

Chapter 9

What is Truth.

When asked the question as to what is truth, then one should go on to ask the questioner as to what is the truth about what exactly, for everything has its set of truths relating to it. The set of truths which relate to the structure of our backbone are not the same set of truths which relate to spring sunshine, or as to where you really went on holiday last year. The truth is that which is so about something. To relate the truth is to state the facts as they directly correlate with the thing in question. What is the truth about the nature of reality and our own place within it? I would suggest one goes and finds them – for they are all there. True enough, we can only come to know that which we can get at. But that raises the question as to what can be got at and by what means. Has every religion that has ever existed all got it right? Have any of them? And who made these religions, and how much did they truly know about any of it? And how do you know?

If you find something which does not fit in with their belief then it is written off as an illusion. Buddhism (which was set up to destroy all the local tribal religions in those parts in those days) claims that there is no real self in the system; so if you come to find it (which they did not) then it must be an illusion. And so it goes. Unfortunately in life we come to find people who, for whatever reasons, deliberately lie about some things. If this lie happens to be about something which we know the facts of then the lie is seen for what it is, a lie. But, if the lie is about something which we do not know the facts of then we do not know it to be a lie.

Likewise, if an assertion is made about something (say by science for example) which is simply a mistake then likewise if we do not know the facts of that thing then we do not know that it is a mistake. Thus, we learn at an early age that human beings are capable of both telling lies and also making honest mistakes; hence we have to be wary, if not indeed even sceptical, about the things which we hear or read. Simple pragmatism and common sense. And I am the epitome of a pragmatist and sceptic; for some human beings force that attitude upon us alas. Would that it were otherwise.

Added to all this there is yet another very interesting psychological device – the avoidance of the truth. I guess we all do this on occasions. This of course is neither a lie nor is it an honest mistake, it is simply a case of shutting up and saying nothing; and which might come about for many different reasons – peace and quiet being high among them. But when it comes to things which we do know something about, and also feel it important to say them, then we human beings go down roads which the proverbial angels would fear to tread – given what this world is like as yet anyway.

My own major interests in life have been psychology, politics, philosophy, and of course that of mystical experience and the gnosis of our transcendent condition, and what it knows – but only after discovering it of course. Why are any of us interested and motivated by this or that? Who knows. I have never yet met anyone who could switch interest and motivation on and off like a light switch for themselves. It is much like these silly guru's who tell us that we must love everything and everybody – what a pack of nonsense it all is. How do you switch on love when and if it is not flowing through you. That would sure be a good trick. People would pay millions for it.

However, this book is about the mind and mystical experience, not the other things which have or still do interest me. So, one is often asked as to what is the truth of this phenomenon of the mystical gnosis and as to what it reveals. This question is reasonable enough, so we will take a look at it, but for the large part it misses the real point of mystical experience and the gnosis. Mystical transcendent experience certainly reveals things, indeed profound things, but most of its wallop is about the effect which it has, not what it reveals. For it changes the way we live in this world; and to say nothing of what it does to ones understanding of all things (gnosis). It is also evidently bound up with the evolutionary unfolding of the human mind and awareness.

In life there are some things which we can prove the truth of, but there are many other things which we cannot. However, this does not mean that they cannot be proved, for the can be and they are; but not by us; but only by life itself; by ones experience of it. But then some folk ask the question as to how real is experience. Well, this is really a silly question when they are lost for anything more sensible to say. The answer is that we never have anything other than experience – that is what you get when existing. We get nothing else. So, how real does experience need to get before we call it real? But some then go on to say 'Ah, but how does experience correlate with the nature of reality'? And one has to remind them that conscious experience IS our reality. This like the old question, 'Does the tree still exist in the yard when nobody is observing it'? Who knows and who cares; for we can never know what exists when there is nobody around to observe and experience anything. We would not even exist to ask the question, let alone care. Even the nature of reality could not prove to us as to what exists if we were not to exist to experience it. People do seem to tie themselves up in their own mental knots at times do they not. One of the potential problems with words I guess – especially when they invent words for things which do not exist.

But if we use words simply to point to the things we find in life, as opposed to things which we do not find, then they are not so much of a problem really. And until such time that we can all read each others minds (heaven forbid) then we are stuck with words for communication. So we had best make good and effective use of them – well to the best that we each can anyway; and all use the same word for the same thing. But as yet humanity still uses hundreds of different languages, which does not help a lot for real communication – especially in my case, for I have problems enough with just one. Moreover, it seems to be problematic enough trying to communicate with people that do use the same language for much of the time; and one often thinks that they must be living on another planet – or another dimension of existence. Try having a serious conversation with a die hard fundamentalist. One would communicate better with a door knob – leastwise you could open the door with it and get in.

However, the facts of mystical experience are that people have them (most spontaneously – some make claim to inducing some effects at times; but I know of none who have seemed to induce the big ones), and that people have had them ever since we first existed on earth (not all gnosis I hasten to add). Psychic experiences (of which there is a very wide range or variety) are far more common than mystical experiences. But in mystical experiences there are only two kinds – Introverted and Extroverted mystical experience. The former are inwards and transcendent, and the latter take place in the physical world. Then there is the deepest kind of Introverted Mystical experience which reveals what we call the gnosis – and which seems to be the most rare of all known mystical experiences. However, there are depths and degrees of both kinds. And they are well documented these days – and I know them to be facts personally; and so do many others. In saying ‘many’ then one has to point out that a tiny percentage of six billion people can amount to quite a few whilst also being a small percentage of the population. However, it does seem to be coming more common throughout the unfolding of time.

The next thing one is confronted with at times is when a certain kind of person claims that one is merely interpreting an experience. But in truth this is nonsense too. Of all the documented accounts which I have read regarding mystical experience it seems to me that such folk simply do what we all do – simply describe the experience which they underwent, what it revealed to them, and what effects it came to have on them – and of course they may or may not mention the implications of the things learned therein; as do I. So, one is not interpreting or altering anything – they are simply telling it as it was. How would one ‘interpret’ the experience of sitting under a tree on a nice sunny day? The damn thing does not need interpreting, for the experience is what the experience is; and it makes us feel whatever it is we feel about it; and we see what we are given to see. And then simply tell it as it was.

True enough, that depth mystical experience (gnosis) did also imply things within the experience itself – for we learn it, understand it, whilst there. One implication, for example, is that we are never terminated. However, we (the temporal rational mind) can never know that to be true can we, for we only live one life at a time. So, that kind of implication does not really interest me. You cannot know something is true other than from hindsight of the event. So, how could we experience that we were never ever switched off to the point of everlasting oblivion – or even that we were if we were for that matter? It just ain’t possible to know. Hence my saying elsewhere that we will never know and understand it all. Some of course might like to have a faith that they will never be switched off permanently; but faith does not interest me and never has – I do not need the stuff; for I take life as it comes. Moreover, one life is sure enough for me, and it was good. Anything else is not my call; and whatever will be will be; and I could not care less one way or the other.

However, in that transcendent state of being we do understand that we are never switched off permanently. Fine, that is the truth of what it reveals and implies about that bit of us there – but it is not my problem, nor my doing; so, I will take it as it comes – if it comes. I do not even know what is going to happen tomorrow on earth; let alone in aeons to come elsewhere. I try to cope with each day as it comes, and have a good restful sleep between times. So, when they say that he or she interprets this or that experience, I say nonsense, just tell it as it is; and which I do.

We sure do not have any control over whether we exist or not; but we sure do have control over as to how we act and conduct ourselves whilst we do exist – and that is worth keeping in mind, and it is that which is important to me. And keeping in mind also that we have to live with ourselves in the process; and I would rather live with somebody who is honest and has respect for their own integrity. It does not matter a damn what other people think of one – it is how you live with yourself and the cosmos of existence that matters. And that is the truth of that one too.

There is another great fallacy with regard to mystical or metaphysical experiences. It is sometimes assumed by some (heaven only knows why) that the people who undergo such things must be different in some way. But this too is utter nonsense. True, they probably will be afterwards to a degree, but certainly not before in so far as I can ascertain. Both myself and the others that I know of are all, what shall we say, standard human beings. Some of the nicest and most admirable people I have ever met have never encountered a mystical experience at all. Leastwise not in this lifetime anyway – let alone the gnosis event.

I am one of those types who judge people not by what they say, or by what they know or claim to know; but by what they do in this world, and the way in which they go about it; and actions certainly speak louder than mere words. True, I have never met a miserable or corrupt mystic as yet; but the same applies to millions of other folk. Mystics are not special, they have just undergone revealing experiences, and do with it what they can. It is just possible that those who become mystics/gnostics were going about life in such a way that somehow put them in the path of it – but I do not know for sure. It is also possible that they were, shall we say, born to become one in some way or another. But once again, I do not know. One could make many guesses to both of these points; but I am concerned only with knowledge of experience; and that is it; and there is no point or anything to be gained in guessing.

I suppose another irony is that it becomes clear from hindsight that more has been said and written about mysticism (just like as with the gnosis event in particular) by people who are not mystics/gnostics than has been said and written by people who are. That is but one of the reasons why I did eventually decide to talk of these things. For what do they know of the truth of it; it is all hearsay to them. Bookshelves are filled with books about mysticism (so called) which were not written by mystics – some of them academics and some of them mere charlatans; and they are so easy to spot. This is why for the last twenty or more years I have tried to encourage them to write their own stuff in their own words, and just as it was experienced. Many have. In the future I hope that millions will. That would sure cause a shake up of the existing paradigm – and give priestcraft (and psychology) something to try and conceal or claim did not really happen, or is totally unimportant, or brain damage – or sent by Beelzebub of course.

This of course does not mean it is wrong or unwise in anyway for academics and scholars to write about this gnosis event or mystical experiences in general whilst having no experience of it. Indeed, some make a good job of it, and with much research which is of great interest even to the mystics and gnostics themselves. But what is unwise is for a reader to take it to be some kind of first hand affirmation of such things. And this of course applies to any field or avenue of academic research. I have never yet read an academic book on mysticism by an academic claiming to know

these things for themselves; and that is just fine. What is dangerous are those who write giving the impression that they do know this or that for themselves when in fact they do not – and one meets many of them alas. But they do not seem to realise that others can see through them like a pane of glass. But a newcomer to these things would not be able to see through them; and at worst take the information as genuine human experience – and on their first hand experience of it at that. So, what is the truth of it as they see (hear or read) it? So, what is true about mystical experience and the gnosis itself? What is true about any experience? It is true that we have it and it is true that we grow by way of it. It is all true experience, and experience is all we ever have, anywhere. What is true of the effects of mystical experience? Ask the mystics, and I speak and write only for myself, and simply mention at times what others have told me personally.

What is true of the implications of mystical experience? Wait and see, for that is the only way to know. I do not know any more than the next man, until things happen. We all know today, most of us can remember yesterday reasonably well; but none of us know tomorrow – not even the mystics and psychics. But, today is extant, yesterday is gone, and tomorrow has not yet been issued forth from whence it comes. And that is it as far as we are concerned. And sufficient unto each day are the problems thereof. But, as it has wisely been said before, today is the beginning of the rest of your life, and you can make decisions here and now; and change things for the better – or for the worse; and that is up to you. But it is wise to keep in mind that whatever you do now, this very moment, will never be undone; for what has been done can never be undone – and it is you, and sometimes others, that have to live with it. And that too is true. Why is so much responsibility inflicted upon man? Because we can cope with it; and things need to be done in this neck of creation. We are not here just to watch the clouds roll by.

Another aspect with truth is that of colouration and or exaggeration of a truth about the facts of something. I guess we are all prone on occasions to exaggeration at times, and simply to press home a point. However, when it comes to the events which I talk about herein then one could not exaggerate them, for words cannot even attain to the quality of these things as they are anyway, let alone add to them (and all mystics agree on that too). So that is both out of the question, and unnecessary even if it were possible. Then we come to the fun and games bit when some truth is, for whatever reasons, disguised as fiction. Maybe the writer does not have the courage to come right out with it, or maybe they have other reasons.

Then of course, and which happens a lot, we get fiction disguised as fact; and which is but another lie – as are most things in most religions and cults. But maybe the most difficult thing to contend with and get ones head around when it comes to truth are the cases where something contains bits of truth, some lies, and some symbolism. And therein is the real detective job. And this of course seems to apply to and cover every aspect of human writing and communication – so called history being a very good example. So, what is truth? Truth is a statement made about something which correlates with the facts of that thing or event. And every phenomenon which exists contains its set of truths insofar as it IS what it IS, and it ain't what it is not. But even that can only be expressed as true insofar as experience can experience anything of it. And what exact effect does observation have (if any) on a thing which is being observed?

We can never know, for we cannot experience it when it is not being observed. So, for all intent and purpose it does not matter a damn what it is, or what it is like, when not being observed. We will never know, and it is irrelevant to us. A good question is... Is it always more or less the same when we DO experience it? Well, this gnosis event certainly is by all accounts. But you can only know that from hindsight of it too.

Then we come to what is probably the last 'problem' on this topic of what is real within an experience; and that is the question of what kind of experience is actually symbolic of something else, and those which are not symbolic at all. First and foremost our normal daily life conscious experience is not symbolic of anything – it is the thing in action itself. However, from hindsight one can clearly see that nearly all the events which go under the heading of Near Death Experiences (just one thing for an example) are indeed symbolic. These events take place just below the level of normal daily consciousness – either IN the subconscious mind itself and some it seems which are projected up from the subconscious mind into daily consciousness (an extended Arkon Image Emanation, as I call them). However, (and I go into this elsewhere, so I will only touch upon it here) if a person has only ever had a near death experience as their only 'extra-ordinary' experience then it seems that some of them at least take what they see to be a real extant thing – like a city of light for example – or a nice field of flowers is taken to be paradise and the after life, etc. This is oh so common. And if you bother to take the time and sit and read a hundred or more documented cases of NDE's you will soon see the truth of it and that there are never two the same – albeit that they do contain some aspects of the event which are of course the same.

So, what is 'real' about these kind of conscious experiences? First and foremost it is true that they are real genuine conscious experiences – and it is true that they have the effect which they have on this or that person. It is also true that by and large they have much the same effect on most people that have them. And the effect is invariably good and worthwhile – hence a terrific experience. But what is true of what they actually saw? From hindsight I would answer it this way – they were absolutely genuine symbolic experiences from the shallower depths of the psyche which were symbolic of the reality at the deeper aspects and layers of the psyche and the vortex of our emanation. But you can only know that from hindsight of what they are symbolising. You cannot simply guess that they are symbolic of something deeper; for guessing is not knowing.

They were representations that made them feel safe and secure in a way that their rational mind would grasp this image and come to understand it. And true enough, those cities of light and or fertile green pastures truly do, in their way, symbolise that level of being which we call paradise, home, or the ground of being – and it takes any fear they may have had away from them – in most cases anyway. In short the experience truly works for what for what it happens for. Nothing is for nothing. But, that experience is not the thing which it was symbolising. And that is a fact. But it is a fact which they do not know at that point. Some of course are smart enough to realise that it was merely symbolising something, but they knew not what exactly. And that applies especially to those who have had two or three or more near death experiences; and each one being different – as some indeed do.

Hence we have to grapple seriously with the symbolic and those that are the thing itself and point to nothing else. Indeed, even a good percentage of night time dreams are seen to be symbolic of something in our life – albeit not all of them. And even if some of them are merely symbolic of the fact that you have not digested your food properly before going to sleep.



Throughout these further pages I will go into many of these things in greater depth, or perhaps I should say that I already have done so years ago; for most of this book was written years ago. Thus, if I seem to repeat myself on occasions it is due to this; and most of this particular volume is extracted from other books over the years and also from articles and even emails – thousands of them. Maybe they made a mistake when they asked me to talk and write about all this, for I also knew damn well that if ever I did start then I would never stop; for there is so much to say – and it is not all about mysticism and gnosis. For it is people that interest me most, and human society and politics. Why? Who knows; but probably because I have to live here with them for a while. Plus the fact that on the surface everybody is different. Interesting is it not. When I used to teach people I often heard it said that when you have taught one you have taught the lot – but nothing could be further from the truth; for they are all different. Fun, is it not.

I remember talking to a Lady once and she said to me, ‘I want this mystical experience and I want it now’ ! How does one reply to that? I simply said tough luck, there are many things which we all want, but we sure do not get them; leastwise just when we want them. She was a good and kind Lady, so I told her that she did not need it anyway, and to simply get on with her life and make the most of it – for no more was needed anyway. She saw the truth of that, and went away happy, and to continue to lead a good useful life. What more could anybody really want or need. And nobody can give another person mystical experience – and who would be brave or wise enough to even if they could? Not me. I have known of folk (not known them personally) who have killed themselves after having an experience which has frightened the living daylights out of them. It is interesting to note however that they were people who were playing at inducing experiences – interesting! The mind is not for messing with, and only a fool would do it.

Over the last few years eight people alone have told me that reading my stuff has prevented them from further attempts at suicide and gave them a reason to live. Well, I suppose that is something positive at least, but wow; the power of the word can be frightening at times. And hence we must stick only with what we know to be so; for words can deeply effect people in many ways. Moreover, when we do not know something then it is the easiest thing in the world simply to say ‘I do not know’; and leave it at that. And that too is honest, and appreciated. And that I also know. It is also strange but after all those years of communication I did not learn anything from anyone that I did not already know about people. At best it simply confirmed things thousands of times over. But I did learn that there are a lot of good people out there, which is good; and also that there are a lot of lonely people out there too, which is both sad and unnecessary.

We all know well enough that there exists a few rank cretins and abject morons, and some very dangerous people; but they are in a small minority. As for the rest it is simply a matter of getting to know them, and to tread lightly on their souls, and to help where one can if help is needed, or where it is not then simply to have a good laugh and share a few jokes and stories, and like ships that pass in the night, simply move on. One should never mess with somebody's mind and their life. And I never did like bullies – it brings the Hawk out in me. 'Tis strange as to how peace lovers can become hawks – but that is also true at times. Oh yes, another thing which mysticism reveals is that not only are we all the same thing at root but also that everyone is perfect at root. And would anyone like to argue with that one prior to knowing it? And if so then on what grounds? Do not judge by what you see on the surface of people; because life is hard, and scary at times, and we are not all at the same place at the same time - on the surface at least; and we do not all react the same way to this or that event, for we are not robots.

What is the truth of our problems here on earth they ask. We have many problems to solve here obviously, but most of them are psychologically based. Perhaps the most pressing problem on earth at this point in time is the exponential rate of population growth. People who had serious genetic malfunctions used to die, probably before breeding; but now we can keep many of them alive, so those malfunctions remain and grow. When it comes to poverty it is said that a child dies every three seconds. If the will to feed them was there then we might be able to keep them all alive, and maybe not. But if nobody died other than through old age for fifty years, would we and the world be able to feed them all then too – and keep on feeding them? Obviously not. Sentimentality will not feed fifty billion people on earth. The answer is not pumping food into people's mouths as charity but rather acquiring the means that they can feed themselves. So, what more could be expected where poverty already exists – kids will die? Civilisation is not an accident, and it has to be worked for and maintained. Civilisation offers charity; but the world cannot live on it.

On occasions people have asked me as to why my interest in politics, for mystics are supposed to be above such mere mundane things (so they say – and 'mystic' is their name for me anyway, not mine). Well, once again this is utter nonsense. Politics is all about how people live work and play together on earth, and what could be more important than that here. Moreover, I was interested in politics and psychology at the age of three, and long before I knew that mystical experience even existed to be known. And keep in mind that everybody has this gnosis within them. Some do not know it; some feel it but do not know it – and some (gnostics) become consciously aware of it – that is all. It is there for the using of. Thus it is that when talking about truth I can only vouchsafe (as can any of us) for Experiential Truth, (and only from hindsight of it at that) and that which exists for consciousness to become conscious of, or leastwise at this level of being anyway. But as to what truth may exist beyond the grasp of consciousness then the answer is easy..... What is truth? Ah, 'tis a divine and eternal mystery to be sure; and wondrous to behold – take another look at that tree, that flower, and that sunset. Could you do it? Yet they are there to be experienced. Chew the bones out of that.

* * *