

QUESTIONS ON OCCULT INFORMATION AND ON THE USE OF SANSKRIT

Lakshmi Devi (Gertrude A. Wolff)
Bulletin of the Assembly of Man, No. 5
February 1961

Q.: What can we believe of Occult information? How can we know for a certainty?

A.: Often information is given out as absolute fact, yet completely contradicts another source which is just as adamant about the truth of its information. An example is that of two or more contemporaries claiming to be reincarnated from the same entity I or two so-called authorities claiming a different string of incarnations for some important entity. George Washington, for instance, is declared by one to be ex-President Eisenhower, by another to be General MacArthur, and another feels he is Richard Nixon. Who is right?

Let us assume that Knowledge Is, that there is an explanation for all things and it is up to us to ferret out this knowledge. Yet our own capacity is extremely limited and actually we know so very little, and for the most part it is necessary for us to grow in capacity to understand. It is not possible that Beings might exist who really have the power of knowing all? We are very apt to ascribe our own limits of capacity to all others, and here we do a grave injustice. Perhaps we should start with the assumption that worlds exist which are not known to average man, as invisible worlds. We can no longer say air is empty of all save air, for if so, could we have radio and television reception? And what about a device such as TV that can register the ordinarily unseen and unheard? Yes, they are proof that sound and image are there. And shall we admit of machinery outdistancing the human in its sensitivity? Could not these powers of sensitivity be latent within us? Shall we deny the existence of the sound of a dog whistle because we cannot hear it?

Actually, many individuals have broken the ordinary physical bonds and become, to an extent, their own TV sets, not only picking up distant sights and sounds, but often those of both the past and the future. Some develop capacities to see subtle forms unknown to the average person; neither can these forms be revealed through such channels as TV—at least not yet.

As to how sensitive a certain individual is, or how highly developed, we have to be even more highly developed in this direction than they in order to judge: them rightly. We cannot grasp that which is beyond our own capacities, but we should accept the fact that some do have capacities beyond our own.

The extent of the various powers varies and in most cases the power exists without too much understanding of it: When that happens it can be dangerous, for power can be wrongly, unwisely used. Powers developed before wisdom and understanding, can wreck lives and do damage lasting for ages to come. That is why in esoteric schools the approaches to these powers are so well guarded. One can be sincere and well-meaning, yet misinterpret results. Many claim to have communicated with the dead, but could this deceased entity be the soul, the mental body or perhaps just the astral shell which is a more or less mechanical envelope from which the higher principles have already withdrawn? If it is a genuine contact at all, it is most apt to be the latter.

If we, cannot know for a certainty perhaps it would be better to err on the side of skepticism than of gullibility. Skepticism is itself a protective garment, yet we cannot discount all the strange things we hear. There are some genuine experiences that defy all the stock answers and combinations thereof, as those will know who have experienced them and put them to all conceivable tests. But unless our own powers of perception are well developed we may not be able to tell the true from the false, or just how true or false an experience is. Learning the reason behind a thing may take considerable effort, but with it we can learn to read the past by taking an effect and tracing it back to its logical cause; or we may know the future if we take a present cause and reason out the effect. The more information we have, of course, the farther we can go and with more accuracy. This may not apply to those who may have flashes of intuition wherein they are allowed to see the past or future in an instant, but even here reason is certainly not ruled out. What are these intuitive flashes? Where do they come from? Why are they? Is there a Power or Intelligence outside of ourselves? Are we perhaps instruments of this Power and Intelligence just as a TV set is an instrument? How well do we really understand ourselves? Admittedly there is a certain amount of fraud, or if not such intent, one may be carried away by emotions and wishful thinking, etc., but we are here concerned with the genuine experience.

Neither do we entirely rule out faith. We often accept things we have no way of knowing, and here again true faith comes with a certain inner knowledge. Many teachings are presented through analogy or logic. We accept a theory which makes sense to us and makes all the pieces fall easily into place, and these theories may become our criterion of judgment—unless we find some flaw or gap which may contradict it. As for factual data of an occult nature, we may have no way of knowing, yet have faith in the source because that source has proved itself every time in the past. We may or may not recognize great wisdom, integrity, motive, etc., and here learning discrimination is most important. A truly wise teacher will be slow to give out factual data, for even if he knows it as absolute fact; he may not be able to prove it to others. Hence he suggests students say, “Thus have I heard.”

The answers are there, but it is up to each of us to seek them for ourselves.

Q.: Why do you use so many Sanskrit words in your writings? Why not use English?

A.: For many Sanskrit terms there are no translations, or even any conceptions of the terms. NIRVANA, one of the best known to Westerners, is hard for them to grasp and is usually misinterpreted, nor can it be explained by a single word. KARMA is usually translated as the law of cause and effect, or action and reaction, yet these are not complete, for karma implies a moral side. Emerson’s law of compensation may be close yet it too can be misleading. AMANVANTARA is a cycle of 4,320,000,000 years, a calculation based on esoteric figures and of great importance to the student of metaphysics but meaningless to the lay public.

MAYA, similar to SANGSARA, may best be translated as illusion in relation to this dualistic existence and the monadic or “real” existence. A CHELA is the accepted student of an Illuminated Master, or GURU, both familiar terms in the East, but are a special kind of teacher and student foreign to Western thought. Krishna was walking with his Chela in the desert when the Chela asked: “What is Maya?”

Krishna did not answer. Instead, as they were approaching an oasis, he said, “Bring me some water from the oasis yonder. I will wait here.” The Chela did as bid and when he reached the place found a man living there growing roses for the extraction of attar. He was invited to dinner, then to spend the night, which he did. In fact, he remained to help the farmer and ultimately married his daughter and reared a family. Then one day tragedy struck, killing his entire family and destroying all his property, Sad and dejected, he wandered into the desert and promptly met Krishna who asked, “Where is the water?” “What!” exclaimed the Chela in surprise, “are you still here?” “It has been just half an hour,” answered Krishna. The Chela had his answer.