

## **Compilation of comments on world events by Benjamin Creme in the year 2004 as published in *Share International magazine***

### **Jan/Feb 2004**

*Q. Would you please give your opinion as to the qualifications of the US Presidential candidate Dennis Kucinich?*

A. It is my personal view that he is far and away the best candidate to have presented himself for the job. I admire his sense of values, the spiritual range, and broad worldview. We included one of his congressional speeches, as well as an interview with him, in *Share International magazine* (see SI May and July/August 2003). From what I have seen or read of him, I am deeply impressed and think that he would certainly be a very good, perhaps great, high-minded President, well-equipped, too, on the practical level to address the very real and difficult problems that face America now and in the future. Kucinich is a well-advanced initiate, and he would certainly be my choice if I were living in the US and able to vote. If he receives enough money and votes to be nominated as the Democratic candidate, and he has only until March 2004 to do that, then Hierarchy would throw the weight of Their not little assistance behind his candidacy. I have little doubt that he would win the election — but you have to get him nominated.

*Q. Is Dennis Kucinich sensitive to Maitreya's ideas and impression?*

A. He is sensitive to the ideas, but they are not coming directly from Maitreya. He has always had these ideas. He is one of the very few US politicians who come from a poor immigrant background (from a Polish family, who lived out of a car when he was a boy, so he knows what it is to suffer financial hardship), which in an American is quite a good thing to have.

*Q. What is the cause of the epidemics of influenzas and repeating colds which so many people are suffering from today?*

A. The year 2003 was a particularly difficult one for the world and many people in it, especially for those of a sensitive nature and concern whose response to the events has been fearful and emotional. The result of the stress invoked has been, among natural disasters, a multitude of epidemics of one kind or another — from the SARS outbreak to influenzas and repeating infections. People do not all have the same infection, or infection pattern or rhythm, even if the underlying cause of all is stress. It is necessary to build up the immune system. Above all, and I recognize that this is easier to say than to do, everyone must become more detached, less emotional and fearful in response to world events, and more certain of the reality of Maitreya's presence and power. Use His hand.

*Q. Is the 'Peace Now' movement in Israel responding to Maitreya's energies? (Their leader said they would protect Arafat against Sharon.)*

A. They are responding to their sense of fair play and you could say that comes from Maitreya or you could say these ideas have always been there in people of goodwill. They have the courage to stand up against the general consensus which in Israel is that it is not a question of oppression and domination. Israel thinks it is a necessary act of self-protection; they have to protect themselves. It is a lie, or largely a lie. They claim they are oppressing the Palestinians entirely for self-protection, but it is taken to such a degree. You do not protect yourself by the arbitrary blowing up of several buildings every night in Palestinian areas. It does not matter if people are killed or injured or if they have nowhere to go. It is just making it clear to the Palestinians that "we are strong, we can

do whatever we like. We can blow up these 5 buildings tonight; tomorrow night it could be 20, by the end of the week it could be 100. We are powerful, we have arms, ammunition, tanks, planes, helicopters, to bomb and shell whenever we like. We are dominant in this country, we mean to stay — and if it means killing every single Palestinian in the process, so be it. We will not stand suicide bombers coming in. We have the right to self protection". And, of course, they have the right.

Every country has the right to self protection. That is the only way they see it. But what they will not see is that their domination and oppression are the very causes of the suicide bombing. They cannot stand the suicide bombers, because they never know where they will strike next. The Palestinians have no armour at all except for a few rifles. The Israelis can stand that. They have a far more efficient armoury — the latest and best American armoury. They are given by the Americans \$3 billion every year to buy arms — their army is the most powerful in the area, and one of the most powerful in the world. My advice to the Palestinians is to stop the suicide bombing. They do not stop because some people earn money for their families by doing it. And they are fanatics, only fanatics will do it. These young people are trained; they should be untrained, and not be allowed to do it. It frightens the Israelis, and they are armed to the teeth. They will not give in because of it but they get harder and harder and more oppressive because of it. Israel would be much more open to talking, negotiation, but for the suicide bombers. There have been a few Israelis who have refused to go in with tanks and destroy Palestinian property. Some young Israeli pilots are refusing to bomb the Palestinians. They say that this is an illegal warfare — it is not a state protecting itself, it is a state using its power to oppress the Palestinians, which indeed it is. I only wish there were more of them.

*Q. The Americans say they have caught Saddam Hussein — how can we be sure that he really is Saddam Hussein?*

A. It is clear to us (Share International), that the US has not caught Saddam Hussein. Our information is that Saddam was injured on the first night of the war, 20 March 2003, and died two days later. The man recently captured was one of several stand-ins, a cousin, who resembles Saddam Hussein but has several different features. See our news release on this very point.

*Q. I have seen reports that confirm your information that Saddam Hussein died shortly after the first bombing. But the mainstream media and leaders around the world seem to be unaware. Is this deliberate ignorance?*

A. I believe that mainstream media have private doubts but are obeying US Government policy not to 'rock the boat'! I am sure some leaders have grave doubts, others may be quite happy not to look too hard for the truth.

*Q. Did the American military set the whole thing up: ie assuming the man 'caught' was a stand-in for Hussein, did he collaborate with the US to appear to hide and allow himself to be 'captured'?*

A. No. He was exposed by an informer anxious to receive the \$25 million reward put up by the US authorities. The military (or rather the CIA officers acting as the army) may well have thought they had captured Saddam Hussein. I do not believe that the government high officials do not know that they have caught a stand-in, whom earlier, on his appearance in Baghdad in April, they had rejected as 'Saddam Hussein'.

*Q. Do the top echelon US authorities know that he is not Saddam Hussein? Is there a small inner circle who know the truth and are feeding propaganda to the media and the world?*

A. I believe so, yes.

*Q. Approximately how many officials in various governments are aware that the captured man is not Saddam Hussein? Does this group include Tony Blair, George Bush, Colin Powell, Donald Rumsfeld, Dick Cheney and all the other top officials of the US and British Governments?*

A. Tony Blair, I believe, is in two minds. He is too intelligent to just accept it, yet does not want to believe it a lie. I believe that Bush, Rumsfeld and Cheney all know the truth.

*Q. Did the US have a specimen of Saddam Hussein's DNA before the supposed capture?*

A. No. They compared it with the DNA they had of his dead sons, which would be not exact but 'near enough' for desperate men to accept. Mr Rumsfeld told journalists it was "about 90 per cent the same, close enough". That of the captured stand-in, a cousin, would probably be about 70 per cent, and the sons' 80 per cent, the same.

*Q. (1) In light of Share International having said that the putative Saddam Hussein captured was in fact his cousin, what possible motivation could the cousin have had for hiding and then subjecting himself to humiliation, prosecution and perhaps execution in lieu of his cousin? (2) Is this all a plot by the Americans to enable the Bush administration to gain points for the capture?*

A. (1) He is sworn in loyalty to Saddam Hussein for as long as necessary to keep up the morale of his supporters, still very numerous in Iraq. Whether he will go all the way — even to execution — remains to be seen. Perhaps that will be the point when the truth of this scam comes out. (2) Of course.

## **March 2004**

*Q. What is your opinion on the Hutton Report? Do you think it was fair?*

A. My opinion is that it is a travesty of justice — neither fair nor even complete. So tight was the remit placed on the work of Lord Hutton that no question of real import, especially in connection with the war in Iraq, and what led up to it, could be discussed. The choice of Lord Hutton as the investigative judge in the enquiry was made by Tony Blair and the tight remit given to him ensured inevitably an exoneration of Mr Blair's actions, and at the same time a denigration of the British Broadcasting Corporation. It was, in a word, a total whitewash.

*Q. In the previous issue of Share International, you said that if Congressman Kucinich won the presidential nomination in the US, "Hierarchy would throw the weight of Their not little assistance behind his candidacy. I have little doubt that he would win the election." If Congressman Kucinich does not win the nomination, however, would Hierarchy "throw the weight of Their not little assistance" behind whoever the Democratic Party nominates, given the global danger posed by the current Republican administration in the US, and their domination by nefarious forces?*

A. Yes.

*Q. Was the recent mailing of the poison ricin to the United States Senate Majority Leader a result of domestic terrorists, international terrorists, or a staged manipulation by elements of the US Government to gain support and sympathy for the current administration?*

A. International terrorists.

*Q. What has happened to the British space probe Beagle 2 which was supposed to land on Mars on Christmas Day 2003? Did it crash, or is it lying in a crater where its transmissions have not been picked up?*

A. It crashed.

*Q. Regarding the two spacecraft recently sent to Mars by NASA: (1) Are Earth's scientist's who are involved with the Mars project receiving any help from 'higher' scientists such as those on Mars? (2) Will they make any surprising or significant discoveries? (3) Was there ever a dense-physical life on Mars? If so, how long ago?*

A. (1) No. (2) Yes. (3) Three million years ago.

*Q. Can you say what is the real cause of 'Gulf War syndrome'?*

A. There are several causes, each suggested by those seeking compensation for the veterans of the war who are still suffering the effects of the 'syndrome': depleted uranium fallout from munitions used by the Allied troops themselves; multiple vaccinations given before the war; tablets given to guard against possible nerve agents; chemical weapons destroyed by the Allied soldiers after the conflict.

#### **April 2004**

*Q. (1) Did the US Administration really ask the British Government to collect information by eavesdropping on other United Nations representatives and even the Secretary-General Kofi Annan, in the run up to the Iraq war? (2) Did the British intelligence actually do it? (3) Why would the Americans ask the British? Surely they would be able to do it for themselves?*

A. (1) Yes. (2) Yes. (3) I have no doubt that they could, and probably did, in any case. But to get the involvement of the British, who were perhaps closer to the UN than the Americans felt themselves to be, allowed the blame, if it were discovered (which it has been), to land squarely on British shoulders.

*Q. It appears that the US administration is covertly trying to oust democratically elected presidents in Venezuela, Cuba and Haiti, and the international free press appears to be ignoring what is going on. In addition, it seems that a US group called the National Endowment for Democracy and right wing oil interests in Venezuela are supporting NGOs there, calling for recall of President Chavez. In Haiti the Associated Press is taking sides with the opposition to the President, where a million strong showed up in support of Aristide but there are no reports in the newspapers. (1) Are these attempts orchestrated by the CIA and/or private American corporate interests? (2) Was the US administration directly or indirectly involved in the Haiti coup? (3) Are they also trying to oust Chavez in Venezuela?*

A. (1) By both the CIA and American corporate interests. (2) Yes, directly. The CIA placed Aristide in power. They also undermined him and eventually removed him when he went his own way. (3) Yes.

*Q. There will be worldwide peace marches and demonstrations on 20 March 2004, the anniversary of the day the war in Iraq began, to protest about "A year of lies: 20.3.03 to 20.3.04". Now that the war is over, do you think there is any point in doing this?*

A. Yes, very much so. The more the people of the world show their governments that they cannot make illegal wars in the name of their reluctant people, the sooner we will come to an end of this inglorious phase. Governments have to understand that their function is to serve the needs of their people, not to make war against other governments.

*Q. Stories have emerged of British soldiers during the recent war in Iraq being lamentably undersupplied with clothes and equipment. Some were sent into war with a ration of only five bullets because there were no more to go round and with mobile phones which were unworkable in the conditions, instead of reliable radio walkie-talkies. Could these reports really be true?*

A. Amazingly, yes. The British soldiers even got the nickname 'the borrowers' from the US soldiers. Such was the lack of equipment, even armoured jackets, that many soldiers looked fatalistically on their chances of survival.

*Q. I understand that Hierarchy will now throw Their weight (within karmic law, of course) behind whatever Democratic candidate we choose to challenge George W. Bush for the Presidency of the United States. (1) Could I ask your Master's opinion of Ralph Nader? He has worked with the Representative from the state of Ohio (and candidate for the Democratic nomination for President) Dennis Kucinich for many years and is likewise 'throwing his hat into the race' but as an Independent candidate. (2) Could Ralph Nader's candidacy affect the election of a Democrat by siphoning votes from the Democratic nominee, whoever that might be?*

A. (1) In the last election, quite apart from the corrupt counting (and not counting) of votes in Florida which gave Bush the Presidency with all its subsequent trauma for the world, only some 500 votes separated the candidates. The intervention of Nader — with no chance at all of winning — deprived Gore of the certainty of success. (2) Yes, of course.

## **May 2004**

*Q. Could your Master please say how many millions of people demonstrated around the world on 20 March 2004 — the first anniversary of the US/UK attack on Iraq? Did Maitreya and/or any of the other Masters join in the marches?*

A. Fifteen million. Yes. Maitreya marched in London, Amsterdam, Paris, Berlin, Düsseldorf, Rome, Madrid and New York.

*Q. On 11 March 2004 in Madrid, Spain, there were multiple terror bombings on the commuter train system that left at least 200 dead and more than 1,200 injured. It is the biggest terror attack in a European country in peace time. Was the attack perpetrated by the Basque separatist group ETA or by an Islamic group due to the Spanish involvement in the war against Iraq?*

A. My information is that it was a fringe group of ETA. That is why the main ETA group denied responsibility.

*Q. If ETA was responsible for the Madrid bombing, (1) did they plan the attack alone? (2) Did they execute the bombing by themselves or were they aided by other groups (Al-Qaeda, Islamic radical groups, paid mercenaries, or others)? (3) Why isn't the main Basque separatist movement claiming it?*

A. (1) Yes. (2) By themselves, but a fringe group only. They have no links with Al-Qaeda. (3) They did not organize it, and the Spanish public reacted with such shock when the government at first blamed ETA. They had never done anything on that scale before.

*Q. Are the claims made by Al-Qaeda (as being responsible for the bombing) authentic, in the sense that they were also involved, or are they using it in an opportunistic way to seed fear among people everywhere?*

A. Their claim is purely opportunistic.

*Q. Denials were issued by a spokesperson from ETA's political arm and from ETA itself concerning their involvement in the Madrid bombing. Due to the present situation with ETA weakened by their former leadership being in jail, is it possible that the bombing was performed by a radical wing of ETA without the other part of the organization knowing about it?*

A. That is precisely the case. A radical fringe group, impatient with the main ETA leadership, decided to go further than ETA has ever gone before with a very large, destructive attack for maximum effect. The Spanish Government was therefore correct in stating that the attack had "all the hallmarks" of ETA. The public, however, were angered that the government was trying to 'cover up' an Al-Qaeda attack (as a result of the government involvement in Iraq) by suggesting ETA was responsible. Immediately, the Bush Administration asked the Spanish Government (of the time) to drop all reference to ETA and announce that the culprits were Muslim terrorists, probably Al-Qaeda. This is now being done. A large group of Muslims, some from Morocco, have been arrested so far. They are not guilty of causing this tragic act. The CIA, as usual, have made attempts to lay 'evidence' — a bag with a Koran inside! It is of course, ammunition for President Bush's plans for re-election, that every terror attack be laid at the door of Al-Qaeda, guilty or not.

*Q. Is it too cynical to suspect US interference?*

A. The US has interfered to make Al-Qaeda the culprit.

*Q. If the US regime is involved in 'changing the facts' (1) how did they do it? Why? (2) Were so-called 'clues' authentic?*

A. (1) By pressuring the (then) Spanish Government. (2) They were not authentic, but given much publicity while any other possibility, eg ETA, was quickly dropped.

*Q. (1) Surely I'm not alone in thinking that if the US regime thought they could continue to hoodwink the public they would by now be parading the supposed Saddam Hussein figure as a vote catcher for the upcoming elections? As it is, we see and hear nothing of Saddam's poor double. (2) Is he still alive? (3) Where is he being held?*

A. (1) Probably, yes. They realize public exposure would lead to much rejection of their captive as Saddam Hussein. They most likely think he has served their immediate purpose. (2) Yes. (3) In the US.

*Q. What percentage of prisoners at Guantanamo Bay have been involved in terrorist activities?*

A. About one quarter — 25 per cent.

*Q. I have followed **Share International** for more than 10 years now. I have made donations, attended the meditations, read some of the books, read the website regularly, and seen Benjamin Creme in person in Los Angeles and London. In fact, I planned a London vacation with my family so I could attend a lecture. I am sensitive enough to feel the spiritual power around Mr Creme; this has kept me listening. However, while I find the spiritual guidance enlightening I find the politics often misguided. In particular I read the 'Questions and Answers' section of your magazine carefully every month and have become more and more dismayed at the political orientation of Mr Creme and **Share International**. It has kept me from deeper participation in the organization. Because there are so many outrageous and irresponsible assertions made that have no backing in any other source, I have begun to doubt the rest of the program. I am not asking you to hide your orientation. It is good that you expose it so openly. However, it does limit your*

*credibility with me and perhaps others. Best wishes in any case.*

A. I am sure the writer is not alone in his dissatisfaction with the political/economic element in *Share International*. I can understand his dismay at what he sees as a greater and greater encroachment on the 'spiritual' element of the magazine by the purely 'political'. When many of the political statements are deeply critical of the present US Administration and its massive contribution to the present chaos, fear and stress in the world, and the reader is American and sees US actions differently, it must be painful, vexing and embarrassing. So, too, it is for many here in Britain when we see our Government lying and spinning in support of US action. It should be remembered that our approach is never party-political and that the questions come from readers who no doubt are seeking truthful answers which they are not getting elsewhere. Certainly, they do not all find the answers to be "outrageous and irresponsible assertions" but ones which do indeed have the backing of Hierarchy. The avowed intention of *Share International* is to bring together the two major directions of New Age thinking — the political and the spiritual — to show the *synthesis* underlying the political, social, economic and spiritual changes now occurring globally. For *Share International*, everything that makes life better for humanity is spiritual, whether on the physical, the mental or the 'spiritual' plane. Why does Maitreya walk with the millions of protesters who call for political action to end war and injustice? The spiritual crisis through which we are all painfully moving is focused today in the political and economic fields. Only in these areas can it be solved and open the way for the establishment of right human relations.

Q. What do you and your Master think of the murder of Sheik Yassin, spiritual head of Hamas? What consequences should the world expect?

A. *It was terrorism at its most blatant, reckless and ruthless, and shows Sharon's contempt for and opposition to, the Peace process. It will only inflame the Middle East and lengthen the struggle for justice for the Palestinian people.*

Q. *Sharon says he wants to pull out of some of the Israeli settlements. Is this just a ruse? What's behind this?*

A. I am afraid Sharon's statements have no value in the context of his actions against the rights of the people of Palestine. He has no intention of surrendering land.

Q. *History shows that empires overreach themselves, are often too busy on too many fronts fighting real or imaginary or trumped-up enemies. (1) Is the American 'empire' entering the final phase of its existence? (2) What can bring America to its senses?*

A. (1) Yes. (2) Profound economic collapse.

Q. *Every day more evidence comes to light of the United States, through agencies such as the CIA, bullying other countries and manipulating their sovereign affairs (such as elections) to benefit the US. (1) Has this always gone on, and we are now seeing the corruption come to the surface, as Maitreya predicted? Or (2) has the present US Administration taken political corruption to new depths?*

A. The United States is a young country, dominated as a personality by the *lower aspects* of the 6th ray of idealism or devotion. It therefore suffers from all of the vices of the ray: devotion to its own interests, suspicion of others' motives, combativeness and self-assertion, self-deception about its own motives, etc, etc. Thus its bullying tactics are endemic and long-standing. Its inhabitants and governments believe they are spreading Freedom and Justice around the world, while they are actually serving their own interests. This self-deception is one of the chief characteristics of the ray. This political corruption has, therefore, always gone on; this Administration, led by fundamentalist extremists, is simply taking it to new depths. The world, as the Master Djwhal Khul has written through Alice Bailey, is waiting for the 2nd-ray soul of America to make its appearance felt, as it did through the Marshal Plan after World War II.

## June 2004

*Q. Could your Master say whether the photographs exposed in the media in April 2004, showing American and British soldiers abusing Iraqi prisoners, are authentic or fakes?*

A. My information is that in both cases, the American and British, the photographs are, sadly, true.

*Q. (1) What is Hierarchy's opinion of the Geneva peace proposal? (2) Should the Palestinians accept it?*

A. (1) It is unfair and unjust to Palestinian rights. (2) Obviously not. Only a fair and just agreement will last.

*Q. In El Salvador the US-backed right-wing candidate Tony Saca easily won in recent national elections, beating former guerrilla leader Schafik Handal. The Bush Administration was accused by some of meddling in the election by publicly backing Saca. Did the CIA actually interfere with the electoral process? If so, how?*

A. Yes. By organizing intimidation of the opposition supporters, and by bribes of cash for votes. Threats of bad effects on El Salvador/US relations and trade if the Left were to win the election were made publicly by US officials before the election. Last month Assistant Secretary of State Roger Noriega told voters to "consider what kind of a relationship they want a new Administration to have with us".

This prompted 28 members of Congress to send a letter to Secretary of State Colin Powell warning that Noriega's remarks were perceived as "interference in Salvadoran electoral affairs".

One of the signatories to the letter, Dennis Kucinich, said: "Unfortunately, what is going on in El Salvador is representative of a Latin American policy that is not about promoting healthy democracies, but instead focused on making Latin American nations bend to US commercial interests."

*Q. Is it acceptable for officials in one country to be crafting advisory documents for other countries? In 1996 Richard Perle (chairman of the Defense Policy Board, which advises the Pentagon) led a team which drafted an advisory document for the then Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu of Israel, entitled A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm — by which was meant Israel. In the document Netanyahu was advised to repeal the Oslo Agreement and "reassert Israel's claim to its land by rejecting 'land for peace' as the basis for peace". He was also encouraged to strengthen defense so as to be able to confront Syria and Iraq, to build closer links with the USA for mutual interest, and, together with Turkey and Jordan, be able to weaken Syria. The document also stated: "This effort can focus on removing Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq — an important Israeli strategic objective in its own right ..." The document also called for the "re-establishing of the principle of pre-emption". (Source of quote and information: Secrets and Lies, by Dilip Hiro.) (1) Does this bear out your information that the idea of pre-emptive strikes far pre-dated the attack on Iraq? (2) How closely is the US Administration involved in Israeli policy and politics?*

A. (1) Yes, indeed. The Six-Day War of 1967, launched by Israel against Jordan, Syria and Egypt, was a 'pre-emptive strike'. Actually, none of these countries was in a position to attack Israel except, perhaps, Egypt — the only one with whom Israel has signed a peace accord. (2) Very closely. Hence the ability of Israel to flout the United Nations resolutions against her. The US uses the veto to protect Israel.

## July/August 2004

*Q. (1) Did licence to torture, or the creation of a climate in which torture and human rights abuses could take place, come from top echelons of the US administration? (2) Did Bush, Cheney, Rumsfeld, Powell, Rice, et al in the USA, and Blair in the UK, know about the torture? (3) Does the same apply to UK government or military top men?*

A. (1) Certainly a climate in which abuse was acceptable had been created. (2) Bush and Rumsfeld knew that a very hard policy, including torture, was in place. (3) No.

*Q. When the revelations about the abuse of prisoners in Iraq were at their height, a video was released on the internet apparently showing the beheading of an American, Nick Berg. There are rumours that he was not alive when he was beheaded. The video-counter on the film of the beheading shows editing, and 'time-jumps'; the body did not exhibit the usual involuntary reactions normally associated with decapitation. It is also said that the men standing behind Berg were not Muslims, but possibly Russian mercenaries. (1) Was it staged? (2) If so, who killed him?*

A. (1) Yes. (2) Iraqi Ba'athists.

## **September 2004**

*Q. (1) Could you please say how many civilians have been killed in Iraq since the beginning of the war? (2) How many Iraqis have been severely injured or permanently maimed? (3) How many Iraqi children have been killed? (4) How many permanently maimed? How many (5) US and (6) British military and/or support personnel have been killed?*

A. (1) Around 25,000. (2) 350,000 approximately. (3) 846. (4) 3,500. (5) 850 so far. (6) 260 so far. [As of 28 June 2004]

*Q. Saddam Hussein has just sent a message via the Red Cross to his 'daughters' saying that he is "still in good spirits". Readers of Share International will have read that the real Saddam Hussein is dead. Could you say why the stand-in is still pretending?*

A. He is still obeying instructions to keep up the pretence as long as possible for the sake of loyal Ba'athist Iraqis. Sooner or later, his identity will be questioned and the truth will be revealed.

*Q. (1) Can this show-trial taking place with the Saddam Hussein impostor be viewed as another desperate attempt taken by the US administration to win over public opinion as the November Presidential elections approach? (2) Was there much discussion or even dissent in the administration about putting this impostor on trial? (3) I cannot imagine the impostor voluntarily accepting a sentence, whether death or prison, for Saddam Hussein's crimes. (4) Perhaps they have made some sort of an agreement with him? Or (5) perhaps they have considered having him silenced in some fashion? (6) Surely, elements of the world media must now be questioning the authenticity of this man's claim, but do you believe they will do so publicly, and what holds them back?*

A. (1) Yes. (2) Yes. (3) That is what he is doing. (4) No. (5) Yes. (6) Doubt. Lack of proof. They find it hard to believe that the US Administration would go so far.

*Q. How many international treaties, international laws or resolutions are being contravened in (1) the Guantanamo Bay detention centre; (2) by the USA in Iraq; and (3) in the Middle East in general? (4) How many by the British forces in Iraq? (5) How many UN resolutions, international laws and treaties are being contravened by Israel and (6) by the Palestinians?*

A. (1) 14. (2) 14. (3) 14. (4) 14. (5) 63. (6) 5.

*Q. I am concerned by the political stance of the messages in Share International. Specifically, the continual insistence that the man captured is not Saddam Hussein and that a radical arm of ETA, and not an Al-Qaida wing, carried out the Madrid bombings. Neither of these assertions has any basis in reality. Indeed, strong physical evidence has shown that in both cases the opposite is true - and it's not just the US government making those claims, but the entire world. I'd like to know what answer you have for me and others who may have these same questions.*

A. With respect, the entire world is not making these claims but merely taking the

assertions of the US Administration without challenge. I have answered questions at length in previous editions of Share International [May 2003, Jan/Feb and May 2004] on the so-called capture of 'Saddam Hussein ' and given my reasons for doubting the authenticity of his capture, and, likewise, my information, as given by Hierarchy, on the Madrid train bombing [SI May 2004]. If the questioner cannot accept my information, then so be it. I cannot be expected to change it for her comfort. By the way, my information that the Madrid train bombing was the work of a radical fringe group of ETA referred only to the train bombing, not to the subsequent attacks.

#### October 2004

*Q. Was there any involvement of Al-Qaeda in the Beslan school tragedy or were the hostage-takers all Chechans?*

A. No. They were mostly Chechen but a number were from neighbouring areas.

*Q. On 7 September 2004 thousands of people spontaneously congregated in Red Square, Moscow, to show solidarity with the people of Beslan, call the government into question over its handling of the school tragedy and to denounce terrorism. It was an unprecedented display of Russian 'people power'. Can your Master say how many gathered there?*

A. Roughly 300,000.

*Q. How should Russia deal with its erstwhile Soviet Republics? Is Chechen independence (and that of other countries in a similar relationship to Moscow) part of the divine plan?*

A. It is part of the divine Plan that all peoples should be free agents of their own evolution and destiny. Russia should have long ago acceded to Chechnya's demands for some form of autonomy.

*Q. Is Maitreya still marching with demonstrators, for example in the latest marches in Venezuela, Berlin, or New York?*

A. Yes, indeed. He took part in the marches in Berlin and New York while the Master Jesus marched in Venezuela.

*Q. Besides voting for Kerry, how can we get rid of the evil men who run this country [the US] now?*

A. Learn, and be ready, to SHARE. Influence the Congressmen and Senators of both parties to see the necessity of SHARING as the only answer to all the problems of today — economic, political, environmental, terrorism, war. Evil can only exist in its own likeness. America is rich, powerful and greedy, and most Americans must like it that way. Change that, and save America and the world.

*Q. What do we tell people who are planning to vote for Ralph Nader? Sure, we would much rather have Nader for US President, but he will not win and may take votes from Kerry.*

A. Absolutely. That is exactly what will happen if you vote for Nader. Personally I have a lot of respect for Nader's ideas. He is a little bit fanatical for my taste. He does seem to have a certain, shall we say, megalomania and is running in a presidential race knowing that he has no possible chance to win. To vote for Nader is a complete loss of the vote for a Democratic President. He should, to my mind, follow Dennis Kucinich's action and align himself behind Kerry and make sure of a Democratic win. This is too serious, too important, not only for America but for the whole world, to play a personal game such as Nader seems to be doing.

*Q. Do you think Kerry will win?*

A. My own personal feeling is that Kerry will win, but only if you vote. If you think Kerry will win and it does not matter because Mr Creme thinks so (which would be stupid), if

you think that and therefore do not take the trouble to go down and vote, then he will not win. You have to vote for him. You have to get the young people out in the millions to vote for him.

I personally would prefer Kucinich above everybody, and it may be that in the next election in four years' time Kucinich will be the one. But obviously he is too radical for the present America, and he would not win. But Kerry has every chance of winning. He is a decent man, a good man, has good intentions and is worth voting for.

*Q. Spiritual teachers of the past that we know of were not associated with politics but focused on spiritual development. I am puzzled by your focus on politics. Please explain.*

A. Because I am interested in love, in justice and freedom for everyone. Politics, economics, that is reality. That is spiritual. Where do you stop being spiritual? When do you stop being spiritual? How do you measure the degree of spirituality in a person? Everything in life is spiritual — we live in a spiritual universe. It could not be otherwise. The trouble is, we do not make it spiritual. We have the most corrupt politics that have ever been devised, the most corrupt economic structures ever devised by man. They are not spiritual but they should be, and must be, spiritual.

What I am talking about is spiritual politics, spiritual economics, and you will find that the Christ Himself, the Lord Maitreya Himself, the World Teacher, will concentrate in the beginning on politics and on economics. What I am saying comes from Him. These are His thoughts, His ideas. Politics, economics, should be the most spiritual things. Politics is about how people live together and economics is about how we distribute the world's resources. If you are not spiritual, you do it badly, like today. Who is spiritual — these spiritual teachers you are talking about, or me, who is interested in how people live? You cannot talk about spiritual development to people who have to work 16 hours a day for a dollar a day, to keep their family from starving. The crisis today is a spiritual one, is focused in the political and economic fields, and can only be resolved in these fields.

*Q. You said you heard not one mention of sharing at the US Democratic Party national convention in July 2004. How are the Democrats going to be any different than the Republicans? Sharing doesn't seem to be a concept of either party.*

A. And you will certainly hear even less mention of sharing during the Republican convention. It is true, sharing does not seem to be a concept of either party, which means sharing is not a concept in the minds and hearts of the American people. All the more reason, therefore, for those who do believe in sharing as the only way to go forward into the future to make it known and change the present attitude. It has to start somewhere, and, of course, despite appearances, there are many American people who recognize this truth.

*Q. If the whole political institution is Piscean, and in my opinion, very corrupt, how will it make a difference who is elected US president in November?*

A. This seems to me to be a very superficial view of the US political situation today. Seldom has it been so polarized as it is now, and, seldom has it been so important for the world that the American people make the right choice on 2 November. Although there are Republicans who will vote Democrat out of disgust at the lies and corruption of the present administration, and Democrats (mainly Southern) who are very conservative (and Piscean) and who will vote for Bush, the differences in outlook of these two parties, I should have thought, have never been clearer. One seems hell-bent on confrontation and war at any cost, however illegal and unjustified; the other more stable, willing to work with the United Nations and with less grandiose plans for a Pax Americana and US domination of the world. I would say there is about 45 per cent difference in the approach of these parties.

November 2004

*Q. (1) Which has more power in the USA — the Pentagon or the White House? (2) Are there other more powerful cliques in the US?*

A. (1) Without doubt, the Pentagon. (2) Yes, several.

*Q. Do you subscribe to Donald Rumsfeld's notion that a 'little bit of democracy is better than no democracy at all'? Perhaps this might be true in terms of Iraq?*

A. "A little bit of democracy" might be seen to act as an example, and therefore "better" than no democracy at all, but the question is: what does Donald Rumsfeld mean by democracy in Iraq? The Americans have imposed a puppet administration most of whom will, I presume, be candidates for election if and when elections can be held. Mr Rumsfeld also used the fact that in America, for instance, less than 40 per cent of the electorate actually use their right to vote. So, his thinking extrapolates, if only 40 per cent of Iraqis vote we have democracy! The difference being, of course, that democracy means one has a right to vote, or not to vote, for a candidate of one's choice. Iraq is so divided into different peoples, religions, aspirations and values that a true democracy emerging from the present chaos created by the American and British invasion must surely be a long-term hope.

*Q. The current US administration seems subtly to be preparing public opinion for a possible attack on Syria and Iran by referring to the potential threat they pose. How likely is a US attack on Syria and/or Iran?*

A. This certainly seems to be the case — depending on who wins the US Presidential Election. If (God forbid) the present incumbent wins a second term, then it is most likely high on their agenda, if and when some stability can be achieved in Iraq. Iran is large and militarily strong, so Syria seems a more likely target, with the advantage of help from Israel. The attitude to both, at the moment, is that of the bully who keeps others docile by threat of attack.

*Q. I'm not a pessimist but what will happen on the international scene if President Bush remains in the White House?*

A. As my Master says in His article: the alternative to a victory for Kerry and common sense and peace "is too terrible to contemplate".

*Q. Recently a bomb killed a Hamas leader in Damascus. Could this act be the beginning of an Israeli-US attack on Syria?*

A. No, I think not. Israel now believes, under the umbrella of American power and protection, that it can do whatever it sees fit against 'terrorism'. With Iraq still in chaos, the US would be chary of an immediate attack on Syria.

*Q. India, Brazil, Germany and Japan may take their places in the Security Council — do you consider that this would make the Council more representative? Is this the kind of reform you have indicated in past issues of Share International?*

A. Of course, it would widen the base from which the Security Council speaks and acts and is a step in the right direction. However, I believe that the Security Council has now fulfilled its original function of keeping the peace, with five member states who had nuclear weapons. Now, openly or not, according to my Master, 24 states have nuclear weapons. The veto which the original members still hold, I believe should be abolished. The true United Nations is the General Assembly of all the nations.

*Q. To some people, both inside and outside the groups working for Maitreya, the notion that a Master would take sides as your Master did in His latest article in Share International and speak so politically, is strange and unexpected. Why does your Master think it is so important? And what does Maitreya think about the US elections?*

A. It is obvious from the article in this issue that Hierarchy see this coming election in the USA as critical for the immediate future of the world.

(See also Benjamin Creme's 'Letter from the Editor' earlier in this issue.)

*Q. The Marshall Plan, which you featured in a recent Share International [July/Aug 2004], was based on the United States giving supplies and aid to war-torn Europe. You indicate that there should be something like the Marshall Plan again. Do you mean that, once again, it's up to the USA to provide for everyone else? Is the USA supposed to give and the others just take?*

A. Ordinary Americans were wonderfully generous in giving aid to Europe on a large scale after the war, but the Marshall Plan was introduced on the basis of 'lease-lend' and was the main agent of Europe's regeneration and reconstruction.

What I would like to see is the USA, which alone uses (and wastes) a quarter of the world's resources, giving a lead to the other developed nations in sharing these resources more equitably. Plans, developed under the inspiration of Hierarchy, already exist for this new form of distribution — which is at the heart of the world's economic problems — to be realized.

*Q. George W. Bush, as many know, is a 'Born Again' Christian. Most Christian fundamentalists believe that the world is going to end and the Christian community will be the only people "saved". Some fundamentalists go so far as to accept that a nuclear Armageddon will be the way the world will end. (1) Is the current Administration's belief (or illusion) in this possible Armageddon scenario the reason why they decided to scrap a key nuclear arms agreement between the USA and Russia? (2) In President Bush's televised speech the night of 4 April 2004, he went on to say words to the effect that God was behind our nation and he was chosen to lead. Does religious fundamentalism have a greater impact on our Administration's current agenda than most Americans believe? (3) Is that one reason for the conservative right's standing behind Israel?*

A. (1) No. There are those in the Pentagon and Congress (of both parties) who have long had a basic mistrust of Russia (despite agreements and treaties). (2) Yes. (3) No. The conservative right are not alone in their standing behind Israel. This stand has two main causes: it is a relic of the time of the Cold War when Israel and the Arab countries were used by the US and Russia as 'pawns' in the Middle East. The other reason is that Jews are very influential in almost every aspect of American life: political, economic, financial, cultural, social. The 'Jewish vote', therefore, is taken very seriously in elections. It has been, traditionally, mainly Democrat.

*Q. For years, I have been hearing about the coming economic collapse that will crash the markets and change the world. Today people from many levels of wisdom from economists to intuitives suggest 2005 to be the time we really see some dramatic signs of this collapse. Recent events like the 'dot.com' crash, the corporate scandals, the outsourcing of jobs overseas, and even the war seem to impact only certain groups of people in America, but there never seems to be any event that really changes our basic standard of living. Can you see any specific events happening in the next year or so that will actually begin to change the American economy and the American standard of living in a dramatic visible way?*

A. The year 2005 may well be the year in which many diverse forces come together to create the conditions in which a major market crash in America and Europe can take place. As everyone knows, there has been growing instability in the markets as a whole over many years, despite the success of individual units. Nothing remains the same for ever, and the many examples mentioned in the question, especially the war in Iraq, could drive the American market to its final collapse. The European markets would inevitably follow the same trend.

*Q. (1) How likely is the threat of nuclear attack by terrorists? (2) Is the danger of such an attack being exaggerated by the US government? (3) If so, why? (4) What is the effect on a nation's psyche (and its individual citizens) to be kept in a state of constant fear, anxiety and stress?*

A. Not very likely. The launching of nuclear weapons, even if available, is not at all easy for 'amateurs' to carry out. (2) Yes. (3) To keep the people alive to the possible danger of terrorist attack and so strengthen the government's position as 'protectors' of the

people. (4) The stress created affects the people's ability to analyze and assess government action, so they become more obedient.

December 2004

*Q. As a US citizen I am deeply concerned by the re-election of George Bush. When I read this comment from the Master via Benjamin Creme, my concern increases: "Q: What will happen on the international scene if President Bush remains in the White House? BC: As my Master says in His article, the alternative to a victory for Kerry and common sense and peace 'is too terrible to contemplate'." [SI November 2004]*

*In one of the Master's articles from several years ago, He assures us that Light will prevail and says: "There is no need to fear in the present conflict" and "this being so, naught can disturb the plan for the rehabilitation of the world". Has the re-election of Bush created something that has altered the greater Plan spoken of? "Too terrible to contemplate" is certainly a long way from: "naught can disturb the plan for the rehabilitation of the world". Thank you for your time and dedication in this most challenging of times.*

A. No. The Plan is working out despite the troubles on the physical plane. The American people will realize the mistake they have made and come back into reality — but will have to suffer a bit first, I'm afraid. Also, Kerry really won the election; only the cheating and vote-rigging of his opponents robbed him of the prize, and these Americans are still there and will not give up.

*Q. (1) Does the final outcome in the US Presidential election accurately reflect the preference of those who voted, or (2) was there any corruption or manipulation which might have changed the outcome? If so, (3) which side cheated more? (4) If the results were 'fixed', by which methods was it done?*

A. (1) No. My information is that there was much cheating. (2) Yes, Kerry should narrowly have won Ohio and Florida and the Presidency. I am afraid it is the same old story, more expertly performed this time. (3) The Republicans. It seems that cheating by Democrats was minimal and only on a personal basis, but cheating by Republicans was pre-planned and widespread, especially with the new electronic machines. (4) Pre-programmed electronic voting systems and various other methods, cruder but just as effective — delayed postal votes, double voting, non-counting of votes, and more. Of course, the marginal (swing) states like Florida and Ohio were targeted and the machines were programmed to change every fifth vote for Kerry to a vote for Bush. However, even without 'stolen' votes, Bush, like Gore last time, did in fact decisively win the popular vote which I personally prefer as a record of democratic public opinion.

*Q. In view of the very suspect election results in the US could your Master please say how many Democrat votes were illegally blocked by one means or another?*

A. 2.5 per cent.

*Q. In Ohio unemployment is rising and there are various well-grounded reasons for discontent among voters; please help a European understand the results. It seems incredible and illogical to vote for a government which causes hardship at home and chaos abroad!*

A. My information is that it was a very flawed election again. It hardly seems possible that Ohio would not bend over backwards to deliver a Democratic victory.

*Q. Could Bush's win in the US election actually hasten Maitreya's public emergence, by bringing forward the economic crash, because of Bush's destructive economic policies?*

A. No, I don't think so.

*Q. (1) With Bush's 'win', does that bring the world closer to the "edge of the abyss" that Maitreya has mentioned? (2) Do you have any sense of how long we would have to be*

*stumbling along the edge of the abyss before we come to our senses? Or will other factors such as a financial crisis bring us to our senses?*

A. (1) No. The Plan is working out. (2) Changes are already under way. Watch very carefully, and as Maitreya says: "Fear not!"

*Q. Can we (please) expect Maitreya to do His first interview sooner than perhaps even He planned before the elections in the US?*

A. No, I don't think so, but in any case, my information is that we do not have long to wait.

*Q. (1) Is there anything that anyone, including those in the 'Emergence groups', both in America and around the world, can do to help speed Maitreya's emergence? (2) Is it more imperative than ever now that your information be made known as widely as possible?*

A. (1) Make His presence known! (2) Yes.

*Q. Will the outcome of the US elections polarize society both in the US and abroad even more than it is already?*

A. Yes, for a time. Eventually, and relatively soon, Maitreya's hand and energies, especially those of the Spirit of Peace and Equilibrium, will make their presence felt more strongly, and unexpected and welcome changes will take place worldwide. This is not the end of the world.

*Q. I know several people who seem quite compassionate, sincere, and intelligent, but who none the less whole-heartedly support George W. Bush and apparently believe that what he and his administration are doing is in the best interest of the United States and the world. How can this be? Can you shed some light on this apparent paradox?*

A. Mr Bush's supporters, half the American electorate, must have among them many people who are sincere, intelligent and reasonably compassionate (if only on a rather narrow front). What they do seem to share is an extraordinary political naiveté which allows them to return to power a man who has lied to them; led them into a disastrous war; squandered their economic well-being and limited their traditional liberties in the name of a vain 'war on terror'. I believe it is the result of the destructive self-deception of America's 6th-ray personality, in other words, glamour, illusion and fear.

*Q. Do you think Osama bin Laden timed his video precisely because it suits his purposes to have Bush in the White House?*

A. Yes.

*Q. (1) With the Bush 'win', can we suppose that at least half of all Americans are scared silly? (2) Can we also suppose that their present leadership has succeeded in literally scaring the wits out of them?*

A. (1) Yes. (2) Yes.

*Q. President Putin congratulated the American people for "not giving in to terror". (1) Am I insane to think that is just exactly what they did — give in to fear and the 'bogeyman' of terror? (2) No doubt we can expect more trauma for both Chechens and Russian citizens.*

A. (1) That is exactly true. 9/11 completely traumatized the American people whose fear was worked on and kept going by the Bush administration. (2) I'm afraid so, yes, but that would still happen if Kerry had been elected.

*Q. What can we expect from Israel with Bush's so-called victory? What effect will it have on Israeli policy?*

A. More of the same. They will be delighted. It will strengthen their hand and tough action, but Mr Bush is committed to addressing the Israeli/Palestinian problem and has

spoken specifically about the necessity of a 'viable' Palestinian homeland. So the Israelis will have to compromise.

*Q. Many people in the media seem to believe that Sharon's Gaza 'pull-out' policy is a genuine move towards peace. Your comment please?*

A. I do not share that belief. I think the exodus of 8,000 Israelis from Gaza is seen by them as a bargain 'quid pro quo' for hundreds of thousands of Israelis in huge and continuing settlements in the West Bank, which was to be the Palestinian homeland. Now, only a fraction remains to the Palestinians as a viable home, and no curb on the building of Israeli settlements has been imposed.

*Q. The national security adviser to the first President Bush, Brent Scowcroft, has said recently that the current President Bush is influenced to a great degree by the Israeli Prime Minister Sharon. "Sharon just has him wrapped around his little finger," Mr Scowcroft was quoted as having said in his interview to the UK's Financial Times. He was also quoted as saying the US President is "mesmerized" by the Israeli Prime Minister. (1) Does this have something to do with the fact that Prime Minister Sharon is wielding some very powerful black forces? (2) President Bush is obviously influenced by those forces as well but is Sharon more 'under their spell', so-to-speak?*

A. Israel is the central point in the triangle Israel-USA-States in Eastern Europe, and Mr Sharon is the most powerful exponent of the nefarious energies which are used and potentized by that triangle. It follows, therefore, that he has much influence over Mr Bush and his entourage.

*Q. South America has succeeded in electing three left-wing leaders, unlike America. Do you think it could lead to really useful co-operation and a new chapter in social reform and improved living standards for South America in general?*

A. Yes. Profound changes are taking place, and will continue to do so, in South America and elsewhere, which are quite separate and distinct from events in the USA. These will change the meaning and appearance of the 'leadership of the free world' by the USA which will be seen more and more to be tackling only old problems in old ways. Unless the USA grasps the challenge of change in a speedily changing world, it will be bypassed and left behind by countries undergoing positive change of their own, leaving the USA isolated and strong — but impotent.