

**Subject:** The Lost Years. Part 3.

**From:** "John Winston" <johnfw@mlode.com>

**Date:** 29/01/2012, 22:36

**Newsgroups:** alt.conspiracy.area-51

Subject: The Lost Years. Part 3.

Jan. 29, 2012.

This talks about his travels in India.

.....  
.....

S: Thank you. When you say that, ♦I studied with Greeks and Romans,♦ are you saying that you studied with them in Alexandria, or did you go on the same philosopher♦s circuit that Apollonius of Tyana did, namely to Delphi, Egypt, Persia, India?

J: Yes, I travelled a great deal in my early years, as a young man ♦ as an adolescent, and as a young man. My family felt that it was very important. My mother in particular knew the universality of the messages that I would come to share with many, and she wanted me to be fully prepared. Now, she did not always understand when I would challenge or debate, shall we say, some of my teachers.

But they always understood. They welcomed the conversations and different insights. There was no restriction. You see, this is what has been misunderstood. There has always been a feeling that the belief system was very constricted, and it was not. So yes, I was exposed and studied and went on many pilgrimages.

S: Apollonius of Tyana describes a circuit that many people followed almost as if it was well known in those days ♦

J: [ ? ] sequential.

S: Sequential. Did you actually set out to follow that same circuit?

J: Not step by step by step. But through exposure, yes, we did. And when I say we, I mostly mean that I was always accompanied by someone from my family.

S: All right. I know that we have many listeners in India, and I♦m sure they would be most interested to know where you went in India at this time, whom you studied with, what lineage they were or what path they followed.

J: What you would think of is it would be the path of Hinduism. It is the path of the M-sters, of the Teachers, of the Yogis.

S: Would you have made a distinction between, say, Vedanta [the non-dual path] or karma yogis [the path of service], or bhakti [the path of devotion], at that time?

J: At that time, no, we did not. There was very little. It was more preferential, but it would be more bhakti [devotion than anything, if you were to look at it in terms of today's. But it was also very rigorous in terms of also physical discipline and training as well.

S: And where did you go in India to study?

J: Everywhere.

S: I passed a marker outside of Pondicherry that celebrated the passage of Matsya, the fish prophet. Was that you?

J: Yes. Yes, it was.

S: That's very, very interesting. What else should we know about these years before you started your ministry? What else would be relevant to us appreciating you as you began your ministry? What was important?

J: What I would want people to know ♦ yes, in India, in Africa, in the Himalayas, certainly, in what you think of now as the Middle East ♦ was the universality. My family obviously was in the Judaic tradition. But the level of sophistication ♦ and yes, because I had the privilege to travel, to study, but also to work along side many fellow travelers, I was not alone.

And I never thought of myself as the only voice, or the only teacher, or the only way. I was one. I was one where the Word, because of the Ho-y Sp-rit, was in flesh. But I certainly was not the only one.

So there are those who have said oh, yes, Je--us, another prophet. And then there are those who take great offense at that. I do not. Because each tradition that I have studied, whether it was in India or Egypt or in the temples, or at home, whether it was with the philosophers or the rabbis, they all were really telling me and teaching me the same thing.

And it was ironic in many ways. Yes, I understood ♦ and it was rigorous! Do not think that I got to go on tour and live in the lap of luxury, because there was none of that. Yes, I was attended to. But it was far from luxurious. And there were times when my family depended on the extended family, always, for support. But it was considered important ♦ because everyone knew that I was being prepared so that I know all paths.

So this is not meant in any way to say that what I taught came from here or there. And, yes, I have traveled, even further than most think. As I travel these days, amongst your star brothers and sisters. But it is the universality, it is the community sp-rit that I would wish to emphasize, it is the community of love.

And that was the message I received. I received it from the high priests. I received it from the yogis, I received it from the teachers and the ma-ters, from the rabbis. They all had valuable teachings, and they taught me also not to be arrogant or conceited, to bring humility to my work, and to know that I was simply honored to be in service, as are each of you.

S: Well, you have mentioned the Ho-y Spi-it in flesh, so I'm going to turn at this moment to another line of questioning. I'm quite sure we're not going to get finished with our discussion today, so if you'd be so kind as to return next week, we can continue and I won't try and rush through this, if that's satisfactory to you.

J: Yes, and why do you think I have turned it in this direction, dear friend?

S: Very good. Thank you. I know I can rely on you to guide me. You mentioned the Hol- Spiri- in flesh, and that raises questions about your ministry. Do you consider that the word "avatar" applies to you and your ministry? Sri Ramakrishna says....

J: Avatar is not a word that I particularly cherish. (3) Let me put it that way.

S: All right.

J: There are those who wish to label me as an avatar. And I would accept that label, but I would not choose it. I would choose the label, or the description, of teacher.

S: Okay. Well, maybe we could creep up on it then from another route. Sri Ramakrishna considers you an avatar and publicly declared that. Can we talk about who was here then, please? You were here in bodily form. But ♦

J: Yes.

S: ♦ Sananda was also here overlighting you, was he not?

J: Yes.

S: So that would be a second layer to your ministry, so to speak, the overlighting.

J: That is correct.

S: And then in addition to that, the -oly -pirit descended into your form. Is that correct?

J: That is correct.

S: And did that, by the way, happen when you were being baptized in the River Jordan?

J: No, it happened at a very early age, actually. The baptism was a symbolic refilling, if you want to put it that way. But, no, in order for me to go forward in my journey on Earth, there was an infilling of the Ho-ly Spi-it at a very early age, of about five, five and a half. And then it was renewed,

or ♦ symbolically renewed - so that the people would know that this was available to everybody.

S: All right. Well, if you were the human form that was overlit by a spirit as exalted as Sananda, and the H-ly S-irit descended in you, that I would call an "avatar." Would you disagree?

J: [Laughs] I do not disagree. I simply say to you that it is a designation that I am not so eager to claim.

S: Okay.

J: Yes, I will accept it. You know there was so much controversy, when I did walk the Earth, not only about my family ♦s position but about the p-litics of the ♦King of the -ews ♦ and wanting leadership and p-litical intrigue. So I am always very hesitant to give myself or to accept designations.

S: I accept that.

J: And I will tell you why. Because you, or your listeners, will then say, ♦Oh, well, he had this overlighting, he had this infilling, and that makes him different or separate, ♦ and it does not. If anything, it allows me to be closer to you.

S: All right, I accept that, Lor-

J: All right. So I have made my point, then! [laugh]

S: Yes, -ord.

J: And I want you to accept, each one of you, I have often teased this ch-nnel that you are M-in-Ms, ma-ters-in-the-making, but now we will call you A-in-Ms, avatars-in-the-making.

S: [chuckles] All right. I had another question for you, but it ♦s entirely slipped my mind. Were you in fact married to Mary M-gdalene?

J: Let me put it this way. Yes.

S: All right. Formally married? I don ♦t know the customs of that age, so forgive me if I ♦ve asked an indelicate question, but married according to ♦

J: She was not my mistress, dear heart, so yes, we were formally married. She was my beloved wife. She was my s-cred other. She was my d-vine other. She was my partner, that made my walk on Earth full with joy ♦ and more human. It was anticipated, you know, that a young man would marry. But it was not simply because of custom, or because I wished to be part of or separate, it was because I wished to be in sa-red union with my Ma-dalena.

The love that we have shared was deep and profound. And there have been many who have naysayed and made up many myths and stories about her. But she was my support as I was hers. She was my sounding board. It was a very difficult.

When we came together, she knew. We discussed very fully what the future held and the road that we would walk together. She was one who always prepared ritual, and helped to put ceremony, often, around our situations.

Now, as you well know from the Egyptians, and from the travels to India, I had learned about ritual and ceremony and the importance of it. But in many ways, even from the family that I was raised in, I was a very relaxed and casual person. I wanted to move amongst the people.

And often she would say, yes, we will move amongst the people, and we will have the joining and the teaching, but let us put some ceremony and ritual, for she had also been trained in this way. So yes, not only was I married, we had a family as well.

Part 3.

John Winston. [johnfw@mlode.com](mailto:johnfw@mlode.com)