

DINOSAURS - EXISTED? WHAT DOES THE TAYGETAN PLEIADIAN TEAM STATE?

Published 19 May 2023 by Cosmic Agency, Gosia

Originally in Spanish - Between 2018-2019

Robert: And what about dinosaurs, Swaruu?

Swaruu (9): Many species of dinosaurs or that would rather fall under the description of "dinosaur" did exist. But the ones that definitely did NOT exist are some famous and silly species such as Brontosaurus, Tyrannosaurus, Triceratops and so on, which are inventions of the 19th century.

By the way, the numbers called Roman are not of Roman origin <--- They are Etruscan. But the Romans have taken them as their own.

Robert: Okay. And all those skeletons?

Swaruu (9): The skeletons are not complete, they are fakes. The ones they have in the museums are plaster, they pass them off as real or say they are replicas. The real ones are so incomplete that it is impossible to assemble an animal with them, so they complete them using their imagination and an entire story has been built around them since the 19th century.

Many skeletons are assembled or completed with bones from other animals, such as cows or even cat bones in some cases. And the Tyrannosaurus skull pieces are not from that species, they are Alpha Draconian, among other species. Although I have my doubts or some doubts about the latter because they are too small to be Alpha Draconian, but some experts here assure that they are.

Gosia: And why do they care that we believe in dinosaurs?

Swaruu (9): Because it is now a story built around the naturalist "boom" of the mid-nineteenth century. And for "honor" reasons they can't back down now and accept that the most famous dinosaurs are fake.

I accept that a Tyrannosaurus skull has similarities with some Alpha Dracos subspecies such as the Alpha Naga of which I have not yet spoken, but both the teeth and the skull are not big enough. And what are those useless little arms for? The animal makes no sense from a practical point of view. And the skeleton cannot support the weight of such a living animal.

Gosia: And the dinosaurs that were there, what were they like? And where have they gone?

Swaruu (9): We would have to look at each species to see which ones are and which ones are not real. Yes, I have the precise data. They become extinct in a place when it no longer suits them as a species, but they continue in other planets, as happens with all the others.

ATHENA SWARUU'S RECENT COMMENT - February 2023

Swaruu X (Athena): Everything is false there, everything, it's just incredible. Now it's coming out that fossils are artificially made. And since the 19th century. They even pass the scrutiny of scientists and geologists. They do it with chemicals and at the same time subjecting the bone to very high pressures as with a press. So Sunday roast chicken bones would pass for being from the Jurassic. Very seriously. On Earth, their fossilization methods are already coming to light.

CONVERSATION WITH EX-CONTACTEES (interviewers' names changed to Gosia) May 2021

Gosia: What do you know about dinosaurs?

Yazhi: Some existed, some did not. The first big famous ones discovered in the 19th century, sadly for children, didn't exist. I'm talking about Triceratops, Brontosaurus, Tyrannosaurus, Megalosaurus and the like. What I can say is that here they are not considered real, it is not seen as possible. Yes, there are big animals like that on other planets, but not exactly like that. And those other planets have a lower gravity than Earth, like point 6G or point 7G.

Gosia: What made scientists believe that there existed giant reptiles?

Yazhi: I remember that they only found pieces of some of them, like Tyrannosaurus Rex, and then the Royal Society of London started to reconstruct them with bones of cows, horses, dogs and cats because they saw economic interests in that.

But what I know is that, objectively, an animal of that size in a gravity of a terrestrial G would have to have much larger bones and another bone structure, another design, because its viscera would be too heavy to stay inside its thoracic cavity. In itself, the total weight would destroy the bones as officially shown. So, for that reason alone, the dinosaur concept is not right. The design is not compatible with life.

Another point, from my perspective, as I have told you many times, animals, species, are shared among many planets, among those that have a capacity to sustain life of that kind according to the species and its needs. Because they don't evolve on a planet, they are seeded on planets. And there are no dinosaurs like those famous ones on any other planet, when there should be.

Gosia: So, would that whole historical period be false? There was no Jurassic?

Yazhi: The problem is time again. If it is already difficult to calculate something from 15,000 years ago, it is unrealistic to try to date things from more than 65 million years ago.

They use carbon 14, but it's practically useless because it gives wrong dates all the time and drastically wrong. So, it's garbage of a system. It uses the decay rate of the radioactive compound carbon 14 which is said to be stable and takes millions of years as a constant. It measures the decay of carbon 14 in organic compounds specifically, being that living or recent ones have carbon 14 at 100 and decay from there. The problem is that there are other things and other radioactive compounds that alter these readings. So, the age of a living mollusk has been calculated in millions of

years, which cannot be. And something of millions of years has been calculated as recent, that's why it's garbage.

It is also calculated by other method, which is by the soil stratum. That is, how far down is something buried under layers and layers of soil that in theory accumulates over time. The problem with this is that the earth is not fixed receiving soil on top of it for millions of years. It moves, it turns, there is erosion, it rains and there are floods and landslides. Although, objectively, I find it a little more reliable than carbon 14.

And there is also the problem of calculating time which is not a constant, as you know, more so before the Lunar Matrix. So, everything together makes it impossible to calculate a period with accuracy as the Jurassic would be where the big dinosaurs lived.

So, yes, I can say that some did exist, but most likely, and by pure skeletal structural logic data, they could not have existed. And there is a motive to create them, invent them, it is a matter of reputations and monetary interests in 19th century London.

Now, about modern dinosaurs found, many new species of dinosaurs are being discovered in China. But it turns out that, coincidentally, they are being found on the extensive land owned by a Chinese company dedicated to making dinosaur bone replicas for museums and collectors, all part of the Chinese Communist Party.

Just too many things don't add up for them to have been real animals. But of course, other species did exist, but more medium-sized ones like elephant at the most or smaller ones like Velociraptor, perhaps, since it is related to modern birds of prey like the eagle.

But in itself, Tyrannosaurus, Brontosaurus, Triceratops, Stegosaurus, Allosaurus, Gigantosaurus, I doubt very much that they were real.

In addition, the original bones can never be seen, let alone studied by paleontologists other than those of the system and the club, because they are very, very controlled as well. That in itself also raises serious suspicions.

Gosia: So, what would be in the Jurassic, Cretaceous, first appearance of mammals, all this would be unsubstantiated assembled data, right?

Yazhi: At least with the foundations within the reach of human science, without forgetting that what they say will always be according to the interests of the controllers and the companies they own.

Regarding the appearance of mammals, we would have to go into the evolution of species. Non-human science does not accept Darwinian evolution as a scientific fact. In itself, as the name indicates, "Darwin's theory of the evolution of species", it is a theory. But in itself, in universities, students are forced to accept it as an irrefutable fact under penalty of expulsion from the system and therefore the end of their careers. What non-human science indicates, and not only Taygetan science, is that there is no evolution of species.

On Earth, there are only two ways to explain the existence of animals:

1. Evolution, as stated by Darwin.

2. Divine creationism.

For advanced interstellar civilizations, it is neither of those two things. Species are seeded on the planets. Some as creations of other advanced races. Other times, simply to encourage diversity in the stellar garden, moving species from one place to another as it is deemed appropriate and as they can be developed by interstellar species using spacecraft.

Applying here also the concept that at least most of the natural existing species have always existed as direct manifestation of the creative consciousness of the whole, of the ether, of the Original Source. Being, in themselves, not even creations, but expressions of the Source being that they are the Source.

But the human mind cannot handle the concept of eternity, nor of "has always existed." Nor that something never had a beginning and never will have an end. Species as a manifestation of an idea, of an identity, as a direct reflection or expression of a concept that the Source holds, as a material expression of an idea. That idea is a soul. So, it expresses itself in the material as that particular animal.

But in itself, without complicating it further, it is not a material expression as in that there is the spiritual expressing itself materially, but it is the same. The animal is the idea of identity that the Source holds to try to explain itself, to have a point of attention apart from itself, to try to observe itself. And it tries to observe itself to be, to think, to exist as consciousness. It is a long explanation, but in itself short for something so complex.

But to say "Darwin or Creationism" is an example of pure human reductionism. It is true that many things or angles within the theory of evolution are valid, such as the natural selection of the fittest. But it can only select the fittest individuals within a species and thus purify the genes of the group, but it can never create a species from a different one.

So, no, the human does not come from the monkey. The monkey is one thing and the human is another.

A Neanderthal is not an evolved human. It was another species of being of humanomorphic appearance. So were Homo Habilis, Homo Erectus and all the others. Using spontaneous mutations to explain a modification of a species by trying to adapt to a new environment or ecosystem does not result in anything, it only ends up as theory.

In observation, one only sees that individuals that are outside their ecosystem tend to die and that's it, not grow scales or gills just because they live in the swamp. It is said that the change is very, very gradual, little by little. It also does not square because it would take too much time, more than can be considered useful, because the conditions of the ecosystem that could be a stimulus for the mutation would change faster by several times factors than the mutation itself.

And it is also known that spontaneous mutations come from DNA damage and almost never or never for positive purposes or outcomes for individuals. So, a species is already perfect in itself. If it does not adapt to an ecosystem, it is because it is not its ecosystem. It is simply not what it was designed for.

Gosia: Thank you very much. Super interesting. And what do you think about them saying that they were destroyed by a meteorite, fear agenda?

Yazhi: Meteorites hit all the time. But in itself, it's rare one of that size of extinction level, I see it as forcibly possible. If they did exist, then I would be more inclined to believe that they disappeared due to a change in the ecosystem in general over time. The Earth transforms the same way anyway.

There is evidence of meteorite impacts. For example, in the sea, between Yucatan, Mexico and Cuba, which is where the meteorite that extinguished the dinosaurs is said to have fallen. And yes, there is a fear agenda component there, of course.