11. Charities

Contents

| Giving spontaneously with love can never be wrong! | . 1 |
|--|-----|
| Charities and misappropriated funds | 2 |
| | |
| Those who are corrupt in charities should be exposed | . 4 |

Giving spontaneously with love can never be wrong!

Giving to others might feel like interference with the another's life path. In England we are sometimes discouraged from giving as it is deemed to encourage antisocial behaviour such as begging and feeding drug abuse. Salumet shares a different perspective on giving. (7/7/97)

<u>Les:</u> Thank you, now if I may still continue to take the time, it's a completely different question: We are frequently asked to contribute charity money, for the sake of children abroad, who are suffering from various complaints — lack of water and a multitude of reasons for which they are not developing and are dying very rapidly, as you no doubt know. Now, the problem is, if we contribute money to those charities, are we interfering with the life that has been chosen by those people, when they came here?

That my dear friend is a very good question —of course, I have told you in past times that each soul knows of what it comes to. Also, I have told you, that you can deviate from that life pattern. We can speak of a multiplicity of reasons here. You cannot interfere, if the soul will not allow you to. Are we clear on this point, because it is important?

Les: Yes, that is the base point, isn't it?

Of course — you, I would say in general, cannot do harm, if what you do is done with love — that is the basis of the point. Anything which comes from deep within, to try to help others, cannot be wrong, because after all dear friends, what are we, if we are not but the love energy? So, I would say to you only this: If it is genuine help that you offer, do not concern yourself about interfering. If those people who accept the help, they know, they know in their souls, if that is what they should be doing. They would be the ones to answer when they return home. Do you understand?

<u>Les:</u> Yes, I do. That makes it clear to me, because I've puzzled this for quite a long time. It is a good question and I thank you for the opportunity of trying to explain it to you all. <u>Les:</u> Yes, I'd forgotten that the soul of the person there, to whom the money is given, is the final arbiter, *(Yes.)* into whether it accepts the help or not.

And when you speak of children, I know most of you tend to say — and I believe this is a phrase you most often use by you here on earth, 'that your heartstrings are tugged at.' And that can only be good, because in this happening, it brings forward the Love that you

should be extending to all of mankind., I wish so, that these spontaneous gestures, happened a little more often without the thoughts of whether you can afford to give or not, because when the mind, or shall we say the *thinking* of the *human brain*, comes into play, then that *spontaneous love* is lost.

<u>Les:</u> Yes, I would agree completely with that.

So you see, you cannot do wrong, if you are giving with *Love*. The onus lies in the one who is receiving.

<u>Les:</u> Yes, because though we presume that we are interfering, that particular soul may only have a limited period of suffering here, before it can gain health. *(Yes.)* But that suffering would have taught it something, no doubt.

My friends, again I say to you, you cannot see the wider scope of life, whilst in these bodies. You need to expand the consciousness within you all, if you are to begin to understand the workings of that *Great Creative Force*, to which we all belong.

<u>Les</u>: And to follow our own soul's instincts, without giving thought to it.

That is what I would advise you all, that after all, these instinctive feelings, come from that *pure love energy* and can only be for the good, not only to those you offer help, but in your own growth. It has to be good. But remember, it has to be a *loving spontaneous gesture*, if it is to remain pure. Do you understand?

<u>Les:</u> Yes of course, absolutely, that is essential I agree. Now I've taken enough time, anyone else a question?

<u>George:</u> Can I just extend that one a little. I think we've made a complication for ourselves, by creating in this country alone, over 23,000 registered charities; it's got very complicated. But I think you've answered this in saying that what one does, should come from the heart and from within.

Of course, my friend, you after all are responsible for your own thinking, for your own actions, for what you make of your own lives. It is all too easy for you to say: 'If only this, if only that,' when what you should be saying is: 'If I, if I,' because in using the 'I', you are saying that all knowledge is within yourself. And you should — especially with the knowledge that you now all have attained, you should all know that the actions you take, whether they are genuine or not, you all have that innate knowledge. So, do not say, 'If only, if only.' But there are so many words you could use, I say to you, in your hearts and in the spiritual part of your being, you know that what you do, is either 'right' or 'wrong' for you. I do not say it would be right or wrong for another being, but instinctively you should know and understand what is right for you. And dear friends, that applies to all areas of your lives.

<u>Les:</u> So, we come back to what Jesus said, cast your bread upon the waters.

There are many sayings you can use, but I say to you simply: Extend your love to all mankind, and your footsteps will always be sure. Again, we return to the very fact that all of you are responsible for yourselves. It is a great responsibility, but one that each one of you must shoulder with love.

Les: Thank you very much

On 8/9/03 another question on giving was to go with our 'first thought reaction'. However, what if the first thought is negative? Salumet gives some advice.

<u>Sarah</u>: Could I ask one more question—it's actually from my daughter? You said to us that your first thought was from Spirit and she said that what if your first thought you had was a negative thought?

It is not from Spirit. When I say the first thought, I mean the first thought of *light*. Any negative thought comes from fear. Remember I have told you there are two sources: there is love and there is fear. That is, I hope, answer enough for her.

<u>Sarah</u>: Yes, it is, thank you.

Charities and misappropriated funds

George asks about the huge number of charities and how much they spend on salaries and advertising. We are still encouraged to give as helping others in any way we can. (22/10/12)

<u>George</u>: I have some thoughts on Earthly charities today. It's obviously good to give—to give to others, but I've noticed that it is getting a little out of hand. This country alone now has 185,000 registered charities and that number is growing 5,000 each year. I feel there's something wrong in this, especially when one third of moneys contributed are spent on advertising the charity and sending out persuasive letters to people. So, I feel we need to take account of how we give, and I just wondered if you have any comments on this Salumet?

Yes, of course I will not say that you must not help others in any way that you can. The purpose of mankind is to help others—this I have said on many occasions. But I understand your concern about the greed that also exists in your world.

George: Yes, I'm sure there is an element of greed in this.

Yes, of course, that has always been and all I can say to you is this: that each individual must think for themselves, and to give in whichever way they so desire, to others, and it must be with their own conscience. And that has to be not to give to those who are seeking to gain for themselves, but to find some way that will help those most in need. It is a world-wide thing I know, but I cannot say: do not give to those in need.

<u>George:</u> Perhaps we should be more circumspect within ourselves **(yes)** and perhaps also it would be good to attempt to influence our government and Law Society to give some measure of control over what is happening.

We have been striving for so long with the governments of your world to do betterment for mankind. It is an onward struggle, but I am encouraged by the many good people that are within your world and who give to others without thought or need for themselves. We strive to help those who help others, and also to influence those in power who are able to change the state of things in order that this greed might be 'annihilated', if you like—yes. George: Thank you for that.

I am afraid mankind has a large part to play in these situations.

<u>Sarah</u>: One with so many charities, as you say, we all have our own free will and it gives you a chance to choose the ones that you feel are right, and perhaps somewhere along the line, each one of them is right for somebody; as long as you say, it's not for personal gain. **Yes, those who seek personal gain over helping others are not doing themselves much good, because any good that they have achieved is struck from whatever good they have**

done. So yes, the responsibility lies with each individual if you are looking to stop this kind

of greed.

Those who are corrupt in charities should be exposed

Taking from charities is very negative for the soul and those who have 'stolen' effectively through greed, will one day have to face themselves. We should follow that innate knowledge when it comes to giving. (14/12/15)

<u>George:</u> Could I ask a question Salumet which is in a way topical, concerning 'charities'? I have the feeling that these have got somewhat out of hand, in that there are many people making huge sums of money from advertising their charities. The top executive, who receives the highest salary, receives £850,000 per year, and of the top 100 executive salaries, the average figure is £208,000 per year. So many, many people are paying into institutionalised charity organisations and I believe are unaware that much of the money donated is going into the charity organiser's bank balances. And in addition to top executives, there are managers, sub-managers and trainee managers and they *all* get very good salaries (yes). So, my question is: is it better that we give on a personal one-to-one level instead of involving these institutionalised charities?

I understand your question, my dear friend. Of course, these people who are not genuine needed to be exposed; and of course, they have been exposed, otherwise you would not be aware of this problem. I can only tell you, my dear friends, that your own conscience will tell you what is best for *you*. As much as there is hidden agenda with these people, there is still a great deal that is done to help others and this we cannot doubt, but of course, if one-to-one giving is there and acceptable, then for most people I would say: that is the way to go. But when you are dealing with so much money, it is necessary sometimes to have some kind of organisation. I can only say to you, and I hope it brings comfort, that these people must face what they have been doing when the time comes. They have to face themselves—they have to know that what they are taking from other people is very negative for their own souls. And I know that at the present time that may seem like no kind of consolation but let me assure you that no one on this planet can do any misdeed without having to face themselves. It is a difficult problem for you I know, but I would suggest that you go inwards and find the right solution for yourselves.

<u>Sarah</u>: But of course, it does actually, even though those people are taking, in our eyes, far too much money, it doesn't take away from the fact that people are giving—and that is in essence the good part about it.

Yes—again, we have positive and negative; all throughout life we have this, but the awareness and the knowledge of what is happening is the greatest weapon to have,

because then these people can be dealt with by those in authority. You understand? (Yes) I hope that is helpful to you.

<u>George:</u> Yes, that's a wonderful answer, and it will help to give this exposure **(yes)** which I feel the problem is; and it also has its nuisance value, in that through mailing shots and TV advertising **(yes)**, it's been calculated that every one of our population here in the UK, receives 200 asks for money through the year.

Yes, again it comes down to a personal level with each one of you. You can only give so much. You cannot change your world in a heartbeat, but if it is right for you, then it is right for many. I say think upon it and do what you feel is right, because my dear friends, you have that innate knowledge of what is right for you.

<u>George:</u> That's a lovely answer—thank you very much Salumet.

<u>Sara:</u> It's not a problem to screen out a lot of this—a lot of people who are asking, and just select just a few ways of giving—if they're enjoyable then—

Yes—underhanded deeds will always be ousted, in many different ways. As I say, once the knowledge is in the open, then people can then deal with these individuals. And of course, that is not the end—they do have to stand and see themselves as they have been. That is a little cautionary note for all of you, my dear friends. (Chuckles)

Because we know, being human, there are good thoughts and not-so-good thoughts, and it is as I have said, individual responsibility that must take charge. I hope it is helpful. <u>George:</u> Yes indeed.