

~8th August 1994~

We wish to apologise to the instrument, for any discomfort she may have felt. We try to join with her as gently as we can.

Les: I'm sure you do. I'm equally sure she quite understands it's not always possible to do precisely what you wish, it takes time.

We are happy with the way things are moving.

Les: Good, that's very nice to hear.

This evening because of the slight difficulties with the instrument, I ask that you take things a little more slowly.

Les: Certainly.

I am happy that you have all gathered here once again and now I think we can begin.

Les: I want to say first, I think it would be difficult to stop them gathering now, they look forward to your company.

I want to say first, forgive us if some of the questions sound trivial, they are not intended as such, but we have to get the message across to the man in the street. Therefore it has to be couched in terms that the man in the street can understand. We may already know some of the answers, but since we are beginning recording afresh, this is why I may repeat some questions if that's agreeable with you? (*Of course.*) Thank you. This is all done with the best intent for propagation of the knowledge and the wisdom that we know is coming, but it has to begin slowly as you'll appreciate.

I have been asked many times about sex and men and women in the next World. It is understood that they do retain their physical sex or semblance of sex—men and women. I don't know the precise reason for that but I assume that ultimately there would be a coalescing of the two and eventually the beings are sexless?

Yes, let me answer for you. Again we have touched on what happens when you leave your physical states. Of course you retain all that you have been, except for that *physical* part of your being. Why then would it seem that you should discard what has been an important part of your being?

Les: No I don't think it would be wise to do it, because it is a personality thing, is it not?

Yes, of course it is necessary for considerable time. In fact what you are speaking of, the *merging* of the sexes, to become '*sexless*' if you like, you are speaking of eons of time. It is not

something that happens quickly.

Les: No, I ask because it's something that's been asked of me many times. People seem to think the '*Etherians*,' as I'm going to call those in the next World, for the sake of clarity, suddenly become puffs of diaphanous material. It's quite amusing—

Yes I don't wish to minimise what you are saying, but yes that is an idea of many. You must remember, whether you are male or female, in your physical being, you are in fact the essence of both.

Les: Of course we are and the division is just for physical purposes.

Yes that is true. Yes you procreate while you are in the physical being, that is a necessity. But you do not suddenly discard that element of yourselves when you come to our side of life.

Les: Thank you. Following on from that, we understand that procreation is not possible in the next world, but should a couple wish to nurture a child from birth, if I can put it that way, is it possible for them to acquire the spiritual child in order to satisfy that longing.

It would depend on the motive for the longing.

Les: The motive again comes into it.

Yes. It is possible, but the motive would be the utmost reasoning behind it but, yes, it is possible, if you can see that it would further your spirituality. (*I see.*) For no other reason!

Les: So, if the desire was solely for the benefit of spiritual progression and for the development of the child, also, (*Of course.*) then no doubt, it would be permitted.

It would be permitted *only* on those grounds. A *longing*, in itself, is not reason enough.

Les: I see. Thank you! Now, tell me if I am going too quickly, won't you?

We think that the instrument is comfortable now.

Les: Oh good—thank you. I believe we flatter ourselves, that we have in our museums and our galleries what are called originals, Old Masters and so on which are sold for fabulous, absurd prices. Am I right in thinking that they are only copies of the originals which are in your world—that the originals exist in your galleries and ours are only copies, even though they have been painted by a physical person?

Again, we touch on a subject we have discussed. We have discussed the power of thought, of inspiration. Yes you are partly correct when you

say they are copies. What would happen—the inspiration comes from us, not necessarily that the original exists. I don't say in *all* cases—(No.) I am trying to explain as simply as possible. The inspiration is given to one here—that is painted. Let us take a painting that is painted by the painter. (Yes.)—Then perhaps a copy, a copy of the *inspired* one is in *our* world, but originally the inspiration comes from *us*.

Les: Yes—because the original physical one is here, but the original thought and inspired one is with you. (Yes.) Thank you! That explains that. I had a strong feeling that you did retain what I regarded as originals, because it was an original thought.

Sometimes—not always!

Les: Not always.

Not always—again, there are many reasons which I will not enter into now, but, yes, mostly you are correct.

Les: Thank you. I believe too, that in your world, if an artist wishes to continue, he can do so—that is if he is provided with materials, always with the understanding that he will be working for others and not for his own personal satisfaction alone?

What would be the purpose of working here, of being inspired, if you cannot carry on? There would be no reason, no usefulness—there would be no growth. So of course, the desire and the motive come into play. And of course, they would be encouraged to continue and of course, with materials that they would not be familiar with.

Les: So, they are able, I should think, to produce much more magnificent work, than would ever have been possible on this Earth..

And they too, in turn, can inspire.

Les: Yes. I'm sure!

You see the follow on—the follow on effect!

Les: Quite—They can inspire others here. Good!

Yes. That is what we would expect them to do.

Les: I had the pleasure once of speaking via my lady (*Leslie's wife, Ruth, was a medium*) to somebody who said he was Michael Angelo. I have no reason to doubt it, because of other factors. He said that since he has been with you, (*spirit world*) he finds his vision—he was blind or almost blind when he left here—isn't needed for his work. He can see by *thought*, even far distant vistas. I found that a most interesting comment.

Let me say, *all* of you, close your eyes—see the beauty that is within you. What matter it that

you do not have sight—

Beauty is a *THOUGHT*. Again I come back—always I will teach you the power of thought. *There, there* lies the *beauty*. Sight is not necessary to be able to visualise—that is what he was telling you, that beauty lies *within*.

Les: So he could imagine without even seeing it, and, presumably, correct any misinterpretation.

Do you know of anyone who is without sight?

Les: I know someone who is partially sighted, but not completely.

Speak to them, listen to them, listen to the beauty that comes from within them. (Yes.) They have a knowledge, perhaps that all you sighted people have lost.

Les: That I can accept and agree with—

That they retain the beauty that they have lost with the loss of their vision!

Les: Thank you. Now we come to another factor—the marvellous things which happen in our physical world, such as the migration of birds from one country to another, without any visible means. There are many theories advanced as to how this is done. Are they following lines of energy in the Earth, as you have spoken of? Do they have the power to do that?

Let me first say, *all* of the animal kingdom, like you, are following their own evolution. *All* life is energy. Our feathered friends have a *sense* that no other human, animal, living thing possesses. It is something original to them. (*I see.*) Yes—some *do* follow energy lines—others have an innate sense of distance of travel. It is difficult to find words to describe. Without being the bird, it would be too difficult for you to understand.

Les: I do accept that. It is something beyond our comprehension again.

Yes. I am struggling for the words to explain to you. Yes, they have an innate knowledge of where they are going. They know exactly where they are going. It is part of their growth, if you like.

Les: Yes—it's interesting, thank you. I thought it must be something like that, because it is so incomprehensible to us and so repetitive, year after year.

I would say, it is almost like you would follow radar, except theirs is an innate knowledge, used only by them.

Les: Yes, so our inventions are commonplace compared with what they have in the natural world.

Yes, yes—I am afraid so. Much has been lost to humankind.

Les: Yes, I hope that our work here and others like us, will be partly instrumental in getting it back to humanity one day.

It lies within your own hands.

Les: Of course. It is there to be nurtured, if we wish.

Exactly, exactly.

Les: Again staying with those for a moment if I may, am I right in saying they have telepathic powers also? I'm sure they must—the movements of a flock of birds performing movements without hitting one another—thousands of birds together who perform the same gyrations, instantaneously—I can only put it down to a telepathic sense.

Yes, I understand what you are saying. Perhaps, telepathy is not the correct phrase to use. They have an understanding—a 'community mind,' if you like. That is the simplest way I can express it. It is not exactly telepathy as you would understand it to be.

Les: Right. They all work on the same common wavelength—

Yes, now we are getting a little closer—yes it is an energy—it is a wave.

Les: Energy again inherent in them all. *(Yes.)* I thought it must be, because, even young fledglings follow the pattern.

It is an innate thing within them.

Les: Yes—it's a pity we don't have it.

You think you do not?

Les: No. I think we have, but we have neglected it.

That is true. If only humankind could realise their own potential. You would be so much better for it.

Les: I'm sure we would. I know that years ago, I used to go into my garden early in the morning, in the summer, and I could literally *feel* the new energy of the new day coming through the Earth, through my feet into me. It was a tangible thing, but I tuned into it. I never told anybody about it, because they would probably think I'm mad.

Let me—I don't like to, but I have to disagree.

The energy is not tangible. *(No.)* It is not tangible, but I understand what you are saying.

Les: Yes, I could feel it, in a way and I was aware of it.

Yes. The awareness was there, but energy is not a tangible thing.

Les: Yes, you are quite right about that. I just used the wrong word.

I am sorry to correct you. I just wanted things to be clear.

Les: No, No. Thank you. So do I, and I appreciate you doing it. Another thing which I have often been asked is that in the next world, is it possible for the inhabitants to suffer—I was going to say physical—but it's not physical, but bodily damage, as we do here. Can they hurt themselves as we do?

You mean physically?

Les: Physically, yes.

Of course not, physically. They do not possess a physical body. They can damage themselves, yes, but it is not a physical damage, it is a spiritual/emotional damage that they can create for themselves.

Les: I see. So, they wouldn't break a limb or anything, as we would here?

No, that is not possible.

Les: No—as I say, it may sound trivial. But it is not meant in a trivial way.

In their minds they can, but of course, if they don't have a physical body, they cannot have a physical brain, but the damage can be there mentally, emotionally, and that is why you do the 'rescues'. You are dealing with emotionally damaged spirit beings. Do you understand?

Les: Yes, I do, and I am told too that—I was going to say, insects (*in the spirit World*)—butterflies come under that I believe, are much more pronounced, much larger, much more beautiful, than in this world. Butterflies, for instance, I am told, have gorgeous colours, and become very friendly, if you wish them too.

It would depend. Yes, all things are, shall we say, larger than life, as you would know it. But when you are speaking of insect life—butterflies, bees, flies, whatever you wish to speak of—unless they have the contact here in a physical form, then what would happen is they return to a group soul. There are a few, and this I know, this is what you are speaking of—those would appear to be much larger, much brighter, than you would find here on your Earth, but the majority return to the group soul. Is that clear?

Les: Yes, thank you, it is.

In the same way, we are asked about pets, the animals, the dogs, the horses, the cats—the same applies.

Les: Yes, so they would not have souls as we

would imagine them to have.

They do, if they have been in touch with humankind—if they have found the expression of love. That is what *singularises* them.

Les: I see. So if a former owner comes over to you and wishes to have his or her pet returned to them, then that can be achieved?

If the pet has gone before, then it will be waiting for that owner—always remember it is the *love tie*—that cannot be extinguished.

Les: Right, so they are in suspense, as it were, until the one who loves them, calls for them again.

Not necessarily so. They will have the freedom of the fields. They will have the love of other people, if that is what they so wish, but yes, they will be there—they will wait for that love tie when the time is right.

Les: I am told that there are other areas where other animals as we know them, also exist.

Yes, let me say this to you:

When you leave your physical beings, *all*, all *THOUGHTS* become reality.

You can have whatever you want to. If you wish to see a field of horses, a field of sheep, whatever—the thought will make that materialise for you.

Can you understand?

Les: Yes I can, I can, I accept that.

So again, we come back to the power of your thoughts.

Les: Yes. I have thought about this a lot myself and I can fully appreciate that the power of thought can produce those phenomena, if you can put it that way, which would then disappear, once the thought disappeared, presumably.

That is quite right. It is the power of the thought that makes it the reality. When you no longer need, shall we say, that thought, then, of course, why should it exist?

Les: Quite, it has no reason to do so has it?

Yes, that is correct—your thinking along those lines is correct.

Les: Thank you. And now we come to rather deeper things—the question of eating meat on this Earth. Of course, there is a lot of controversy, as you no doubt know, between vegetarians and meat eaters. What are your feelings—what are the feelings in your world about that? Are animals put here for any reason other than a food supply and are we at liberty to use them as a food supply, provided we thank them for what they

are giving us?

Yes, this indeed is a subject that is much discussed in your plane. Let me speak, as I know. Let me say this to all of you: You should have a regard for *all* life. Once again, let me say, you have all been endowed with your own freewill, *but* I say to you—respect *all* life forms whatever that may be. Examine your conscience. If you wish to *kill* an animal, that is up to you, but remember this: *(long pause)*

All forms of existence were put onto this Earth for their own development, their own growth, their own evolution.

Provided the reason for killing is a ‘good’ one, and I use that phrase reservedly, reservedly—provided it is a good one, then your own spirituality will not suffer. But to kill, to kill an animal cannot be said to be good. I know this may go against the thinking of many of you, but it has to be said.

Les: Of course.

Let me speak of past people: They killed animals to exist, to feed themselves, but they had a respect for their life. They did it—how can I say, in a *loving* way. Again, I speak reservedly. They would kill one animal with *love* to feed their families. Can you see the difference?

Les: Yes, I can indeed.

Can you see the motive—the cause behind it? *(Yes.)* In that way, their own spirituality would not suffer.

Les: Again, it’s the motive, isn’t it?

But today there is too much killing and with a senseless hatred behind it. That can *never* be deemed to be right.

Les: And so-called sport?

Sport—sport does no good, for the one who calls it sport. I have to say again—the cause, the *cause and effect* are so important in your lives here. So, if you wish me to give you an answer, then I would say it is *wrong* to kill animals to feed yourselves.

Les: Yes. Thank you, I would like to follow that up with another question before I ask other people to take some time. Let us assume, to quote your analogy of a man killing for his family, and apologising for having to do so, you would regard that as a satisfactory motive. Would that have an effect on the animal’s development?

In what way?

Les: Well, if the animal is developing, one assumes they are part of a communal soul, would it affect the animal's development in that communal soul.

I see. If the *animal* has been looked after with love, with respect, then although the ultimate is death to the animal—*no*, the animal will not suffer, no.

Les: Thank you, because, I think, in the past, the North American Indians, and other tribes, of course, were aware of this, and always gave apologies to the animal before they killed it.

That is what I am saying, they had respect for life. And although, they killed—in a way, they redeemed themselves. I am saying, although it is not right, can you see that sometimes, there *is* a reason for doing these things.

Les: What we would call extenuating circumstances.

Well, partly, if you wish to put it that way.

Les: But I do understand, thank you.

Those people had a great respect for life—all forms of nature, not only the animals, but as you were saying earlier, the ground they walked upon, the rushing of the river, the sun in the sky, the moon at night—they respected many things, and so they did not affect their own soul's growth, because of the love that they extended. Does that make sense to you?

Les: Yes, it absolutely does, thank you. It confirms my own opinion on these things. As one American said, when he was asked to sell some land, many years ago, when asked how much it was worth, said who can set a price on the sparkle of the water, or the scent of the trees.

Yes Exactly.

Les: It has no physical price at all, only a spiritual value.

Who are we to judge what is of value? We do not have that right. We were endowed with *all* of these things for the good of *all* people therefore it has been entrusted to us, if you like. And so, you must show that *love* and *respect* to *all* things. But, again, as you know, people are at different stages of awareness, and so they cannot always be blamed, if you like, for their actions.

Les: No, they are becoming much more aware of the need to respect nature, fortunately. Various organisations are now springing up, to try to educate the populace into these things.

That can only be for the good.

Les: Of course. I think I must give some time to others now to ask questions. Thank you very much. Brent, George, does anybody have a question?

George: While we are on that topic, could we add to it the position of fish? Some people who are vegetarian, will eat fish, as well as vegetables, but would it be proper to see fish with the animal kingdom and avoid killing fish?

It applies to all. Fish are not exceptions, they are still the pattern of life. It should make no difference whether it be fish, a chicken, a cow or a sheep—it all applies in the same way.

George: Thank you.

George:—This is something quite different. There is some evidence that there was an Atlantis, an Atlantean continent, where the Atlantic Ocean is now. There is evidence that it had a civilisation, that it submerged and that the last island submerged some 12,000 years ago. Would you be able to confirm any of this? If so, would those people in spirit realm influence us today?

Let me say I am aware of the story of Atlantis, and I must say to you, there have been many changes on your Earth, going back many, *many* thousands of years. More that one island has sunk in the time of the Earth's existence. Many people have come, lived on this Earth, and disappeared as, too, have the animals at different stages of evolution. Yes, there *was* an island, with a people with much knowledge. Yes, they *would* influence people, but no more than any other, once they have joined us in the spirit realms. You are speaking, only of *one* race of people—let me say to you, there have been many. They were not an exceptional, people. Does that answer your question?

George: Thank you, yes. My further thought was they may have excelled at working with stone, and possibly left wonderful stonework, in other parts of the world.

There are many areas in your world today, which are largely still undiscovered. I do not come here to tell you where these places are—that is up to mankind to discover. I am not here to interfere with the working of the world. But let me say this: There have been many races, who have trodden your Earth, who have had superior knowledge in many aspects, on different things, not only stonework, but on precious gems—on *many* things. But one day,

these places will be discovered. Is that useful to you?

George: Yes, thank you very much!

Les: Just to confirm what you have been saying to us—there were gold artefacts found, manufactured, or hand-worked gold artefacts, found in seams of coal, which were laid down thousands of years ago, buried in the coal. Have you read that George?

Remember I am speaking of a very early time on this Earth. Much is still to be discovered.

Les: Yes, I'm sure it is.

Those people were not as unusual, as you would like to believe. Do we have someone in distress in the room?

Les: Is somebody in distress within the room? *(no one spoke.)*

No matter. Let us continue.

Les: In your previous visit, when you were talking about reincarnation, you said that one would not come back, unless there was, quote, 'A 'wrong' to be redeemed.' Now, when we come back, we have no knowledge *(memory)* of that wrong. What is the reason that we are not given that knowledge, so we can begin to take steps to rectify whatever it is we have come back for.

What would be the purpose of having the knowledge?

Les: To know that if we had mistreated somebody, say—I appreciate that person may not be alive when the reincarnation happens.

You would be placed in the situation that would be apt for you to learn whatever it was you were to learn. It would be too simple for you to return with the knowledge of what you had to do. Do you not see that it would? It would make things too awkward. There would be no purpose to it, if you knew *why* you returned.

Les: I agree it would be defeating the object, probably, *(Yes.)* but we would be placed in the position, even unknowingly—we would be placed in the position, where we could redeem that wrong, would we?

Not unknowingly—you would come into the situation that you need to have to redeem the wrong, but you come knowingly, not unknowingly.

Les: I see. So the knowledge, in effect, would be given us at the appropriate time?

The knowledge is there—where it is forgotten is when you return to the physical being, but the knowledge is there within that soul.

Les: And that will be triggered at the right opportunity?

At the correct moment, it *should* be triggered. Each and everyone of you here, is given *more* than one opportunity, more than one opportunity to know, to accept what is going on, in this particular lifetime. It is entirely up to you whether you accept or reject.

Les: Yes, so that is where our freewill comes into it, then, *(Yes.)* the opportunities are given us for redemption.

You are placed within the correct opportunities.

Les: Then it is up to us to use our freewill. *(Yes.)*

Thank you, that answers that one. Good, any more questions?

George: Could I ask a question about the Christian religion? We've had several. I'm looking at the good parts of Christianity—the prayer, the love—and I'm particularly looking at the Laws of Moses, the Ten Commandments, which indicate that we should love God, that we should love our neighbour as ourselves, we should not kill. Can you advise that these laws are *still* a good set of laws for us to observe?

It is the Eternal law. You have used the ultimate word—*LOVE*. The word love is the *be-all and the end-all*, of your existence—There is nothing more important for you to learn.

That does not mean to say it is a love encircled in its own way of thinking. You can have a love, but *still* have the freewill to disagree. What is the brotherhood of man, if it is not an eternal love that you need to learn—but at the same time, you can learn to disagree, without any hatred, any malice. *Love, love* is the eternal law. It is what you should *all* strive for. I can say no more than that. It is the very highest thing that you can strive towards.

George: Yes. Thank you.

Les: Any more questions?

Brent: I've got a question about belief. When I first got involved in so-called spiritualism, what was appealing to me was that I wasn't required to believe anything in particular. I didn't have to believe in Jesus as the son of God for example, in order to be saved, with the threat of the punishment of hell. It was presented to me as a way of thinking, a way of life, that relied on a lot of open mindedness and that appealed to me very much. Now what I'm wondering is, you just

said we are given opportunities to believe and to understand what is going on, as though that's a condition for progression and I just wondered if you could clarify this.

Yes, I have said you are placed here with freewill—true. Why do you suppose we were given freewill? Let me say, you can only *grow*. We ask that you don't believe—we ask that that you accept only that which is true to your own nature, your own conscience—whatever. I don't particularly like the word 'belief.' To me, it has many connotations. As I have said, '*love*' is the essence of all being—it is what you must strive toward. The more open-minded you can be, the more *aware* you can become. I am saddened still when I know and hear how much religion has a hold on the people here. It is a string, if you like that needs to be severed, but that is difficult when it has had such a *strong* holding for so many, many years. (pause)

All that we ask you to do—follow your heart, listen to your inner voice or conscience, if you prefer—follow that and you will not go far wrong.

Each and every one of you has a pathway to tread. We can try to influence you, we can try to guide you, but ultimately, the choice is yours. Follow your own heart, and you can ask no more. And, now I have to say we come to an end, this time.

Les: Thank you.

We don't want to distress the instrument.

Les: No, of course not—I was just about to ask you that, actually. I do thank you for what you have told us and we look forward to your next visit.

Next time, I wish to speak on the people within your group. And now I will leave it to you to close this time.