

On the Meaning of Realization

Part 4 of 16

Franklin Merrell-Wolff

October 12, 1951

Tonight . . . under which material, I propose to . . . could be . . . for the present let us regard title. The material I have in mind has a bearing both upon . . . and yoga and also a bearing upon the Gestalt psychology or what you know more commonly as the psychosomatic psychology. I shall not give you finished conclusions but the elements rather of a problem which I'd like to bring forth into statement.

To begin with let us consider this most primary thought: no part of a conception is completely, or all-inclusively, or integrally . . . The reason for this is not hard to discover . . . for a conception is an idea held by a cognizing subject, an "I" or a self. The conception, thus, stands out as something distinct from that cognizing self; yet, it stands in the relationship of dependence upon that cognizing self, although that fact is not explicit in the conception itself. The conception, therefore, is partial; it is a distortion, because the truth, the integral truth, would have to include the conceiving subject, or self, or I, as well as the objective content.

There are certain states of Realization where the separation between the object and the self, or the subject, is dissolved and the field of consciousness and the cognizer coalesce so that they are coextensive. This is a mystical experience that has been reported over and over again—one with which I am also familiar. Now, the result is that when one is in this state of consciousness he is dealing with a kind of awareness which...just so soon as you attempt to represent it in any form. The minute that you begin to represent it you are giving it exclusively an objective form, whereas in its reality, on its own level as pure truth, it is objective and subjective at the same time—all-embracing. The name for this type of consciousness is *knowledge through identity* or *knowledge by identity*. It is not knowledge as concept, and cannot be such, nor is it knowledge by perception; it is knowledge by identity. For that reason necessarily then, no positive conception can be completely and integrally true. I put in the word positive for a definite reason. In as much as I wish to leave open the door to the possibility that we may have a negative conception that is completely true, as for example a conception concerning the limitations of the possibility of conceptions—just what we're dealing with now. Some of you may have recognized that I am, thus, avoiding a logical trap, namely this: if no conception could be completely true, then that conception itself is not completely true. However, despite the fact that no conception can be completely or integrally true, it still remains possible, and I believe indeed a fact, that a conception may be perfect in its restricted zone. It may be correct, and in that sense, in the restricted sense, complete enough.... As a matter of fact, we do have conceptions that are of this sort, or very nearly of this sort, in the body of pure mathematics—the only place in this world that I have discovered perfection.

Now, that is just a general principle concerning conceptions I believe we must accept. It is also true, in principle, that any conception which has been influential, any

conception that has actually worked, has had influence that persisted for some time, is not completely false. There is a part truth in it. Thus we are brought to this position: first, the disavowal or repudiation presented as exclusively valid. Now, it so happens that most religious people, at least in our Western sense of religious people, take their basic conceptions as exclusively valid, and that is the reason why our different religious groups have had many bitter struggles in the past. This idea which I have is the true idea and the only true idea—typical religious attitude that we have known so well in Western history. That is a conception advanced as exclusively valid, and in that exclusive form, my primary proposition requires us to repudiate all such. But on the other hand, a vast number, perhaps even an infinite number, of conceptions may be part truths—a representation of partial aspects of an ultimate reality which can never be exhausted in the process of representation. It thus becomes possible on the positive side to accept, in a conditional sense, a vast number of religious and philosophical and other ideas as part expressions of a truth, as having a partial validity. To be sure, many conceptions seem to be at war with each other. The problem then presented to us is to find a statement which will integrate the warring conceptions; and whenever we find such an integrating statement establishing a base of fellowship or cooperation between what otherwise were antagonistic conceptions, then we have made a definite advance towards a more all-embracing consciousness. This is part, and I think a very important part, of the labor before us in achieving integration.

Now, when I speak of an integration in this sense, I do not mean merely crude compromise between antagonistic or incompatible positions. I mean developing a conception that is sufficiently embracing and validly conceived so that the essential part of the apparently incompatible conceptions can be included in it as a whole—as a logical whole. I'm going to illustrate this by a very simple case. We say of the earth, for instance, that it's being driven away from the sun by centrifugal force. We also say of the earth that it's being drawn into the sun by the gravitational field, or by a force of attraction. So we might say the earth is going away from the sun; the earth is going toward the sun. You have a flat contradiction placed thus baldly, and if individuals grasping one or the other wing of these part truths were religious about it, they might go to war on the issue. Things no more sensible than that have happened in the past, but let us see what happens when we use what is known in physics as the parallelogram of forces. You draw a line indicating the tangential motion of the earth due to the centrifugal force, and then another line at right angles to that towards the center of the sun representing the centripetal force. The actual motion of the earth is represented by the diagonal line of that parallelogram. That diagonal line then is the integrating conception that unites these two forces that are moving in an opposed sense. The concept of the parallelogram of forces takes account of the truth of both statements which by themselves seem to fight each other so they no longer fight each other. We've taken a step into a higher level of conception. Now, that has happened again and again in the history of science. Until some steps that are integral in this sense are not easily understood; they make a strain upon our imagination, but they bring together elements that otherwise seem to be incompatible.

Now, this is introductory to two types of conception presented to us: one through the psychosomatic psychology and the other of the theory of the superposition of consciousness, or rays of light, or beings. How these two become incompatible, or apparently incompatible, I think I can make clear. First of all as to the psychosomatic

conception, it simply is this: that in approaching the human body, instead of viewing it as a body—a human being as a combination of a body on one side and a mind on the other side, or a body, a soma, and a psyche, or a body and a consciousness—you think of it as body-mind hyphenated, or psyche-soma hyphenated, as a single entity having two poles; that you're incapable of separating the body from the mind and still having a mind or vice versa.

Now, the conception, as I understand it, grows out of a practical situation. It is discovered as a matter of fact that states of consciousness, at least certain sorts of states of consciousness, have a definite effect upon the well-being of the body; and, on the other hand, states of the body, such as that of sickness or having a limb cut off, malfunction in various ways, or imperfect function, have an effect upon the mind, or the consciousness, or the psyche. If one is dealing with the problem of healing of human beings, he cannot isolate the two sides completely. He may emphasize, he may focus his attention upon the body side, the somatic side, or he may focus his attention upon the psychic side, but he always has to take into account the other component. This is distinct from the practice that has been general among therapists for a long time, and I shall presently speak of why the therapists took that other point of view. Heretofore we have had doctors of the mind and doctors of the body, each trying to stay in his own compartment, one separate from the other, but the results were not too satisfactory; and in the new—almost completely new line that has unfolded in our own day, there are some striking successes growing out of the conception of body-mind as a compound but inseparable entity. Of course all of you are somewhat familiar with the conception because we have had exemplars of it here, off and on, throughout the past year or more.

Now, if we are to view the psychosomatic conception in an extended sense, give it a metaphysical interpretation, a number of problems arise. There's no question about its pragmatic value in the therapeutic field, but there are these questions: to what extent are the body and the consciousness of the individual inseparable? If the total of all of the individual's consciousness is bound to the body in such a way that the destruction of the body means the destruction of the consciousness, it would follow that there would be no continuance of consciousness after death of the physical body. If the psychosomatic conception were conceived as an absolute truth, as all-embracing, that would be the consequence. One modifying consideration might be this, that a portion of consciousness is in dependent relationship to the physical body, but there are other portions of consciousness that stand in interdependent relationship with subtle bodies of one sort or another; or there may be a consciousness that stands in a general relationship to the whole cosmos of matter, and death, then, meaning a slipping from one level of correlation to another level of embodied correlation, and so on. But one thing that would be ultimately excluded which is very fundamental in the highest yoga would be this: that there could not be a disembodied consciousness—completely disembodied—the pure consciousness of Enlightenment.

Well, now, this thought occurs to me, and that is that the psychosomatic conception is a part truth, that it has a limit . . . of validity, and is not valid all the way. To this extent we can see a very great importance in it. We do know from experience that emotional states, states of affect, stand in intimate relationship to the body, that the body is very greatly affected by the affect; and in turn the state of our body has definite influence upon our emotional states. We have plenty of experience of that kind. Now, I

think the conception in this zone has a high validity; that would be my guess concerning it. But now let us consider intellectual consciousness. No doubt very often, perhaps more often than not, the individual's intellectual conceptions are affected by his moods, but that need not be the case. One need not write a pessimistic philosophy because he has chronic indigestion. It's entirely possible, it's been proven again and again, where an individual has the intellectual will that he can step aside from his own affect, just disregard it when he's functioning intellectually, and look objectively at things. If the logic and fact lead to an optimistic conclusion, he will draw an optimistic conclusion even though he feels like the dickens himself. Now, that's an assertion of an independence of a kind of consciousness from body condition. In that zone it does not appear that the psychosomatic conception has anything like the validity that it has in connection with states of affect. As a matter of fact, there is much that the thinker experiences—I mean one who has devoted a good deal of his life to thought and particularly to hard heavy thought—that would indicate that the body is a very definite barrier to the intellectual life, that he thinks intellectually with a great deal of difficulty. I'm talking about hard thinking, not the kind that happens of itself. The organism fights it, the organism actually suffers under sever intellectual effort, and that one can produce intellectually best if the body is relatively frail, because a relatively frail body cannot oppose the intellectual effort as well as a powerful body could; and on the whole the great thinkers, if you looked at a mass photograph of them, do suggest physical frailty. In my own experience, the highest pitches that I've ever known intellectually could be reached only by imposing a very considerable punishment upon the body. The organism tried to escape from the effort, and I sometimes found it necessary to even take days to get it sufficiently in hand for a concentrated intellectual drive, and it couldn't stand more than a relatively brief time in that sort of thing.

Now, the implication is that intellectuality is with respect to organic man something alien; something that we may say doesn't belong naturally to organic man. At least that's a conclusion which suggests itself to me most readily: that the organic man, the creature perhaps of organic evolution, that part which is related most closely to the animals, is something that could have lived without ever having developed an intellect. The animals and the vegetables do beautifully and survive, many of them perhaps better than man, without intellects. I think it's quite demonstrable that an intellect is not necessary for the living organism in order to enable it to survive; rather it is something alien that has come into an organic being at a certain stage as a superposition.

Now, it so happens that both in *The Secret Doctrine* and in the writings of Sri Aurobindo there's a strong confirmation of this theory. It is definitely stated in *The Secret Doctrine* that in the evolution of animal man there was a stage when there was the descent of the Sons of Mind, the *Manasaputra*, who entered into or projected a ray of themselves into these animal humans, and the animal humans, it there says, were ape-like; they looked very much like apes though they were not apes in our modern sense of the word. In other words, an ape-like creature is we could be if we never had the descent of the Sons of Mind. Well, this would imply that a consciousness that's not dependent upon the physical body can descend into these instruments or vehicles, psychophysical vehicles which we possess, and the power to function, the power to exist on the part of this descending consciousness, is not conditioned by the state of the body. The state of the body does have this kind of effect: that it may not be able to manifest its functioning

as well in a body that is defective as in one that is not defective, but the point would be that it's like the crippling a musician would face if he played with an untuned piano; but the untuned condition of the piano, or the otherwise defective condition of the instrument, would have no effect upon, or no bearing upon, the musical competency of the musician. The musician would have the music in him. He knows it already. His manifestation of it through the inadequate instrument would be defective, of course; yet, nonetheless, a master musician could produce more with a defective instrument than a mediocre musician could produce with a magnificent instrument.

We have then the conception of superposition—one which I find extremely important for yoga. Sri Aurobindo, now, confirms this view when he says living beings—animal man had reached the point . . . mind was to be born, there was a descent from the mental plane of mental beings into the prepared humanity—virtually the same statement. And then he points out something that's rather obvious when it's pointed out: these descending beings operate according to the laws of their plane, the plane from which they come, but with a material that's alien—the material down here in this world alien to that consciousness. This applies to both the life beings and to the mental beings. He pictures the descent of both. The result is—let us apply this to the intellectual level now with which we are more particularly concerned—the result is that your concepts don't quite fit this world and this world behaves in a way that is strange with respect to the conceptual order. A thinker who's sufficiently intellectual can step aside into the conceptual order can think in terms that are essentially perfect there, so long as they're completely detached from this world. Difficulty arises when you try to connect those conceptions up with this world. Now, that difficulty is faced peculiarly in the domain of applied mathematics—mathematics applied to the affairs of life, business, engineering, and so on. The pure conceptions have to be mutilated before they're applied, with the result that your applied mathematics becomes a sort of science of allowed error. You deal with correctness to this degree, not perfection of statement, which perfection is characteristic of the pure mathematician. There is a distortion comes in there and pure thinking doesn't fit; something in this world is strange, incommensurable with respect to it. Fundamentally, it obeys some other law.

Now, our attempt to build a science, in the Western sense of the word, is an attempt to comprehend this world in terms of a conceptual system, and this world to a degree is comprehended, to a degree we get a certain control, as is demonstrated in all our applied science. For instance, your automobile will run, and the plane will fly, and that represents a victory of applied science—two victories out of many thousands which we have known. But we find that all of our basic conceptions fail, more or less, after time as our experience grows. That's why there had to be an Einstein to correct Newton; and I think it was Heisenberg who made the rather startling statement growing out of an experience of ours—certain scientists, I say, of our humanity, not of us individually—that when you locate an electron in its path you cannot determine its velocity, or if you know its velocity you cannot determine its location. And out of that he built a theory of uncertainty, namely, that we don't know the, in any determinate sense, in any complete sense, the ultimate movement of matter; and we can't know it because in the very process of experimentation, of observation, we introduce a distortion and the results don't fit our conceptions. That illustrates the point that Sri Aurobindo made, I think very well, that the material of this world does not precisely

conform to the law of the mental world. Hence the mental beings are bound to feel a lot of frustration. They were apt to feel quite a bit of disgust with the evolution because they all the time have to deal with the sense of something not clicking, not being perfect, not being in true alignment. In other words, to tie this in with our basic subject we're dealing with, we have evidence that there is a kind of consciousness for which the theory of superposition is more applicable than the psychosomatic theory.

Superposition can be carried further and indeed becomes a fundamental metaphysical conception in the hands of Shankara. The whole universe, for him, the whole world of the bodies, of course—our bodies, as well as the universe—exists as a superposition upon Root Consciousness. I in reality am identical with that Root Consciousness; my being lies there. The superimposed universe, including the whole of our body consciousness, and so on, body states, is something that does not really affect our ultimate true being. Liberation is simply the act of cutting that pure, Root Consciousness asunder from the superposition—the universe disappears and one finds himself in the transcendent infinite completely free.

Now, if one were to extend the psychosomatic conception so far as to be an exclusively valid metaphysical conception, then this kind of yoga would be an impossibility. There would be no existent being apart from a body of some sort. There could be no transcendent beyond the cosmos. Therefore, I suggest that it's a conception carrying a part truth to be valued pragmatically because it works to some degree, at least in the therapeutic field, but not something to be taken as an exclusively valid philosophical or religious doctrine. Now, in my own experience the principle of analysis was fundamental. The psychosomatic conception is anti-analytic. It's a non-analytic kind of thinking or awareness that's implied in it. Perhaps not all of you are aware of how the analytic process arises that has been so important in Western science and philosophy. The biggest name in connection with it is that of Descartes. On rereading a little bit of Descartes I've been somewhat impressed with the fact of how naturally I tend to go the same line that he went, not because of Descartes' writing but because it's natural to me. I naturally think that way.

Descartes, when he graduated from the schools, had discovered there were a lot of things said by the theologians and others that were only given to him on authority. He didn't know whether they were true or not, and he was querying a whole lot. He traveled a lot—questioning, studying; and finally a lot of doubt arose in his mind. He found contradictions of course; he asked himself why should I believe in such and such a statement, in such and such a theological dogma, and so on. Well, he didn't know. So he said to himself, I'm going to start a search and throw aside everything that I have learned—just as an exercise—and begin doubting everything I can possibly doubt until I find something that is impossible for me to doubt and then upon that as a foundation build again. Well, he found first of all that he didn't know and could easily doubt everything that was given to him by the authority of the church or other authorities. You'll notice there's some similarity between Descartes here and what Buddha recommends when he said don't believe anything because the wise have said it, or the gods have said it, or I have said it, but just because you know it directly. Well, it's something very similar that you find in Descartes.

Well, he wondered whether he could doubt the existence of an external world and he found he could, quite easily. He found that he couldn't question the fact that he had sense impressions, perceptions, and so on that came along, but he said a demon might be fooling me. We do know that we sometimes get fooled by our sense impressions that don't click, maybe they all fool us, maybe they're all just like dream entities. Well, so he couldn't build on that foundation—the notion that there was an external world. But he did find that he thought—and by thinking he meant this preceding process as well as conceptual thinking—that these images did exist. He didn't know for certain that he had any senses, he could doubt that, but he couldn't doubt the fact that these perceptions actually existed there. So, he said there's no question but that I think—which includes I perceive—and he drew the further conclusion, which has been disputed, therefore I am. He could doubt the external world, he couldn't doubt that he thought and had perceptions, and he thought that having perceptions implied that there was an existent being that had the perceptions. Now, the Buddhists carry that analysis further and they say there isn't that existent being—that perceptions are there all right, but there isn't a self that experiences them. There isn't a mental substance that experiences them. They just happen as it were. Well, as a matter of logic, you cannot derive the self, the “I am,” from the fact that I think or that thinking is. You can't even say for certain that “I think.” You can say for certain: “thinking is, perceiving is.” However, Descartes, with this formula, starts the stream of modern philosophy.

Now, there were two things that came out in his consciousness very clearly: this mental order of the “I am” and he reintegrated the world as something external, but for this he had to have the help of God. He thought he proved the existence of God in this way: ideas may come to us from our own nature, but everything has to have a cause, and ideas that we have which don't come out of our own nature would have to have a cause elsewhere. Now, we have an idea of an absolutely perfect being, an omniscient being, an infinite being, and so on, which doesn't come out of our nature. The effect cannot be more than the cause that produced it, therefore that infinite being, namely God, must be or I could have the idea of such a being. That's one of his arguments. It has been criticized pretty strongly. Now, since God is there and since he does not deceive you, therefore you may believe in general in the existence of an external world. So he derived an external world as part of his philosophy by a route like that. One may question how adequate the route is.

Now, you have then, “I am,” or the mental being, the mental substance on one side, and this physical world on the outside, and the property of the physical world, so it seemed to him, was that it was essentially extended, extended in space, and had this capacity of motion, and that's all it had. The mental beings, on the other hand, had the power of thought; they were not extended in space. There were thus two orders, two orders distinct: matter over here, the mental or conscious order over here. Now, you've got them clearly and sharply separated. Then immediately begins the problem: what is their relationship to each other? And that has kept philosophy busy for some hundreds of years trying to get together what has now been separated. You posit that there is a rigid causal system out here in the realm of matter, in the physical universe, and science gives us the impression that it is so. Your predictions can be so precise, particularly in the astronomic order. You can predict the appearance of an eclipse down to the fraction of a second, and so on. It seems like a mechanical order rigidly determined, for the causal law

is absolute. On the other hand, in this “I am” order there is the feeling, at least, or the sense of freedom and of spontaneity. It doesn’t seem to obey that mechanical order out there. Well, since the material universe includes the human body and the human brain, the question does arise: if the movements of one’s arm, for instance, were to obey the laws of the mechanical order, how in the world could consciousness, the consciousness of the man come in there and be responsible for the movement of the arm? If something from the mental order could cause the movement of the arm, you would have something coming into the mechanical universe that wasn’t there before, something that couldn’t be accounted for by the stream of causation.

Well, one theory for getting around this difficulty is this: that there is a strictly mechanical order out here and there is a mental order of freedom here and that the mental order can’t have any effect on the physical order, nor the physical order on the mental, but there is a parallel action with a *preestablished harmony* between the two. In other words, we don’t see the external world; we merely experience states of consciousness corresponding to it by reason of a preestablished harmony. But the two orders, you know, don’t mix up at all.

Well, then there are those that tried to handle it by a *monistic* method from the materialist’s standpoint, and they say there is a mechanical order and that’s all there is; and consciousness has nothing to do with it. Consciousness is a mere epiphenomenon that happened upon the log of evolution. It’s something that probably won’t last. And then there is the monistic attitude from the other side that views the whole universe, the material universe, as merely my idea, that the order of thought is the whole thing. These are the two monistic attempts at resolving the difficulty.

And then there’s the theory of *interactionism* whereby something can be, as it were, thrown in from one order into the other so that the something, an energy as it were, were introduced into the universe and an energy can be lost from the universe in going back into the mental order, and so on—a sort of an interactionism.

At any rate there’s been a lot of trouble trying to resolve the difficulty and the psychosomatic theory is a contribution in that old controversy that begins with Descartes. Descartes got them apart and now for 300 years we’ve been trying to get them together; and the psychosomatic theory is one of the latest attempts to get back. But the problem remains do they avoid the logical difficulties that the others had to face? Of course that has no bearing upon a practical application in a purely pragmatic healing. You use anything there that works, so far as it works. But when you come to deal with a larger problem of a general world conception, you may find that there are plenty of difficulties in it. It is only a part truth, maybe only a small part truth.

At any rate, from the standpoint of yoga, there is a power in the analytic approach, which was essentially that of Descartes, in which you start a cutting off. You see, his doubting was a process of cutting off, cutting off, cutting off, till he got to something that you can’t doubt; and when you’ve got to something that you can’t doubt there you have indubitable reality. Whether those things you’ve doubted may prove to have a reality of their own subsequently is another matter; but the reality you know certainly is the reality you can’t doubt. So you strip off, strip off, strip off, till you get back to that most ultimate core. Now, this can be used as a method of yoga and it can be used successfully. It is the thing that I’m familiar with, for it was used in what is

reported in *Pathways*. Now, when you cut off and cut off, you do come to the final fact that you have these modifications of consciousness which you call perceptions; and back of that by subtlety you can recognize, can isolate the consciousness as distinct from the perceptions so that you have consciousness apart from content—consciousness that doesn't depend upon a content for its existence. Once you've got that isolation and analysis and added to it the direct Realization of it, then you've made the breakthrough and made the breakthrough in a great way.

Now, it's true your direct Realization you can't command; that comes of itself. But your analysis can be a means of preparing the way. You can isolate by analysis, just a process of cutting off, cutting off, cutting off, till you get to something you can't cut off. Now, there are other techniques that add on—embrace, go out and embrace, embrace, embrace, further, and further, and further. You see they're two opposite approaches. This is that of dropping everything until you get down to the thing that is inescapable, certainly true, certainly real; and there you're on solid ground. But, at least in my own experience, I confirm Descartes: that that solid ground is just consciousness itself; and since it is a pure consciousness, it's something that's not affected by process. Its existence is independent of all becoming—the becoming being like a drama or play upon the surface of that consciousness as upon a screen, but the consciousness itself being in no wise dependent upon the play. And by this play I mean the whole universe. You look upon the whole massive universe of the stars and the planets, and at the other pole, of the atoms, and electrons, and positrons, and so forth, and life phenomena, and all of that, as just one vast moving picture upon the surface of this untouched, immovable, timeless, and pure consciousness. And the Realization is: I am that pure consciousness. One with that Realization stands invulnerable. What happens to his body doesn't touch him; what happens to all of his equipment, subtle as well as gross, doesn't touch him. It may be perfected, it may be defective, it may be cut off and lost, but that doesn't touch him. Hence, he's above all danger, all suffering, all loss and gain, in an absolute infinite perfection; that's the reality of him, and that is a high yogic Realization when it comes as a Realization. But you can approach it successfully by this method of analysis which cuts off, cuts off, and cuts off. It is the opposite method from that of the psychosomatic people who have to think synthetically and cannot think analytically.

Now, this doesn't mean that there isn't a place for synthetic thinking, but it does mean that your synthetic thinking follows analysis instead of starting with the raw confused and obscure material of ordinary experience. It breaks that down by analysis and then reintegrates. It destroys the world that you come to and then rebuilds that world by a new synthesis; and the world that is rebuilt is a more understandable one than the raw world that you first contacted.

Now, if the right persons were here, what I have said might start a warm argument. This would step upon many toes; but, on the other hand, many people might not realize why it would step upon their toes. Maybe if you remember what I have said sometime later you will understand why somebody gets rather warm when a pretty abstract idea has been formulated because they touch conceptions that become rather vital in one's life.

Well, I think that's enough for tonight.

Participant: . . . and with the analytical approach to yoga, do you think guard against getting caught in the intermediate state or—?

Wolff: I would think so. Whatever dangers you'd run into, I think it would tend to avoid those dangers because you can doubt most all of the things that belong to the intermediate zone. It's the zone of formation, and variety, and so on. It tends to strip away until the whole cosmic order ultimately is stripped away and there remains only the transcendent consciousness. That's if it's carried through successfully to the limit; always bearing in mind, however, that the arriving at your ultimate conception of that which you can't doubt is not the same thing as Realization. The Realization comes spontaneously, but it prepares the way.

Any other questions?

Participant: Well, that would seem to be a very safe way, a safe approach then, in that respect.

Wolff: It seems so to me, but then many of the Vedantists, for instance, are very antagonistic to the use of analysis, and Aurobindo doesn't give it very much of a place. The emphasis in that case is almost always upon devotion. Now, I have of course spoken of the yoga of surrender a good deal of late, which is a yoga that is not exclusively devotion as Sri Aurobindo understands it and then teaches it, but it accentuates the devotional side. And this is not the path of devotion; very definitely it's the *jnana* path.

Participant: What do you mean it is not devotion?

Wolff: The analysis, the method of analysis is not the path of devotion. It's the *jnana* path.

Participant: I was interested in your bringing out the fact that in the psychosomatic if the mind and the body were completely connected it would preclude immortality.

Wolff: Yes, it would preclude the possibility of a consciousness persisting when there was no body in any sense.

Participant: Is that the general way that it's given out, the psychosomatic?

Wolff: I don't know. I don't know if it's carried theoretically so far as that.

Better turn it off . . .