that plane. Still, depending on your energetic alignment some would indeed seem truer than others, and over different issues. But it is up to the individual seeker to decide that for him or herself, and personal truth itself becomes relative. One path or teaching within it may seem more truthful to me but less so to you. The key thing to determine is to which spiritual force in the Universe it aligns – Light or Darkness. This can be differentiated along the vertical. And on p. 996 I spoke of that axis upholding the quadrality range from Symbolism to Energy as Positive to Negative. Thus, simply because you profess to be a follower of a particular spiritual leader doesn't mean that your personal practice of that person's teachings is the most truthful. Similarly, the teachings of spiritual leaders themselves exist within that range of True to False. And indeed, all religions warn of heresy – showing how each feels itself to be True. Mokichi Okada taught the importance of discernment in the principles one adheres to, as they would affect the ability to live a life free from poverty, conflict and disease. Such sagacity was especially crucial in Japan, where religious sects could number in the thousands. But it's a principle we should all apply. State your truth and live by it. Then, examine the results. Even if the reward you seek is in the life beyond, living in accord with *Divine Light and Universal Truth* should manifest blessings in this one. And to judge the efficacy of your path, regardless of which it is the two fundamental Christian commandments could be applied. Is the spiritual good you seek ultimately for the sake of God and pursued with all aspects of your being – Soul, Heart, Mind, and Body? And is the physical good you seek for Humanity as much as for yourself? These are the key questions to ask, and the criteria for living in *Paradise on Earth*.

Nonetheless, God is all these variations – Spiritual to Physical, Good to Evil. How can the God that exists as Unity and is considered everything, suddenly become only half of everything at Duality? It can't! But when we think of Good and Evil as opposite energies, or, of God and Satan as those personifications – both of which all religions understand in some manner – they may be equal and opposite in that balance quantitatively but not qualitatively. That balance does not exist apart from but rather together with all those upholding not only the *Principle of Balance* but the *Law of Order*. And the chief we should consider is the quality of Actuality to Potential. Within Unity, the Good in God is 100% actuality, Evil is 100% potential. In the spiritually actual sense God is all Good. Throughout spiritual diversification in the Spiritual Realm, Good remains the *driving force* until the Balancing Center is reached. Evil doesn't become the *driving force* until the Physical Realm. In the physically actual sense Satan is all Evil. So, the biblical reference to Satan as the deceiver of the whole world (Revelation 12:9) speaks to the truth of the effort required to overcome the Physical Realm's *driving force*. But the only reason we can is because the dominant

force overall is the one responsible for both – Good. And while we can think of God’s Grace as a gift freely given, it is one Humanity and each individual within it must choose – not just for life in the thereafter but in the here and now. I said before that God’s Light is always on. To me this represents the *irresistible* nature of Grace as it comes from the Spiritual Realm. You can’t choose whether or not you receive it. But it *is resistible* in the Physical Realm. You can choose to refuse it. People say no to it all the time. If it were absolutely *irresistible* here, there would be no evil manifest in the world. It would only be a potential. Again, a theologian may say I’ve misused or misinterpreted the previous italicized words in the context of Grace, since humans are unable to resist sin on their own. But to think of this as how it works out practically speaking makes sense to me in the light of the *System of Quadrality*.

So, is professing a philosophy based on the four-in-one energetic nature of the Universe the work of Satan or merely the truth of things? You decide. But in doing so realize that the range includes not just the physical energy of Mind and Body, but the spiritual energy of Soul and Heart. Would it be wrong to think of the *Holy Spirit* as an infinite spiritual energy that loves and cares about you, or that Its infinite physical balance – *Johrei* – could be accessed by any member of Humanity to create through intention and action an ideal world?