

# Lectures to University Students

## Part 6 of 7

Franklin Merrell-Wolff  
February 1968

Dr. Merchant and Fellow Students:

Since there are several new faces this evening that I do not remember seeing on the five other occasions that I've been here, I will not be able to assume certain things I have said before and will have to make a new beginning.

One word which stands out of peculiar importance in connection with what we will say is the word 'Realization'. Its meaning is not too easy to grasp; it is in a way manifold. It can have a bearing on knowledge, but it also can have a bearing on the life of feeling, upon the attitude toward action, upon the problem of a transformation of human consciousness so that it becomes integrated or liberated. I shall have to give a little of the meaning that in its totality would require extensive elaboration. Ordinarily when we develop to our ordinary possibilities, we open up those resources by a method which we call education. It simply unfolds resources that are more or less awakened in the individual. In the case of Realization, we're dealing with the awakening of resources that are latent, that are not now generally active in individual consciousness, and these resources can be manifold, can carry enormous implications.

First of all, Realization may be viewed as Enlightenment, as it was so viewed by the Great Buddha. Enlightenment was the state in which all of the causes of human suffering were destroyed, and then arrived at a condition of bliss and wisdom that was a complete fulfillment; and at a departure, either during life or at the time of dropping the body, to a state that was entirely beyond, entirely other than this world of external relations, and strivings, and warrings, and aspirations, but, rather, a state of fulfillment. Again, in the emphasis supplied by Sri Shankaracharya, Realization is viewed primarily as resulting in a state of Liberation from a bondage to essential ignorance. From a more Christian point of view, we would think of it as perhaps a transforming of the will—a will that was self-seeking, aggressive, to one that was universally fulfilling. Realization may be in minor degree essentially in the form of a preliminary step, or unfolding, reaching out toward the day when a Fundamental Realization may be attained. Realization, too, can be the initiation into various powers of which the most important are the kind that affect consciousness, its content, its influence, its state of affective feeling.

Tonight I am going to deal with a particular Realization that in my experience was preliminary to Fundamental Realizations that came later. I'm not talking and giving to you that which you can acquire in books that you could study in the schools, for that is unnecessary—you could find it there in those books; but I'm giving what I know out of direct Realization itself as a testimony to what is possible, as a testimony to the fact that this that we call "yoga" is not some monopoly of the Eastern peoples, but is a possibility for all men. Furthermore, as an evidence that Western man does not need to repudiate his

own especial psyche or soul in order to attain that which is liberating, enlightening, and fulfilling. It is true that the people who have been the custodians in largest degree of the mysteries of yogic Realization have been the East Indians. It is true that practically all great religions in the world are Oriental in their inception, for Christ, too, was an Oriental of the Near East; Mohammed, of the Near East; the Sufi mystics of Persia, and other portions of the Near East; Shankara of India; Buddha of India; Krishna of India; Lao-Tze of China; and others. But the West has more to offer than merely improved plumbing. Now, I bring in that reference because there have been Easterners who have thought that by improved plumbing, by which meaning material devices to supply material goods and to make things more sanitary and so forth, summed up the genius of the West. I'm maintaining the West has more.

There is one great one of about 600 B.C. recognized by the Eastern adepts as a master and called the Foreign Master, a Greek. I refer to Pythagoras, and I think if we penetrate deeply enough, we will find that the inner genius of the West has its seed in that which Pythagoras brought. There is something there that the East does not have, and that is mathematics. Mathematics is in special degree the expression of Western genius as I see it. I know the practical genius but that does not loom in my consciousness as large as this key to practical mastery which mathematics is. None of these machines that we have, none of this possibility of navigation on land, sea, and in space, would be possible without mathematics. That on its practical side, but for Pythagoras, mathematics was not simply a practical tool, it was something tied in closely to his religious sense, and he made a contribution to the history of mathematics which was perhaps the most important of all, namely, the principle of proof as essential to mathematical development. The orientation to mathematics of the religious sense has later been carried on by Plato, by the neo-Platonists, and a few others including Cantor, the originator of transfinite numbers.

Now tonight, I'll bring in a little of the mathematical element. I have had experiences that I could not formulate without the aid of mathematical tools. I'd have to be inchoate. It is also true though that if one ascends the scale of Realization, sooner or later there comes a time when nothing can be said, but through a certain use of the power of mathematics, we're able to drive back the boundary of inarticulateness further and can say more, can use figures that are more pat than many of the past.

As an illustration of the use of figures, there is the Indian story of, I think it was five blind men, who came upon an elephant. One of them touched the tail, and one touched a leg, another, an ear, and the fourth one, the trunk. Then each gave a description of the elephant. The one that touched the tail said the elephant is like a rope. The one that touched the leg said an elephant is like a column. The one that touched the ear said the elephant is like a fan. And the one that touched the trunk said the elephant is like a snake. The meaning here is that ultimate reality has many appearances, and it's characteristic that each of the religions of mankind takes one of these characteristics and develops it, finds in it a truth, a particular value, and then goes further—and this is where evil comes in—says this is the only truth; this is the whole truth. And out of that there has grown many wars—religious wars, the cause of much, if not most, of the evil in the world. Now, it's entirely possible that there has never been a religion that had influence upon mankind that did not have a certain truth in it, but it is also true that when any religion is regarded as exclusively valid, it becomes a source of evil.

Now, I use the Oriental figure of the elephant to illustrate how an ultimate reality might appear very differently to different perspectives. I'll take another figure now from mathematics to illustrate how one could predicate of one thing powers, or aspects, or appearances, that would seem at first sight logically incompatible. Let us assume a flatland. That has been done in some of the mathematical recreations where all of the entities were only two-dimensional and they had no cognition of a three-dimensional entity. Now assume the existence of a right circular cylinder of unit diameter and unit height. That means it's as high as the diameter is long. Right circular means it's flat this way, doesn't lean one way or the other. Now, let us draw that. If you run a plane through there, intersecting it at right angles to the axis, and you'll get a circle. If you run a plane this way through there, and you'll get a square. I think you all know enough about mathematics to see that without going into it any further. Now, have that figure go down through flatland so that the axis is perpendicular to the plane of the flatland, and the beings in flatland would see only a circle. Have it go down, be introduced into flatland laid on its side and, as far as the axis, and the intersection would be a square. And that could start a big argument in flatland. Since this is a strange thing that comes from outside of two-dimensional space, their having no conception of three-dimensional space, they treat it as numinous, that is, as being a god. And they build up different religious views, and there are strong proponents of the idea that God is like a circle, and strong proponents of the idea that God is like a square. And if they behave like we do here, they get into war over it and cause a lot of suffering.

Now, a wiser course in dealing with conceptions that seem incompatible, if they are fundamental conceptions, is to seek a possible integrating concept. In this case our integrating concept is readily understood once you conceive of three dimensions as the right circular cylinder of unit diameter and unit height. It is both a circle and a square. Now, that is used to illustrate how a figure from mathematics can with more logical patness integrate some of the difficulties that the more sensuous figure of the blind men suggested already, but not with such logical completeness. I don't know whether you're following point, but I'm dealing with something very fundamental; something, which if understood, could eliminate most of the conflict in humanity and therefore most of the pain. Seek, when there's apparent incompatibility, for the integrating concept.

Another illustration of that from our Western science: we say that because of gravitational pull, the earth is falling into the sun. Also, we say because of centrifugal force, the earth is being driven away from the sun in a tangential direction—two apparently contradictory statements—the earth falling into the sun and the earth flying away from the sun. Now, this is still in science strictly. There is the integrating concept called the “parallelogram of forces” that eliminates all contradiction from that. This is the sun down here; and the earth up here; and the circle orbital path; attractive force down here; tangential force moving that way. Now then, we take and draw a parallelogram in this form proportional to the various energies and draw a diagonal line, and that is the direction at which the earth is actually traveling as the resultant of these two forces. Actually you break it down into parallelograms that are infinitely small in calculus and add them up, but that's a little more technical than I expect you to be able to understand, at least all of you. Now, what I've done here is to show in science how an apparent paradox that seems to be a contradiction was integrated by means of the parallelogram of

forces, and how by the conception of a three-dimensional figure, we could integrate circularity with squareness—apparently incompatible.

Now, when one has the experience of a Realization, in some measure he departs out of the dualistic domain. He has consciousness, be it in small degree or largely developed, of another order of being in which there are properties that we never find here conjoined. He comes back then and speaks in a language that is paradoxical, and many have great trouble to understand him. This is what's one of the difficulties in mystical literature. Bear in mind that that which here is ordinarily incompatible can be beyond the dualistic order united in one entity: an example which we have demonstrated over and over again, the experience of what we call the "Current." It's called a current because it is first experienced as a flowing through; it's highly possible that some of you may experience it here tonight. It's very frequent that there is an induction of that. It has, thus, a quality that you might call fluid. It could be symbolically said, then, to be like water. But it also has the quality of fire at one and the same time. And usually we don't find water and fire in the same place here. Oh you might find it by putting some sodium under water, but not as a rule. Fire and water are incompatible; and yet here is an entity that in its approximate complete description requires what seems to be a contradiction. Its fieriness can manifest as an experience of heat in the audience. I've seen it happen again and again, and faces would turn red, perspiration would run off of their faces, people would take off their coats. It happened rather dramatically down in Phoenix just a few days ago. Now experience like that gives a certain proof to the relative consciousness that we're dealing with something—something that can produce effects, that can be experienced without having gone through a long yogic discipline.

Now, other things that are much more valuable can happen. It is typically characteristic of most, though not all, Realizations, that one has an experience of a great delight—*ananda* as it is called—something that far transcends the pleasure or the amusements we get from ordinary life. One who has been reasonably deeply immersed in such an *ananda* may find the pleasures of ordinary life a kind of pain, a kind of something hard to endure. This is a state not caused by any external circumstance; a state that flows down from within. It is possible—this is a matter of practice—to live for protracted times in a state of a low tension *ananda*. High tension, no; it actually becomes a strain on the physical body—but a low tension, a gentle bliss can be persisted in day after day in which one goes about his affairs, can walk in it. You can't handle machinery in it. I've checked up on that. You can't drive a car, that calls for an objective extraversion, and this calls for an indrawn state. It would be dangerous to drive a car.

Now, in this state the consciousness is in what we would call a light trance. You might not even know that it was trance-like; it's so light. You can deal with the problems of the external environment where there's clear vision and clear sense perception of the environment as ever, and yet in a curious way, you're untouched by the environment. I had that demonstrated to me once in Chicago. In fact, I didn't know I was in a protracted light trance until I was pulled out of it downtown. Maintaining the state, I usually walked in a rather rhythmical way with my gaze more or less over the heads of people only noting the environment in a peripheral sense, but not allowing it to get in on me. But because of a companion with me who turned to window shopping, turned here and there, I got pulled out of it, and then the city hit me as something extremely painful. It was

something like a shock, and I knew then that I had been living in a light trance, giving lectures in a light trance, going on continuously. One can build the power to enter and withdraw from it.

This also has a bearing upon thought. I may not get to the things that I had planned tonight because I find it's necessary to cover ground that I couldn't assume. And it has an affect upon thought, and last night I spoke of two kinds of thought; that which we call "speculative"—that's our ordinary reasoning thought directed by the mind, the kind with which you are familiar. You can go home and perform your studies with this thought and know that you can rely upon it, that you can turn it on. It may take some effort. It may make you work hard, if you have some really hard problems. It can be taught in the university, and probably the most important thing a university can teach is how to think in the speculative sense. The garnering of information is an added something simply, but that's something that goes on throughout life. Learning how to think, I'd say, is the most important thing you can take away from the university. But there's another kind of thought you don't learn in the university—or at least if you learn it there you didn't get it from the university, from its regular operations—and that is a thought that we call "transcriptive." The word was introduced by Aurobindo, and I don't know of a better term.

Now, last night I used a figure to suggest the difference between these two kinds of thought—a figure which I said would not have been available in the calendar period B.C., before computers. Imagine a computer that had a gremlin in it which could program the computer itself and keep the computer busy working out these programs so that the human beings that wanted to use the computer never got a chance because the computer was too busy. Now, let that represent our speculative thinking—the ego, more or less, ego-directed speculative thinking. There may be a question as to whether I think or whether thoughts happen. We'll leave that out for the moment.

Now, there is above this lower, outer nature an inner nature in each one of us that we may call the divine part of ourselves. It may be experienced as an identification with the Self, or the *Atman*, or it may be experienced as a coming close to a Divine Companion—a very delightful experience. Thus, there are what we might call two entities, this outer entity—or two souls—and an inner entity or soul. There's a figure used in the *Upanishads* that refers to this as two birds upon a limb that are strongly attracted to each other. Now, having attained to a certain state of yogic Realization, one finds the Divine Companion, and if he learns the art of what is called a quiet mind—which isn't the same thing as trying to make the mind absolutely blank because I don't find you can do that; it calls for a certain subtle understanding—the thinking that is introduced into the mind is a transcription from an inner consciousness into outer verbal or symbolic terms. Now, that is analogous to the man using the computer instead of the gremlin using the computer. When this happens, you can deal with problems easily that otherwise would be handled only with great difficulty, if they could be handled at all. You may write, and say that the pen did the writing—it wrote itself—and that you had made no effort. *Pathways* was mostly written that way. You might find yourself writing poetry, as I did, though I had never written before and I had never been interested in it, and didn't bother to know the structure of poetry. This is an example of transcriptive thinking. It can become a habit. Generally when I give a lecture, when dealing with a new audience, the lecture will

start on the speculative level until we establish a certain rapport in the audience, then there's a shift over—which some people can sense immediately—into the transcriptive form in which case there's an effect on the audience that you don't get from the mere exposition of ideas in the speculative sense. Speculative thinking goes no further than the mental. This other thought may carry a germ within it, something over and above the meaning you get from the dictionary value of the words, and that meaning has a power to penetrate into the psyche, and produce effects within—very often, the reported effect, such as an awakening to a certain new depth, a new delight, a new richness, a decent of peace where there had been storm, a sense of presence. This can happen. This comes out of this transcriptive presentation where the mind is the instrument of a higher power. Not merely the plaything of the gremlin which you're working with in school.

Now, I will make use of the board. A great Indian philosopher known as Shankara formulated the philosophy that is known as *Mayavada* or *universal illusionism*. As the basis of the interpretation of the problem of the world—why there was so much suffering, why there was so much difficulty, why there was so much that was unsatisfactory. He said of this: it is unreal, and the resolution of this problem of suffering is the dissolution of the *maya* or illusion and in its place, you will find the real. The real is none other than *Parabrahm*. And a figure very commonly used by him, and by other Indian writers, is the figure of the snake and the rope. Those of you, and I guess all of you here are familiar with snake country, and when you're walking in snake country, part of your consciousness is always alert to the possibility of a snake being in the vicinity when you're out in the desert and so on. You may see a piece of rope or a piece of hose, a stick, anything of a more or less long and sinuous nature, but instead of seeing that you see a snake, and you jump. A moment later you see what it is. Now, that snake that you for a moment saw illustrates what is meant by *maya*. It represents the world of insolvable problems—of grief and misery and all sorts of unhappiness. But once you recognize that that snake is a rope—the rope symbolizing *Parabrahm*, the reality—no troubles are left. All is peace, and happiness, and assurance. That's the figure. The aim in that yoga is ultimate departure from a dream world, a *maya*.

Now, that is not a speculative idea. It expresses something that you can experience. I have experienced it, where everything about became suddenly unreal. I've seen thoughts start to dissolve just like pieces of metal in an acid bath, and consciousness in the organized sense of a mental consciousness, of embodied consciousness, beginning to disappear and dissolve into an intangible richness that is extremely attractive. But I had to stop that because I couldn't go on with that self-indulgence. I wouldn't be here if I hadn't. Now, there is a basis, and a serious basis, for the philosophy.

But now Aurobindo, of our own day, has testified to the fact that he knows this experience but there are others, out of which he has developed a philosophy which he called *universal realism*. It's developed in *The Life Divine*—a very good philosophic work. You can almost have a thousand pages of fun in it—excellent dialectic, superb dialectic. Shankara was a good dialectician too. And he presents his case very convincingly. And he stands opposed, first of all, to the philosophy of Shankara—acknowledging though that the yogin following the lead of Shankara's philosophy can indeed attain to the yogic Realization, the Realization of Knowledge and Liberation—and he maintains the philosophy is inadequate and presents the philosophy of universal

realism. He takes the battle of Kurukshetra in the *Bhagavad Gita* as a real battle and that the instructions of Arjuna were to face the problems of that battle as a real battle, not as merely a struggle in the individual life or mind as some other interpreters have made it. The battle is to be fought in order to bring about the triumph of the *Dharma* and the overthrow of the *Adharma* in this world; and that the problem before us, then, is the regeneration and transformation of this world and not simply a private or even collective release into some *Nirvana*—though he does not deny the reality of *Nirvana*, having experienced it and its great majesty.

Now if we're going to apply the principle that all Realizations are capable of an integration if they are authentic, and there's not a matter for dialectic battle between the followers of Shankara and the followers of Sri Aurobindo—each maintaining their teacher is the true one and other false—but rather the aim should be to find that integrating conception that can see these two possibilities at one and the same time as true, as different aspects of the same reality.

I pondered this problem for several years and then finally discovered that I already had, in a certain preliminary Realization, the key to the resolution. This Realization came to me once when I was alone on El Dorado Creek up in northern California, a tributary of the North Fork of the Middle Fork of the American River, up in the land of the old gold Argonauts. I remember at the time, I think I was looking at the sky when it suddenly dawned upon me that the real is not there where senses report appearance or concepts indicate objects; but the real lies where the senses report nothing and where there is no concept; that therefore the objects before consciousness, perceptual or conceptual, are relative voids. This doesn't change the detail of any of our sciences. It merely changes the metaphysical interpretation of what the scientist is studying. Instead of the scientist studying something, he's studying relative nothings, voids, emptinesses. That's an empty place. This is relatively full. An inversion in the system of valuation is what is involved. It can be stated in a very simple form: *reality is inversely proportional to appearance*. We won't write that down in the long English. If we use our mathematical shorthand, we can say the same thing this way:  $R = 1/A$  where  $R$  is reality,  $A$  appearance, and the relationship of  $A$  under the 1 gives the value of inversely. And this '=' is a directly convertible copula—the 'is'. Only you who know logic would understand that statement. That's a mathematical way of saying the same thing.

Now, this led to interesting results. How many of you here have had mathematics as high as trigonometry and coordinate geometry? Not very many—that's not very far in mathematics. It's all you need now. From your algebraic transformations and equations,  $RA = 1$ . Now, when you take our usual  $xy$  here, think of your  $RA$  as variables like  $xy = 1$ . Who recognizes what curve that particular equation gives us? It's the equilateral hyperbola referred to its asymptotes as coordinates. That language probably doesn't talk to several of you. Now, this is applying mathematics to religion. Now draw—let us draw rectilinear Cartesian coordinates. This is the  $y$  axis and this is the  $x$  axis. And that equation would give us figures like this. These coordinates are asymptotes—a line to which this curve becomes parallel at infinity. In mathematics you get very familiar with infinity. And that is not the usual form in writing that so I rotated it through 45 degrees and ran the coordinates through the foci; and the equation becomes  $x^2 - y^2 = 2$  instead of  $xy = 1$ . Now, our asymptote comes down through here now, and through here. Oh yes, I

added the conjugate hyperbolas like that just to make it a balanced figure. This comes out of that *substantiality is inversely proportional to ponderability* or *reality is inversely proportional to appearance*. Now, instead of taking these rough drawings, a draftsman made this. Here's a better one. Playing with it, I drew in a square tangent to the four hyperbolas, or four branches of the two conjugate hyperbolas, and a circle tangent, and then an inscribed square in the circle. Then the figure was satisfactory. Now, they don't follow mathematically from that formula. Then I noticed what I had satisfied the conditions of the mandala: circularity combined with fourness. Also, I had that sense of integration in myself through it.

You may remember the problem of the squaring of the circle. As a mathematical problem, it's trivial. It was the discovery that with a compass and rulers alone, you could not draw a square having an area equal to a given circle. It is known, however, you can do it with other means of construction. That isn't of importance. There's a mystical meaning attached to the squaring of the circle, or the circularizing of the square, and that is the transformation from the—say, I think it's getting awfully close in here. People are getting sleepy and the air is getting a little stale; and it's getting warm, too. We've got several heaters in here now—human heaters. Actually, the Great Pyramid of Giza illustrates the problem in stone by presenting the ratio between the diameter and the circumference of a circle correct to five decimal places, and that appeared to have been a place of religious initiation. The square represents the power to measure. Actually, in all measurement, land and otherwise, we use squares or rectangles. In your integral calculus, you merely use rectangles or squares that are infinitely small, but you use the same place for an integration of an area. The square represents, therefore, the power to think cognitively because as soon as you have concepts—I should say think conceptually—for as soon as you have concepts, you have measured the content of your consciousness in some degree. Squaring therefore is organizing, making measurable, understandable, or conceivable, an original meaning that was inconceivable. The circle, thus, in a certain sense represented the heaven world. Now, what we mean here is that in the older sense, the Ultimate was represented by a circle symbol, a delimited figure. This outer square embracing that old circle means an increase in the power of thought now possible that can embrace that which was unthinkable before. But beyond that, this hyperbola reaching out into space, not a delimited circular form, that embraces space, goes to infinity—consciousness moving away from definition of objects into illimitable spaciousness. This corresponds to actual experience.

Now, the implication of this thesis would be that if you follow the direct meaning of the concept in its direct leading, if you think that in the concept there lies the substance, or if you think in the sensuous image there lies the substance, you're caught in a *maya* or mirage, and that would be in accordance with the thought of Shankara. On the other hand, because the relationship is *reality is inversely proportional to appearance*, by using the appearance, the sensuous object, the idea, as an instrument and inverting its value, it can lead you to the real. By inversion, therefore, we arrive at the philosophy of universal realism. Taking these objects in their direct implication you arrive at the philosophy of universal illusion, the philosophy of Shankara. And here, I suggest, is a schematic integration whereby one could accept both Aurobindo and Shankara at the same time, not merely as personalities, but in the sense of their philosophies.



Now, I think, since we've covered just about an hour, and that's about as long as I find people can listen without becoming over-fatigued, we better come to a close. And if you have questions, I might be able to answer—well maybe not answer but, uh, turn 'em around a bit and throw 'em back at you.

Student: Will yoga supposedly enlighten you?

Wolff: Hmm?

Student: Will yoga supposedly enlighten you.

Wolff: Of course, yes, if you go far enough. But what do you mean by yoga? Do you mean something like *Hatha* yoga? No, that won't be enough to enlighten you. But the yoga of knowledge, yes; the yoga of devotion and the yoga of action, yes, they will. I know it. I've been through the mill.

Student: How is it possible to turn our conceptions around?

Wolff: Oh, you mean inversion?

Student: Yes. Yes.

Wolff: Well.

Student: Take, take an example or something.

Wolff: Well, I did it with that formula there. Here's the diagram to do it.

Student: Yeah, but—

Wolff: You might be able to do it in your consciousness with an image like that out there. All right, you can—I might suggest this. Take the energy value out of the image; deplete it; withdraw the libido out of it; make it empty.

Student: Then, what's there?

Wolff: Hmm?

Student: Nothing is there then. What?

Wolff: Well, you dive into apparent nothingness, it's what you seek to do, and you find that that apparent nothingness is absolute fullness. In other words, you reverse the direction of your orientation here. Instead of the orientation to the object, which parallels materialism—it isn't necessarily materialism, but it parallels it—instead of the orientation to the object, to the thing, to the external, you turn to the apparent nothingness and find it absolute fullness. That will help you understand the *Shunya* Buddhist *sutras* where they use the figure of the emptiness or *Shunyata*. Everything is called empty, empty, empty. Everything you can touch is empty. You turn away from that. Get the consciousness to turn away towards the void, and you'll find the void is full. The apparent void is full. The apparent fullness is empty. So it's an inversion. Your professors generally won't like you if you do that.

Student: Can you then assume that the psychic waves in this room, for example, are more important than the objects that are in this room?

Wolff: Sure, sure, sure. You'll find that out too. You'll drop this, this thing some day, and you'll find that other isn't gone. It's much more important.

Student: If you would have kept on in your state, this ultimate reality that you were reaching, if you wouldn't have brought yourself out of it, what state would you be in today—I mean physically? Would you—would your body still—

Wolff: Well, I probably—oh, I don't know whether this thing would have been alive, or it might have been occupied by some other entity, or so on. But I'd have been quite—quite delighted. It's a wonderful attraction.

Student: Could you have gone, um—how much deeper do you think, or above, could you have gone?

Wolff: I don't know how much deeper. I know I plunged into darkness where I couldn't distinguish anything, which I interpreted as meaning here the relative consciousness could not register a thing. That's why it's dark, you know. Now, the darkness which symbolizes unconsciousness is not really an unconscious. It's merely "other" consciousness. And, it's dark because it cannot correlate with this organized consciousness we have developed here. You plunge into a darkness and you don't know whether you'll ever come out, but you do have a faith that the heart of things is friendly. And I found that faith justified. Any other questions?

Student: The light trance that you were discussing, in what way is this related to common, ordinary daydreaming? Or is it?

Wolff: Daydreaming? The old common, called, uh—oh, no, no, I see what you mean. No, you can think on your problems in it. Light trance. I thought you said light transit, and I couldn't draw the correlation.

Student: No.

Wolff: Light trance. No, it's not daydreaming. It's a state in which you can carry on your lectures. You can do your reading. You can engage in most of your light activities—not something handling machinery that calls, involves—in traffic, which calls for close concentration, extraversion of consciousness. You can think seriously—mathematical problems and so on. It's not mere daydreaming.

Student: Well, the reason I wondered, I was thinking about the feeling that you get where you've gone completely through town or 100 miles and, behind the wheel, and suddenly realize that there's a bright new world out there and you missed the whole show.

Wolff: You missed the whole show. Well, there is a sense of that. Trance has several different meanings. There is the hypnotic trance, for instance. I've had the experience of that. It can happen, you know, driving along a line. And it's well to have had the experience of hypnotic trance because you can catch that at an early stage when it starts to come in on you. It is not the same as a mystic trance. There's one effect—this may sound very strange, indeed, although you'll find it in the literature—there is a nectar, which is not a physical thing at all. You can experience it in a hypnotic trance. I have, and it's course. It's a little bit like, uh—it's a mixture of flavor and perfume, as it were, which seems to localize on the lips, but it's also connected with the exhaled breath. Now, in a mystic trance you can have that in an extremely delicate, like the attar of roses, in that case; and in the hypnotic case, like a synthetic perfume made out of coal tar with

perhaps some skunk mixed in. Now, these things—you'll find that in the literature. They happen.

Student: Well, I have a question. You said that you didn't realize that you were in the state of trance. I think you gave the example of being in Chicago—

Wolff: Yes, it was a very light trance.

Student: —this light trance until you were brought out of it. Well, what brought you into it, that you did not realize that you were into it?

Wolff: Well, thinking the way I'm thinking tonight will put me into it. You don't have to go into elaborate meditation. I just think of lecture I had, and be thinking through it, and I'll find myself in that state; but then that's—there are over 30 years of experience in it. That makes a difference.

Student: Why did you come back from your deep—

Wolff: Hmm?

Student: Why did you come back from your deep trance?

Wolff: Oh, you mean from that experience when I saw the mind breaking up and so forth? Well, I'll tell you the reason. It's contained in the pledge of *Kwan-Yin*, and I quote it to you: "Never will I seek nor receive private, individual salvation; never will I enter into final peace alone; but forever, and everywhere, will I strive for the salvation of all creatures throughout the world." Those who have reached that point can do something if they return. And there are those that have returned. And if they were not here, this humanity might well be doomed. That's the reason for return. And that also, that pledge should be in the heart of the aspirant when he strives along the way. And when he has the rich, most bounteous harvest of consciousness, of knowledge supreme, and delight unimaginable, he may also return that he may bring it in some measure to others. That's the reason for return. Not because you care for life in this world that in a moral sense is relatively a cesspool; and in an aesthetic sense, in a deep aesthetic sense, it's relatively a cesspool, with all of its war and its cruelty—inhumanity of man to man all through it. It's not attractive. There's nothing that'll haul you back. It is, in fact, a kind of hell; but a hell that would be helpless if there were not those who voluntarily return to it. That's the reason. Now, perhaps that's enough for tonight?