

IDENTIFICATION AND DISCERNMENT IN MEDIUMISM

In mediumistic communications two important questions particularly come to take shape:

- 1) Do the entities, as such, exist in themselves or are they reducible to the human channels through which they seem to express themselves?
- 2) Is the single entity, that introduces itself complete with name and surname XY, identifiable as such?

It is obvious that we know nothing about entities except on the basis of the experience we can have of them. It concerns the experience of communication: communication that takes place through human channels. By human channels I mean human subjects who accomplish a mediumistic role and whom we can also call «mediums» by using this word in its broadest sense.

It appears sufficiently clear that the mediums provide psychic energies. Not only these, however: they also put in their language and their culture. This is at least what happens in the normal way: that an unprepared medium expresses himself well in a language he doesn't know (xenoglossy) is a rare phenomenon which only happens in forms of superior mediumism. If the same medium were to put in his own language and culture, then one does not see what could prevent a drift from these more formal elements to the real and proper contents. When an entity speaks are we sure that it doesn't change its ideas too, into one with the medium's language? In this case, how can one distinguish where the medium ends and where the entity begins with everything it is needed to genuinely communicate to us?

The difficulty in establishing a boundary between the entity's genuine manifestation and the medium who is its vehicle induces the most skeptical to reducing the entity to the medium itself: therefore, not only the formal elements (culture and language) but the contents themselves are considered pure expressions of the unconscious of the medium or of those who act as human channels in the plural (like in telewriting with the «oui-ja», the planchette, the glass, to which two subjects normally adhere) and more generally speaking, all those present. The unconscious does everything, it is from the unconscious that everything emerges.

What can one reply to this objection of such a factotum unconscious? One can answer only by trying to see whether there are elements amongst the contents of the mediumistic communications that escape from the medium's culture, from what he already knows.

Amongst the artillery that our critical interlocutor has at his disposal, at this point he could mobilize an objection of a different kind: could the X notion, that the medium declares in good faith to have learned from the entity for the first time, not on the contrary be a notion that he has already learned by himself in a more or less distant past and then forgotten? Of course, I admit this is a possible explanation.

This explanation could be supplemented by another: whereas the notion X could have already been learned on the level of full consciousness and then forgotten, the notion Y could have been learned on the subliminal level. Every time one opens the page of a book, even without exactly reading it, everything that is written on it can be engraved in the subject's memory without him even realizing it. This kind of perception, with the relative memorization, would take place, in this case, on the subliminal level. Let's imagine that this person is a good hypnotic subject and therefore, under hypnosis, is taken back to the precise moment in which he didn't exactly read, but, let's say, intraread that open page. Well, we know by experience that in such conditions the subject could remember that entire page word by word. Another case could be that of a person who for the first time in his/her life is walking along the high street of a city without paying any attention to

many details, and then, hypnotized, is taken back to the moment of his/her walk: it may be that he/she manages to remember even all the shop signs and their window displays. There is no doubt that also this hypothesis of learning on the subliminal level is capable, until one has proof to the contrary, of justifying the possession of many notions.

Furthermore, there is a third possible objection: a certain datum of experience Z, that one is convinced to have acquired from the communicating entities, could, on the contrary, have been learned by the subject by means of an extra sensory perception (ESP). In certain cases one could even invoke a super-ESP with the aim of explaining the learning of a series of information that is not really easy to pick up all together. In our turn, we cannot deny that a super-ESP, difficult as it is to put into action, nevertheless represents a possibility that is not to be excluded in principle.

In any case it concerns more or less remote possibilities. To consider A, B, C, D as possible does not at all mean that they are all possible in the same measures: A could be extremely possible, B could be less possible, C even less and D could only be possible in principle but, in concrete, appears extremely improbable, or, if one prefers, even probable in infinitesimal measures.

Now, that all mediumistic communications can only be explained with one of these three restrictive hypotheses, or with a combination of these three hypotheses but with these only, with the absolute exclusion of the spiritualistic hypothesis, well, this seems to me as being a rather difficult thesis to support in a real and punctual comparison with the data. It is indeed admissible in principle, however, as an extremely improbable possibility. "Er sor Cesare" (Mr. Caesar), a man of the people, an innkeeper in Rome, Piazza Madonna dei Monti, is a Catholic; in principle every Catholic could become Pope; therefore, even Cesare could: why not? The thing is theoretically possible, one has to see how probable in practical terms. Its probability could be so infinitesimal that it could border on zero. Well: I made this example with the precise aim of giving an idea of how much, according to me, it could be probable that the totality of the mediumistic communications are reducible to non spiritualistic factors: it is a thesis that could nevertheless be supported, but at the price of what dialectic aerobatics! This, needless to say, when one wishes to compare it with the facts, with the entire sum of the available data, not only with those with which it is convenient for us. If, on the other hand, instead of as a hypothesis to explain the phenomena, one wishes to use it as a kind of formula of exorcism, like a kind of *keep back Satan* to frighten a demonized spiritualism with a pitch-fork, then this is a totally different matter.

Compared to the affected, cunning complexity of the reasoning one has to resort to in order to really exclude the spiritualistic explanation from all the mediumistic manifestations, it is incomparably more simple and appears incomparably more plausible to admit that one can resort to such an interpretative formula in at least a more limited number of cases.

In a particular manner, if alleged entities give us news that then proves to be exact, one could well hypothesize, at least in certain cases, that such information comes from genuine sources. We will then see what on the other hand one could conclude when the affirmations of the alleged entities are, rather than verified, falsified.

As far as the experimentation carried out by us is concerned, one can generally associate to the elements of confirmation other elements which, isolated and considered in themselves, would lead to more negative conclusions. Of each phenomenon quoted as an example both these falsifying elements as well as those of positive confirmation will be noticed.

The first case I would like to mention is that of the entity Elisa, defunct grandmother of our friend Stefania. Our young friend seems to be a rather remarkable subject, although we have not managed to persuade her to experiment in a more systematic manner and let herself be studied a little more in depth: it is precisely the fact of "being studied" that makes her uneasy. *Leit-motiv* of the scarce communications we have obtained from Elisa is that she lovingly watches over her granddaughter and, if necessary, defends her. She defended her, so to speak, also against us, one day that Stefania was absent: one of her disappearances which at the time we deplored and to which we then resigned ourselves, since the people of whom we are not the teachers should be taken as they are and for what they can give if and when they want.

The first time that Stefania came to us we welcomed her and then experimented with her with the usual telewriting. And her grandmother Elisa manifested herself for the first time to me (see the written record No. 209 of the 5th of September 1986).

In April of 1988 Stefania joined our experimental group for a brief period of time. A certain séance started at nine in the evening with the following modalities. Five of us were sitting around a small three legged table and were holding our hands open palm down over it with our little fingers touching those of our neighbour's. As a means of communication the table is, needless to say, rather slow, but can contribute in establishing a mediumistic atmosphere between us, enough to break the ice. After a few questions to which the entity answered with a *yes* or a *no*, the entity called herself more in detail *Grandma Elisa*. It was time to attempt a quicker type of communication; Bettina and I sat in the corner of a bigger table, with a board, and our fingers touching the glass. Stefania also placed her own fingers on the glass, to attract her grandmother and transfer her to us. We immediately felt that an invisible guest had risen to the bait. «Are you Grandma Elisa?» I asked. *Yes*. «If you don't mind, can you give us your name as confirmation?» *Elisa*. «Tell us everything you like». *Do you want messages?* «We would like to know something about your present condition». *She knows that it is a pleasant state*. «Do you still have your human aspect? If so, can you describe it to us?» *She knows*. «Can you not tell us anything about your present condition?» *I want her*.

Stefania took over as the interrogator, keeping herself to more general matters: «How are you Grandma?» *Fine*. This was at least something, and we were nevertheless pleased to hear it. I took up the questioning again: «Elisa, do you want to tell us anything more specific, or for Stefania?» *I want to say that Stefania [is] a dear granddaughter*. «Then what?» ...*Whom I love*. She had stopped without finishing her sentence. Second break. But he who thought the sentence had come to the end would be terribly wrong. In answer to a new question, Elisa concluded with: ...*A lot*. This time it had finished, inexorably finished, both the sentence and the whole discourse with it. When asked: «Do you want to say anything else?» Elisa replied: *No*.

Therefore we were left with nothing other to do than ask: «Is there another soul who wishes to speak to us?» *Yes*, came the answer. «Who is this other entity?» *Egidio*. «Egidio who?» *Grandfather*. (The other one, not Elisa's husband). Egidio made a sad request: *masses*, because, he added, *I am in need*. «In what condition are you, Egidio?» I asked. He replied: *Dark*. «What else?» *And very cold*. Stefania intervened: «Aren't the masses we had said for you enough?» *No*. *Pray*. «Grandpa, don't worry, we will have other masses celebrated». *Alright*. «We are with you, Egidio, by your side», I added. «This is a bad moment, but it will pass».

Fifty days later (20th May) when the collaboration with Stefania had stopped a long time ago (to tell the truth, more on her initiative rather than ours: but every one has their own intimate reasons which are not for others to censure, however much they may not like them) we had another séance, Bettina and myself, with Carmelo and Maria Grazia (who had already intervened in the aforementioned one) and a new addition: Rosanna. And Elisa unexpectedly returned to communicate with us.

Under mine and Bettina's fingers the glass ran up and down across the board a number of times. And, when we asked the still unknown entity who she was she immediately answered: *Grandma Elisa*. With my usual accomplished technique of pretending I hadn't understood, I asked: «Whose grandma?» *Stefania's*, she answered, *who you don't love*. «Stefania», I replied, «is a dear friend and I am very fond of her». *You may say so, but is it true?* «Of course. Can't you read my thoughts?» *No*. *You're only saying it to please me*. *She is a good girl*. «Who ever questioned it? I too am a good boy». *She needs to speak*. «When she wants to, we are here. I am fond of her and respect her. I only have one reservation: that she is not constant, she wants and doesn't want, she gives you an appointment, then cancels it. She goes up and down like shares on the stock market». *No, no, no, no*. *You are impatient*. «I didn't know that Stefania had such a terrible grandmother». *She is a girl that should be defended*. «You defend her excellently. But there's no need to do it against me: there's no reason to do so. Do you want to send her a message?» *That I am by her side and I protect*

her. «Not from me I hope». *Invite her with love.* «Of course, in the hope that she will come». *She has physical and psychic problems.* «We are wide-open to all understanding possible. Do you have anything else you wish to tell us?» *No.* *Love her.* «Do you also have a good word for us?» *Be more patient.* «A little kind word for us, after all?» *Look after yourselves.* «Regards to you too, Elisa» (418).

I must confess a little ashamedly that I didn't immediately see to granting Grandma Elisa's wish and keep the promise I had made to her. Besides the friendly relationship that continued magnificently, the experimentation with Stefania had marked time, at least for the time being. Above all her health reasons should lead one to the utmost caution.

It was nevertheless remarkable that an entity tied to a certain person had come to us in absence of that person, without her knowing it and in a totally unexpected sudden manner. Grandma Elisa invisibly helped and protected her granddaughter, and heaven help he who laid a finger on her: this is all very human. Likewise human is the request for mass and prayers for the souls of the dead, made by Grandpa Egidio, who seemed to be in much more unpleasant conditions. By coming to us in the absence of Stefania, did Grandma Elisa, besides vivaciously expressing her well-known affection for her granddaughter, give us particular information that could then be verified? As we can see, she was unwilling to give us information regarding herself. That the two Grandmas Elisa, the one who separately manifested herself to us and the one who manifested herself before in the presence of Stefania, were the same personality only appears probable by means of the motivations that appeared through both in the first and second case with full coherence and continuity.

Linked to the experimentation of the same group is the case of another entity, Edith. When she was living on earth, Edith was a girl from Venice. She was about twenty years old when, so it seems, she was murdered and her body disappeared in rather mysterious circumstances, which she herself is unwilling to remember. On the other hand we are not policemen and it is not our task to distress the entities, to pester them with third degree interrogations, especially when our relationship with them is already hanging on by a thread because of their intolerance towards our «scientific» method and our request of news to verify.

The entity Edith had been, so to say, borrowed by us from two other young friends: Fabrizio and Giulia. Who are they? They are two young people, of about twenty years old, sentimentally bound to one another. They came to visit us on their own initiative and took part in a number of séances before the long summer interlude. Edith is «Fabrizio's spirit guide» and she manifested herself through Giulia's mediumism, which appeared to be rather outstanding. Through Giulia, with Fabrizio present, Edith manifested herself to us in three different ways: table, telewriting and incorporation mediumism (in other words speaking through the medium's mouth, without however altering the usual voice in this case).

During one of these séances I asked Edith if she wished to separately come and make Bettina and me another visit. Edith answered that she would like to: the first occasion arrived, since I was experimenting alone with my wife and only with her, I called Edith. After I had called her, which I had carried out with the due concentration of both of us on the desired entity, the glass, which we had already placed on the «yes» box, also remained there when I asked the question «Are you Edith?» Then, when I repeatedly asked the same question a number of times the glass started to move slowly in a circular direction in an increasingly more determined manner. I asked: «As a proof: who are you?» Answer: *E. I am Fabrizio's spiritual guide.* It would take too much time to transcribe or refer everything we said to one another. There were two visits made by Edith, one on the 15th and the other on the 17th of April: both of them made after we had called her.

What did Edith tell us in substance? After her tragic death, it seems that she did not fully integrate in the other dimension. In a certain way she remained bound to earth. Her soul did not take on any human aspect; nor can we say that she integrated in that sphere of the afterlife where normally in the first stages after passing away the entities that have kept the aspect they had when living on earth do indeed have a mental life, but one that is thronged with images that recall those of earth very close up (in the same way to images and scenes of our dreams).

Edith remained wandering in this world and was immediately attracted to Fabrizio. This young man nurtured a very keen interest for mediumistic experiences. Therefore Edith wanted to be his «spirit guide». She followed his existence for a couple of years without being able to manifest herself to him, until this was made possible thanks to Fabrizio's meeting with Giulia, who is a medium. Edith confessed that she was in love with Fabrizio. Who, to tell the truth, is a handsome young man, dark haired, with a rather gloomy character and, coherently, a man of few words if not taciturn. The fact was, however, that Edith ignored Fabrizio's physical aspect. In her present condition she did not see things, she did not perceive physical realities, but she read thoughts. This incapability of hers to perceive physical realities seems to be related to her lack of corporeal-like form. This form, or human aspect, continues to substitute in its own way something material for the soul, although it is obviously of a thinner materiality than that of her body that is no longer. Edith's love for Fabrizio, deprived as it was of sensuality, seemed to be more definable as an affinity love.

It is worth noticing certain particulars. When Edith manifested herself, both to the group and to us two alone, the glass made the same movements in the same style, in both cases with extreme energy. Our two young friends confirmed the fact that Edith appeared to be very fond of Fabrizio and in a certain way in love with him, although she was unaware of and indifferent to his physical aspect. They confirmed, so it seems, that she had no human form. She never mentioned or referred to her experiences of the afterlife spheres. Every now and then, she used to like to come out with «short phrases» (as Giulia called them) that had their own certain incisiveness and sounded, so to speak, like sentences, or judgments, that had a sententiousness typical of many adolescents. In Edith there was a sort of desire to be with others, but since she spoke very little, getting a word out of her was like pulling teeth, they sometimes wondered and asked her: «Are you fed up with talking to us? Well, let us communicate with someone else». But she stayed there. She had kind of mood swings: sometimes she was very outgoing and extrovert, then she fell back, if not in true and proper dumbness, then in a laconicism that she had in common with Fabrizio. She sometimes seemed to be jealous of Giulia. And therefore, between jealousy and silence, there were moments in which the three of them sat there not knowing what to say.

As far as I was concerned, I was helped by my insistence, which I fed with my usual lists of little questions to ask regarding the post mortem condition (besides, what else can one ask disincarnated souls?), but Edith liked these questions even less than Grandma Elisa.

Although Edith said very little about herself, this particular experience had with Fabrizio and Giulia was important in the sense that I will immediately explain: they made it possible for Bettina and I to communicate with one of «their» entities, who manifested herself to us two in ways that they themselves had confirmed as being typical of her: in other words, Edith revealed characteristics of her personality to us that, in a certain way, we had ignored and which, a subsequent interview with Giulia and Fabrizio was of use as verification.

Latest news regarding Edith. Fabrizio and Giulia came to see us again in the autumn and told us that they had had very few communications in the summer, in which Edith had hardly ever appeared. In the spring she had already told us that she would have absented herself for a long period of time in order to integrate in her own after world dimension better. At the moment she was very busy in this sense and was in the company of other souls, so that she could go up a level. From other sources I have understood that, sooner or later, the souls are urgently requested to «raise themselves». This urging comes above all from the «guides», who can have individual talks with the souls, but can also gather them together in small groups in kinds of seminars, where, besides other things, special meditation techniques are taught and placed into action that are particularly useful for the aforementioned purposes. Edith, however, did not speak about guides. It is likely that a certain lack of preparation of our two young friends prevented the flow of more complete information, precisely due to a lack of receptiveness from the human channels: the mediumistic one is a strange message where the receiver cooperates as much as the sender in its drafting.

Both Stefania and Giulia appear as being two very valid subjects. We have also carried out other experimentations with them in our centre «The Convivium» in Rome, which I will not mention here

as they are of no interest to this particular discourse. If health reasons were not a hindrance, if we managed to carry out an experimental activity with a certain perseverance, then I have no doubt that we could obtain excellent results.

We could also mention cases of entities borrowed by us from our friends, without them, however, having any knowledge whatsoever of them before: these are Mes, given to us by Efsio Cabras, and Fievole (Feeble) who came to us on the occasion of a visit made by two other friends of ours Mr. and Mrs. Fiorello and Mariacristina Verrico. From a certain point of view these latter two cases are less important for us (precisely due to the lack of previous knowledge concerning other people from whom we could obtain elements of confirmation) whereas, due to different aspects, they are interesting and worth noticing. Their analysis is, if nothing else, precious for the knowledge of certain mechanisms.

Let's consider the case of Mes. Such is the name used by a totally new entity in introducing himself (new for us two as well as for our friends) in the telewriting séance of the 30th of December 1986 (257). Present with myself and Bettina were also Efsio, Gianni, Elvezia and Viviana. Out of us six, those who really moved the glass when acting as channels were Bettina and Efsio. Since there are two channels that normally function, in coordinating the experiment I made sure that all those present took it in turns, in a way, however, that one of these was always either Bettina or Efsio. This allowed the glass to continue to move and to give answers without stopping, as happens on the contrary when Bettina is available as the only valid channel, when she has gone out of play and elements, which can only help but not do, remain with their fingers on the glass.

Due to the presence of these two valid subjects, Mes' discourse continued without stopping. As a matter of fact, it proved to be a coherent discourse not only in content, but also in style. The sentences flowed on also when I suddenly ordered a «change of the guard», in other words a substitution of one of the two channels not only in the middle of a sentence, but (always more difficult!) also in the middle of a word.

What did Mes tell us, also here, in substance? His condition was *not a happy one*. His was one of *expiation* in the *dark* and *loneliness*. What was he expiating? *One of his many lives*. What came up here was the subject of reincarnation. Although convinced that with death something is recycled not only in the physical ambit (decomposition of the corpse and the return of its chemical elements to the great cycle of nature) but, likewise, to the psychic level (probable «reincarnation» of the psychic remains that the disincarnated soul gradually abandons), although admitting all of this we are not reincarnationists in the current sense of the word. Neither are the souls we come to communicate with, as a rule, for affinity. The reincarnationist Mes was rather attracted, for affinity, by the definite reincarnationistic orientation of Efsio and Viviana and most likely Elvezia. Nevertheless, a soul of this or the other tendency is not so much attracted by the tendency that prevails in us who are present, so to speak, for a number of votes, as rather by that which prevails in us due to psychic forces. It is well known how pugnacious the reincarnationists are: so much so that they impose themselves, even if there are only a few of them, up against a silent and discreet majority of people who think and feel differently but don't make it a burden.

What had Mes done in his life on earth, or one of *his many lives* as he prefers? He committed the sin of *egoism*. He *lived a very free life without reserve*.

«Were you aware that you were living badly?» I asked. He replied: *No*. «Well, then it really isn't so much your fault». *No, because evil doesn't exist*. «Why are you expiating an evil that doesn't exist?»

Mes gave a brief outline, which was significant despite a certain inappropriateness of language, of his conception of the relativity of evil, which then found confirmation in rather well-known and widespread forms of pantheism. In order to refer to the East, of particular mention are the «non dualistic» Indian doctrines; as far as the West is concerned, one only has to mention the names of people like Giordano Bruno, Spinoza and, always of course *mutatis mutandis*, someone like Hegel. It is a mentality that is very much widespread amongst the adherents of that school of spirituality which, roughly designated as «theosophy» and, today, «esotericism», revisits the Indian traditions

with a mentality that cannot be but western and therefore ends up by proving to be rather foreign, reductive and banalized despite its best intentions.

Said using Mes' words: *Evil doesn't exist, because all evil and good exists. Evil or good exist on the basis of some hypotheses.* In other words (if, needless to say, I have understood): in absolute terms, a unitary reality exists in one whole block, which cannot be definable either as good or bad since, in its absoluteness, it is beyond all of this, it is above it all. It is us who, by dismantling the one reality with our concepts, hypotheses and theories, speak of «good» and of «evil». What can come into play here are our personal painful or gratifying experiences. However, we have to be careful, Mes warns us: *We should not let ourselves get carried away by emotivity.* What comes to mind here is the «Don't laugh, don't cry, or abhor, but understand» said by old Spinoza.

«Dear Mes», I replied, «a physical pain, or evil, for example a toothache, is no longer a simple hypothesis». *It is a necessity*, he replied. «What do you mean?» *You have to think of the expiation materially.* (If I have understood: it is good, since it allows you to expiate what you did that was «bad, wrong, or evil» in the past, always in a relative sense).

In this way, we met Mes in that more numerous séance. I have reason to consider him an entity borrowed by us from others, since I think that it would be very unlikely for a soul of his trend to spontaneously come into contact with us at least in that epoch. At that time it was almost exclusively Christian souls who came to communicate with us, souls who did not believe in reincarnation but in the resurrection. It was later on, and only later on, that we also became more receptive to souls of different traditions and beliefs.

Four days later, on the 3rd of January 1987, finding ourselves once again experimenting alone, Bettina and I called Mes. In answer to the question «Are you Mes?» the first entity did not answer yes, as happens when our invisible visitor does not wish to lie or lose this contact with the living on the earth that he has most likely been eagerly waiting for. We were sorry but we had to cut ourselves off. After the second call, and the repeated question, we were answered in the affirmative. We let this entity study the letters and then we asked him: «In order to confirm, who are you?» *Mes*, he answered.

The dialogue that followed is interesting for its theoretical consequences. «Dear Mes», I attacked, «the other time we were unable to end our conversation». *Energies had run out.* «We really wore you out with all those changing of the guards». *The changes lead to a greater expenditure of energy than the normal conversation between us two.* «Nevertheless you gave us a wonderful demonstration that you do not reduce yourself to us, but that you are yourself despite the variations of the human channels». *Perhaps the conversation was rather confused.* «On the contrary, it seemed to me, in substance, that you expressed yourself very clearly and with perfect coherence». *You know, one formulates the thought. The transcription of the latter is modified in the mind of the carrying subject.* «Who is the carrying subject?» *The one in the couple who possesses more energy.*

«Speaking specifically about the séance four days ago, which one of us influenced you the most?» *The influence, as you call it, does not only come from the couple that is operating but from the entire group. The carriers in the couple are not always valid. Let me explain: if Bettina is an excellent carrier with you, she may not be if she operates with Efisio or Elvezia. Now there is a further explanation. Efisio is stronger and Elvezia weaker. Why is the message not influenced by Bettina? Efisio, being stronger, imposes his transmission. Elvezia is weaker, but Bettina is not capable of opposing her energies, those of Viviana, of Efisio and of Gianni. Have I made myself clear enough?*

It is more than clear that Bettina and I had been overwhelmed by the eastern-esoteric-reincarnationist coalition of our other four friends put together. Needless to say, they were the ones who attracted Mes instead of the Christian-Catholic soul (or thereabouts) who usually rises to our bait. However, the industrious Mes told us something else, which we should take into special consideration: it seems that Efisio and his friends had not only overwhelmed us, but also him.

«What actually was the result of the other time?» *The message was the one that filtered through from their convictions.* «So what are your convictions?» *I too have convictions that are different to yours, but I see that some of their convictions have entered.* «What actual difference is there between your own convictions and those that you expressed willingly or unwillingly?» *Good and evil is not a subject that one dismisses or solves in two words: «There is no evil» or «There is no good». It is a long argumentation.* «So those affirmations that were expressed the last time, how would you correct them now?» *«Evils» and not «evil». For us (I imagine he means to say: for us disincarnated souls) there is no physical evil, but for you there is toothache. Do you remember? «I remember very well». For Efisio evil is sin: but what sin? He doesn't specify, but he says as a whole that they don't exist. And so on (258).*

Always if I have understood, Mes does not recognize himself in a too schematic monism; neither does he recognize himself, more generally speaking, in any doctrine proposed in a dogmatic, inarticulate and hurried manner. If his theosophism was attracted by our four friends (all rather aggressive esoterics, some more some less) then it may be that also mine and Bettina's taste for more articulated and nuancés discourses could have to some extent attracted him: he also seems to share this taste, this liking, but it is only now that he has managed to express it, with the help that Bettina and I can give him now that we were alone without any interference of third parties.

As one well remembers, we have already spent many pages in Mes' company. The reader has already obtained a lot of news on him and I apologize for any repetitions I deemed necessary, so that the problem we now face could be put into perspective in its most precise terms and in the most explicit manner.

The attitude of a soul in its present disincarnated condition, its beliefs, its trend, its inhibitions, all of this has its bases in what the same soul was when it was incarnate on earth. «What faith, or what convictions did you have in your last earthly existence?» I asked Mes. Who explained to me that at that time he was a *non Catholic, with a strong attraction for the Indian religiousness, a convinced reincarnationist.* «What were you: a Blavatski, a Besant theosophist? a Steiner anthroposophist?» *Yes, yes. Theosophist (269).*

Mes labeled his own trend by himself. Let's see now how, by his own words, certain inhibitions that appear to be connected to that certain trend are clarified. It concerns, in substance, a certain inability to pray, a certain qualm of assuming the attitude of prayer in full, despite one's best intentions: the habit to steer one's own spirit in a certain way, the habit to organize one's own spiritual life in a certain manner could exclude different habits, like that of prayer. The theosophist claims to be able to resolve the problems of the soul through a gain of consciousness which, in the end, remains of an intellectualistic type: it is the subject who, of his own initiative and by concentrating on his own means, turns the attention to certain things that he is taught and in the end – at least one hopes – understands them, assimilates them. They are teachings that do indeed go back to inner experiences had by someone a very long time ago, but which are handed down like a notional baggage, by intellectualistically learning and by more or less repeating – so to speak - in a slavish manner: as one commonly says, in parrot fashion.

If I have well understood, all of this also comes out from the case of our friend Mes. On the 5th January I opened a discourse with him with the following words: «I have met other souls who were in the same condition as yours and, as far as I know, they were able to improve it with short prayers that I taught them. Needless to say, it is not the case that I insistently advise a soul to do things he doesn't feel like doing or which he is unwilling, or unprepared to do. If I am not too indiscreet, I would like to ask you a question: do you pray? Do you address God like you would address a Person, a You?» *I do not pray with such a personal relationship,* replied Mes, *but I worship Him, I contemplate Him.* «The important thing is that we have a direct line with God». *Yes, yes.* «But do you feel God like a force that pulls you up?» *He reabsorbs me.* «It is as if you are at the bottom of a well at the moment and you need someone to throw you down a rope to pull you out». *The power of God.* «Do you invoke it?» *Yes.* «I think that you more than anyone else feel this need to be saved». *Yes, yes, yes, yes.* «So you have to abandon yourself to this Superior Force who alone can save

you». *Yes, yes: an abandon*. «It is not you who has to save yourself from yourself, it is not you who pulls you up by yourself». *No*. «It is God who saves you. Right?» *Clear* (259).

Whatever the ideologies which prompted our dear Mes, he became well aware of all of this due to direct experience: it is from his verified incapability of pulling himself out using his own strengths that his personal *De profundis* arises, his spontaneous invocation to He Who can truly bring him to safety.

He is well convinced of the need to abandon himself to God: but then, is he really capable of doing it? It's easier said than done, says the old proverb. *I am always thinking of God*, our invisible friend confessed to us five days later, *but perhaps there is something lacking in my relationship with Him... I abandon myself to God, but in a way [...]* (A pause followed). «Concentrate on the idea you have in mind and the word you are looking for will come out by itself» *...Intellectual?... That is, my abandon is not an attitude of prayer*. I insisted on the need for our friend to establish a personal relationship with God: that he should learn to address Him «informally» like he does with his fellows with whom he establishes a person to person relationship. *I find it easy to do it with you*, replied Mes, *but the difficulty with Him is addressing Him «informally»... Unfortunately one carries around a baggage of human convictions with oneself that remain engraved and influence one* (261). As we can see, the best diagnosis is that our friend ends up by doing things by himself: with a, I would say, rather autonomous gain of consciousness, although my maieutics may have influenced him to some non essential extent.

Even if I have not reported everything, I have somewhat talked at length remembering essential points of a certain discourse that I had with Mes, with the aim of helping him come out of his rather unpleasant condition. Here, I have to some extent marked time for a double reason: in the first place, in order to give an idea of what his big problem was at the time, how he himself defined it although urged by myself; in the second place, in order to illustrate the antecedent fact of what was to be our new collective experiment of the 13th of January.

On this date, Bettina and I met up again with Efisio and Viviana and two other friends: Giuse and Olga. On the contrary, Gianni and Elvezia were justifiably absent. Also on this occasion two little tables were set up next to one another around which the couples Efisio-Olga and Bettina-Filippo sat down at the beginning. Bettina and I began calling Mes, who almost immediately gave signs of life, on the second attempt. I proposed him to undergo this experiment: other human channels would take over and I would have asked him to sum up the terms of the conversation held by him in the previous communication with us two regarding his present problem. I precisely referred to what I have just reported. I will give a list of some of the essential answers, at least at first sight and before receiving his comments, which seemed to me somewhat disconcerting, to say the least. I have numbered each reply.

1) In answer to the first replies, with Bettina and I acting as channels, when I asked him «How are you?» Mes, who had already given his own name, replied: *You living*.

2) *I am a new experience* (channels: Bettina and I at the two first words; Olga and Efisio during the next three words).

3) *My new life has no problems, but new experiences* (Olga-Efisio).

4) *I am working* (Efisio-Filippo).

5) *I am pleased you ask me questions* (idem)

6) *I would like to know the right road for me for my upward ascent* (Efisio-Olga).

7) *I know little, but I know that I still have a lot to do* (same channels).

8) *My condition is very nebulous* (idem).

9) *I don't know how to face it, because when I look up high I forget my suffering* (idem).

10) *I love his buts* (Olga-Giuse).

11) *His mistakes: I love the mistakes I made because they have made me know* (idem).

12) *My soul is free* (Giuse-Efisio).

13) At this point Bettina and I went back to acting as channels. In answer to my question «What is your soul free from?» Mes answered: *From my physical body*.

And so: from the moment in which Bettina and went back to acting as mediumistic channels, the situation began to gradually improve and poor Mes finally returned on the right track.

In order to give an idea of this gradual return, of his first uncertain steps and of his final decisive re-entry on the right track, I have reported the series of replies. I objected: «I thought that your soul had not made free itself from your physical body, but from your nebulous condition». *That long evolution.* «In other words, is a long evolution required in order for you to free yourself of your negative condition?» *Yes.* «But who are you? Tell me your name again please». *Already told you: Mes.* (This is a question that I normally repeated every now and then, a little to verify if our interlocutor was still the same one). «Let's see if we can pick up our discourse we had together the last time, in the previous séance». *Waiting for the evolutive journey is not easy: many theories have to fall.* «We are still speaking generically. Do you remember anything more specific and precise that I said to you the last time? What advice did I give you regarding the best attitude to adopt?» *Abandon to God.* «Ah! We've got there at last! So what was your difficulty?» *An intellectualistic attitude.*

«Well done Mes. How did you get it? Did you think it over?» *From you.* «Do you mean to say that you recovered the memory by obtaining it from me?» *Yes.* «Any more declarations?» *I can't manage to do what you want me to do.* Already when I proposed to him the experiment of summing up the terms of the conversation had days before, Mes had replied in telegraphic style: *Depends [on] memory. I'll try.* Evidently the communicating entity's memory gets its strength from the memory of the human channels that are operating at the time. By changing the channels, replacing them with new channels that know nothing about him, the entity can no longer manage to remember certain things. This does not at all mean to say that he is no longer still the same entity: it does not at all mean to say that he had changed his own identity. Mes remained himself all along. In fact, in answer to the repeated question of who he was, he always answered *Mes*, with infinite patience. At least this answer was correct and coherent since the people present had all been informed of his name. «Are you referring to the experiment?» I asked. «Look, your success is not at all a question of life or death. Even if it fails, we are happy with understanding the mechanism of the failure».

My condition is nebulous. «What do you mean?» *No light.* «Are you not saying it in the sense that you don't have clear ideas at the moment?» *No.* «Has your situation improved since the last time?» *More shaded.* «Go on, say it». *Softer.*

Certainly he wanted to say that the clouds that surrounded him were gradually losing their thickness, and that he was beginning to see or at least catch a glimpse of something or some presence and therefore not feel as alone as before: these things have already been clarified. He can't say anymore than this. He is dead tired. All of these replacements, changing of the guards and all his mental efforts to answer in an unpleasant situation like a third degree interrogation have exhausted his energies, so much so that our good old Mes can only manage to express fragments of words which make no sense to us: *App... app... asfi... fitam.* In answer to the question asking him if he was tired he answered by turning the glass onto the *yes* box. In reply to our warmest thanks for what he had done; he answered: *Regards* (262).

Two days later, on the 15th of January, Mes came back to communicate with Bettina and I alone. It was the time to critically examine together everything that was said in the séance of the 13th January with all those somewhat strange sentences that had allegedly come from him and which we needed to see to what extent they were his own work and what the hell they meant. It is worthwhile mentioning this dialogue here once more almost in full.

The communication had a playful beginning. In answer to the question «As confirmation, who are you?» The answer was *Sem.* «Are you Mes back to front?» *Mes, so you understood straight away then!* «Dear Mes, would you mind commenting on our last séance, the one we had two days ago with the intervention of our friends. First of all, how did you feel?» *Not at ease: psychological and emotional barriers.*

«I understand well. Now I'm going to read you what you said step by step on that occasion, at least in the form that reached us.

1) «When I asked you “How are you?” what reached me was the answer “You Living”. What does it mean?» *You living: also you living, how are you?* «Did you want to reply with this kind of sentence and only the words “you living” came out?» *Yes: only a part of the answer.*

2) At this point I read him the written report until the sentence «I am a new experience». I asked him: «What does this latter expression mean?» *I am in a new experience.*

3) «You then said: “My life has no problems, but new experiences”». *No more earthly problems.* «I wasn’t referring at all in this question to problems you had on earth, but to those you have in the spiritual world now». *But this wasn’t transmitted by the channels.* (Who were, as one remembers, Olga and Efsio). «What was not transmitted by the channels?» *I give a thought.* «Okay. So what happened in the transmission?» *The problem became earthly and not spiritual.* «Can you please explain yourself better, so as to clarify the whole context of your answer, too?» *That is to say, the present problem is evolutive, or rather, of new experiences. My new life has no earthly problems, but has the problem of having new experiences, in other words, of evolving.* «Therefore, you still have problems, although of a different kind». *It is an evolutive problem that comes to pass through new experiences.*

4) I continued to read the written report until the sentence «I am working», and I asked him: «What work was it?» *Work of remembering.*

5) «Immediately after you said: “I am pleased you ask me questions”». *Questions, not summary.* «In other words, you meant to say: “Ask me questions, as I am unable to make a summary in this moment”?» *Yes.*

6) You then said: “I would like to know the right road for my upward ascent”. This seemed rather generic to me. Did you perhaps mean to say something more specific, more precise?» *The discourse we had already had: my personal relationship with God.* «Was this thought in your mind? Was there the memory of your specific problem of your relationship with God?» *A little vague.* «Nevertheless it was there». *Yes.* «And so it became even vaguer when it was transmitted through Efsio and Olga who knew nothing about it».

7) «Then in answer to the question “What is your present condition?” the following answer came out “I know little, but I know that I still have a lot to do”». *Always because of my difficulty with relationship.*

8) «Then: “My condition is very nebulous”». *I’m in the dark.* «Also in the fog». *In the fog.*

9) «Furthermore: “I don’t know how to face it because when I look up high I forget my suffering”». *I don’t know how to face it because I have difficulty in praying.* «This “looking up high” makes you “forget your suffering”: what do you mean?» *In the hope of an elevation I will forget suffering.* «But what happens about your difficulty in praying?» *It is only hope.*

Before moving on to the examination of answer n. 10 allow me to give a personal interpretation of answer n. 9, which I formulated at a later date when the relationship with Mes had already finished a long time earlier and I did not therefore have any possibility of submitting it to him himself. The theosophists, the esoterists and such like, like Mes, tend to skip over the empirical situation: it is precisely with this «looking up high» that they imagine they have already arrived or nearly arrived, or they «hope» to arrive there easily. Therefore they tend to consider this dualism as something already overcome, whereas it takes much more to overcome this. It is a dualism which, in reality, they remain immersed in. It is only by invoking God that they can truly save themselves, given the impotence of man. Otherwise, it concerns a purely imaginary and verbal salvation. The «hope» Mes trusts in in certain moments is illusory: when the moment of his illusory «looking up high» has passed, he goes back to his «sufferance».

10) «The next sentence that came out was this: “I love his buts”». *But you always say “but”.* «So you love my “buts”: why?» *Sorry, but you are rather funny.* «Do you mean that when I say “but” it’s funny? Keep in mind that when I say “but” in that way, it’s to imitate you». *So I must be funny too then.*

11) «However, immediately after, in answer to my question “What does his buts mean?” this reply came out “His mistakes” which then had this specification: “I love the mistakes I made

because they have made me know”». *I don't remember “mistakes” now. The contact with you happened in an unpleasant condition.*

12) «Then you supposedly said: “My soul is free”. What do you mean?» *Freer since I have been communicating with you.*

13) «At this point Bettina and I took over once more. In answer to my question what did you want to say exactly “My soul is free” the answer that came out was “From my physical body”». *But it is banal. «I'll attempt an explanation: most likely with the couple of channels that came before us (made up of Giuse and Efisio) you gave the right interpretation; but then, when we took over and you forget it, you replaced it with a banal interpretation». Perhaps this was the case.*

The rather unrewarding reading of the...incriminating answers is over, thank God. And all that is left to do is to evoke that final part of the previous communication again in which we see Mes reacquire, in a few brief words, his memory of the exact terms of his problem and his capability to express them in an appropriate manner.

At this point I made the following consideration: «I have noticed, dear Mes, that when you once again had Bettina and me as channels, at first you continued not to remember the things you said to us two alone, and then, with somewhat rapid progress, you once again remembered them very well». *Identification.*

«The process of identification is gradual: is this what you mean?» *Yes. My energies have to tune in to your vital tone which changes according to your physical, psychic, mental and emotional condition.*

«Do these changes also take place during the same séance?» *Yes. Sometimes you are tired or irritable and this has an influence on the entire conversation. You should not let yourselves enter our contact. Instead, this part of you enters.*

«Does Bettina behave well as a channel?» *Bettina is more relaxed when she works with you. On the contrary she is tense when she works with the others. (As a matter of fact, we work together in perfect harmony as a couple of channels, and we give our best performances when there are no third parties involved: good subjects and excellent friends as they may be, their presence nevertheless lowers the level of communication, it impoverishes it, it makes it become rather trivial: this is a more than evident fact, object of pure observation, for which we can blame nobody. Maybe, Bettina unconsciously shows a certain bashfulness in performing). «Mes, when do you no longer feel our presence and can no longer manage to remember things we said to each other when alone? Is it when we take our fingers off the glass? Is it when we move some metres away from the séance table?» *If a chain for direct contact has been created between you, then your presence continues for a while; but if the detachment is immediate and you move away, then it could be immediate. «What could be immediate?» The lack of presence.**

«What happened when our presence went away: could you remember but couldn't manage to transmit? Or couldn't you even remember?» *With you or with them? «What I mean is: while they were acting as channels». Two possibilities (here Mes actually said *colon* and therefore I had to put it in): the impossibility for me to remember and the difficulty in trying to give suggestions to Efisio, which then had to be transformed into words. «Which one of the two possibilities most often happens?» Both of them a bit (263).*

I have somewhat talked at length about Mes because from the experience we had with him what came out *in nuce* was what by now only remains to be developed, to study more thoroughly, to analyse in detail, as I will do step by step by mentioning experiences had with other entities.

What is remarkable is the fact that Mes, in passing on to communicate through different channels, «said» somewhat unexpected and strange things, which, however, in coming back into contact with us for a critical re-examination, found it hard to explain why they had come out.

As a useful comparison I will now shortly mention analogous attempts of justification made by other entities. I have put them in chronological order and have limited myself to a few chosen examples in a much vaster material.

Tonino, who, at a certain moment decided to call himself Tony, was a reckless fellow when alive on this earth: motorcyclist (who in fact died by crashing his motorbike head on into an undefined obstacle), a discogoer and organizer of small musical groups, or bands. In one of his astral life phases similar to those on earth, he rather unsuccessfully tried to organize one in the sphere, too. On the 8th of November 1985 he came to visit us for the umpteenth time as lively as ever although a little disappointed by the poor success of his astral band which was stagnant. All of a sudden the exact expression 459 *too too too* came out whose meaning escaped me, although he immediately tried to explain it by saying: *Music. Rhythm. New music. Too too too. My way of composing* (74).

The following time, when reading the written report to Tony who had come back to us two when we were alone, I asked him: «Can you please explain what “459 too too too” means?». *To compose modern music*, explained Tony, *one uses numbers or syllables more than notes*. (Another friend of ours said that this method is adopted by young people, but we knew nothing about it). *I’ll give you an example*, went on Tony. *You want to sing a song but you don’t know the words, so you put in numbers*. To show him that I had understood, I sang «O sole mio» saying, instead «Three four four nine nine». *Yes, yes* (75).

On the 13th November 1985 the spiritual guide Sirio came to visit us who, at a certain point, expressed himself through a trio of channels made up of Vittorio, Camilla and myself. By referring to one of Camilla’s uncles, Sirio said, besides other things: *Life and love to her uncle*, then *Best wishes uncle*, and finally *I feel it* (76). The interpretation of the somewhat sibylline phrases was provided six days later by Sirio himself. The three phrases meant: the first *Camilla’s uncle is alive and needs love* and the second one *Best wishes for his spiritual journey*, whilst Sirio wanted to express his own sensation with the third one: *I felt Camilla’s anxiety*. As a matter of fact, the guide remarked that *The channel was difficult*. What were the reasons? *You and Vittorio weak, Camilla foreign* (79).

Another discourse, on the following occasion addressed by the same Sirio to Bettina and Lilia, acting as channels, proved to be somewhat out of proportion: *Everything is safe with you. You give love and peace to everyone, good and happiness in the world, goodheartedness and charity. You give the example to nations and populations* (82).

A few days later our guide, so dear but sometimes rather enigmatic, gave us his explanations: *Everything with Bettina and Lilia is okay: that is couple*. «Do you mean to say that they work well as a couple?» *The couple goes safe*. «As channels?» *Yes*. «Okay. What the hell did you say after that?» *They give love and peace*. «Do you mean they are and have to be good and charitable?» *Yes*. «And what about these examples they give to nations and populations...?» *It is a way of saying*. «Rather out of proportion, since they are not the Queen Elizabeth of England and Catherine the Great, but only Bettina and Lilia, two very small middle class women». *If they are good, charitable, happy, pacifists, if they come into contact with people of other nations...* «They set them a good example». *Yes*. «Okay, but everything is said in such an inappropriate manner: this is why I didn’t understand, and I doubted that the message had come from you». *It is difficult to use the language* (85).

On the 19th of November 1987 two other friends of ours had come to see us, Mr. And Mrs. Fiorello and Mariacristina Verrico, who are both good subjects and valid scholars: besides other things, they are authors of a famous manual of that same telewriting, of which we two are experts, that goes by the title *La psicoscrittura - Pratica della scrittura automatica* (*Psychowriting – Practice of automatic writing* (Mediterranee Editions, Rome 1980). With Mr. And Mrs. Verrico acting as channels, a new entity came to visit us, who, in the end, after being asked to give a name by which we could distinguish him from the others, said we could call him Feeble (since he was becoming such due to the tiredness of the subjects and the lack of their energies) (365).

My first impact with Feeble was, on the whole, rather conflictual. It was only later on that the corners were rounded off: when Bettina and I called him to communicate in two subsequent communications, when we were experimenting by ourselves.

I can reproduce a part of our third communication here, in which I read out the written report of the first one with the purpose of having, also here, the entity's self-interpretation and his comments.

«Dear Feeble, I'm now going to read you the remarks you made during our first conversation. In the beginning you said: "Only Filippo asks the questions". Did you want to speak to me?» *Yes. «Why only with me?» Because you are not very convinced.*

(I have skipped a few remarks for the sake of brevity). «I asked you to describe your passing away to me in order to see what your description had in common with that of others. And you said: "Ask intelligent questions". Was it by chance a stupid question?» *There is no memory in leaving one's body for another existence.*

«I then asked you if you could tell us anything about your first stages after you had passed away. And you said: "A sense of freedom. Very dark with a loss of identity. Not remembering like not being. They gradually take on forms of identity during the search of the ego. Very few remember everything". Are they at least your concepts?» *We are in a condition of waiting. In order to arrive many reincarnations await us. The concepts [are] mine, the linguistic terms [are] human.* «In any case what you told me, was it essentially your own work? Are the ideas yours?» *Yes.* «After having said "Very few remember everything" you added: "Very few [one means: memories] are used to maintain a contact"». *If everything were lost, you and I would not communicate.*

(I have skipped over another piece, which, besides other things, is relative to medicinal herbs that Feeble advised me to take for my cough). «At a certain point, I asked you for an evaluation of my research work. You answered me: "I can't judge yet. You are only at the beginning and full of doubts and behaviour that is often too puerile". I asked you what this behaviour consisted of and you answered me: "Not much familiarity with us". I stated to you that I had put 372 communications together. How much does one need to have in order to have familiarity?» *With us.* «With you disincarnated souls?» *No, not with us.* «You said I don't have much familiarity "with us"». *That believe in reincarnation and the return to the One. I say that you don't talk with us.* «In other words my puerility consists in not talking with you reincarnationist entities etc. etc.». *Yes, yes, yes, yes, yes. "I don't play with these", says a child when he doesn't want to accept new playmates.* «Up until now those souls of a different trend to yours have come into contact with me because of a spontaneous impulse due to the affinity which joins us together, not because I wanted them to or because I exclusively wanted to have contact with them». *I'm joking, hee, hee, hee.*

«Okay. I apologize for the third degree interrogatory. By skipping some phrases, I always read "your" sentences: "Don't strive" and "Identity crisis". What do they mean? *You had not to strive because you weren't well.* «Would you believe, I had interpreted: "Don't try too hard to find the identification at all costs"». *No: «Don't tire yourself».* «So what does "identity crisis" mean?» *Identity crisis is when there is an obstacle in accepting us.* «Who is the identity crisis for?» *For you, who after all don't believe in us.* «Thank you for this clarification, dear Feeble». *Do you want to play with me?* «Of course I do, although, especially at the beginning you made me feel somewhat uncomfortable and uneasy with your rather irksome language». *We didn't know each other and each one of us was in a tight spot.* «I felt like an unprepared and rather foolish school boy before a severe teacher».

This impression will fade away. «Well, I'll call you soon». *If I don't come I'll already be there with you.* «I see, as a matter of fact, that you are already waiting to swoop down like a hawk on the first available womb». *Yes. Thanks and bye (369).*

That same evening, in which we had experimented with Fiorello and Mariacristina and had got to know Feeble, another entity, that we already knew, came to us: Whirlwind. He was the first to come at our request.

How come he gave us this name? He is precisely a soul with a – how can I say? – whirling temperament: it was as if he had quicksilver; restless and fidgety, he couldn't stay still for a minute; overwhelmed by a continued restlessness he roamed from sphere to sphere as if always in search of new sensations. Needless to say, this restlessness harmed the spiritual progress that this soul desired so much but still couldn't manage to want with the necessary constancy and resoluteness. So I

advised Whirlwind to repeat a very short prayer, a kind of ejaculation, over and over again: something he could also do whilst he was on the move. As a matter of fact, he came back to us a number of times to tell us that the repetition of this prayer was gradually having the effect of improving his conditions more and more.

Another premise I have to make is that one day Whirlwind mentioned two visits he had made in rather exotic astral spheres, so to speak. The first one was in an *Islamic sphere: I saw not seen*, he added, *if not...* I asked him to complete his thought. *They are all jealous there*, explained Whirlwind. *They are in gardens with gushing fountains*. It is a landscape that they have created for themselves like that of *The Arabian Nights*, *because the real world is not like this*. «What were those souls doing?» *They were walking and speaking*. «Were their Uris with them?» Whirlwind did not answer at first, until I explained that the Uris were those virgin maidens who are part of the Islamic paradise. *Beautiful*, he replied. «Did they have these Uris with them?» *Yes, yes, yes, yes, yes*. I asked him another question: «Were the Uris real souls or mere psychic formations, creations of the thought of those directly concerned?» *Mental*. «Not real souls». *No*. «Did you verify this or is it a simple idea of yours?» *My idea: all too idyllic*.

The second astral environment that Whirlwind had visited was *an African sphere made up of huts, a landscape of violent colours and many children*. «...Because, precisely, so many people die in childhood in those countries». *Yes: unfortunately it's true* (361).

Having said this, I can refer to a conversation had with Whirlwind on the occasion of Mr. And Mrs. Verrico's visit. Acting as a channel with Bettina, I called him first and then suggested he should let himself be interviewed another time, while our friends were acting as channels. He accepted to subjecting himself to this experiment. And so we passed him on to Fiorello and Mariacristina.

So I asked Whirlwind: «Can you please explain to our friends what type of discourse you had with Bettina and I the last time you came to visit us?» Here are some of the answers we obtained: *Waste of time. Ask precise questions. Use the means with more strength*.

«Can you say something to our friends about your problems?» *Let's not talk about me. Let's talk about more interesting things. Ask precise questions*.

«Why do you call yourself Whirlwind?» *It's my nature: I am sad and happy at the same time*.

«What type of existence do you have now in your dimension?» *Make reflections*.

«The problem I ask myself now is whether you are actually Whirlwind or not. Are you still Whirlwind?» *Yes*. «But I no longer recognize you». *It doesn't matter. Ask questions*. «I have already asked you some to see whether you are still Whirlwind or whether you are another who has taken his place». *They are not pertinent questions*.

«Have you prayed these last few days?» *A lot*. «And in what way?» *Staying near the light*. «What technique did you pray with?» *Ask other questions*.

At this point our friends Mr. and Mrs. Verrico had passed the glass back to Bettina and I. I asked a question to check: «Who are you?» *W*. «Can you give me your name in full?» *Whirlwind*. «And who am I?» *Living being on earth*. «Can you see if you can give me a sign that it is truly you. What is the problem that we talked about so much the last times?» *Prayer and movement*. «Very good, ah here we are. So what was it that made prayer so difficult for you?» *Intense activity*. «As far as the astral journeys you mentioned to us are concerned, where did you make them? What was there in a sphere?» *African children*. «And what did you see in the other one?» *Another one, but I can't remember*.

We should notice that, after having passed the glass to our Verrico friends, we moved about five metres away from the little table, ending up in the adjoining corridor. It was from here, through the door, that I asked my questions. As long as we remained «out of range» Whirlwind's answers were, as we have seen, rather inadequate. They went back to being substantially correct when Bettina and I took up our place again, once more acting as channels. Although he hadn't been able to answer the final question, in that re-established situation he once again gave us the impression that he was

indeed still Whirlwind as we had left him, and once again able to answer those certain questions after a temporary lapse of his memory.

So, here are Whirlwind's comments when I asked him the next time to explain the sentences that had apparently come from him. *There was no help.* «Was it you who said those words?» *Yes, yes. They were of no help to me and I was looking for you who could.*

«About your name (or pseudonym) Whirlwind, do you assume the paternity of the answers that came out? Did you say "It's my nature: I am sad and happy at the same time"?» *No.* «So how come that definition of the name "Whirlwind" came out?» *Maybe it didn't come from me. "Whirlwind" could make one think of this.* «Therefore, you're saying that it was our two friends who, so to speak, gave this definition?» *Their impression.* «Do you mean to say that Fiorello and Mariacristina influenced you?» *No: they answered.* «Can you explain yourself better?» *Perhaps not. Strong energy.* «Nevertheless you continued to be present?» *Yes.* «But they practically gave the answers». *Yes.* «So also certain previous answers practically came from them». *Yes. But I needed questions.*

«At a certain point I no longer recognized you. I'm sorry but you have to admit that I too had my reasons». *It was obvious that you didn't recognize me. But you didn't ask me any questions that helped me.* «I asked you questions in the sense that I insisted that you gave me proof that you were still Whirlwind, but you answered me: "They are not pertinent questions"». *I was Whirlwind and you didn't believe me. I lost my patience.*

«Then I asked you if you had prayed. Do you remember what your answer was?» *Very much.* (In reality: «a lot». But it is the same). «"What technique did you pray with?" I asked. You replied: "Staying near the light". Is that yours?» *Theirs.*

«I apologise again if, due to the needs of my research, I have to be rather tiresome. Then I asked you who I was. And you answered: "Living being on earth". But do you remember now what my name is?»

Yes: Filippo (366).

As we can see, even with the renewed presence of those channels that make certain memories possible, the recovery of the latter is gradual: it is only in the end that it can be total and full.

I carried out a similar experiment to this one carried out with Whirlwind with another disincarnated soul, who allegedly lived on earth in a presumably much more distant epoch. He introduced himself to us as Proculus, an ancient slave of a tavern in the suburbs of Capua, who lived no less than in the times of the Emperor Claudius. Our meeting with Proculus took place in the ambit of thirty-one communication (273-307, excluding a few intermediary ones relative to different manifestations) which took place from the 3rd of February to the 8th of April 1987, during which we met seven souls of ancient Italy. (I have dedicated my book *Sette anime dell'antica Roma* [*Seven souls of ancient Rome*] Luigi Reverdito Editore, Trento 1989, re-proposed in our internet site, amongst the Texts of the Convivium, under the title *Channels to ancient Rome*, to the critical report of this mediumistic experience). The thing may appear to be strange and almost incredible: however, these seven characters not only appeared entirely probable, but they gave us about eighty pieces of information regarding things we did not know and which we managed to verify at a later date.

What language did these entities speak in? They spontaneously tended to speak in a rather imprecise Latin with the roots in the right order but the endings adrift. Since the communication progressed with more difficulty in this language, at a certain point I suggested to the entities to refrain from trying to find the words and limit themselves instead to concentrating their minds on pure thoughts: the discourse then came out in Italian through us.

Let's come now to the specific fact. For a long time Proculus was part of (and came back to being part of) a chorus of souls who were all exclusively absorbed in the worship of the Divinity. He had long forgotten everything of his wretched life on earth. As I have explained elsewhere, as far as we know, the oblivion of one's own earthly identity (not a definitive but a temporary oblivion) would make the mystical journey much easier for the souls. But we pulled those souls down from heaven and with our psychic energies we helped them recover some fragment of ancient

memories. The ancient terrors came back with the memories of a time gone by. Proculus was once again worried that his ancient master, the innkeeper Volumnius, could capture him once more. Therefore, by remembering that Tartarus (in other words, Hell) segregated his damned for all eternity, he hoped that Volumnius was locked away inside, well guarded and placed in the impossibility of ever hurting him again. It is not spirit of revenge, but fear, pure terror that made Proculus contradict me when I spoke to him on the contrary of forgiveness and re-habilitation.

On the 28th of February, two days after this discussion of ours, the entity came back to us to communicate and immediately began the topic again that was worrying him: *Thought a lot. Eternity not eternal. I don't understand.* «God is good», I replied, «He loves us and saves us all for a happy eternity: this is the only eternity». *Everyone? So I'll find myself in the cellar with Volumnius again.* (During the last years of his earthly life Proculus slept in a damp basement cell). «You will see that Volumnius has repented and will beg for your forgiveness. He needs it». *Forgiveness because you are of Christ.* «Okay, I understand that this is our doctrine: but in any case, if you don't forgive him, you can't evolve either». *But he is a hot-tempered man.* «But now he is a spirit. His quick temper was in his flesh». *I believe you because you are a wise teacher.* «You are too good to me: in any case, what I have told you is the truth». *But when we meet I will come with you. Will you take me? «As a slave?» Yes: so Volumnius will be left dumbfounded.* «But slaves don't exist anymore». *Well like as you said.* «As a friend». *Yes: free slave.* «Like a freedman?» *Yes* (286).

Proculus' plan was clear: he wanted to become my slave, or at least a freedman, not because he was pushed to doing so because he merely liked me, but rather because by becoming my property or at least passing under my jurisdiction, he would deprive Volumnius of any right to regain possession of him in case the divine will should open the gates of Tartarus, thus freeing all the damned locked up therein.

And so here is the experiment. I have defined it as being similar to the previous one carried out with Whirlwind, but I have to restrict the range of similarity here: the analogy is only in the fact that I left the table and went out of the room this time doubling my distance (ten metres). In what sense were the conditions of the experiment with Proculus no longer analogous? An element of marked difference is given by the permanence of Bettina as a channel, next to a friend of ours, Dante, who was acting as a channel with us for the first time. The questions were asked, suggested by me, by another friend, Felice.

Up until that moment another entity, Opimius, an ancient wine merchant, had been with us. This latter, with me absent and on Bettina's request, had confirmed a definition - which was correct, although incomplete - of the Via Popilia that he used to travel along: *A road I used to [travel] along by cart [from] Salerno [to] Capua.* He had already explained to me on another occasion that he used to transport wine from the wine trade port of Salerno to the taverns of Capua, traveling along that consular road.

Opimius then took leave and Proculus took over: *Proculus venit.* Remembering his own scholastic teachings, Felice tried hard to talk with the ancient slave in his own language: he asked him how he was in Latin and how he was whiling eternity away. *In coelis mea vita est pulchra* (My life in the heavens is beautiful) was Proculus' answer, who then asked: *Philippus non[ne] est in cubiculo?* (Is Filippo not in the room?). Felice asked him, still in Latin, whether he had by chance heard my voice. (I gave my suggestions one by one out loud from the room at the end where I had moved to, leaving the doors open). *No*, answered Proculus by moving the glass onto the relative box.

As proof, Felice asked Proculus who was sitting in my place at the time. *Vir in cubiculo est bonus* (The man in the room is good. I am writing the entity's Latin here with all its imperfections, even the most obvious ones).

At this point Felice asked if Proculus wanted to send me a message on the topic we had dealt with on the previous occasion. *Eternitate non est eterna dixit Philippo mihi.* Felice asked what I wanted to say. *Religio sua.* Which? *Christus.*

At this point Felice announced my return to Proculus. *Hic[ne] est?* (Is he here?). «Adsum, Procule dilectissime», I said to our disincarnated friend while Bettina and Dante continued to act as channels. «Philippus vere hic est» (I am here dear Proculus. Filippo is truly here in the flesh and blood). *Philippus*, he said, with a tone of voice, I would say, that was emotional, if he still had his voice. «Ave Proculus. Quid agis?» (Hello Proculus, how are things?) I added the following suggestion to this greeting: «If you like you can answer me in my language by concentrating on pure thoughts. Well?» *A lot of confusion*. «Our friend Felix is in my place». *Felix est nomen suum* (Felice is his name), added Proculus, perhaps as a question. I replied: «Felix est nomine fortunaque» (He is Felice [that is Happy] by name and fortune). *Tu facetus* (You are facetious, you are always joking).

«Let's pick up from our discourse we had the other day. What were you saying, Proculus?» *It is not a religion for me*. «...Because you want Volumnius to remain in Tartarus, is that not so?» *Yes*. «You have to forgive him, otherwise you won't enter Olympus either». *I can forgive but he has to stay there*.

«At this point I propose a compromise: is it okay with you that Volumnius is happy in Tartarus, that he is rich and will enjoy eternity amidst sumptuous feasts and beautiful slave girls as long as he remains where he is?» *Yes*. «So he will be happy where he is, with your forgiveness, as long as he doesn't come here to bother you. Is that okay?» *Yes*. «Alright then. Will you come and visit us again in two days' time?» *Duos dies. Valete pulcherrimi amici* (Two days. Look after yourselves, most illustrious friends) (286).

I have talked at length here too in order to represent this other invisible friend of ours in action, with his extremely peculiar psychology, with the worry that above all torments him and which comes out again, coherently, also in my absence.

Here we should notice that the substitution of channels is not complete: I was substituted by a friend who was totally new to these experiences of ours, and, on the contrary, I moved far enough away so that the entity could no longer feel my presence and asked where I was, but Bettina remained present and, as we have clearly seen, continued to mediate by making it possible for the entity to express himself almost as if I were there. Nevertheless, with all this playing puss-in-the-corner, with me who went away and came back again, the poor soul frankly declared that he felt *a lot of confusion*.

The results of this particular experiment exemplify what happens in an intermediate case in which there is no permanence of both channels, but there is no complete substitution either. Despite the mental confusion which could arise in the entity, one can notice that the fact that even only one of the human subjects remains, this ensures the continuity of memories in the entity and therefore the precise and full sense of his own personal identity remains within him.

On the other hand, one can neither say that the sense of one's own personal identity ceases to be altogether in the entity who finds itself all of a sudden communicating with totally different channels: certain memories become clouded, which are then re-formed almost immediately when the former channels come back to act. What happens to the entity is similar to what happens to us when we dream: we are still the subjects, but our memories are partially clouded over, immersed in a somewhat strange situation we are not at that moment aware of and a prey to suggestions of which however, when we wake up, we free ourselves. It is what happens to us every night and which should not come as a surprise to us.

To sum up. One can certainly say that we help the entity to manifest itself on our plane: in a certain sense we therefore help it to exist on this plane of reality. This manifestation or - if one prefers - this existence of the entity on our plane is conditioned by us.

In a certain way one can also say that the manifestation of the entity through us leads to the formation of a new composite personality.

In this way Angelica expressed this kind of phenomenon as she experienced it: as far as her earthly personality is concerned *I have lost a lot of it in my elevation*, she said, but, *since some of it comes back when I communicate with you*, it follows that *I find something human again in you*. In

answer to my question as to whether she could see us two, she replied: *No. I feel your palpitations. And therefore, by placing myself on them, I can once again feel as I did when I was on earth.* «Are you sure in this case», I asked her, «that you totally felt as you did as you really were? The fact that in order to feel earthly you have to pass through us does this not alter your earthly memories to some extent?» *I also feel a little like you. In other words, it is not my earthly personality, but also a little bit yours* (333).

I asked Livia, another female entity who had become a good friend of ours, the following question: «In the couple made up of Bettina and I what is each one's contribution?» *You give the language, the sharp-witted spirit, the culture.* «And what about Bettina?» *Energies.* «So what do you give of your own?» *I, like the others, have a different spirit, but you have the body and ours passes through yours.* «In other words, you give...» *The information in your style.*

«I have always remarked that you are intelligent, quick-witted and full of personality: therefore surely you must give something». *Thank you, but look at the various written reports: how I change with Lilia, with Aldo, with other [human channels].*

«In any case, when you express yourself with the words that I give you, do you feel as if these words are your own?» *Yes.* «Is the new composite personality that you and I form different in some way from your personality as it is in itself?» *From me. You will only be able to know my real, present personality when you too are like me* (87).

From this and other testimonies given by entities it is quite clear that we human channels help them to express themselves. Unless higher forms of mediumism intervene, one can generally say that in our type of communications the entities borrow their language from us, their culture and also their humour (that's if they have one), in other words, everything that makes up the expressive form of the transmitted contents. It is clear that, since we make ourselves expressive channels of the entities, we condition their way of expressing themselves. Therefore, their expression through us also becomes to some extent our expression: it is inevitable that in the end the entities mimic us a little.

The conditioning of the communications on our part becomes stronger the more we ask questions, precise and pressing questions.

Like the testimonies that are generally produced here, the one given by Gill is worth mentioning as an example: *...The questions you ask make the answers easier.* «But do they condition them?» *Of course they do: I am in you.* «So, if they are no questions, what will happen?» *We will speak freely.* «In other words, what will come out?» *Discourses and not affirmations.* «In other words, the question is to some extent the spring or the trigger of the question». *Yes. Without any questions nobody would make an experiment of us* (167).

If our questions provoke the entities' answers, then it is clear that, at a certain point, they cannot help but condition them. The conditioning could reach the point, at the worst, of being deforming. This is what the entity Purified Soul affirms. (This is evidently a pseudonym: they are stage names that the entities give themselves on request instead of their own ones and a surname, or which I sometimes deduce from the answer given to me by the new entity in answer to question «Who are you?»). I had told Purified Soul about our collective experiment where we had exchanged a few words with an entity who introduced himself as the defunct, abducted and murdered politician Aldo Moro. In answer to my perplexity regarding the matter the new entity told us: *You know, the languages and the answers are given by the presence of the participants. Now, if Moro were to come, his answers could be altered by the convictions of those present.*

At this point I asked Purified Soul: «Since they are showing a new film today about the tragedy of Moro and a lot of controversy has arisen and many people are thinking about him, could it not perhaps be that, instead of speaking with the entity Aldo Moro in person, we actually spoke with a psychic formation generated by all of these human thoughts of ours on him?» *Generally speaking this is possible, was the answer, but we would have to know: 1) Did those present know about the film that had come out? 2) How did they react to the name Moro? Sub-question to 2: a) Did they leave their minds clear? b) Did they give a mental answer according to their political, emotional*

and sentimental convictions? «I understand». *In other words, the soul of Moro came to you, but you gave him the answers* (212).

As we can see, our interlocutor had no difficulty in admitting that we could have really spoken with the defunct President of the Christian Democratic party. Or, rather, the point is this: if the famous entity we bothered speaks like the character in the film, then one has reason to deem it to some extent unlikely; the reason is that a nevertheless genuine communication could have been tainted or polluted by our questions, since the questions themselves, that are far from being open to receiving the answer that comes, demanded a far too precise and univocal answer.

The moral is: one has to ask questions in order to put certain mechanisms into action, but one has to formulate them in such a way and intention so as to exclude, as much as possible, that they could influence the answer.

What can happen is, precisely, a phenomenon of rather typical tampering or pollution. The classical example is that of water which flows out pure from the source but, as it continues along its course, it becomes polluted. In this way it seems that if we are truly interrogating the right entity who sees straight, his reply could be correct and genuine at its source but then subsequently become contaminated, altered, along its course.

Once we asked an American entity, Petulia (this is how her name came out, despite the fact that the common one is Petula), to describe the hotel room that adjoined our bedroom. I had previously given myself the idea that this room had a double bed that faced head to head with our beds. I had formed this idea because one could easily hear the guests' voices of that room from our bedroom. Well, Petulia's description, although on the whole exact, agreed with my preconceived idea that the headboard of the bed rested against the dividing wall, on the contrary the headboard actually rested on the opposite wall.

This is how Petulia explained the mistake: *I saw well. Then, by transmitting, everything got confused with your convictions.* «Can you tell us», I asked her, «something more about this difficulty in transmitting?» *You put the words*, she replied, *we only the thoughts.* «But, the fact that the bed in that room is facing a certain direction is a thought». *I say that I formulate an overall thought. Then, by transmitting it, it becomes mixed up with your ideas. And in the end you form the words* (160).

As I have said, Petulia is American, and I tried a number of times to speak with her in English. I noticed that the discourse in English was much more fluent when I acted in a couple with a person who knew that language as well as me and possibly better. When I was acting in a couple with Bettina, the expression in that language was laboured, as it was to a certain extent blocked by her who did not know it. I repeat, this happened also when it concerned the entity's mother tongue. Petulia, then, proved to be particularly unwilling: *No English. Difficulty*, she said to me immediately. I advised her as usual to limit herself to thinking, so that her pure ideas would come spontaneously to express themselves through us in our language. Therefore she justified: *I feel resistance when I answer in English.* «What or who is this resistance caused by?» *Not by you.* «Who does it come from?» *Other energy.* «From Bettina?» *Yes, you speak English well, but I find it more difficult* (159).

Granted that my knowledge of such language corresponds to the encouraging judgment of our new friend, the fact is that up until then I had spoken to her exclusively in English. It was at this point that I began to speak to her in Italian to ask her: «Do you grasp my words or my thoughts?» *I'm grasping your words now, but just a while ago I was grasping your thoughts*, she explained (159). It is likely that this depends on the fact that, since she herself began to speak in our language through us, Petulia tuned in to Dante's language, therefore she could grasp the words themselves of this language, whereas she only grasped the thoughts of the discourses I addressed to her in Shakespeare's language.

In the following séance, the 160th one held on the 10th of May 1986, I carried out another small experiment with Petulia: I formed a couple of channels with Bettina, and without any forewarning I

let Gianni take over. Then I asked the entity: «Can you tell us what new happened just a moment ago? What is new now?» *New sensation. «Due to what?» A different transmitter.*

Expressing myself this time in English I asked Petulia if she could answer me in English or if she could at least tell me, in her language, a few words. But she couldn't: she remained silent. So I touched both Gianni and Bettina's shoulders and asked if the situation had improved: *A little, replied Petulia.*

By playing further on her patience I asked her, in her own language, if she could make one more effort and say a couple of words to us in English. *What?* She asked. «Whatever you want». *Not easy (160).*

In the next séance after this one our defunct American friend came back to explain things better: *Your friend doesn't know English. «That's true». I couldn't manage to do it because neither of them knew English. «I understand». I felt as if there was a wall. The transmitted waves came back (161).*

This image could be elaborated with greater sharpness by François, who spoke to us in the beginning in French that was more fluent than Petulia's English although it seemed somewhat hampered and – how can I say? – italianized: not the French that a true French man would speak, but that of one of our school children who was always hovering on sufficient in French. I should point out that both Bettina and I studied French at school. I said to François: «I see that you find it hard to express yourself in French, despite the fact it's your language: do you find it difficult?» *Oui. «Can you tell us why?» Not from you: I feel completely in harmony with you. Bettina on the other hand blocks. «How can you feel that there is this block?» There is no fluent communication. «What sensations do you feel?» As if I were being held prisoner in a net. «In other words: you want to come to us, but there is this net in the way that prevents you from doing so». Yes: the net is more elastic than a wall.*

Immediately after I said to François: «Excuse my asking, which I hope you won't find rude of me, but I'm only asking you as proof: do you know the French words you want to tell me?» *I know them, he replied, But when they come to the net they can't pass (163).*

This fact about words that our interlocutor has quite clearly in mind, or even reads, but then can't manage to transmit them, is also mentioned by other entities, for example, by Tullio. I subjected Tullio to the following experiment. I opened a volume of the *Novelle* (Short Stories) by Franco Sacchetti, who lived between the Fourteenth and Fifteenth centuries. I chose the Novella III, whose contents I ignored. I didn't even read one word: while Bettina and I were looking elsewhere I made Tullio read them by putting the glass on the first line of the beginning passage. He said that he had read the words *Re Adoardo d'Inghilterra* (King Adward of England). One should notice this name beginning with the letter A which we had not seen anywhere in our lives (at least as far as we can remember). I then read it to check. The text of the short story began with these precise words: «Lo re Adoardo vecchio d'Inghilterra...» (Old King Adward of England...)

Before I could congratulate myself, Tullio asked: *Why didn't "old" come out?* «I don't know», I replied. «What do you think?» *I remember that I read it with the means. «In other words the glass». Yes. Could it not perhaps be that one or both of the channels held it back? «Perhaps». Sometimes I think that you channels are barriers for the transmission.*

«Have you already communicated with others living on earth?» *Yes. But they were messages and not experiments.* In order to give the most vivid idea of this conversation, I will dwell a while on a rather amusing detail. I suddenly sneezed: «Excuse me. We were saying?» *Be careful of the flu that's coming back. I'm sorry for the interruption. I was transmitting messages and formulating certain concepts with words that were extremely precise for me. Instead they came with the medium's words.*

«This observation seems important to me». *I would have expressed the thoughts I was formulating with determined words. Instead the words the medium had in his head came out. «And what about the communication you are having with us at the moment...?» Sometimes the words you use come out.*

«Tullio, I'm now going to read you a sentence that was written by me as dictated by yourself just a short while ago. Can you tell me if and to what extent the words used are not yours but ours or came out with our contribution? Here is the sentence: "Sometimes I think that you channels are barriers for the transmission"». *"Channels", "barriers" and "transmission" are yours.* «How would you have expressed the same concept in your own words?» *I would have said that I found it difficult to communicate with you.* «Us two, taken together, what are we in the communication?» *You.* «Therefore, instead of defining us as channels, what would you call us?» *Am I speaking to you?* «And instead of using the word "transmission" what would you say?» *I am communicating, or I am giving you news.* «Instead of "barriers", what word would you spontaneously use?» *Obstacles, difficulty.* «It's true that words came out that we had already used before this communication, however I have to point out that these words ("channels", "transmission", "barriers") far from us having used them first, on the contrary they came out from communications with you entities: insofar as the communication is your work, you used them first». *Maybe, but they seem rather affected to me.* «They are terms with which one tries to express precise concepts». *I am sure that what you are telling me is correct, but my language is simple. I speak with the living and not with channels.* «Also the word "living", to indicate us incarnated on earth, was proposed to us by the entities. We would have spontaneously said "alive"». *So you see there is this difficulty (171).*

At the time I did not realize; but, at a later date, by re-reading the afore-mentioned sentence and by comparing it to the transcription that Tullio had given us in his own language, I saw that the sentence was not simplified but emptied: «You channels are barriers for the transmission» is a precise concept, whereas, «I found it difficult to communicate with you» expresses a vague sensation without either explaining or clarifying, or making anything clear. Needless to say this rather unhappy exemplification does not mean to say that good Tullio's comments were not of interest.

When neither the mediumistic techniques nor the energies of a particular nature work efficiently, the transmission not only of the forms but - at worst - the contents themselves that one wishes to communicate, are blocked. Instead of channeling both of them the mediumistic energies act autonomously and elaborate their own different answer. It is in this sense that we can indeed help the entities to transmit the contents they wish to communicate to us; but, since we influence this communication, we can, at worst, contaminate it.

Therefore, we help the entities to know things not only by making it easier for them to experience them through ourselves, but likewise, by allowing them to draw from what we have already learned and from all the notions in our possession. However, this knowledge which the entities borrow from us is inevitably influenced by the limits of our knowledge.

The entities' learning could be gradual, like ours, but also immediate. In this second case we can define it as learning due to identification: by incarnating itself into us two, an entity which has never known our language can, all of a sudden, express itself in Italian like that of an educated Italian. It takes years of study and practice, mixing with the native speakers of that language and living in those nations where this language is spoken to accomplish objectives of this kind on earth. This kind of learning due to identification is to such a point so immediate that in a matter of a few seconds an entity is capable of considering our situation and giving us advice that is not necessarily infallible, but which, however, proves that there is a certain knowledge of cause in the entity itself. A soul that I had only known for no more than half an hour was so capable of putting himself into my shoes and identifying himself with my whole situation that, just during the same séance, he dictated some drafts of letters for me to write to certain types of possible interlocutors (233).

Therefore, in the same way as we help the entities to know, to learn new things, we also help them to remember. Here too there is the other aspect, the other side of the coin: it is true that we help the entities to remember, but it is also true that, by doing this, we can also influence their memories to such an extent so as to alter them.

The entities' memory is a complex problem. Let us immediately say that generally speaking they tend to forget the experiences had on earth. *Earthly memories are lost*, said Renato, *they are so longer essential* (36).

This simple fact more or less considerably misleads the disincarnated souls, when they attempt to recall earthly experiences and knowledge by themselves, with their own exclusive strengths, without being able to obtain any support from human channels and from the knowledge, rich or poor as it may be, that these channels have at their disposal. As a result frequent mistakes, sometimes huge ones, follow, of which the responsibility cannot be dumped upon the poor soul who does what it can: *Try to excuse me*, said Umberto, *but sometimes we think we have said correct things, but on the contrary we are in a state of weakening of memories* (40).

Tancred outlined a survey: *The mistakes are due to different causes... When one has just arrived, one is confused: if somebody comes to you, he will tell you wrong things. Or rather he is in a phase of transition: he would have answered wrongly.* «Transition from what to what, more precisely?» I asked. *From sleep to the passing in the nearest sphere to the life left. There is confusion as if just awake one has to give an answer* (39).

The loss of memory is not only due to contingent facts, but, more generally speaking, it is aimed at and more strictly functional to the sanctification, to the elevation, to the mystical ascesis of the soul. As far as this matter is concerned, the guide Joseph pointed out: *if the spirit is taken by continual earthly memories he can't manage to acquire a profound spirituality* (41).

I am going through a period in which I forget all my earthly memories, the afore-mentioned Umberto confessed to us. «In the previous period spent in your astral dimension», I asked him, «did you remember everything?» *Yes. Sometimes you are aware that you have forgotten. It is as if one's memory becomes enveloped in the fog.* «What is the reason for this progressive oblivion of everything?» *My guide tells me that I have to spiritualize myself more in order to go into a more elevated sphere. At the beginning I put up resistance. I didn't want to forget, but then I understood with the teachings that it was a stage of my evolution.* «Does one reacquire this loss of memory later on?» *Only at the end of everything.* «What is there at the end of everything?» *As the Catechism said, the resurrection of the dead* (40).

When I said to him «Lucky you who have so pleasant memories», Tancredi replied that *they will go away*. However, he added, *I hope to have them back again*. «What is the reason for this temporary oblivion?» I asked. *I was told*, he explained, *that it is necessary in order to have a development of the spirit, but when we get our glorious body back we will be perfect: we will once again have all our earthly experiences and in addition, saintliness* (39).

Loss of memory also means loss of one's own name and one's own identity. Agostino also gave me a certain surname for himself besides this name. However, when I asked him if he was sure about his name, he replied: *I hope it's true, but who knows?* (125). Another entity, after having told me that I could call him Yale, explained: *It is a name I use to distinguish myself, but it is not the name I had on earth which is now left in mothballs* (186).

One can also gradually associate the oblivion of one's other biographical details to that of the oblivion of one's name. «Where are you from?» I asked Ulderico, who answered: *I don't remember. I am in a strange condition: at times I know and other times I don't; my name seems right and then it doesn't* (252).

I tried to carry out a verification using the Lateran archives of two entities who had given me their names and surnames and various other personal details stating that they had lived in Rome in the nineteenth century locating their house with certain accuracy. The Lateran archives indicates (or at least, should indicate) parish by parish; house by house, all the people who lived there year by year and one can trace the acts of baptism, confirmation and death. My research proved to be unsuccessful for both names, of Battista R. (known as Titta) chair maker, as well as the nobleman Giorgio P.

Titta did not come back to us any more. In the various occasions in which he had spoken to us about himself and his memories as a common person in Trastevere he expressed himself, right

down to the smallest detail, in the most human and likely manner communicating to us an impression of absolute sincerity. Our unsuccessful verification must have embarrassed him a great deal and, in his simplicity, he must have been totally lacking in justifications to give: this is how it must have happened, unless further communications were not prevented by factors of a different type.

Unlike Titta, Giorgio came back. And here is the part of our new conversation with him which interests us: «Dear Giorgio, we are pleased you came to the appointment». *Thank you for your hard work.* «Do you know the results?» *Yes. Useless: the memory is nebulous.* «How do you explain the negative results? We don't mean to tell you off, we are only trying to find an explanation of the psychological mechanism together». *It isn't a deception: the formation of names could sometimes be automatic.* «Who told you this?» *My guide, when I set out on the road of elevation.*

At this point I told Giorgio that I thought that his surname P., was guaranteed by the fact that he himself had added that it coincided with the surname of a certain historical character. I concluded by asking him: «Are you sure that P. is your real surname?» *I have this certainty,* he replied, *but some interferences of yours and mine get in the way.* «But are you sure that your surname really is P.?» *Yes, yes. There is always the sure answer, but then it is wrong, that is to say, when I answer I am telling the truth, but then I am told that it is not correct.* «You are telling the truth since you express what you are subjectively convinced of. However, it may objectively prove to be a different thing». *Yes: then you make research and I am disappointed* (251).

His good faith appears to be sufficiently evident here. Could there be a margin of bad faith in these kinds of answers? Perhaps there could: maybe in partial shadow area. *You should know that there are many who wish to communicate,* Tonino told me. *The moment has finally come and you want to speak freely. Instead you...: "What's your name?", "Where did you used to live?", "When did you die?" Well, at this point, afraid that you may be cut off, you say the first name you remember* (85). Although there may sometimes be a pinch of cunning, it should be said that it generally concerns immediate, automatic reactions, where, as Venanzio pointed out, *there is no time to be cunning* (164). It could nevertheless concern a craftiness of the unconscious.

A fictitious biography could also accompany a fictitious name. This is how Godfrey sums up the matter: *Unfortunately the loss of the corporeal dimension plays a leading role in the loss of one's personal details, and so a contact with a channel is made and a fictitious name pops up. A story is then grafted onto this* (178).

It is the case of another entity who one day introduced himself to us with name and surname, qualifying himself as a priest and more precisely as a military chaplain, who died in Libya during a bombing in 1941. He spoke words of great beauty and spiritual meaningfulness. However, when I went to the Military Bishopric (in other words, the general headquarters of all chaplains of the armed forces) to verify it, I couldn't even find a shadow of a chaplain who even came anywhere near to corresponding to these data. The hypothesis of the conscious, intentional deception contrasted with the loftiness of the message and with the evident good faith with which this expression appeared to come spontaneously. The guide Sirio, whom I questioned on the matter, was driven to giving me a different hypothesis: *It could be the overlapping of two souls: the lofty and spiritual words of a priest who by now has no more earthly memories and the soul of another who inserts himself onto his or with true data or data that he believes to be true.*

One may well wonder: if the data are not true, then where does it come from? Sirio replied that the entity (in our case the chaplain or whoever he may be) *also fishes out from you.* For example *Bettina had a father in Africa* (who, as a matter of fact, fought in Northern Africa during the last war); *then you see a map of Libya on television* (152).

As a matter of fact, we human channels influence, with our mental property, not only the entities' way of expressing themselves, not only the contents that they wish to communicate and which often reach us altered, but also their personal and biographical data.

In general one can say that any entity, as long as it communicates, is and in a certain way remains to be a prisoner of the medium or of the human channels it adheres to. I asked Artemio:

«Now that you are communicating with us, what different type of experience do you feel compared to the one you feel when you are free in your sphere?» And he answered: *I feel ties, conditionings, influence.* «Do you feel uneasiness?» I asked him again. *Not exactly, but I feel limited* (123).

It seems that the influence acts in reciprocal proportion to the level of mediumism. Compared to telewriting, which seems to be the lowest form of mediumism, incorporation appears to be of a higher level and therefore less influencing; furthermore, one has reason to believe that the direct voice is something more and influences the entity's behaviour and message even less. All of this, which could perhaps be affirmed in principle, should nevertheless be verified with the utmost accuracy. Furthermore, one should be aware that other factors can intervene in the single cases making the whole matter even more complex.

I asked Jacob: «Have you ever communicated with the living before now?» *Yes: in Trieste,* replied the defunct Austrian. «So what difference did you notice between that experience you had there and the one you are having with us now?» *There was a medium there.* «How did you express yourself?» *Using my voice.* «So how was it? How did you feel?» *More active.* «Was this perhaps due to the fact that, since there was a real and proper medium, he gave you more energy?» *I don't know* (141).

If there are stronger conditionings that operate in the inferior forms of mediumism, then this does not at all mean to say that these cease in the superior forms. By referring to the medium Demofilo Fidani through whom it manifested itself as well, another entity told me that, needless to say, on the unconscious level, even *Demofilo directed the energies.* Therefore, when I asked that same entity to write me a letter which was entirely - so to speak - unscheduled during one of Demofilo's séances, it declined to do so, saying that *there is resistance coming from the medium.* It is true that the entity at issue - who I do not wish to name here - has already proved to be not very disposed to doing his utmost in tiring experiments also with us: nevertheless, even without considering the entity's laziness and his by now well proven unwillingness, his affirmation appears to be very significant and understandable (108).

In all cases, some more, some less, the entity who manifests himself through human channels or through a real and proper medium in the context of a determined human environment always receives their influence in some way or other. A strange entity, definable as such only in the broad sense of the meaning since he introduced himself to me in the most explicit of ways like a more profound part of my psyche, told us that the communicating spirits *are as if subdued from your personality.* «As if hypnotized?», I asked my alter ego, who answered: *Yes, yes* (234). Gill wasn't quite so keen on the word «hypnotized»: *I would say more influenced* (167). On the contrary, the guide Tito fully accepted it (154).

My alter ego's reply tried to give some explanation, although generic, of this fact: «Another problem I have», I had said to him a moment before, «is that, when the entities manifest themselves, they tell us things that are at that moment in keeping with the degree of our gain of consciousness. If they tell us something more they do it step by step. There are never any great leaps. They never tell us things that go too far beyond what we know or what we have acquired up until that point». Another closely linked problem that I put forward to my alter ego immediately after, is this: «Certain entities say that they have forgotten everything in order to elevate themselves and concentrate on the worship of God and their mystical ascent. When one of these entities comes to us, he immediately grasps our whole situation and finds his bearings perfectly. How can this be explained?» My alter ego answered: *[This happens] because, in your heart of hearts, one could say, he tunes in with your problems.* «But he does it immediately», I replied, «and this is what surprises me: he doesn't get to us through subsequent degrees of learning». *You are the means and the entity places himself on your tracks* (234).

If, while and as long as he communicated, he felt *influenced* by us, when he then returned to his own sphere Gill remembered things *much better* and he felt *freer* (167). *One is free in the sphere, one feels influenced by you,* confirmed Arna (272).

If a disincarnated soul, in communicating with us, gave us a false name in good faith, what will happen, what will he think when he returns to his sphere? *It depends on the degree of loss of memory*, explained François, distinguishing three cases: 1) *I could say: "Goodness me, what have I said?" in remembering my real name.* 2) *Or I could continue with the one given convinced that it is true.* 3) *Or I could forget it* (163).

I asked Gill this question: «You told me that your surname on earth was C. Let's say you were wrong and that your real surname is, on the contrary, Verdi. When you go back to your sphere, do you remember that your name is Verdi or do you carry on making the same mistake?» *According to my condition, either I remember or I don't.* «Could you erroneously remain convinced that your name is C. even when you have returned to your astral environment?» *Yes, yes.* «Or could you come to know in your sphere that your real name is Verdi, to then go back to believing that your name is C. every time you come to communicate with us?» *Yes* (167).

Ugo put forward his own explanation: *Now I'll give you my theory. Not only Filippo makes theories.* «I continuously», I replied, «elaborate theories and meeting a spirit who also constructs his own theories could, for me, be...» *...Pleasant.* «Exactly. Let's hear it». *I have elaborated the following... What's the word? Can you help me?* «Do you need a word? Do you want to say "hypothesis"?» *Now I'll explain. In space* (in other words, in the sphere) *I have a more vivid memory. More than data I would say sensations: atmospheres to be clear, as Proust would have said.* «This reference is suggestive for me: Proust who eats the "Madeleine", that type of little biscuit, and the taste that reminds him of certain experiences had in his childhood». *Yes, yes. When I am on your same wavelength the memory of communication is different: it seems that it is as if drowsy and principally controlled by the channels.* «Is it rather as if you were hypnotized by us for the duration of the communication? I don't know if I have explained myself well». *Your question is clear, but I prefer the theory of two memories.* «Do you mean to say that, when you communicate, a rather different memory comes to operate in you?» *That is to say controlled by the channels' memory.* «If you say "controlled" then this makes one think of hypnosis, where the subject is, precisely, controlled». *Yes, but it isn't hypnosis.* «The other day a guide agreed that it concerned a kind of hypnosis». *But I don't exclude your theory. It's only that I find it hard to accept it. I am speaking, as you have seen, in first person.* «Do you mean to say that you are expressing a personal opinion?» *Yes: mine* (155).

One could, in certain cases, be led to hypothesize that the entity's memory works well in the sphere and is then altered when the entity moves onto communicating with us. On the contrary, there are other cases in which the entity remembers nothing, or almost nothing, of his earthly existence and it is only by coming into contact with us that he is helped to remember something, and increasingly more, by our psychic energies. It is through us that the entity recovers that vital contact with the earth that gradually allows him to remember increasingly greater and more numerous fragments of his existence lived on earth. Even if *everything has been forgotten*, thanks to the contact with our psychisms *a vision, a memory returns every now and then*, said Constantia. I asked her: «Do you have your memories of your life when you are in your sphere?» *No*, she answered. *I came into you like energy without memory.* And then she added, after a few more words, *I go back to my sphere but I don't remember our pleasant meeting* (377).

In other words, it seems that we help the entities to remember not only the things we know, but also those we don't know. This goes for both the souls as well as people living on this earth who come to mediumistically communicate with us.

Amongst the «living» there is an old lawyer who I will not name (for people like this it is not very expensive to sue us) who, by communicating with us in astral projection and on an unconscious level, remembered, thanks to us, a certain rather unpleasant episode which we were witness of, but could not remember his own address and not even the neighbourhood of Rome in which he lived (125).

Amongst the disincarnated souls there is Renato who recalled things of his life on earth that I also knew of; however, at least in the moment in which he was communicating with us, he said that

he couldn't even remember his parents' names or where he used to live in Rome: the fact is that *you give me the memory*, he explained to us (36).

Another friend of ours who came to us in astral projection was Gianni, who, thank God, is alive and kicking and an extremely pleasant fellow, remembered his sister's name, known to us too, but not that of his mother, which we did not know. Nevertheless, he said that he had been to listen to a conference that same afternoon on *vacuity*: he managed to transmit the same word to us and we well know by experience how difficult it is to obtain the transmission of the exact datum (117).

Another living friend who mediumistically came to communicate with us, was Felice, that I have already mentioned, who, when questioned, answered that he had eaten some cheese and an orange for dinner (the menu proved to be correct even if incomplete, although he sat down to a frugal meal as he was on a diet, of which I could envy more the target reached rather than the hard journey that led up to it) (145).

Another disincarnated soul, a defunct elderly Russian lady, a friend of ours named Stasia, came to me first to communicate in an entirely spontaneous manner without even identifying me, but then gradually remembered who I was and who she herself was in her life on earth and the friendship between our two families and many other facts. Stasia explained to me that such memories were re-awakened in her by the contact with our corporeity (327).

As a matter of fact, what recurs many times in our communications is the idea that the ability to remember is essentially connected in us with our corporeity; it is gradually lost as, with death and elevation, the corporeity fades away also on more subtle levels; it is recovered once more in the end of time with the resurrection.

It is remarkable how, according to all appearances, also the seven disincarnated souls of ancient Rome, with whom we subsequently communicated in the period February-April 1987, came to us totally lacking in earthly memories, and they re-acquired them - gradually and partially - due to the contact with our corporeity (273 and 307).

This is what I referred to Stasia, who commented: *You put your body there* (327).

Amongst the alleged memories that we made emerge again in Stasia and those we reactivated in the seven Roman souls, I however see this difference: I am unable to verify certain memories belonging to Stasia which refer to things I know nothing about, due to different reasons which is not the case to go into now; on the contrary, our Roman friends told us a quantity of things that I then managed to positively verify: directly or indirectly they provided us with a quantity of news relative both to major and minor history as well as to their daily life of that period and their Latin language.

It concerns things that neither I nor Bettina knew. In the end I drew up a list of things that I think I have learned from these seven invisible friends who came to us from so long ago: I have listed as many as eighty.

At this point someone may well object that I already knew many of these things and had forgotten them to the point of not even being able to remember having ever learned and known them. This could well be the case: but all eighty of them? It is absolutely unlikely and not to be believed.

A second objection that one may make is the following: apart from things I forgot that I had forgotten, there are others which I could have learned in a subliminal manner. I'll mention an example I have already proposed: if, for the first time in my life, I am walking along the high street of a certain city, things that I paid no attention to will also be engraved on my memory. If I were a good hypnotic subject, a good hypnotizer could then take me back to the moment of that walk and it could perhaps be then that I clearly remember all the shop signs in their order of sequence and a quantity of other details that I did not find at all interesting and which I limited myself to storing up in a totally passive manner without paying the slightest bit of attention to them. That being stated, here is the objection regarding the things that I am convinced I had learned by communicating with the seven ancient souls: it concerns things I could have read and learned, precisely, by skimming through a dictionary and glancing at the various pages without completely reading them and therefore on a subliminal level picking up other meanings of the same word left in shadow areas on

the margin of my field of consciousness, or picking up other pieces of news in the same way from books or experiences I had. As far as I am concerned, I have no difficulty whatsoever in admitting that I could have learned many things in this manner: however, it seems highly unlikely that all eighty of the aforementioned notions must have been learned in one of the two manners with the exclusion of any possibility of paranormal learning.

My interlocutor could reply to this counter-objection of mine by putting forward a third hypothesis, likewise already mentioned: after having put aside a certain number of things that I may have learned in a normal manner and then forgotten, and after having put aside others that I may have learned on a subliminal level without realizing it with a full and clear consciousness, what is left is a third group of notions that I may have learned in virtue of an extra-sensorial perception. In psychological terms, my conversation with the seven souls of ancient Rome could be nothing more than the dramatization of that which could, essentially speaking, be reduced to mere forms of telepathy and clairvoyance.

It would concern very extensive ESP (Extra Sensory Perception) so much so as to deserve to be defined as a super-ESP. However, it is strange that such a vast capability of paranormal knowledge would not even slightly put me in the position of being able to realize the mistake I made when I was under the illusion of speaking to disincarnated souls. This alleged super-ESP could, at the most, make me an almost omniscient subject, a man who is almost capable of knowing everything, but who never realizes that he has fallen into such a huge illusion when he persists in giving certain phenomena that spiritualistic interpretation that they so evidently suggest, so naturally and spontaneously.

We find ourselves here faced with a very strange contradiction: the phenomena forcefully suggest a spiritualistic interpretation, and yet not one of them is susceptible to such an interpretation. I had the clear and definite sensation that I spoke with disincarnated souls that belong to the Italy of two thousand years ago: the psychology of the seven characters fits like a glove, their reactions also to everything I told them about the modern world are highly probable (they are reactions that I would precisely expect from ancient men brought back to life), the seven souls appear to have come out from the Satires of Horace rather than from the Quo Vadis of Sienkiewicz (and definitely never from certain American spectacles): well, each tessera of the mosaic is perfectly in its place. At this point, however, any spiritualistic interpretation should be excluded on principle, we don't know why; and any hypothesis, even the most over elaborate one, is deemed valid in explaining, in a reductive manner, those phenomena that on the contrary suggest the spiritualistic interpretation so clearly and insistently.

What is there left to say at this point? That I am wrong and that I often make mistakes is something I admit to without a doubt, but is it possible that everything conspires to deceive me? Have I really come to grips with Descartes' «evil genius»? As far as Descartes himself was concerned, this was an extreme hypothesis, formulated on the boundaries of the incredible. Descartes was very fond of proving that we have a truly fundamental and unassailable certainty, which is not important to mention here and which we will call X; therefore, he says: even if, for an extreme and absurd hypothesis, an evil genius exists that always deceives us, X would nevertheless remain something absolutely evident and certain. Therefore, the evil genius is not a hypothesis that one can reasonably put forward in a scientific ambit: it is an extreme occasion, only applicable in a kind of indirect reasoning. In terms of reasonableness, the hypothesis of an evil spirit which always and systematically misleads us is a likely hypothesis: it is, on the contrary, and due to its own definition, a highly unlikely hypothesis on the limits of absurdity. I think that the same should be said, on analogy, of all the hypotheses that can be put forward on that same level. Affirming that the notions I claimed to have learned from the Roman souls should be attributed, all eighty of them, to origins of a non spiritualistic nature and that therefore the spiritualistic form of their transmission is a continual deception is, according to me, on more or less the same level of the *génie malin*: this is something that is not likely, but highly, extremely unlikely. As a hypothesis it goes against common sense. It is simply absurd and ridiculous: it would appear as such by the light of the sun if the

positivistic-scientific side taken had not protected far too many people, and what is worse, far too many scholars against good sense and against the sense itself of the ridiculous.

To sum up, the entities seem to be entirely plausible, not only, but they have proven that they know a quantity of things we don't know. Interpreting this fact exclusively with the three reductive hypotheses excluding the spiritualistic one in a total, precise and programmatic manner is a forced attitude and one that is not plausible in the light of the most elementary good sense. What are at stake here, according to all evidence, much more than scientific rigour, are the inhibitions, the scholar's personal, psychological difficulties. The adherence to the thesis of the entities' autonomous existence remains the only way to avoid a whole tightrope walking of reasoning and over elaborated, extremely affected interpretations.

Nevertheless, although farfetched, the limited objections remain all the same a touchstone that is very difficult to eliminate: the entities' autonomous existence is a reasonable, likely hypothesis, one that is susceptible to ever greater confirmations; we cannot consider them an absolutely truth, incontrovertibly proven once and for all.

It would be useful to multiply the elements of confirmation. I myself have proposed various experiments to the more willing entities, aimed at confirming their autonomous existence that is independent from us human channels and from our psychisms. I have invited them to describe the content, unknown to us, of closed boxes, or also rooms: although with some imperfection, they knew how to do it. I placed different objects on trays of the same kind and mixed up the trays without looking, then choosing one at random I asked the entity to describe the object on it: he did it, despite it being a probability out of six, and then one out of five, of guessing it right. I asked many entities to describe the covers of books I had chosen from many others with my eyes closed, which I placed into briefcase and made Bettina take them out with her eyes closed fifteen days later: I repeated this experiment a number of times with different entities and the book covers were always described, to say the least, in an unmistakable way. By placing the glass on a page of a book I managed to make the entity read a few words, and I noticed that his reading was made much easier the bigger the letters were. There is no need for me to repeat, also here, that during the experiments we always kept our eyes closed or looked elsewhere. I also managed to get the entity to say the last word of a literary work known only by name and never opened or without any mention of its content. (In this case the book containing the work was within my reach, although I had never read it). As I have already shown, I have managed to make the entity speak a number of times through human channels that continuously changed during a whole series of substitutions: despite the change of channels, the entity who remained in his place continued to express himself with full coherence and continuity of speech, confirming to be him all the time. I have already talked, earlier on, about entities borrowed by our friends - their «spirit guides», so as to speak - who also came to communicate with Bettina and I alone a few days after they had manifested themselves to a larger group including those same friends and ourselves. Well, I am convinced that the success of these experimentations confirms even more the entities' autonomous existence compared to us human channels.

The IV chapter of my *Colloqui con l'altra dimensione*, (*Conversations with the other dimension*) re-proposed with the same title in our website www.convivium-rome.it (see The Texts of the Convivium), contains the most varied information on the aforementioned subject.

It therefore seems that the entities exist in themselves, in the most autonomous, real, and let's say, objective manner. At this point can we identify them more precisely?

Let's try to tighten the noose a little at a time. Let's make an example: an entity tells us that he lived on earth in a certain country; well, can he prove that he is able to tell us something about his country, or his city that we didn't know? It is a fact that news of this kind comes out from our communications quite frequently.

What can we say at this point? Let's say that an entity claims to be from Porto Torres (Sardinia). He gives us some news about Porto Torres or some fragment or gleam of news, that we can later verify. It means that, although we may doubt the correctness of his name and surname with which

he introduced himself to us, that entity from Porto Torres really lived there or had at least been there. It is true that he could have got this news from others and the fact that he supplied it does not at all give the absolute proof that the entity comes from this place. Needless to say, it is not proof, but it is nevertheless a clue: call it what you like, it is already something.

Needless to say, one can raise the three aforementioned criticisms also here: we already had that news of Porto Torres to then forget it, even forgetting we had ever possessed it; or rather it concerned news learned on a subliminal level; or, further still, of information learned by means of extra sensorial experiences (telepathy, clairvoyance, super-ESP): here too such objections are nevertheless possible in principle. What should we do? We should neither here omit relying on a bit of good sense and on the remarkable intuition that could be developed with the practice of this research.

By tying the noose even tighter one arrives at the problem of individual identification. We two have not as of yet had the opportunity to identify a disincarnated soul that we did not know and who was likewise unknown to any others present. Those who have manifested themselves to us, and who correspond to people we knew well, expressed themselves completely coherently to the memories we have of their earthly personalities: they showed the same character and expressed themselves in an identical manner right down to the smallest detail. Perhaps they sometimes appeared as if they were a little faded compared to their expressive ways they used to have. One says that this is due to the lack of their corporeity. Needless to say, something is missing. Nevertheless it is definitely them.

The living are those who appear exactly the same: when our friend, alive on earth, came to pay us a visit in astral projection, it was exactly one hundred percent him, without attenuations of any kind whatsoever. This was explained to us by the fact that, unlike the disincarnate souls, the living being still possesses his body, and having a body means still maintaining all of one's corporeal dimension: the corporeity is something more than the simple physical body bounded in space: it is made up of a whole collection of psychic elements and it is from the whole subtle corporeity that it expresses itself, lives and is fulfilled on the earthly vibratory level.

Therefore, when the living being comes to invisibly communicate with us through our mediumism, it is just like him. The emotional part of his personality is completely present with his typical reactions.

What, on the contrary, are transmitted to us with greater difficulty are his memories, especially the memories of exact dates, numbers and precise words. Sometimes this data are also transmitted: however, favorable conditions are required, a stronger mediumism, or, with mediocre forms of mediumism, particular moments of grace; what could be of great help is the fact that the medium, or one of the human channels, manages to perceive, at least on a subliminal level, something that can act as an inductor; what could also be of considerable help is the presence of a psychometric object which could also in some way act as an inductor.

Let's make an example of a psychometric object: I ask what the last word of a minor work of a certain author, of which I only know the title is; I have never even flicked through this work, but it is included in a volume that I am holding in my hand: it could be that the contact with the volume, or the vicinity to it helps to «induce» the learning of the word through paranormal means, whether it concerns a true and proper mediumistic communication or whether in substance it only concerns a phenomenon of clairvoyance.

I think that, on the basis of what has been said up until now, a kind of general rule can be established: an entity is helped to perceive something real from the fact that we have corresponding experiences, knowledge or memories, or that we have developed paranormal energies, or that we find ourselves in some effective relationship, also physical, with the reality to be known. The emergence of paranormal energies could also happen by chance, and it is likewise by chance that this relationship could come to be established with the reality one aims to know. In other words, when something of the kind starts, we find ourselves in the most favourable conditions because the entity that works through us can experience and communicate that «bit more» which escapes the

knowledge that we human subjects have acquired or can acquire with normal means. Generally speaking, one can also say, conversely, that experiencing and communicating of an entity through us human beings is obstructed both by the fact that we have no corresponding experiences, knowledge and memories, as well as by the fact that we expect answers and news from the entity that are in fact different from the real situation.

Once we communicated with an unknown person who introduced himself to us with his name and surname, saying he was a hairdresser and gave us a lot of news regarding his own shop, work and family, which later proved, in substance, to be sufficiently accurate. We two knew nothing about this hairdresser, to say the least on the level of the consciousness, but we had driven past his shop, which has a sign with the owner's name and surname on it, a number of times on the bus. Well, although the bus route is half hidden by trees, and although the bus never stopped at that point, although that name and surname «Michele Calabrò» associated with «Ladies Hairdresser» is highly suggestive for us and difficult to forget whereas on the contrary we don't remember it at all, despite all of this, maybe we picked up that name and surname and other words written below on a subliminal level: and this is how the subliminal memory of that perception left at that level «induced» the telepathic contact with the psyche of this gentleman and allowed him to mediumistically communicate with us and transmit us a fundamentally true message.

This case of Michele Calabrò remains for us, at least for the moment, a rather unique one concerning a soul who is still bound to his physical body who mediumistically manifested himself telling us facts about himself which sufficiently corresponded to the truth thus allowing us to identify him in remarkable measures.

We have still not managed to have analogous identifications of unknown people also amongst the disincarnated. Needless to say, Bettina's mediumism must be insufficient for an enterprise of this kind. The entities who advise us on the subject do nothing but say it and urge me to attempt with more valid subjects who, on the contrary, are not easy to find, and, once one has found them, it is not easy to subject them to a long and hard period of training and demanding and systematic experimentation. Nevertheless, the history of parapsychology presents us with many cases of identification: a documented review of the most famous ones can be found in the volume *Identificazione spiritica - Conferme e utopie (Spirit Identification – Confirmation and Utopia)* by Alfredo Ferraro (Agis, Genoa 1979).

As far as I have seen from close up, during a séance with the medium Demofilo Fidani held in 1985 which I myself took part in, the entity of his old friend Renato Piergili, initiator and director for many years of the group itself, presented himself. After having spoken directly to us, Renato agreed to leave us a message by letter, which he likewise directly wrote down on the spot in a matter of a few seconds. Well, when the handwriting of this message that was mediumistically obtained was compared to that of the written report of a direct experiment made by Renato himself when alive in 1948, it turned out to be perfectly identical, letter by letter.

In other séances held by Demofilo Fidani in 1986 the entity of Gastone De Boni, who when living on earth had been a famous and illustrious parapsychologist, manifested itself according to all appearances. Here too the entity left a letter which was then analyzed in comparison to texts written by De Boni himself when he was living in our dimension. This time the comparison made between work written in doctor De Boni's hand in the last few years of his life on earth and the aforementioned mediumistic writing, was made by an extremely qualified graphological institute, the «Moretti» of Urbino, which, in its declaration of expert opinion, concluded with certainty that the two pieces of writing belonged to the same person (they can be seen in the magazine «Luce e ombra» [Light and Shadow], in the articles of Lina De Boni and Silvio Ravaldini, which respectively appeared in the booklets 4/1987 and 2/1988).

Our objectors could find something to say here too. Let's see: one can affirm that of anything that happens a trace remains, so to speak, in the ether. Not only the memories of the earthly life of Gastone De Boni (or of Renato Piergili) would be impressed in that which, by borrowing an ancient Sanskrit word, the modern esoterists of theosophical roots call akasha: the same could be said –

why not? – of their handwriting. And here we have that, in virtue of the famous super-ESP, the medium picks up the way of being of this handwriting and revitalizes it managing to write with the same handwriting.

It is clear that, by turning to super-ESP, one can not only invalidate any claim of identification with a communicating entity (whether he is disincarnated or incarnated on this earth), but one can, before anything else and more generally speaking, weaken the thesis that we communicate with true distinct and autonomous souls and not with mere secondary personalities of our unconscious. However, be careful: everything we can say about the existence in itself of entities and their identification could be thrown into crisis by the hypothesis of the super-ESP only when it concerns affirmations proposed as absolutely true, certain and guaranteed. In other words: when we affirm that the entities really exist as such and that we really communicate with XY having identified him with certainty, affirmations of this kind do not turn out to be, at least for the moment, proven or provable in an absolute manner. The hypothesis of the super-ESP is permanently lying in ambush ready to weaken such a claim and, at least for the time being, does not prove to be either refuted or refutable. However, in any case, what remains, and for sure, is the possibility to give our conclusions a relative value: even if we are not authorized to consider them as being absolutely certain, we can consider them very likely, or, even highly likely.

It is enough to steer our life and also our research. The probable nature of many conclusions, their relative certainty proves to be more convalidated the more we manage to multiply the signs and elements of confirmation.

It is especially in this sector of research in which we try to communicate with the other dimension and to know something about it, that we really find ourselves surrounded by mystery. However, this kind of mystery is not pitch darkness: it is more like a landscape that we can glimpse in the mist, through a soft haziness that nevertheless allows us to catch a glimpse of something. This is a condition that we have to accept. Needless to say, there are difficulties, but this does not mean to say we have to give up searching for the pure and simple reason that definable data in exact terms don't offer themselves to us immediately. It concerns gradually doing the little we can, without ever losing heart. It's worthwhile being patient and persevering: research that has the other dimension as its object is far too important and vital because we can know something more about what we are as men and about our ultimate destiny of eternity.