

Notes for Chicago Classes

1. Man may be viewed in two diametrically opposed ways:
 - a. He may be regarded as an exalted animal, one in whom culture has evolved from a primitive psycho-physiological base, a growth out of the slimy or muddy base of raw life and unconsciousness. This is the typical position taken by the western psycho-biological sciences.
 - b. He may be regarded as an absconded God, a primary spiritual being whose higher consciousness has been submerged under a temporary obsuration. Progress in culture in this case is viewed as essentially a progressive awakening from a state of essential sleep. This is the theosophical standpoint, the view of the great religious leaders and metaphysical philosophers.
2. From the standpoint of medical psychology the existential phenomena connected with the deeper or mystical phase of religious consciousness appear largely as neurotic and degenerative. From this the untenable conclusion is often drawn that necessarily the fruits of this kind of consciousness are discredited. This is a confusion of a judgment of value and of existence. It is true that in the end mystical consciousness tends to overthrow ordinary consciousness, and it is also true that certain types of mystical consciousness tend toward something inferior. But the higher kind of mystical consciousness tends toward something higher. From the latter standpoint the ordinary consciousness has the value of a kind of dream. It tends to replace the dream by something that is, at least, more real. To one who takes the base of ordinary consciousness as the ultimate criterion of value it is quite possible that all mysticism may seem to be destructive. In so far as the assumption of this base is to be challenged the conclusion is likewise challenged.
3. Medical materialism and most of psychology hold that conscious states are correlated with psycho-physical complexes. It may be true that embodied consciousness is dependent in some sense on bodily states, indeed this seems probable. But it is a radical over-belief to predicate as a consequence that consciousness as such is dependent upon bodily states. Of necessity the only consciousness which science can study is that which is correlated with bodies. To deny the possibility of that which science cannot study involves the arbitrary assumption that only that which is within the range of scientific observation has existence. Neither logic nor the facts justify this assumption. Properly science per se can only be agnostic to questions of this kind.
4. Concerning hallucinations: Hallucination is defined as 'the perceptual construction of an object which has in its construction no elements of external reality.' Typically, modern psychology regards all subjective appearances, whether in visual form or otherwise, as hallucinations, regardless of whether associated with insanity, the use of drugs, physical weakenings through sickness, or mystical experience. By calling these subjective experiences hallucinations it is meant that they have no objective reality, not even in a metaphysical sense. On the other hand, the objects of ordinary perception are regarded

subjective
as externally real. Some psychologists, such as C.J.Jung, would give such appearances a real metapsychological value but would deny their metaphysical reality. What position can we take with respect to this problem? In what sense and to what degree may we validly regard subjective appearances as real? Clearly, we cannot maintain universally that all subjective appearances are objectively what they actually seem to be to the individual. The study of insanity and the effects of drugs makes this impossible. Yet to condemn all appearances with their associated interpretations because of the manifest delusions of insanity and the drugged state would be to throw out much that is vital to the best religions. I am satisfied that the problem cannot be handled in any such simple blanket way. I will offer an interpretation that, I believe, fits the facts as known to science, and yet is consonant with the teachings of the Sages down the ages.

In the first place, when the psychologist regards the subjective appearance as a merely phantastic construction of the unconsciousness while at the same time accepting the objects given through the ordinary senses as being objectively real, he is not consistent. For by the same analysis by which he discredits the subjective appearance as having any other than a psychical reality, would equally well discredit the existence of the external world. In ordinary perception we never have immediate contact with anything more than psychical elements or entities. The predication of the actuality of the external world is no more than an over-belief, or working fiction. I submit, that in principle we are just as much justified in attributing to subjective appearances a metaphysical actuality as we are in predicating physical actuality of the apparent objects of ordinary perception. From the standpoint of strict psychology, both are over-beliefs. My own view is, indeed, that both externalities are creative constructions, for the most part unconscious or, rather, not consciously conscious. The construction we call the external world is largely the work of the collective mind of man, and hence has a common ground that is truly objective to the individual mind. The subjective construction being more individual and personal, but not exclusively so, carries less objective social constraint. It, therefore, does not afford as wide a base for common social action as the former. It may afford a base for selected groups where there are sufficient common elements in the metaphysical construction, but in general does not afford the common denominator on which all men may meet. We may call all these constructions relatively objective to the extent to which they afford a common ground for two or more individuals. But in the highest sense all constructions are unreal since they are not self-dependent, but are essentially creations out of something else. But Reality is veiled in them, in all of them. That Reality is the Significance which they mean, and this is a reality that is not constructed but revealed or made manifest. In this sense a subjective appearance may be more or less real than an objective appearance. It is all a question of the richness of the significance manifested. The question, then, of whether one's experience, whether subjective or objective, has given truth or error, is really a matter of true or false interpretation of meaning, and not a question as to whether or not the seeming object has an existential actuality, whether physical or metaphysical.

To attain the state of infinite closeness to pure disembodied or naked Significance, the state of Identity, is to have all forms both in the objective and the subjective sense to vanish. This is formless consciousness or high Samadhi. Understand clearly, this does not imply the loss of the creative power to produce new constructions for the embodiment of Significance, nor the incapacity to become once more aware of the already existing constructions in the minds of others. But it is definitely to know the proper office of those constructions. They have real value as the vehicles of Significance, but not otherwise. He who has reached this position has found the permanent in the transitory.

5. One may fuse with the superambient Sea of Consciousness either by the break-down of the psychophysical organism, as in insanity, or by conscious conquest of that organism as in Recognition. The common ground is that both events reveal the fact of the surrounding Sea of Consciousness. And the manifestation of this fact is of importance whatever the cause. The vital difference is that, whereas in the former case the individual fuses with the Sea helplessly, in the latter he has some degree of conscious command within it.

6. An unconscious subjective complex cannot be effectively and permanently sublimated so long as it remains unconscious. For permanent results the complex must be rendered conscious first and then sublimated. (Principle from Jung's "Psychology of the Unconscious".) This gives the rationale underlying the technique of purification. The student must recognize his guilt and impurities before they can be consumed by the Spiritual Fire. A general formula of renunciation of all negative qualities is not enough. Each negative quality must be recognized specifically for what it is without any side-stepping. Then only does effective sublimation become possible.

7. The idea of an external world may be regarded as an extrojection of a psychical value. The objective uniformities of the external world which give the impression of external existence would be regarded as ~~be~~ due to an extrojection of the group psyche. Thus the base of the objectivity to which the individual must conform is the general psychic character of the human group to which he belongs. This idea seems to me to fit the central doctrine of the Kantian philosophy given in the terms of modern psychology. Group man thus lays down the laws and form of his phenomenal world. The legislative group psyche is not the psyche of repressions but an original psychic base prior to self-consciousness.

8. What we call the external world may be psychologically viewed as a frozen extrojected group phantasy.

9.

9. Jung states that introversion is caused by a lack of *adequate* external objects with the result that the individual seeks a substitute for them in his own soul. However, he contends that the lack is not a real one as the world is rich enough to meet all needs - "it offers boundless opportunities for every one." The failure lies in the individual not in the world.

Psych. of the Unconscious. p 193

I challenge the idea that the external world is rich enough. Painful limitations and boundaries invest every thing in the external world and all here leads to a tragic terminus. That the libido cannot always find adequate fulfillment in an external object is revealed in the drive that leads to the development of pure mathematics. Typically the pure mathematician, like the artist, is seeking more than utility but an end-in-itself for the libido. He arrives in a domain that dwarfs astronomic spaces to relative insignificance and also at ~~one~~ *the point* where intra-atomic distances are large enough to contain whole universes. Is this phantasmagora? In one sense it is free creation as are the phantasies of introversion, and yet no thought is more rigorously law-bound. Also out of these constructions have come the very keys that give us our primary control of the so-called objective nature. If this knowledge is a phantastic construction then it would seem that the world which it controls must be composed of the same phantastic material. Then all relative or formed material whether subjective or objective must be equally regarded as phantastic creation. In all ~~thats~~ then, there is no criterion separating the real from the unreal having more than pragmatic or passing value. The only persisting reality remaining would be the libido itself.

What, then, is the libido? It is not other than Life in its totality, something revealed in the various forms that it casts before the eye of consciousness, whether subjective or objective, but not to be bounded nor comprehended within the limits of any definition. It is a creative power of unlimited potentiality. The ever-present substratum of all form and all modes. Thus it is the permanent and changeless element underlying all the phantasmagora of the changing world. Thus it is the Divine and the Immortal. What does it matter what name is used to represent it? What advantage is secured by calling it "libido" rather than God, Brahma, Space or THAT? In any case it is essentially an unknown and nameless "X". Logically, when all these words are properly understood they point to the same reality. Affectively, though, they do have different values. In this sense, is any term less satisfactory than "libido". Etymologically it is tied close to lustful sexuality, however much its meaning may have been extended and purified. It roots the Divine in the pig-sty. What is the trouble with the modern psychological and biological mind that it should gravitate toward such a source to find its Divinity? It would seem that the mind of the modern psychoanalyst is very much in need of being psycho-analyzed.

The meaning of libido as it has become developed in the hands of Dr. Jung is really profoundly mystical and shows a considerable similarity with the Indian notions of "prana" and "Jiva." For the libido as now seen is not only the driving force of particular living organisms, but also an amorphous

and universal force underlying all living forms and consciousness. These two aspects repeat the distinction between prana and Jiva, save that the latter is conceived as a principle not *only* underlying mankind but all manifestations whether called organic or inorganic. Will not the modern psychologist be forced to a similar extension? Are we ultimately justified in separating the energy of the physicist from the libido of the psychologist and the biologist? If the meaning of prana-jiva is equivalent to that of libido, what advantage does the latter term possess? Where libido suggests lust, prana suggests breath, though both mean life. Lust and breath are both fundamental aspects of life as seen in this world. Both are justified ways of approaching life. Is there not something of obscene taste that prefers to grovel in the pig-sty roots of lust? For my own part, I prefer to turn to other terms than "Libido", even though this term may be logically adequate, so long as there are other terms that are equally adequate and which do not associate the Divine with the muddy.

What would be the state of consciousness that is conscious of Libido directly through identity apart from all forms whether in terms of external perception or internal phantasy? This is the state known in the West as advanced mysticism or Cosmic Consciousness. God-realization simply becomes transformed into Libido-realization. The philosophic or theological constructions out of this state in the former case would have their analogue in the latter based upon the notion of the psycho-physiological Organism, the latter word spelt with a capital "O". The fundamental direct awareness, if of the same degree, would be identical. The divergencies lie in the interpretations. The Indians call one who has attained this state a "Jivanmukti", that is, one who is liberated through ~~realization~~ conscious realization of his identity with Universal Life. This is simply being self-conscious on the Divine level, with the clear knowledge of the purely dependent or derivative character of all manifested form or relative consciousness. The identity realized by the Jivanmukti gives realization of all that Universal Life is, including its inherent power, joy and knowledge, unrestricted by the limitations of particularization. He is of necessity just as immortal as is Universal Life.