

Chapter 27

Synetic Dialogue

and points of reference.

This is a very important chapter. I would recommend reading it slowly, and perhaps twice. Imagine that you were chatting with a stranger in a pub when all of a sudden he came out with statements such as... *I am the beginning and the end; and the light which is before all others; and you can only attain to paradise by way of me; for I am the resurrection: I am the knowledge of the truth.* What would you, or some young person make of all that? Indeed, what would anybody make of it? The guy is obviously nuts, ga-ga, around the bend, insane, brain deficient. Indeed, in some given cases he truly may well be nuts and just mimicking others – but not necessarily so. From hindsight one would have to judge by other things as to whether he was mentally sick or not. For he might be one of the wisest people there is on earth.

We read such statements in some aspects of some religions, and even more of them in such things as Gnostic Literature and Hermetic Philosophy, and various other ancient texts. But not in modern day documentation of the more common types of mystical experience reports. So, what was going on exactly – and which was absolutely true of experience, and also logical, and straight to the point without any beating around the bush? To the best of my knowledge (some other folk may know better) there is no word for this type of communication at all – and hence it sounds nuts; for we are just not familiar with it at all in this day and age. But when I came to read these things after the transcendent experience which reveals this gnosis myself it was all obvious and crystal clear as to what was going on, and why – and it was very clever. But I never read anywhere as to where these people explained what they were doing or why when talking and writing like that. So, many years ago (about five books ago) I had to coin a word for this kind of dialogue – and I came up with the term *Synetic Dialogue*. I will explain, and I hope it makes a lot of things clear for some people at least; for such it is.

The term Synetic Dialogue is a pure invention of my own, but it is derived from the word Synesis, and which means syntax with specific regard to meaning as opposed to mere grammatical form which has to arrive at what is meant. Think of it this way; it is not a form of dialogue which carries a meaning to anything, but rather the thing which is meant, yet without the need for having to arrive at it – if you follow me. Thus, in a way it is a kind of language which is not symbolic at all – it simply means speaking straight from that point of reference without any explanation.

This is probably the biggest mistake some ancient mystics ever made. I do not mean by using that type of dialogue and communication, but rather in not explaining what they were doing and why when they did use it. Thus, in a way, this is, or rather was, a kind of secret communication which only other mystics/gnostics could understand. There used to be a lot of secrets and elitism in those days it seems; and perhaps some of these people truly did think that they were something special and perhaps knew things which were not for sharing with the mob. Then again, mystics, and especially gnostics, were always cannon fodder of priestcraft and politics - and maybe their lives here depended on secrecy, and keeping quiet. I can think of no other reasons as to why some of them (it was not all of them) would talk like this without explaining what they were doing and why. But, as I say, from hindsight it is oh so easy to see and understand, and any child could work it out. It is simple to explain, and I would imagine that many have worked it out anyway; mystics or not. But, for those who have not, I will explain; and also by way of analogy too if I can think of one.

It is all to do with points of reference – where one is talking from. Imagine that one night you had a dream (this is not really a good analogy). The next day you are telling somebody about this dream. But, instead of telling them that you had a dream and then telling them what it was about, you simply spoke from the reference point of within the dream itself – and without ever mentioning anything about it being a dream. So, it is that simple. In effect it is this...

That level of our conscious existence (the I AM phenomenon in the mystical reunion of transcendence) can only be reached after this mystic death and resurrection event. It cannot even think let alone talk. And there would be nothing to talk to anyway even if it could. It also has no memory of anything and knows nothing about this world or ever having existed in it. In fact it never has existed in it, and never will. That is to say that it does not exist in temporality, but only in that non moving realm which we call eternity or home at our root of being. It is like the foundation stone of a building – below the ground. As I say, it is like a river bed – but not the river and water that flows over it. So, there is no way that this thing can talk, or even think – for thinking is a temporal process, and nothing of temporality can go there.

However, and be all that as it is; that consciousness KNOWS and understands. Sounds totally illogical and irrational I guess – but there you go, for that is how it is. And this is what has become known as the Eternal Wisdom (Sophia), or the Eternal Gnosis. It is ‘Eternal’ in two senses of the word. One is that nothing moves there, so there is no change. But in the other sense it is that it keeps becoming known during time and peoples existence on earth – it keeps popping up. The experience never changes, and neither does the life philosophy which it inspires – and hence also the term The Perennial Philosophy. But you have to experience it to know it and live it to effect it here on earth. It is truly as simple as that. And if they wish to change the name of all this to brain death and stupidity – then fine, let it be so; for names do not change anything.

But, what if that level of consciousness COULD talk? What would it say? Well, I think I have done that elsewhere in this book – and perhaps quite a lot of it at that. However, to talk whilst here as though we would whilst there (if it could talk) gives a far greater IMPACT to the reality than mere prose which tries to describe it. Hence, it is also done for impact.

You and I cannot really even describe the feeling of what it is like to sit in the sunshine on a nice day; and we cannot give another person the experience of it – they have to do it to know it. However, this synetic dialogue comes as near as possible to doing just that – giving them the experience in words; as it is known and understood there. It is very clever really, and very effective – but NOT if it is not explained as to what is going on and why. And I have just done that, and it is true.

So, in effect it is just simply talking from THAT point of reference yet whilst here. And when known (by experience) it is seen to be both true, and known to be true; and so obvious as to what is going on and why. Maybe this is why they did not explain, for they knew that anyone who knew it would understand not only as to what was going on but also that this or that person truly was cognisant of what they were talking about – whilst without the mob having any clue as to what they were saying or getting at. I guess it must have been a kind of proof in so far as one could prove such things. But this of course is just a logical guess on my part as to why they really did do this without explanation – I was not around then so I do not know for sure; but that is the only possible explanation and it sure makes a lot of sense of so much that seemed to go on in those days – and of course of the texts which still exist even today. If I, and all my friends and family, had this gnosis; and yet they would be murdered for mentioning it, and the truth of it; then I guess I too would have to resort to secrecy and cryptic dialogue; for their sake. But if one is a loner, then no problem.

We could I suppose use an analogy also in that of talking whilst an adult of some of our experiences as a child. But instead of saying ‘as a child I thought and felt, this that or the other’, one simply spoke from that point of reference as it was then, as a child, and his or her experience, feeling, and understanding at that time. It is all a matter of talking from a perspective of being, and where that being is at at that moment – but a moment other than now; and a place other than here. So, there one has it. It was done either to mystify the mob or as some kind of private coded language for only those that knew this gnosis event personally for survival here. No genuine mystic or gnostic would bother to communicate with people if his or her communication was only going to mystify them. Trying to use words for these things is problematic enough on its own – for all language and words are symbolic anyway – but they can work to a degree if one goes about it the right way. They only have to convey meaning for heaven sake; and that should not be too difficult. And if I use the word *tree* then you have a damn good idea as to what I am talking about, and you do not confuse it with an ice cream.

However, if somebody read that kind of stuff; and not having a clue as to what this was all about and what was going on and why, and if they chose to believe, literally, this or that person who said these things; and above all others; and not reading any other such material – and taking it all literally from their point of reference; then truly would such a person believe that this or that speaker was some kind of truly special person; or totally insane.... *ONLY through I, can you attain to paradise* – you see. And yet the person was not saying only through me (the individual person) can you attain to paradise; but rather saying that paradise can only be known by THAT level of consciousness – and it exists at the root of all of us. So, only through I AM (and becoming it) can you know that transcendent paradise, and acquire that gnosis. Fact !

That level of consciousness IS the resurrection, and the I AM consciousness which exists there. IT IS the first emanation of created BEING, and nothing there comes before or after it THERE. It is all dead true of experience, and at that level of conscious being. Absolutely. It is not a man, or a woman, or a child, or some kind of god, or some kind of all knowing critter, it is just the primordial ground of conscious being and this primordial Cosmic wisdom and understanding which it has – and which we all are. And everything starts somewhere – and personalised life and conscious existence starts THERE. It is the first foundation ‘stone’ of our existence. But it sure did not create itself or bring itself forth into existence. It is not a creator or first cause of life and the nature of reality. And nobody knows what is. And if anybody says that they do know then they are not telling the truth. It is the child of creation only in symbolic language – it is simply the first rung of the created ladder of cognitive being. True, the first child of the life force is a quite good symbolic analogy however. Thus, it is not true in one way, yet true in another. And more often enough that applies to myths as well. They are true in one way, but not in another way.

Anyway, try an experiment. Walk into a pub tomorrow and say to them that ‘I AM the first and only child of the creative force; and only through ME can you attain to paradise’. See what they say. Don’t try to explain any of it, just simply say that. What will they think and what will they do? However, after their comments (and if you are still alive) then go on to explain to them and see what they say then. Was it any wonder then that such pious religious gits of the past used to nail such people to tree’s and or burn them at a later stage? And maybe they even did give them opportunity to explain themselves before doing so. I was not there, so I cannot know for sure. But it does not take much working out.

But in all truth it was their own bloody silly fault if in which case. And what result could they expect when saying that in such a way without explanation to a bunch of fanatical religionists who also had power at that time? Today they would just lock you up in a safe place and maybe give you a front lobal lobotomy job; or just totally ignore you. It has been done you know. However, and keeping in mind that much of these ancient stories are pure fabrication, lies and distortions anyway – and at best some bits are pure myth in an analogy of something else – something which the gnostics alone knew the truth of. But they could have explained it.

Maybe some of them truly were pretty thick in other ways. For that primordial wisdom and Earthly intelligence are not the same thing. And then there is the elitism bit is there not. And even half baked learning can be a dangerous thing if not used wisely. And they sure only knew a half of it all – the inner, not the outer. For did they not refer to this physical world as a poverty? They did indeed. And did they ever mention anything about it all coming back to earth again and which fulfilled the event and rounded it all off here on earth? No, they did not; for they did not know it.

These things to an extent also apply today. Go on any discussion forum about mysticism, or transcendence, or gnosis, and others; and you will always find plenty of people who are acting like guru’s; and some of them have their little collection of adoring cling-on’s and followers. But when you get talking to them, and if you can drag them down into details (like I have done, and insist on doing) you will find that most of them are not even mystics or gnostics at all. Most of them are not even psychics.

They are simply charlatans who want an audience, or money, or are simply dead lonely people; or whatever else motivates such people and gives them an ego trip. I just would not really know what motivates and drives them to do this - but there certainly seems to be many of them around. But then of course there are the genuine ones too, and one can eventually come to deduce that after enough talking. But, in the meantime how would you, or a young kid, know the difference between a genuine one of a fake? You would not know. But you might just FEEL it – a deep gut feeling and subconscious recognition of a truth about yourself as well.

True, you will also find others who have had many psychic experiences between them, and some with quite a few themselves. You will also find a few people who have indeed undergone some kind and degree of mystical experience. And with luck you will find the odd one here or there (if you are indeed lucky) who really have had some kind of big mystical event in their life including this mystical gnosis event. But not many. There may well be thousands of that ilk around today. But life here contains over six billion people – and how many are you ever going to meet and communicate with in one short lifetime? And how many of them are actually going talk about it or communicate it? I have met those who do not. I have also met some who go half way and talk of it in metaphors and symbolism. There are all kinds of people on earth – and each with their own way of going about things. Obviously I would like to see them all talking about it just as it is. Will that ever happen? I do not know. But one can only try to encourage them to do so – for there is a lot to be gained and nothing to be lost – except priestcraft and false guru's of course.

This is why it is best, and important, for them to write their experiences down for posterity and for anyone in the world to read at other points in time. And that of course also leaves much data for future analysis of the fullness of the human condition. In a few hundred years time there could exist enough first hand documented accounts needed for the job of in depth analysis and finding so many correlations of conscious experience which exists to be known; and of course their effects. And that too would be a nail in the coffin of priestcraft.

But, and it is true enough, that a mystic will come to recognise another mystic by way of such dialogue (and then further debate of course). But this of course is only by way of words and communication – you cannot KNOW that they are in the true sense of knowing by experience. You cannot experience their experience so to speak. But those who are not genuine ALWAYS give themselves away by eventually saying something which just ain't so when it comes to mysticism, transcendence and gnosis. And of course, they do not know that. But those who we can judge to be genuine, can say a lot, and yet one never finds them saying something which is not applicable to it. And that is how it is done. So it is deduction really; based upon ones own past experience of it. And you cannot do that if you do not know it.

And this of course brings one to the interesting question of modern times, and so many people who are seeking out guru's for some kind of what they call enlightenment or whatever. It seems to be endemic now that so many people are looking for something which they intuitively feel is there, but do not know what exactly; nor how to tap into it.

If one is the type of person to do that kind of thing – and it seems that there are now millions of them that do, as I say – then it is obvious that if they are seeking this or that thing then they do not have it yet. For one does not go seeking for something which you already have. So, if they do not know what it is exactly, then how would they recognise a genuine mystic from a false guru; or even one with this mystical gnosis itself? The simple and obvious fact is that they cannot; as said earlier.

So how do they choose to follow the teachings of this or that person; or this or that religion even, or this or that philosophy; or this or that self proclaimed guru? Guesswork maybe; faith; gullibility; stupidity; or what? They have not got a clue. And I know for a fact of hard earned and long experience that there are more charlatans out there than there are genuine mystics who communicate with people. And one can see through them (without them knowing it) like a clear pane of glass in sunlight. A child mystic could do it. As to how many closet mystics and gnostics truly exist out there, then one can never know obviously if they do not communicate with people or write about it. But quite a few I would imagine – or guess at least.

But without knowing these things oneself from inside experience of them then nobody, just nobody, could tell a genuine one from a false guru. It is not possible (other than perhaps deeply feeling it). So, that is the situation in mysticism and gnosis, even today. There are some clues that one could point out from hindsight; such as: real mystics do not take on pupils; and any information which they do disseminate to anybody they do not charge for it. They do not give lessons, let alone for payment. They have no interest whatsoever if you believe them or not – in fact they will tell people not to believe them – but go find it for themselves; for that is what it is all about; and that is why some of them talk about it.

I have also never met one yet that did not have a real crazy and wacky sense of humour, as mentioned elsewhere (unless I seem to bring that out in them anyway). They laugh and mess about a lot. They are easy going and well laid back, as they say these days. And moreover, they will never contradict themselves in anything which they say, and you will not trip them up. If they do not know something, they just say that they do not know it – they do not go on to invent something which they do not know. So, therein are some clues, for whatever little it might help – but not a lot I guess. It truly takes one to recognise one. And even that is done by deduction by way of much chatting and really getting to know them. They do not glow with an aura of light which you see with eyes or touch with your hand. Maybe however you might just see a certain kind of ‘light’ in their eyes... “Oh no, twas the light in her eyes ever shining.....” !

I have met a few people who for a while, maybe some weeks even, I truly began to think they were the real thing. And then one day – zap, they say something; and you truly realise that they are not. They have just picked up their package from books and beliefs. And so it goes. And thus, as I say, nobody can know if anything I have said in this book, or any of the past books, or articles, or thousands of emails, is true or a whole pack of lies which I invented in order to fool them for some reason or other. They just cannot know – unless they already DO know it for themselves; or when they DO come to know it. And this is why I say that I simply offer it as mere food for thought. But only life can reveal the truth of itself to you. And this is why it IS important for people to document their experiences for the record, and for the future.

The interesting point here however, and I certainly do not fully understand it or how it works exactly. Is that words which are true, seem to sink deep into the psyche – for the psyche recognises them to be true without even the top-side rational discursive mind knowing it, and hence some kind of empathy results somehow.

That is to say it is recognised to be true at a deep level below consciousness. And at times it begins to have affects on the inside; and the top-side mind comes to know of these effects in due course. A lie would never do that. Tis all very mysterious; but it works. Hence one could rightly say that our own inner dynamics ‘knows’ what is and what is not true of itself. Tis a rotten analogy but one could say that when snow falls upon snow then it settles, but if it falls into the fire it melts away. But somehow, and I have no idea as to how, the stuff of our inside recognises what is true of itself – just another mystery to me alas – but one that works nonetheless.

I have even met a couple of people who quizzed and questioned me for months about these things, and in fine grain detail. So, I told them quite a lot as I knew it; for it was no skin off my nose, and I had sufficient time to do it at the time; and they were indeed interested. They had also read all the poems and articles I had written up to that time, etc. They knew all that much as well as I did – except it was second hand ‘knowledge’ from them; and they admitted having no experience of these things. And they then went off and started teaching it, or rather talking of it as if they actually knew it to be true. I told them that they had to stop doing this. And they did not like it one bit. They said, but I fully accept all this as being true, and I therefore intend to share it and disseminate it. So I told them that they did NOT know it to be true at all – they only had my word for it, and I could have been telling them a whole pack of lies for all they know.

I told them that there is nothing wrong in saying that I heard this or that, and I will mention it – that is no problem. But when done in such a way that the listener thinks you are talking from personal experience, not hearsay, then not only is it leading them up the garden path, it is a lie – and albeit that you might not have actually said it – but the effect is the same. And you are nothing but a false guru. We parted company not good friends. I heard that one of them eventually killed themselves. I wonder why. Very sad, and very true.

Hence if one does not know something to be true of human experience then do not say that it is, or even give the impression that you do know it to be true. It just is not good enough; not honest, not true; and it can lead people astray. Leave the mystics to do their own talking, and in their own way. Plus the fact that such a person is one day probably going to invent something just as a gap filler in answer to a question which he or she does not know the answer to or not heard. One does not tell them quite everything, and for that very reason. And we all know what happens when these things get distorted – the world is suffering from it even now, and for, and from, thousands of years in the past – and it messes peoples minds up something rotten.

A good exercise, and for whatever good effect it might also come to have (the mystics have HAD to do it) is to truly question yourself as to what you do and do not really know – for sure and beyond any doubt. This is a good path, possibly to many things, but not least of which is simple honesty and the truth of the facts of it.

What do YOU really know about anything, or this or that thing? And what IS knowledge as you see it? And where did it come from? Do you know that if you stick your hand in the fire that it will probably hurt and certainly do your hand no good? Do you really KNOW it – or have you just heard it or read it thousands of times? There is a difference is there not. I know that it hurts and that it is not good for your hand – the hard way. And which in fact is the ONLY way of knowing it; by direct first hand (excuse the pun – perhaps I should say the right hand) experience. I know it hurts.

That is to say that I know experience reveals that it hurts – by doing it. Albeit by accident and not deliberately. Would that same event hurt if one was not conscious at the time? I do not know, for I can never be conscious of an unconscious event. True, if I was merely asleep it may well wake me up and then hurt. However, having root canal work done on your teeth does not hurt does it – and even though one is conscious. But somehow it is disconnected from the root (excuse the pun again) of where the pain stems from by way of anaesthetic – and albeit that the work is felt in the conscious mind.

However, I certainly would recommend this a few times in your life. Take a few hours off from other things and simply question yourself as to what you, as yet, truly DO KNOW about anything. And as to how you KNOW that you KNOW it. In a manner of speaking this is a case of making yourself simple, and honest. And truly, at times at least, it seems to allow other things in. Maybe you have simply made room, and time, for them to pop in. However, do not let it stop there – actually live your life in this existing awareness. I do not know for sure as to if this can in any way be some kind of catalyst for bringing these things about. But I do know that it is often the case in the mystics lives prior to these events occurring. It might just be a coincidence. And it might not.

But even if it does not do anything else it does make one a little more aware of what one truly knows, or not, as yet. And that alone is a prize enough I would have thought. It is but another point of reference better to be with than without. So, even before coming to know your Self, then most certainly become aware of what you really do and really do not actually know as yet. I went though all that myself merely for the sake of it and the love of truth – whatever that was. I was certainly not looking for anything else to come from it. And as I say, it may have been just a coincidence – but I do not know whether it was or was not a mere coincidence. I get a deep gut feeling that it was not coincidence. But gut feelings are not the same as consciously knowing for a fact.

Each person can only live their daily life from the point of reference of where they are at right now; and that is comprised of the sum of their conscious experience thus far and all their inner and subconscious self, and what they make of it all; how they feel about it all, and what their existing goals, drives, motivations and ambitions are, and of course the sum of the equipment which came with their personal package when they were born here anyway. And one cannot really do much more than that, except keep an open mind. But, as is obvious to all, some prefer to negate all that and simply live their life from the reference point of this or that belief system which they themselves have chosen to adopt from somebody else - via the assault of both their reason and experience by social brainwashing and their own local environment and

nurture in so many cases. And how much of this belief system of theirs is justified by their experience of existing? The mystics, and indeed many that are not, live their life as they find it to be irrespective of anything which they hear or read, and take it from there one day at a time. Religionists do not. And it is as simple as that. One mob lives with reality as they find it, and grow by way of it, and the other mob does not.

And irrespective of what this or that person, or this or that section of society decide to think or believe about the experiences of the mystics (and the psychics too for that matter) then at least the mystics point of reference is one due to living life and experiencing what it has to offer and what it is. And when can this ever be said for the religionists who adopt the teachings of priestcraft? Which is justified by life itself and which is not? The question of course is rhetorical and obvious to all.

But this world contains many millions of people who are not gnostics, or mystics, or even with much in the way of psychic experience, and yet, as I have said, they are just fine, no problem to the world and society, and they make a good job of their life and are an asset to any community and society, or country for that matter. So how come – and when some of these quasi mystical types tell them that they must know these things in order to live well?

Well, the answer is both simple and obvious, they are just living their lives (as is all any of us can do anyway) and doing the best they can without any pretence, without any malice to people, and they do care about living in and helping to make a decent society – and that is what it is all about anyway. So, they do not even need it. Thus, their actions, their commitments, their love of life, is unconditional of anything, or any so called prize. The prize is simply in living like that and loving it. The mystics are talking and acting on what they know, but these others are not – so, who is really the smarter? And who more worthy of being what they are? You work it out. No, these kind of people do not even need it, for they are living it anyway. And this point, this fact, is so important to realise.

So all this inner stuff just works as it works whether you know it or not, are aware of it or not, are conscious of it or not. But the difference being is that these millions of folk are not doing anything to prevent it all from working the way it should work in the first place. And on the occasions when a person has pushed me on this subject of them wanting it, I simply say, forget it, for it is not that important, for you are already living the effects of it here and now anyway – so just get on with your life in the same way. They ARE the stuff of life and the dignity of man in action – whether they know it or not. It does not matter a damn whether they know it or not so long as they are living it. And that is IT. Q.E.D.

And when they ask as to why then do those who do come to experience these things then have it, and assuming that they too were just living ordinary useful lives; then I have to reply that I do not have a clue. And that too is true. However, to simply talk of it when you do know it can certainly help clear up many confusions from the past – and this Synetic Dialogue business being only one small aspect of it – but an important one to be sure. But it certainly seems to be the case to me that there are some things which the incarnate mind does indeed have to know at some point in their journey through life (and this gnosis being one of them) and what the hell does it matter as to who comes to know it whilst alive on earth?

And I know for a fact that if one is kind of just hanging around and not doing much, and thus kind of empty and available anyway; without mental or psychological hang ups – and then ZAP! It pops in of its own natural accord. Just like that; as the comedian says – just like that. But we do all know do we not, that some people just love to attribute this or that thing to themselves. Some have this gift of speed reading and unusual memory recall, just for an example – and by virtue of it some (not all) seem to think – Oh how clever I am. Bullshit ! Tis life and the nature of realty which is clever old son. And all that you have is merely on loan. And in essence you are NEXT in line to nothing created. Genuine mystics keep it all in perspective – the false ones do not, for they have no perspective.

Some of these false guru's lead others to assume that they are either an emanation of, or in direct contact with, 'the highest on high' (and whatever that is supposed to mean). But any genuine gnostic will affirm that they are an emanation of, and integrated with, the lowest of the low, and the deepest of the depths of ALL BEING.

And genuine gnostics will not say, "Listen to me, for it is I that knows". They will say, "Find your Self, for it is that which knows"! And so it is, so help me the power of truth; so it is. Hence know Thy Self, for you are the beginning and end, and the knower of the known, and the watcher at the gates of dawn, and the first and last judge of creation. You are that.

But keeping fully in mind of course that there is stuff which you are not – and that is not only the other half of it – but the most important part of it too. But you are not irrelevant, for it could not be known without you, and it truly is YOU that fulfils creation.

Blimey, what a job – who would volunteer for it. But then again we do not have to volunteer do we – it is inflicted upon us. Oh, life is such a dogmatic little bugger is it not; and it gets its own way. Ah, never mind, it is good. And it is fun, and it is worthwhile. And anyway, it gives us something to do does it not. So, let us grab a beer and drink a toast to life and the nature of reality. Why not indeed. And if you like a good mystery – well, this one will keep you going – for eternity.

* * *