

Original video post on “Aeon Byte Gnostic Radio” YouTube channel:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Svp8SfxJqFO>

Video repost on “benpadiiah” YouTube channel:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=twA5PsbTKEA>

Permalink to audio post on google drive:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1YMwBk89IlpOXDCJj0y079vxJiT2QVftd/view?usp=sharing>

Permalink to transcript of interview on google drive:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1DOPcPGskOB36UYasjc10gH2b2Wr_CF5G/view?usp=sharing

Reverend Jonathan Barlow Gee is a 43 year old author of over 50 books, all offered as free pdfs online. His main work, the "metaphysicians' desk reference" has been available in print since 2003. He began researching the topics of "metaphysics," mysticism, magick and esoterica in highschool in the mid-1990's, and has since copiously studied the works of the QBLH, John Dee's "Enochian" theurgy, the Gnostic apocrypha and researched the modern sciences as much as ancient histories. His comparative models are available on his websites and through the group he founded called the "Pythagorean Order of Death." The stated purpose of the "Pythagorean Order of Death" is the "restoration of Atlantean Democracy" - a model for global government based on idealizing number-theory.

<http://www.benpadiiah.com>

<http://pythagoreanorderofdeath.ning.com>

<https://issuu.com/benpadiiah>

<https://www.youtube.com/c/benpadiiah>

Table of Contents*:

(M&V meet JBG) Introductions = 00:00:00

Q's & A's:

(M) How did JBG get started in occult research? = 00:02:01

(M) What is the Pythagorean Order of Death? = 00:03:18

(M) What are some tenants of the POD? = 00:05:17

(M) What are the psychic revolutionaries
& the psychic conspirators? = 00:08:15

(M) Who are the Neo-Sethians? = 00:12:52

(M) How Is Aleister Crowley Neo-Sethian? = 00:14:20

(M) Does the Order of Death date to Atlantis? = 00:20:32

Miguel asks Vance's opinion = 00:22:40

(V) How does “death” factor into global governance and ESP? = 00:23:04

(V) Can you use ESP to communicate with the dead? = 00:25:35

(V) Is “Atlantean Democracy” like modern “globalism”? = 00:26:43

(V) Should there be “layers of gov't” or one central hub? = 00:27:51

(M) What is JBG's “take” on so-called “reptilians”? = 00:29:34

(M) Have JBG's views changed with the “strangeness” of 2020? = 00:33:57

(M) Who are the “Great Burners”? = 00:37:03

(M) Who might be a “Burner” today? = 00:38:52

(V) Is George Soros a possible “Burner”? = 00:40:31
(M) What does JBG think about early Christianity? = 00:44:30
(M) Who were Jesus’ Apostles? = 00:45:35
(M) What does JBG think about the “Apocryphon of John”? = 00:55:24
(M) Did Mary Magdalene write the Nag Hammadi
& James the Just write the Dead Sea Scrolls? = 00:57:53
(M) How does Paul fit into early Christianity? = 00:59:50
(M) What is JBG’s opinion of the Gnostic deity, Abraxas? = 01:02:25
(M) What about Enoch, the Watchers and the Giants? = 01:05:36
(V) Has JBG had any “experiences” with non-physical beings? = 01:12:02
(JBG & V) discussion of tachyons, heliocentrism
& the dual loci points of gravity in orbits = 01:14:41
(M) What does JBG think about modern “conspiracy theories”? = 01:18:53
(M) Why did JBG make a video about the “Sith” from Star Wars? = 01:22:26
(M) What historical religion is most like the “Sith” theology? = 01:23:59
(M) Are the “Sith” Gnostic? = 1:24:22
(JBG, M&V) discussion of Disney’s Star Wars = 01:26:04
(M) JBG describes his video, “Pyramids: Prodigy of Atlantis” = 01:27:40
(M) does JBG see the pyramids as tombs? = 01:29:22
(M) What were the purpose of the pyramids? = 01:30:02
(V) Were the pyramids involved with initiations
& astronomical sightings? = 01:32:17
(JBG) links to work = 01:33:46
(M&V thank JBG) Conclusions = 01:35:24

* All time-stamps are coded to:
Video repost on “benpadiiah” YouTube channel:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=twA5PsbTKEA>

M: This is the Aeon Byte interview, and with us we have the pleasure of being joined by Jonathan Barlow Gee. Jonathan, thank you very much for coming on the show, and how are you?

J: I’m very good, thank you very much for having me.

M: The pleasure is all ours. As we talked, I love your body of work, you’ve done such great scholarship for many years, from all these fascinating topics, your insights are engaging, they’re intriguing, really good scholarship, I think our audience will love your body of work and everything else. But before we get to that, I’d like to welcome too, the moon-dog Vance. Vance, how are you?

V: Okay, just weathering power-outages and so forth here in sunny California, but we’ll hear about spiritual power now, right?

M: Yes we will, and like I was telling you, maybe Governor Newsom needed to save some money to pay for his tab at the French Laundry, so that’s California, because we are here

in the middle of a snowstorm and the power's fine, so the spirits, the winter spirits are with us.

M: So Jonathan, when I was doing all this research, I was like, god, you're like the renaissance man of all these great topics. Your work goes back to like 2010 at least what I saw on YouTube and read some of your books and you remind me of what I like to call sort of the "golden age" of comparative mythology, back in, maybe 10 years ago, when you had Graham Hancock, [...], Timothy Freake and many other researchers that were doing this fascinating work on comparative mythology, alternative archaeology, and this useful stuff that I feel has made the world better and really expanded the consciousness of humanity. So how did you get into these esoteric topics?

J: Well, it goes back as far as the late 90's of the last millennium, the last aeon. I was in high school and bored and started reading Time-Life's Mysteries of the Unknown series, I believe it was, in the library at high school, and that's when I started researching these topics. After that, I just stayed with it, and I'd keep researching them today but it seems that, after a certain point, I kind of hit a peak - or a plateau - where it seemed that I had learned as much as there was to know about most of these, and then I started coming up with my own theories based on what I'd learned.

M: Great job, and for the audience, I'd definitely suggest you check out his website and his YouTube channel for so much good stuff, and we definitely want to hit on a lot of his good stuff on this show. So, why don't we start with more or less the central theme I feel of your work, or at the very least it's a starting point, and that is the Pythagorean Order of Death. Could you tell the audience what that is, Jonathan?

J: Certainly. That is a group that I created, that I created with a few other friends of mine, after we left a forum online where we all met. The forum that we met at was an "Illuminati" themed forum and we all left it because we thought it was doing a poor job representing that theme. We decided to, as our final degree personal project, create something that might reflect it better, in our opinion, and to that end I created the Pythagorean Order of Death, after which some of the original members, some of the founding members, left because they didn't like what I had created and wanted to do their own thing. But that was in probably 2007, 2008, and there's been more or less a continuous web-presence for the POD since then. The material has expanded a bit, there's been some amendments and some abridgments released since then, but there's about 13 degrees split into about 5 different schools, or systems, and each one of those has a pdf, and then there's the Omnibus, that's released more or less annually, that updates an abridged version from all of them.

M: And are you able to share with us some of the tenants of the Pythagorean Order of Death?

J: Certainly. The basic tenants are, the main goal is, the mission statement is, to disseminate the information about what I call the "Atlantean Democracy" system of government, which is, in short, an alternative proposition to the document that seems to

be - or one of the documents that seems to be - the motivating, driving force behind the modern, what could be called "New World Order" of the globalist faction of the Order of Death. So the Atlantean Democracy system is an attempt to create a pluralist, decentralized, min-archist version of a global government as an alternative to a global monarchy. The history of the Atlantean Democracy system is complex and partially fictional - at least, or at least partially speculative - insofar as there's no way to prove it one way or the other, but the system as far as I've designed, or received or understood it to be is basically dependent also on a free-energy system of wireless electricity replacing the actual economy that we have today. So it's kind of a pipe-dream in a sense, but maybe useful, maybe something that in 100 or 200 years could be considered a useful goal to consider.

M: And in the Pythagorean Order of Death there's two types of individuals: the psychic conspirator and the psychic revolutionary. Who are those?

J: Okay, well the Order of Death itself, which is a topic I got the name for from an Alex Jones documentary about the Bohemian Grove and a song by Public Image Limited with Johnny Rotten the former singer of the Sex Pistols, called "order of death" - both of them are called Order of Death - and the way I've applied that term is to the group of all people who are aware that they are psychic or telepathic or to some extent clairvoyant. So in my experience, all living forms, all living beings, all life-forms, have the capacity for non-verbal, or non-physical communication. What we're doing right now, talking on the computer, is a form of indirect communication, and I believe that animals of the more developed species also use a form of this by passing messages along from one to another over greater distances. So I believe that all life-forms are at least in potential telepathic and that this manifests itself in the higher evolved animal species as a kind of "animal internet" or a naturally living, connected network of minds. So I would call the "animal internet" ubiquitous to all living beings, but the "Order of Death" is only the people - and presumably animals, but mainly the people - who are aware that they are psychic and who use their telepathic ability and their potential for clairvoyance actively, more so than passively. Of the Order of Death, there are two types, and those are psychic conspirators who want to continue to use their telepathy to convince people who don't believe in telepathy that there is no such thing as telepathy and that telepathy is impossible and that it doesn't exist and that they don't have it, in order to disempower them and to continue to use their own telepathy to essentially rule the world. And those are the "psychic conspirators" within the "Order of Death" who want to continue to use their powers over the "cult of sleep," which are basically psychic life-forms that have been convinced they aren't psychic or that they aren't telepathic or that they - for whatever reason - aren't allowed to exchange ideas mentally only. The other form of person in the Order of Death is the "psychic revolutionary" and the psychic revolutionary wants to free all minds to their full psychic potential and to reveal to everybody alive that we are all psychic and that there is a mental only ideal form of network that we all share, and we can all communicate our ideas through it. That mental network would be the Enochian Communications System, which is a whole other topic.

M: Yeah, we can definitely touch upon that topic, and yes we've done many shows on the

idea that all humans are psychic. At some point we lost that ability or it was suppressed by the powers that be, so what you're talking is definitely very known to the audience and very known to the topic and the ethos of this show. So, moving ahead, could you tell us who are the "neo-Sethians"?

J: The Neo-Sethians are essentially the modern "psychic conspirators" in the "order of Death" insofar as their agenda is to maintain power, but what their philosophy is is the second-coming-ism or eschatological end of days belief, which is based on 2000, at least 2000 year old prophecy - the book of Revelations - and which they essentially believe that, if they bring about these certain "signs of the times" for the "end of days" then they will be able to force a second-coming of Jesus which is highly problematic in my opinion because it involves, essentially, trying to destroy the world in order to summon god.

M: We definitely don't want that. And for example, you mention in, I forget what documentary or what YouTube, that - let's say somebody like - Aleister Crowley would be a "Neo-Sethian." So, is a "neo-Sethian" by what he does, or can we say this is sort of a continuation of an ideology going down throughout history?

J: A bit of both, definitely both. He was - Crowley himself was - I would consider him to be "neo-Sethian" insofar as he brought about a "new age" or welcomed the dawn of the "new aeon," but I believe he did so in a way that was - in a sense - calendrically premature by about 100 years. If you look at, in the Book of the Law, his own explanation for the term Aeon, it is a period of about 2000 years, but if you look at the dates he gives for the speculated past aeons, they don't correspond with that measurement. So if you take just the measurement itself of an Aeon, and you apply it back, then you have 2000 years before the present, the time of Jesus; 2000 years before that, roughly the time of David and Solomon and Moses; 2000 years before that perhaps Abraham or Noah, that era; and 2000 before that, you would have the beginning of the universe according to the biblical literalists. So each aeon, supposedly, there is a world-savior archetype that manifests itself, and at the present - or rather, 2000 years ago, there was a group of Gnostics called the Sethites and their main belief was in the second coming of Seth - who was the third son of Adam and Eve and the firstborn mortal human, who had both wisdom from having inherited the knowledge of the tree of good and evil as well as was mortal and lacked the... fruit of immortality from the tree of life. So they believed in the Gnostic era that Seth would resurrect, or reappear or reincarnate, and when they saw Jesus they were some of the earliest converts to what we call today Christianity, because they became some of his closest followers, apostles and disciples. So now, 2000 years after that - or an Aeon after that - we have Aleister Crowley attempting to explain to people that we were about to enter this new aeon, this new age, of vast changes to our society in the same sense as had happened with Jesus, and even Muhammad some - I think - 400 years later; the early era of the last Aeon was highly contentious. And Crowley was essentially attempting to say we were entering into that phase, the "equinox of the gods" and so forth, when... one aeon changed over to another, and this is part of a natural cycle measured by the calendar. If one uses aeons instead of months on a base-12 calendar, one can use this structure to measure even the ice-age

cycles. So to a certain extent, this process or this cyclical - every aeon there's a world-savior type figure that manifests and exists is, theoretically, part of a naturally occurring cycle that also involves space-weather, the peak of the sunspot cycle, the entrance of a plasma sheet in the galactic orbit of the earth and the sun around galactic core, as well as increased asteroids, even possibly an electromagnetic pole-reversal, possible crustal displacement - all of these sorts of things that we've had people talking about, quote-unquote "disaster theorists" talking about, for the last 100 years or so as part of entry into this new age. I would say Crowley was attempting to - and I keep using the phrase "attempting to," but I'm not sure to what extent he's really succeeded - I would say that definitely he was one of the people who was trying to bring awareness to this process.

M: So, what we have is this group who is attempting some sort of apotheosis - becoming divine - by bringing about the end of the world and they work through taking advantage of certain astrological or time-cycles to gain this power. Is that basically a good summary, Jonathan?

J: 100% yeah, yeah I would say that.

M: Awesome, awesome. That's the tag-line or the elevator pitch if Crowley was like walking in the..., "man we could end the world and we could all become god, and dot dot dot, we could do it this way." And this must go back, probably, I mean - as your work has shown - and for the audience, Jonathan has tons of charts, gematria, maps, I mean, everything. It's just a huge body of work and he puts a lot of evidence in this. Can we say this goes back to the days of Atlantis?

J: Well, again this steps into the field of speculation.

M: Right, of course.

J: Because if you were to say, for example, what do I believe about all of this? I'm not sure I believe in any of it. I want it all to be a voluntary and an optional type of philosophy that any of this exists and is relevant in anyway. Part of wanting people to wake up to their psychic potential and being a psychic revolutionary myself, means that we have to realize that all of these myths are partially fictional - or have become fictionalized in the history of them - but that they still can teach us a core, moral lesson. So for example the myth of Atlantis, whether or not that's a 100% valid and accurate description of the past history prior to archaeological evidence for some kind of "world flood" or "great deluge," it can still teach us a valuable moral lesson for ourselves today about the application of certain forms of technology and the ability for ourselves to destroy ourselves using that technology and why we shouldn't pursue that.

M: Well said indeed; I would agree. For some reason I'm thinking of - I think it's Irenaeus or Epiphaneus talking about the Ophites trying to cast - or the Cainites I believe actually - trying to cast magic to bring down heaven upon earth and destroy the world. So that definitely had some "neo-Sethian" vibe, or "original Sethian" vibe. So, Vance, from your standpoint,... what do you think about what he's saying. Of course, I've read many of his

books, I've seen a lot of his videos on YouTube, but from your perspective, how does it sound?

V: Well it's interesting. I don't know enough about it to really form a full opinion. But one question I had was, Jonathan, why is it called the Order of Death? How does death factor into the global governance and ESP and so forth?

J: That's a great question. This is something that I haven't participated in personally, because again I see no personal benefit from it, or even social benefit, but the majority of the esoteric schools of mystery and the secret societies that practice modernly what we would traditionally consider magic, all of them involve some sort of death-centered ritual at some point in their degree system, where the individual has to undergo what they call "ego-death," and in many of them this is forced upon them or even brought about in a surprising way which is traumatic to the ego. For example, the third degree of Blue Lodge Freemasonry nowadays involves a ritual where one is ceremonially buried alive, almost in a sense and the purpose of this - the moral of this - is to encourage people to meditate on their own mortality and to think about themselves as a finite - a temporally finite - being and to encourage them to think "well what can I do while I'm here in this lifetime that would help improve the situations that I see?" Of course, it's all very ethically ambiguous after that, how one applies that knowledge and what they learn from that moral, but all of them do have that particular death-obsession in common. And I think that that maybe what distinguishes, for example, the cult of sleep - who are psychic but believe themselves to not be - from the Order of Death - who are those who know that they are psychic - is having meditated upon one's own mortality and understood the magnitude of that meaning in their own personal lives.

V: Yeah. How about life-after-death? Do you think, in this system - can you use ESP to communicate with souls that have passed from the physical world, or how does that work?

J: Well again this is something that I don't practice doing, and from my perspective it's speculative although there's ample evidence of people that believe that to be possible and who do use their abilities to do something similar to that at least. I'm not going to say that those people are 100% right or 100% wrong, just that, from my personal experience, it remains speculative and I can't say certainly for sure one way or another. But it shouldn't be ruled out at all.

V: Yeah, fair enough. You know one more thing I had, before Miguel continues with his questions, a lot of people would hear "global governance" as a "bad" thing, you know like a bunch of tyrants trying to rule people and kill off a lot of people for the benefit of the entire earth, and so forth. I assume the global governance that you're talking about, you know - Atlantean based, is something different than the kind of "globalism" that people are talking about, or is it?

J: It's meant to be 180° opposite from that philosophy that "globalism" has to be "evil." And "Atlantean Democracy" as I've tried to line it out or lay it forth - the premise is that

the global government, even if it's inevitable, doesn't have to impinge in anyway on the day to day free lives or rights of individuals. Civil liberties should be maximized under such a situation, in my personal opinion, and in no way minimized.

V: I agree. How about centralization versus - do you believe in layer of governments, or just one huge global government?

J: Well the "Atlantean Democracy" system basically has a very small, central government that has no army; it has no ability to enforce its dictates. Its so-called dictates would be more like philosophical recommendations. It's meant to in a form, in a sense, entrap the people who would self-select into positions of authority over others, into this almost "American gladiators" like situation, where they then debate or even fight and kill each other to determine whose point is valid. But because they have no real say over anybody else's personal lives in the whole world, it would just be a form of almost entertainment, to see these so-called "philosopher kings" battle it out in rhetoric and even possibly physically just to determine what they think is the right course of action for humanity when nobody has to abide by their findings.

V: Interesting. What do you think, Miguel?

M: Yeah it is very interesting. I was going to ask, and of course, when we start getting into these topics, it's inevitable that we ask about the "reptilians," and of course you deal with reptilians in a lot of your work. What's your take on them?

J: Well, I believe the reptilian hind-brain is more or less an acceptable description for the rear cerebrum's organelle's or their sub-organs, because it occurs even in reptiles. It's basically what a reptile's brain looks like is the back portion of our own brains. So when one is - when a human, when a person - is using these parts of their brain more than their forebrain or their midbrain, they're acting in a reptilian type of fashion and they're thinking in a reptilian type of fashion. The people who kind of hide in that, or cloak themselves in that, that sensation of "fear vs. love" being the ultimate "life-line" of - those are the only two options that they see because they're binary and they think in a simpler format of reality than mammals or people - these people are in a sense de-evolving even now from being the complete mammals and the complete human beings that they could be. So, in the future, what I believe will happen - in one possible future - is that the people who are currently expressing this reptilian-ism now - this trait of being fear-driven and curious about other emotions but unable to understand them - these people will eventually create a sub-species of humanity that will itself continue to evolve as well. So the people that are more or less reptilians now, eventually their sub-species group will become more like avians or birds in some format - perhaps like the angels are depicted, the cherubim are depicted in ancient art, with wings symbolically; and other sub-species of humanity will also form along with them which will be more mammalian or more insectoid even as they would go up or down the evolutionary ladder, and then this will form a kind of class structure, or class-system, in a social hierarchy between these different groups of what I've called "animal factions," or "animalistic factions."

M: Yeah, I've always... sorry go ahead.

J: And this is what I; sorry I cut out for a minute. But this entire description of reality is what I refer to as the “worse future world-line” of 3 possible future world-lines and the “better” one being a return to Atlantean Democracy. So, in this sense I believe if we continue to follow in the direction of the Protocols then we'll end up devolving into animalistic sub-species, and if we follow Atlantean Democracy or any other alternative, then we'll end up in a “better” world-line in the future, and things will continue to evolve and progress upward.

M: I agree with you that the whole “lizard-people” has to be, or is, people who are dominated by their base emotional, not even emotional, but predatory part. And sometimes I miss David Icke talking about the “reptile people” because I think that's what he was talking about too, not taking them that literally if you would. Have your views changed with the strangeness in 2020 and the continued strangeness of 2021, or do you think that this is just part of the cycle?

J: Well, the way I understand the cycle is that it is peaking currently, between 2000, the year 2000 - when, on May 5th, there was an alignment of the 7 planets of antiquity - until December 21st, 2021 (or sorry, 2012 now; the past, no longer the future), when the sun and earth and galactic core all aligned as predicted by the Mayans; then that was the peak 11 year period in the sunspot cycle for the aeon, so we saw the maximum amount of solar activity then, which caused the maximum amount of essentially heat in the global atmosphere - and everybody could identify that as either global warming or as climate change, either one, because it was exacerbated by human pollution, but it wasn't entirely caused by it. So, at this point in that cycle, we're at a peak for space-weather activity and also I believe at a period of convergence between these time-lines. In comparison to Aleister Crowley's concept of the “equinox of the gods,” I think that when one Aeon calendrically rolls over into the next, it corresponds to all of these astronomical or astrological type events and what you see on the earth during that period of time is usually a period of great social upheaval and a lot of philosophies forming, a lot of so-called false prophets and a lot of so-called magicians - self-proclaiming magicians - running around that, 600 or 400 years ago you wouldn't have seen that many, and that that's the cause. But I do believe that after the year 2029, these time-liens will begin to diverge again and the peak sunspot cycle phase will be diminishing and that what we've called global warming will begin to wane and descend into a cooling phase.

M: Yeah, you mentioned too in your work, the “great burners” that happen or represent peak of the sunspot cycle. For example you talk about Ahurah-Mazda, Shamash, Ishtar. Who are these Great Burners?

J: Well the idea of a “great burner” is essentially that of the cultural hero or world-savior that I mentioned earlier that, every 2000 years or so, there's this person that comes along that brings forth or ushers in all of this change, culturally and socially and spiritually even. For example, 2000 years ago, Jesus would have - could have - been

considered a “great burner.” The concept of Tezcatlipoca and of Kukulcan, those were based on the same sort of premise. Noah, Ziasudra or Utnapishtim would have been one of these as well, after having preserved culture from destruction in the flood. Anyone who brings about a massive social change; even Martin Luther, during one of the periods of lower solar activity and a colder era, could be considered a form of “burner” or “great burner,” John Dee as well, again Muhammad - the Prophet of Islam - even though these are on “off-periods” in the 2000-year Aeonic cycle, they more or less still overlap with a 500 year cycle that occurs within that.

M: Do you have any speculation, Jonathan, on who might be a burner today, as we speak? I certainly don't. I mean, I'm trying to wrack my brain. I see a lot of false prophets, that's for sure, but no burners.

J: 100% yeah. Well the only difference is really capitalization, I think. Anybody can bring data forth and be a world-teacher, especially nowadays with the cybernetic-internet - anybody can teach the entire world whatever they want. But in terms of being a world-savior, the information they teach has to be beneficial - not just to them personally, in terms of making them money, but it has to improve the situation socially for the entire world and not even just humanity, but for our equilibrium with nature and other species as well. So yeah, I think it's likely that between Aeonic peaks there are lesser burners who are more like false prophets or proselytes or people that profit from, that profiteer from making prophecies, and then at the peak of the cycle you may have someone who is more earnest, more honest and isn't in it just for a buck, and maybe can make a larger difference, but then again maybe not.

V: How about George Soros? Arguably, no matter whether you think he's funding good or bad causes, openly claims to be trying to influence society on a global basis, with lots of lots of influence and money. So is he a possible burner?

J: More likely from the perspective of the psychic conspirators yes. From the perspective of psychic revolutionaries, he'd be the opposite - somebody who's attempting to quell the fire of the human psyche from flourishing. In so far as the causes, the causes that any philanthropist backs, be they good or evil popularly - or according to the populist populous - whatever causes they back, they're doing it financially. So even Elon Musk, as perhaps a political counter-example, is applying financial gains that he made, perhaps scrupulously or unscrupulously by inventing PayPal, I think, he's applying those financial gains to going to Mars, and creating neural-link and the sky-link satellite system - whatever those are - and, again, he probably believes that he's doing the right thing and for the right reasons and that what he's doing is benevolent and beneficent and good and will improve society, and humanity and nature in general. In a sense, only time can determine whether or not he's right or wrong. But, from learning from past history, if you look at people who have gone before who have attempted to force global or globalist agendas to occur, you have people like Alexander the Great, or Julius Caesar, or Napoleon, or Hitler, or George W. Bush and these are all people that are considered, in hindsight, less popular than they were during their own lives. Which, I think, is an interesting point about the “great burner” or a true Messiah or Prophet, would be that

during their own lives they're vilified. They're completely shunned and exiled at best, if not crucified - murdered, violently. So in a sense it does behoove psychic revolutionaries as long as we, or they, are the minority to remain more or less in the shadows, or secretive or occult even, so that we don't get murdered by the people who are in charge who want their political agendas to be seen historically as right and good but that don't want any alternatives to be allowed.

V: Yeah, that sounds good to me. I like, I've always said that globalism would be great if the people that were ruling in an enlightened manner as opposed to just power for its own sake. So I like it.

M: I would agree, but they want to be gods on this earth, and they want complete control over society and all the resources, so I don't see one right now. Good point how they're vilified, again we can talk about how Muhammad was on his heels most of his life, and of course, the great example would be Jesus, somebody who as you said was vilified, paid with his life and so forth; but Jesus is an interesting one, don't you think, Jonathan? Because he pretty much was a nobody when he died, and he really was a nobody for several generations. I mean, he had his loyal group and the religion grew and it grew, but it took centuries before it really spread across the earth. So what do you think about that one, that somebody has, he had no footprint at the beginning.

J: I agree. It's tragic, and I think a lot of his ethical teachings that he spoke himself personally, got twisted in the not just the first few hundred years following his life and death, but definitely after the institutionalization of Catholicism as a global force since then. I think his ethical teachings are all but lost on the ears of modern, the majority of modern Christians even.

M: And who do you think was his original inner-circle? You said, it might have been the Sethians. Can we say that basically Mary Magdalene was you might say his right hand man, or woman? How do you feel about the original Christians?

J: Well from my research on this topic, what it appears to me is though, is as though, the New Testament gospels themselves maybe Roman forgeries, they maybe written in the first hundred years or so following the life of Christ, by people - Pliny the elder, the younger, possibly for the Flavian family or for the Augustinian emperors - as a means of propaganda to encourage people to succumb to imperialism by "turning the other cheek" and only using non-violence as a methodology. However, I do believe also that the person of Jesus, or the character that the person in the New Testament was based on, was an actual living individual who did certain, that taught certain, certain Gnostic (I suppose one could say) beliefs 2000 years ago and may have used what could be considered today a form of magic - ritualist or ceremonial magic - to perform something that would be considered by subsequent believers as miracles. Miracles of healing as opposed to dark magic, but nevertheless; if you read, for example, the Babylonian Talmud, I believe, of the era, it describes this Yeshu and his trial as that of a magician who was using a name of god that he had gotten from an Egyptian temple to essentially break the Rabbinical laws that said you shouldn't practice any form of spiritual act or

healing practice even on Sabbaths, Saturdays. So when he did that, they considered him a criminal, a black or dark wizard, tried him and put him to death and it was relatively unceremonious at the time. It didn't make necessarily the biggest stir in the Roman Empire when a supposed terrorist from Judea was executed; it was not as big a deal even as when Usama Bin Laden was executed nowadays, because at the time, Jesus wasn't even the greatest of the terrorist groups active in Judea. Judas Iscariot and the anti-Herodian Maccabees were. But it seems to me that the original group of Jesus' apostles and disciples were comprised of the Essenes, some members of the Essenes of Qumran, some members of the Iscari or Sicari assassins group of political terrorists, some members of basic Gnostic or Coptic philosophical and religious belief systems. And for example, James the Just - there's a lot of modern speculation that he was a brother by blood to Jesus, but I suspect that it was probably a half brother who had the same father but a different, or rather, who had the same mother but a different father. In the trial documents they compare Yeshu to a, someone who had been sired by a, well... In the Babylonian Talmud trial documents they describe Yeshu by comparing him to someone who had been sired by a foreigner on the wife of a high-priest. But this means either Jesus himself was, similarly to that person, a bastard of a Roman soldier and the wife of, say, Shimeon Caiphas for example, is left open to interpretation. So it's impossible to say with certainty, but there is a high degree of likelihood that Jesus was born from the rape of his mother by a Roman soldier; his mother was the wife of the high-priest of the Essene community at Qumran, who were the exiled high-priests from Jerusalem over the state of Israel that had become Judea. So when, if you look in the Bible, when Jesus was born, his parents fled with him into Egypt, he spent time there and supposedly, according to the Babylonian Talmud, stole the name of god from a temple there, and then when he returned, he returned to Qumran, and was unwelcome. They called him the "wicked priest" in their documents and said that James the Just, who was his half-brother, who was the rightful son of Jesus' mother and Jesus' step-father - who was the high-priest - they said James the Just was the rightful heir and Jesus was an upstart. So what I believe happened then was that Jesus went across the Dead Sea, to the east-coast of it, the east shore (Qumran was on the west coast of it); he went across the Dead Sea and wrote what's been called the "Angel scroll," in which I believe he wrote down the name not only of god that he stole from the temple in Egypt, but also names of various other magical incantations that he could use to create miraculous seeming events. The angel scroll since then is the only way that we know that somebody named Yeshua Ben Padiah even existed 2000 years ago from an archaeological perspective, instead of just rumors in later literature; and the Angel Scroll itself has only been publicly admitted to existing once by Stephen Pfann of the University of the Holy Land, in 1999, and then was subsequently redacted or retracted by him as being an accurate or legitimate piece of apocrypha. He was only shown it by its owner in a private collection and he didn't release the owner's name. So all we have to prove that this document itself even exists is one circumstantial description by Stephen Pfann nowadays, and other than that there's no proof that Jesus himself ever wrote anything down. So the early Christians themselves would have all been going on hearsay, on like the writings in the Gospel of Thomas who wrote down the sayings of Jesus, and these sorts of things, whereas, in reality, there was likely a book that Christ, or that Jesus himself, wrote and that was the angel scroll of Yeshua Ben Padiah.

M: Yeah, I love your reconstruction, great work. And I lean towards being a mythicist, but as I tell people, my second option would be Jesus the magician. And I think it's so obvious when you start digging in, and of course you've got the work of Morton Smith and Robert Conner and others, Jesus was definitely a magician of the ancient times, probably battling the Nephilim and the Archons and other beings on high spiritual places while performing some stuff down here on earth. What about something like, you mentioned the gospel of Thomas, what about something really of high philosophy, high theology, complex, like the secret book of John or the Apocryphon of John as some call it. What do you think this comes from? Original teachings of Jesus, or is this a later work by some very mystic, ecstatic Gnostics?

J: I'd say it's, in that particular instance of an apocrypha, it's got its own particular history. I'm pretty sure (I haven't read it recently enough to be 100% sure, but I'm pretty sure) it was written, or at least set, after the crucifixion and after the resurrection of Christ, and it's Jesus explaining to John the Apostle the nature of cosmology, the afterlife and - for example the spirits that rule over the different parts of the human body - and explaining that there's an aura or a unique soul that governs every living thing, including every blade of grass. So it's possible, it's most likely (pardon me), that that was taught by Jesus to his apostle John during the lifetime of Jesus, that John wrote it down as being taught to him after the death of Jesus by the reincarnated or resurrected Christ, and then it was written down again by another scribe following that from the account of John the Apostle, and that the later scribe may have also taken a few (also) liberties with the text. So it's possible, it's definite there's a grain of truth in it, but it's also possible that there's a large degree of subsequent translational errors or accidental obfuscations along the way.

M: No, that makes perfect sense, and I think, I'm trying to figure out - let's see - what was the book I was reading last night... give me a second because I think. Again I was reading it while the kids were doing jujitsu, I was on the bench reading the book "forbidden gospels," and you mention in one part, and I don't know if this is your theory, or you're quoting someone, or maybe even speculating, Jonathan, but you say that Mary Magdalene wrote the entire Nag Hammadi library and James the Just wrote the Dead Sea scrolls.

J: Yeah. Yeah, I think that they may have either written them or been curators, more likely that they were curators of these texts. James the Just would have been the chief-priest at a time when Jesus came back from his exile, under the high-priest at the Essene community of Qumran, so the high-priest would have been Shimeon (or Simon) Caiphas and the chief-priest would have been James the Just - his son. James the Just then would have been the chief scribe or chief editor of the scribes at Qumran; and Mary Magdalene, following the life and death of Jesus, was said to have gone into Egypt, where the Nag Hammadi library was eventually discovered, and I believe that she was curator of those scrolls as well, and the keeper of that library; and that also incidentally, originally it was in the reverse, meant to be read in the reverse order from the compilation of it today. For example, we start with, in the Nag Hammadi library that's published in books today

we start with one story and end with another, whereas I think in the original edition it would have started with what we call the last entry now and ended with the first.

M: Fascinating and very interesting. How does Paul fall into your reconstruction or speculation?

J: Paul or Saul came along later. I believe he was an agent under Roman influence by Shimeon Caiphas or even Josephus who was... meant to destabilize the early Christian cult and advocate that they break away from the traditional Hebrew religious beliefs and practices. For example, encouraging that one didn't need to be circumcised, that one could practice the passover, or the last supper as opposed to the passover feast; and that one didn't need to keep the lunar-solar calendar, that one could go by only the solar-civic calendar; all those sorts of ... that one could be saved by baptism and repentance, all of the doctrines that eventually became the sacraments of the Catholic Church were essentially invented by Saul or Paul later and I don't believe that really any of them were necessarily advocated for by Jesus himself necessarily. We have definitely the lord's prayer was spoken by Jesus, but other than that, the different beliefs of full-immersion baptism or just sprinkling water over the brow, or how much wine and how much wafer we have to eat to receive the sacrament of the transubstantiation, all of that argument is irrelevant because it's all, *ex post facto*, it's all after Jesus' life and death and had nothing to do with his teachings.

M: Yeah, well said, and now before we move on from those early Christian times, I have to ask you, as we've done some shows on this deity, from both a Jungian and a scholarly perspective, I've been on a couple of podcasts talking about this entity, and that is Abraxas. How do you see Abraxas?

J: Well, Abraxas is a Gnostic parody of the Hebrew monotheist concept of Jehovah. Abraxas was not necessarily considered a real god, more of a satire or parody cartoon version of god as the demiurge, or the universal god as the universal demiurge. So it had the feet of snakes, which in Buddhism you find as being one of the three poisons; it had the breastplate or chest-piece of a boar, or wild pig, and that's also one of the three poisons; and the head of a rooster or cock, which is the last of the three Buddhist poisons or symbolic semi- or Demi-subelements in Buddhist cosmology, equivalent to the tattwas in hindu and to salt, sulphur and mercury in Alchemy. I don't know if Abraxas was necessarily; personally I tend toward atheism, personally. I don't believe that there's necessarily such a thing as a universal creator deity. I do believe that there are evil psychic forces on earth that possess people, evil philosophies that can possess people to do evil things; but I don't see necessarily there being a real plethora of good philosophies that likewise possess people to do good things. So I tend to think that the majority of the earth psychically is ruled by what we would ourselves consider to be an evil force, or the devil, one could say. So in that regard, I'm more of a Cathar, in traditional historic beliefs. I believe that Jesus was, and that any great burner would be a manifestation of this force, or at least tempted to be, this evil, Satanic world-king type lust for power. In regards to...

M: The Rex Mundi of the Cathars, that's what you're talking about: the king of the world.

J: Yeah, yeah.

M: Very interesting.

J: And like, um...

M: Go ahead.

J: No, I guess I'm done. I'm just rambling.

M: No, no. This is fascinating. So how would you put for example, we have to talk about it whenever we're talking about any sort of esoteric Christianity, Judaism or Islam and that is, of course, Enoch and the watchers and the Nephilim. How do they fall under your work?

J: Well I've done a lot of research on the Enochian tradition, and it started for a rather silly reason. In 2003, I wasn't very interested in magic and mysticism as much as I was with metaphysics and theoretical cosmologies. So I wrote a book called the "Metaphysicians' Desk Reference" which I had self-published and which is available on amazon in a really rudimentary edition - lots of spelling errors and grammar errors - it's very poorly edited (I didn't pay to have it edited, so I edited it myself); it's a really poor edition - a better edition is available as a pdf online without any of the, or without most of the, spelling errors. Anyway, after I put that book out, I realized that there was somebody named John Dee, and that John Dee - not unlike me, and before I was born, long before I was around - had studied many of these same topics. And my name being Jon Gee and his name being John Dee, and a lot of our works overlapping, I realized at some point I was going to have to find out who he was, and study his works, and be able to provide an answer when asked; "What about John Dee, since your name is Jon Gee?" So that's when I started researching the Enochian material and I tore through what I could find pretty quickly. There's the Enochian magic of John Dee and Edward Kelly, of course, from the 15- and early 1600's, and then there's the basis for that, essentially, which is the legend of the biblical patriarch Enoch who lived before the world flood. Just one moment.

M: No problem.

J: Ok so, Enoch is mentioned in, I believe Genesis 2? no 1, yeah 1:4, or something like that.

M: Early in the story, yeah we know that.

J: Yeah, maybe 2:4. But yes, very early in the Bible he's mentioned, but only very briefly. And it says that Enoch walked with god, and god took enoch, and he was not; and it also says that he lived during the time when the "sons of god" came down and bore wives to

the sons of man, and these were like giants or the titans of old - mythic heroes or ostensibly the elder deities of the Greek, Olympian pantheon. So that's about all that was known of Enoch for, presumably, the last aeon, until around the 1800's when, I believe it was James Bruce? I don't remember.

M: Yep, same guy who gave us the Bruce codex with the Pistis Sophia I believe, yeah.

J: He was looking for the source of the Nile river in Ethiopia and found, on an island in the middle of a lake that was close to the source for the Nile river, a group of Hebrew Ethiopians who were preserving the traditions - not only of the Kebra Negast and how they had stolen the Ten Commandments on the two stones of the tablets of testimony from the temple of Solomon - but also the apocryphal book of Enoch. One of the great mysteries of John Dee's era is how did John Dee know anything, if he did even, about the legend of the Enochian angels from the Enochian apocrypha? And it's possible because a Slavonic translation of the book of the watchers - which is an abridged version or shortened version of the book of Enoch in Ethiopia - the Slavic or Slavonic version may have been known to John Dee in the 1500's but there's no direct evidence to state with certainty that he did know of it. So that maybe one of the greater Enochian anomalies as I call them. Nevertheless, in Ethiopian Enoch and in the Slavonic Book of the watchers (or Enoch 2 or Enoch book 2 or the secrets of Enoch), there was a legend that was also preserved in the Essene Qumran Dead Sea scrolls, but in the Essene Qumran Dead Sea scrolls, there was also another chapter or book, in addition to the book of Enoch, that was called the book of the giants. And the book of the giants, the Ethiopian and Slavonic Enoch, all describe the same events from the same time-period that happened prior to the deluge, or what the Greeks called the time-period of Atlantis.

M: Fascinating and very awesome. Vance, do you have a question for Jonathan?

V: Yeah I do. This is a little bit of a different direction, but: Jonathan, of all the different things you've studied and know about, is there a particular story from the past, system, cosmology, what have you, that you can directly personally relate to? I mean have you had any experiences of communication with beings from the non-physical world and so forth? And that's the question.

J: Well that's a great question, too. I - to go back to when I was about, probably, three years old - I had a dream (or possibly not a dream) about being abducted by an alien, that I made into a comic book later when I was about 7 or 8, that was called "the alien and the blackberry juice." I don't know if that was a legit experience, a dream or what and the comic book was only a few pages long and has since been lost, so I don't really recall it deeply. That would be the only form of supernatural or naturally supernatural type experience I could say I've ever had - naturally paranormal experience. Other than that, I've done a lot of drugs. I've never done ayahuasca or DMT, however, and it's supposedly on ayahuasca and DMT or even 5MeO-DMT that one will experience these sorts of beings, and whether these are extraterrestrial biological entities, or the plant-spirits, is still a topic of modern debate among psychonauts and people who consider themselves academic scholars of these topics. My drug of choice was actually LSD, which

I can't recommend to anybody because it can give people a bad trip; I never had one. What happened for me was that I experienced the "Chikhai Bardo" once or twice, and was able to bring back some observations from during that and that's peppered throughout my works in hopefully a helpful way. A lot of what I learned in that state, while reading books in that state actually, was about metaphysics and theoretical cosmologies - things of that sort - and still hasn't been accepted as being valid by modern theoretical physicists. Tachyons for example; I have a personal theory that I've never heard anyone else espouse, that tachyons - which are faster than light particles (or particles that can travel faster than the speed of photons in a vacuum) - that these are the cause for or the force-carrying particle of gravity, because gravity is an attractive force unlike the other three elemental universal forces - weak and strong fusion and fission and electromagnetism which are all repulsive forces. But I believe that if tachyons travel faster-than-light, they can also travel backwards or opposite the arrow of entropy, backwards in time. So they maybe a repulsive force but simply acting in an opposite chronological form on the same material substances we measure the other 3 forces by. But again, I've never heard anybody else say that and it's probably just a half-baked acid-head theory, at least at this point.

V: Well still, many scientists start out with you know ideas that aren't, well, in fact, any new idea starts out with something that no one's probably considered seriously before, right? Even the theory of relativity was resisted. They've spent years trying to prove it, especially general relativity, so there you have it.

J: Certainly. It was the same also with heliocentrism when that came along. People were still arguing over the retrograde cycles of the planets being caused by these smaller loops in their orbits; people didn't expect heliocentrism to be true and it was rejected violently for a long time until finally it was accepted as a necessary fact of reality.

V: Yeah? well, you know, I have a personal theory about that: I think the sun is the center of the solar system and the earth is the center of the solar system too, it just depends on your perspective. It's a lot more convenient to think of the sun as the center, but even the sun is not in the exact center because the center of gravity of the solar system is not smack-dab in the center of the sun, so.

J: Correct, even the sun revolves and rotates, yeah.

V: Yeah, there's a point, it might be (I don't know where it is) - it might be inside the sun somewhere, I don't know if the center of gravity for the solar system depends on where the planets are too, but everything orbits around a center of gravity.

J: Yeah, what you're talking about is the two loci, or locus points that form an epicycle, or not an epicycle, an eclipse.

V: An ellipse.

J: An ellipse, yes. Pardon me. And this has gone to the premise of Nemesis or a dark star,

or even Vulcan - a so-called dark-planet, orbiting the sun opposite earth in early theories - there's the sun itself, and then there would be another external locus or centroid point for the ellipse of any orbiting body, so the earth, for example, orbits in a relatively elliptical path and it's secondary locus is outside of the sun or possibly near the surface of the sun, but nevertheless isn't exactly. And even the sun itself has two of these because it orbits around the black-hole at the center of the Milky Way.

V: Interesting.

M: Very interesting, indeed. I assume you don't think the earth is flat, do you Jonathan? Because I was going to ask you, what do you think about this age of continued conspiracies? Do you see them as distractions or is this the collective consciousness really starting to search, as traditional or sensible reality or the official narrative of the world just makes less and less sense, what do you think?

J: Well, I don't think the earth is flat. I agree with everything else about that though. It's definitely what the Bilderberg group called a "post-truth world" that we're living in now - there's a plethora or pleroma of information available online, and most of it is mythic and fictional; modern conspiracy theories being a form of contemporary mythology even. Nevertheless, a lot of it is true, in the sense that it has a moral, a useful moral value, and a lot of it is just misinformation or disinformation. For example "Q" - the "Q-Anon" phenomenon that we've seen be so influential recently - I speculate that that might be an artificial intelligence program itself that is releasing these drops of data or files of information; it certainly doesn't seem to be a group of normal thinking people, and from what little I've seen of it, it does seem more like a chat-bot in the way it words things and in the way it (so-called) thinks.

V: That's funny. Never heard of that before.

M: Yeah, it is interesting. I wouldn't be surprised. For a long time I thought it was Steve Bannon and I was suspicious he was behind the whole "Q" thing, but who knows? There's so much of it right now, and like you said, it's the lessons, the morality, the mythology behind it. And as I tell people, "what does it say about you? What's going on in your internal world that this conspiracy spoke to you?" Because most conspiracies, as we know, aren't going to end. I mean, they still have yearly conferences on the Kennedy assassination, even if it's obvious what happened now (ahem CIA). But they're going to have, for decades and generations, people will be talking about the Kennedy assassination, so... it's better if we looked inward and see how it helps us or what is it pointing for us to do to make a change, I would say. But, on a little side-note there, Jonathan. You have a video about the more or less the theology of the Sith, and you talk about the kings in the Star Wars mythology. And that's interesting, because again in a synch, just like a week or two ago, I was doing some research on the Sith metaphysics and somehow, because I was trying to tie it into of all things Abraxas and some Gnostic theology, but why did you decide to do a video about the Sith?

J: Well, that's a valid question. That's actually my most popular video series is my Star

Wars philosophy lecture series on YouTube - it's had tens of thousands more hits than any of the others which, I consider all the others far more important and more interesting. Nevertheless, the Star Wars one is the most popularly accessible, and it's just talking about the hyperspace drive, the Jedi code and the particular video that I've released most recently is a compilation of a series of videos that I'd released earlier that talks about the kings' list of the Sith empire and the Sith rule of two and things like that. M: And this, I mean, this is canonical as far as Star Wars is, right? J: It was until Disney bought it. Then as soon as that happened... V: Talk about the evil empire.

J: 100%. 100%. That totally squashed my independent research and made it all irrelevant and they rewrote history and it's just a corporate debacle, it's a fiasco. Since Disney bought Star Wars, I can't say for sure that anything in any of my Star Wars videos is any longer canonical - it was at one point when Lucas owned everything - but yeah.

M: And if you could associate Sith theology with any historical religion, what would you say, Jonathan? What's the closest?

J: Well, that's a good question too. Probably the "Neo-sethianism" of today that we see is most parallel to that for a plethora of reasons.

M: But don't the Sith want more than anything, how did somebody put it to me? They want to use the force to be free of the force. They really in a way, that's maybe Hindu, they see the force as karma and they want out, which definitely is a Gnostic idea.

J: Yeah I'd agree with all that, yeah. The idea of the dark side of the force being a pathway to, "as they say, many abilities that some consider to be unnatural," does relate to the same thing in the Star Wars universe as what we would call magic and mental-manifestation, for example, in our own reality. In the history of Darth Plagueis who was the mentor of Darth Sidious, who was (spoiler alert) Emperor Palpatine, Darth Plagueis was able to re-animate the midchlorians from death, thus essentially bringing a being back to life after they had died. And in the same sense, the neo-Sethians of today wish to resurrect or reanimate or reincarnate Jesus in some form by ceremonially, ritualistically burning down the world to summon him forth. I think there's a lot of parallels there.

M: Something I will definitely look onto. But then again, why bother - because for all we know - there's rumors that Disney might scratch the last three movies and make them non-canonical and then, Jonathan you'll be right back at the top again, so...

J: Who knows?

M: Let's hope it happens. Let's hope Disney, well, I don't know if they'll come to their senses, but let's hope the pressure is enough to break them.

J: No, they're a major corporation, I have no faith in them ever doing the right thing.

V: You just wait, Baby Darth Vader is next.

J: 100%.

V: Baby Vader.

J: A bobble-head. Baby Vader bobble-head.

M: I have enjoyed the Mandalorian I have to admit. It's closer to episode 4's ethos than anything that's been put out for a long time, or episode 5; episode 6, I had, ugh, I had my problems with episode 6, but interesting you say that the Sith videos get all the traffic, but, for example I really liked your YouTube documentary, "pyramids: prodigy of Atlantis." And you've got some really good views on that one, I know it's about 5 years old, but you've got over 40,000; and you put a lot of work into it; it's a three hour documentary and it's well done, you've got all the visuals, all the charts, everything else. It's excellent work. Maybe you could share with the audience about this, because I would highly recommend the audience to go watch "Prodigy of Atlantis."

J: Sure yeah. That was the very first longer than feature length documentary video I'd done, so it seems to have been the most popular overall longterm, in terms of views. I've done a bunch since then, but they haven't gotten as many views, yet. Prodigy of Atlantis talks about the alignment of the pyramids in Giza, Egypt, and in Teotihuacan, Mexico, with Orion's belt, in the constellation of Orion and the three belt stars, "Alnitak," "Alnilam" and something else, I forget. It's as thorough as I could make it. The only speculative things that it mentions are the use of steam as a cutting device, and animals and wooden cranes as possible, additional methods of construction. Everything else in it is more or less mainstream. I tried to shy away as much as possible from the "ancient aliens" hypothesis or telekinesis being used to build them, as well as the theory that were simply tombs where people were buried, because I consider both of those to be opposite-ended, fringe theories.

M: You don't see them as tombs do you?

J: No. They were used ritualistically to - they were used, at least at one point, ritualistically to mummify the bodies, but there were never people buried in them like tombs. The tombs in Egypt were all at Memphis, right? I'm sorry, I'm terrible with names and such. The valley of the kings. All the bodies were buried in the valley of the kings.

M: Ok, Ok. So real quick what do you think was their purpose for the audience?

J: The pyramids? I think that they were constructed as essentially a library of information; I think that they were aligned to the [stars] of Orion's belt in order to draw our attention across history not only to that constellation but to its orientation relative to our planet's surface. The pyramids at teotihuacan - which were built thousands of years later but which were aligned to the same constellation - they're, the pyramids at teotihuacan are arranged at a right angle to the pyramids at Giza to where the avenue of the dead at teotihuacan is an east-to-west road and the pyramids at Giza are oriented in a

more or less north-south arrangement (Mintaka, that's the other name of the constellation star), where the smallest pyramid is southwest of the larger one, which is also southwest of the great pyramid of Cheops. These may have been oriented to an earlier north-pole position, as well as Angkor Wat in Cambodia, which was built even later than Teotihuacan, which was built long after Giza, but all of these may form an equator that points to a different location for a north and South Pole. That's at least one theory in the book, "Atlantis Blueprint" by Collin Wilson and Rand Flem-ath.

M: Very cool. Always cool bringing up Collin Wilson. Well, we're getting at the end, Vance. Do you have any last question for Jonathan? A burning desire as we say in AA?

V: Yeah well, as long as we're on the pyramids, how about initiations and astronomical sightings and so forth, do you think the pyramids had any involvement in those activities?

J: Well they were definitely astronomical in their orientation and in their architecture. I think that throughout time since they were built, they've definitely also been used in initiation rituals. However, I'm not sure 100% as to what their original purpose was, so I can't say with certainty. It would only be theory and speculation.

V: Yeah, it's interesting, the queen's chamber, the king's chamber, the pit, and all that of the great pyramid of Giza, those are kind of interesting structures. But I guess we'll have to wait for another time to further explore the pyramids. Miguel.

M: Indeed yes. Well, for the audience, Jonathan, his documentary is 3 hours long. I watched the whole thing because it really was fascinating, I think you should check out too.