## **On the Meaning of Redemption**

Franklin Merrell-Wolff August 10, 1969

With your permission I shall sit while speaking, as what I shall have to say may well take over an hour. What is planned to be said this morning is the most important thing I have ever said, certainly in this life, and I believe ever in any of the incarnations that have been mine in the past. If you get its bearings, it will be perhaps the most important thing ever said in the West. I plan to tell you certain things that have been largely esoteric concerning myself—which some of you know—which are necessary to the understanding of why it is possible to say these things; and, furthermore, because of certain cyclic reasons, it is very possible that this will be the last time that I'll be with you. I hope this is not so.

Since what I'm dealing with bears upon the most important feature of what I regard as the most important scripture or *shastra* available to us, namely, *The Voice of the Silence*, the portion that I refer to is at the very close of the section on "The Seven Portals." Those of you who are familiar with *The Voice of the Silence* know that it deals with the ascension of the ladder to ultimate Realization, to the culmination that is *Nirvana*, and more than that, the renunciation of *Nirvana*. It's the portion dealing with the latter that I shall read.

Calm and unmoved the Pilgrim glideth up the stream that to Nirvana leads. He knoweth that the more his feet will bleed, the whiter will himself be washed. He knoweth well that after seven short and fleeting births Nirvana will be his. . .

Such is the Dhyana Path, the haven of the Yogi, the blessed goal that Srotapattis crave.

Not so when he hath crossed and won the Aryahata Path.

There Klesha is destroyed for ever, Tanha's roots torn out. But stay, Disciple . . . Yet, one word. Canst though destroy divine COMPASSION? Compassion is no attribute. It is the LAW of LAWS—eternal Harmony, Alaya's SELF; a shoreless universal essence, the light of everlasting Right, and fitness of all things, the law of love eternal.

The more thou dost become at one with it, thy being melted in its BEING, the more thy Soul unites with that which IS, the more thou wilt become COMPASSION ABSOLUTE.

Such is the Arya Path, Path of the Buddhas of perfection.

Withal, what mean the sacred scrolls which make thee say?

"Om! I believe it is not all the Arhats that get of the Nirvanic Path the sweet fruition."

"Om! I believe that the Nirvana-Dharma is entered not by all the Buddhas."

Yea; on the Arya Path thou art no more Srotapatti, thou art a Bodhisattva. The stream is cross'd. 'Tis true thou hast a right to Dharmakaya vesture; but Sambhogakaya is greater than a Nirvanee, and greater still is a Nirmanakaya—the Buddha of Compassion.

Now bend thy head and listen well, O Bodhisattva—Compassion speaks and saith: "Can there be bliss when all that lives must suffer? Shalt thou be saved and hear the whole world cry?"

Now thou hast heard that which was said.

Thou shalt attain the seventh step and cross the gate of final knowledge but only to wed woe—if thou would'st be Tathagata, follow upon thy predecessor's steps, remain unselfish till the endless end.

Thou art enlightened—Choose thy way.

Behold, the mellow light that floods the Eastern sky. In signs of praise both heaven and earth unite. And from the four-fold manifested Powers a chant of love ariseth, both from the flaming Fire and flowing Water, and from sweet-smelling Earth and rushing Wind.

Hark!... from the deep unfathomable vortex of that golden light in which the Victor bathes, ALL NATURE'S wordless voice in thousand tones ariseth to proclaim:

JOY UNTO YE, O MEN OF MYALBA. A PILGRIM HATH RETURNED BACK "FROM THE OTHER SHORE."

A NEW ARHAN IS BORN.<sup>1</sup>

The basis of what I shall say is a group of five Realizations reported in *Pathways* which occurred between 1922 and 1936. Two minor preliminary ones of the form, "I am Atman" [or] "I, the Self, am Atman"; [and] "I am *Nirvana*." The one that was reported as "Substantiality is inversely proportional to ponderability," or "Reality is inversely proportional to appearance." And concerning this, just within the last few months, I came across these words out of *The Voice of the Silence* confirming that Realization, where it says, "Study the emptiness of the seeming fullness and the fullness of the seeming emptiness."<sup>2</sup> I'd read those words many times. This time they stood out. And then on the 7th of August, the first of two major Realizations, 1936, which followed the pattern of Sri Shankaracharya. The ascension recognized as a rising above space, time, and law leading to the vestibule of *Moksha*, which is *Nirvana*. But I'd been impressed long by the words of Kwan-Yin which run this way, "Never will I accept or receive, private, individual salvation; never will I enter into final bliss alone; but forever, and everywhere, will I

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> H. P. Blavatsky, *The Voice of the Silence* (Pasadena, Calif.: Theosophical University Press, 1946), 69-72.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Ibid., 55-56: "Thou hast to study the voidness of the seeming full, the fullness of the seeming void."

strive for the redemption of all creatures throughout the world." At the vestibule of *Nirvana*, one tastes of that which is true of that state: a Delight so powerful, so rich, that it is beyond human comprehension, combined in some way with an energetic potential that the human body can stand but a little of it—an experience of an invulnerable Peace and a Beauty that makes all earthly beauty seem empty and dead. These qualities, not the result of something else, of delightful experiences or peaceful ones, or of beautiful objects, but a self-existent Delight, Beauty, and Peace. And along with this the knowledge that Consciousness can not be destroyed, that immortality in the root sense is not in the least in question, but is an eternal fact, and a totally new perspective in the world view and the understanding of hidden things.

I remember that looking upon this and thinking of turning one's back upon it, that it seemed rather appalling. For how long? A lifetime? No. A million years, that's more like it. And it is said here in this book, that that's the Great Renunciation without compensation. It looked a bit grim. There was one, a Sage whom we knew as Senior, who said, "Watch for a cycle involving the number thirty-three." I knew that it was a cycle of time, but how much time I did not. Thirty-three days, weeks, months, years? It certainly didn't seem like thirty-three days. But after thirty-three days, there walked into me something I did not know existed, and was not therefore seeking it, that transcended the original Realization as greatly as the original Realization transcended ordinary experience. I'd used the figure from Cantor's transfinite numbers to express it: that the first transcended ordinary consciousness as a denumerable infinity transcends finite manifolds, and this second was like an infinity of a higher order that infinitely transcended the first infinite. It, however, was not a state of delight, but a state of balance between pain and delight. A balance between all dualities whatsoever that are so essential to our very functioning in this outer domain which we call Sangsara. Its keynote was Equilibrium, more worthwhile than *nirvanic* Delight, strange as that may seem to our human understanding. And I said to Senior, this certainly is compensation beyond all expectation. "Well," he said, "The Voice of the Silence didn't tell it all. It was pictured as a renunciation without compensation so that the candidate would be completely sincere. The law of compensation cannot be violated. Not all is written here." And that too has been confirmed by Erma, whom some of you know, and who also says more from this same source will come forth in the last twenty-five years of this century.

Now the importance of what I'll have to say is testified to by certain signs. I wrote it up in a letter to Erma Hamilton, and the result of that was it was read before a *Secret Doctrine* class that's held down in Arizona, and instead of an answer in the form of a letter, she and her associate came up here on a rush trip returning the next day, though extremely busy, and requiring the permission of the Brothers, spelt with a capital 'B'. I'll introduce it by reading a copy of the main part of the letter. And also another thing that surprised me very greatly, I've learned here, from one who is present, that the local Indians have been aware of what's going on and that they approve, and they know it through a certain second sight which seems to be normal with many of them. They experience it as a phenomenon of sensible light. But, to read from the letter:

For weeks and months I have been in a state of deep brooding, thinking, and penetrating into available sources with respect to the *Tri-Kaya* and the

three fundamental zones or states known as Sangsara, Nirvana and Paranirvana or Paranishpanna. I have been going over the source material again and again looking for keys which may appear as isolated sentences, clauses, phrases, or even words. Slowly I have been attaining some rather exciting successes. As an instance, I came across a line in The Voice of the Silence in the section on "The Seven Portals" which runs this way: "Study the voidness of the seeming full, and the fullness of the seeming void." I had read this many times but it never stood out before. This is precisely the preliminary Realization that I had on the banks of El Dorado Creek in 1936 that led to the formulation: "Substantiality is inversely proportional to ponderability" or "Appearance is inversely proportional to Reality." Another instance occurs in the case of The Tibetan Book of the Dead, largely to be found in footnotes. I find that nearly everything that can be predicated of the 'Clear Light' is also true of the 'High Indifference', such as: unformed, unmade, unsullied, unsulliable, and so forth; and also the positive characteristic of 'Equilibrium'. One apparent difference is that the Clear Light emphasizes the quality of Light, while the High Indifference has the value of Twilight, since it is the synthesis of Light and Darkness as well as of all other dualities including Sangsara and Nirvana. Then the question arises, "Does the High Indifference have any relation to Paranishpanna?" I know that this is a terribly presumptuous thought, but it persisted in hanging around. But if we assume it to be valid, certain exciting consequences follow that are highly heretical both from the standpoint of the Brahmin and Buddhistic philosophy. To introduce this I must first refer to certain other correlations.

1. The thought occurs to me that there is a correlation between the *Tri-Kaya* and the three zones or states known as *Sangsara*, *Nirvana*, and *Paranirvana*, as follows: *Sangsara* corresponding to *Nirmanakaya*; *Nirvana* to *Sambhogakaya*, and *Paranirvana* or *Paranishpanna* to *Dharmakaya*.

Now, there's a little difference now, and this is where we're getting a little heretical, from the correlations that are made in what I read there.

If, then, any entity could be a *Tri-Kaya* he would or could participate in all three zones or states *at the same time*.

And this is where we're really getting heretical.

But this is contrary to statements in "The Mystery of Buddha,"<sup>3</sup>—

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> H. P. Blavatsky, *The Secret Doctrine*, vol. 3 (Wheaton, Ill.: The Theosophy Co., 1910), 376.

Which, incidentally, were written by HPB. They were part of a manuscript that was on her desk at the time of her death, was not part of the third volume of *The Secret Doctrine* which does exist and is in manuscript form, but was published by Annie Besant as a third volume and it is not the third volume but it is authentic HPB material. The most important section in that manuscript was this section of about eleven chapters on the mystery of Buddha and that has been material that I've been working on very heavily of late.

—in the so-called third volume of *The Secret Doctrine*, and in *The Voice of the Silence*.<sup>4</sup> In one or the other place it is affirmed to be a matter of either-or, not both-and.

Either you're *Dharmakaya* or *Nirmanakaya*; you can't be both. But what I'm projecting here, that it is possible to be a *Tri-Kaya*. No doubt you can't be two, it's either/or if you are not a *Tri-Kaya*.

To enter Nirvana is to be shut away from Sangsara,—

This is what you'll find said over and over again.

—with some rare exceptions, such as the Blessed One himself.

I assume you all know who the Blessed One is, that is the Great Buddha. There's only one seven-fold Buddha connected with our humanity today. That's the one who's last normal incarnation was as Gautama, some 600 years B.C., but who has repeatedly appeared since—is to my own definite knowledge still accessible. And note here, there is no exception to a law; there are exceptions to rules. If the Blessed One can be in *Nirvana* and also here, that proves that such is in principle possible. No individual can do anything, no matter how rare it is, without thereby proving that that something he does is in principle possible. Catch the logic of it?

Hence, to continue in the activity of redemption he who has reached to the threshold of *Nirvana* must renounce it and take the *Nirmanakaya* Robe,—

This is the common view.

—a renunciation said to be for an interminable period of time and without compensation. Think of a million years of organized consciousness without any *nirvanic* break into Pure Consciousness. Could any entity endure that without exhaustion? It is not merely a question of willingness to perform, but also of the capacity to do so.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> On the audio recording, Wolff inadvertently omitted the phrase ". . . in the so-called third volume of *The Secret Doctrine*, and in *The Voice of the Silence*."

See, here we're beginning to unfold additional meanings of *Nirvana*; that it is not only bliss and withdrawal, but is also the source of refreshment, rebuilding the strength of functioning. That's a side that hasn't been emphasized.

Now, if the suggested correspondence given above is correct it would appear that the renunciation of *Nirvana* is equivalent to the renunciation of the *Sambhogakaya* Robe—

Here's another deviation.

---rather than the *Dharmakaya* Robe, the latter being associated with Paranirvana.

2. There are other correspondences that I have made, partly in the "Aphorisms on Consciousness Without an Object" and these are: *Sangsara* with suffering,—

And by Sangsara we mean the whole universe. I might stop and elaborate what it means. The last figures that I have seen from scientific sources, and they do change pretty rapidly, is that the cosmos has a radius of ten billion light years. A few years ago it was three billion; they keep changing. But at any rate, the whole of the cosmos-planets, stars, galaxies, galactic systems, the whole works-is Sangsara. Not only that, zones or lokas invisible or inaccessible to outer consciousness, all the hell worlds, all the heaven worlds of the ordinary religions are in *Sangsara*. Incidentally, most of the heaven worlds are only vital heavens and those are very inferior heavens. Just think of a heavenly state of sitting on a cloud playing a Jew's harp for 10,000 years, infinity in fact. Or walking in golden slippers down the golden streets of the New Jerusalem, clackety-clack for the rest of eternity. At 3:30 in the afternoon, the Supreme will appear with his only begotten Son beside Him and you can sing His praises every afternoon at 3:30. Or, Happy Hunting Ground of the Indian, purely a vital heaven, physical-vital. Or the Norseman's state where you got up every morning and after breakfast had a grand war with your fellow warriors and in the evening everybody got healed from his wounds and had a grand feast and the next morning you repeat it over. Such heavens, they're all in Sangsara. Not only the vital heavens, but the rarer mental heavens which are of still much higher order and only a few ever go there. They're all sangsaric. That whole thing is what we mean by Sangsara. Nirvana stands in contrast to it, conceived as dynamically equivalent—the other of Sangsara. Get some idea of the level of conceptions we're dealing with. We're putting that whole thing I've described as just one term, and the least valuable term of the whole thing. All that science is concerned with, all that most religion—only religion at its highest point reaches beyond sangsaric realms. Now then-

> *Nirvana* with Bliss, and the High Indifference or, as suggested, Paranirvana with a state that is neither Bliss nor suffering but a fusion of the two in a state that is more attractive than either, something that is quite inconceivable to a human kind of consciousness.

From the foregoing, what I am suggesting is that it is in principle possible for an entity to abide in all three zones or states at the same time, and in this case there is no renunciation nor sacrifice, save in the sense of 'rendering sacred',—

Which is the true meaning, etymological meaning of the word.

—in the labor of redemption. And there would be no problem of exhaustion in maintaining organized consciousness for an indefinite period of time. One would blend in himself the mundane and the supramundane consciousness as the microcosm. And why should not this be possible since manifestly the macrocosm does so include and blend, and it is said that the microcosm duplicates the macrocosm? No doubt such a microcosmic blending would be rare as yet, but I am speaking of what is in principle possible.

I see in the foregoing the possibility of a new dispensation in which the purification by suffering is replaced by the Purification through Joy, in the transcendental sense.

3. There is still a third set of correspondences which I made several years ago, and this is: (a) the correlation of *Sangsara* with the object of consciousness; (b) *Nirvana* with the subject to consciousness; —

That is the Self.

—and (c) the High Indifference, or *Paranirvana*, with the consciousness uniting subject and object. This tended to confirm the earlier Realization in the form "I am *Nirvana*."

The High Indifference was a progressive state involving four steps: (a) a state of universal satisfaction; (b) a state of Indifference—

And here, many people have stumbled at this word "Indifference." I mean it in the sense Aurobindo uses the word 'Equality', equality of attitude towards all things, if you can get it. It's not in the usual sense of the word 'indifference'. This is something that J. William Lloyd, who was the first man who read my manuscript and was himself a mystic, couldn't get. And I imagine that you who have read *Pathways* probably have not gotten it. In fact everything I'll say today is implicit in *Pathways* and if you haven't had it already, it shows what you haven't gotten out of *Pathways*.

---(c) a state in which the subject and object vanished and only consciousness remained; and (d) a movement into darkness meaning *shes-rig*---

That's a Tibetan word and I'll explain it later.

—could not make correlation, from which I awoke in the morning with a sense of a still vaster beyond. At the level of (c) the subject was the Self, the universal object was solely Divinity—

That is the inside view of the whole universe is a sense that it is all Divinity.

—with these two aspects being one and the same as in the Realization "Atman is Brahman." The effect of these two vanishing into Pure Consciousness was to place me in agreement with the Buddhist doctrine of Anatman and Nastikata or Non-theism.

Those of you who are familiar with Buddhism know that it teaches the doctrine that the Self is not permanent, nor is the Divinity permanent. And this Realization confirmed that position.

I was transformed from an Adwaitee Vedantin to a Buddhist. I saw a relative validity in the Vedantin *Atma Vidya*, but a more ultimate validity in the Buddhistic position. A radical implication of all this is, Pure Consciousness *is*, before any entity becomes.

Now that turns it upside-down with respect to our ordinary thinking. That is beings, human beings, gods, angels, whatever you please, *devas*, whatever you please to call them; they are functions of Consciousness, derivative from Consciousness, but not the source of Consciousness.

Entities are functions of Consciousness rather than the other way around as we ordinarily suppose, to use a mathematical type of formulation. This I understand to be the real meaning of the *Alaya Vijnana* of the Buddhists. But there is verification to be found in the writings of HPB.

In Section XLI, of "The Doctrine of [the]Avataras" under "The Mystery of Buddha," the question of the sense in which Lord BUDDHA was an Avatar is discussed.<sup>5</sup> The sense in which this is asserted by the Brahmans, i.e., as a descent of the entity Vishnu, is denied, but as Maha Vishnu or Adi-Buddha, or Primeval Wisdom or "*Nirvana*, in short, [because those are the words of HPB.] . . . the Lord BUDDHA *was* an incarnation of Maha Vishnu," and hence an Avatar. (Elsewhere it is pointed out that He was also a Jivanmukta.) But 'Primeval Wisdom' is a quality of Consciousness and *Nirvana* is a state of Consciousness and this made an Avataral descent.

Do you get the point, that here is the use of a conception of Avataral descent as meaning not an entity descending but a quality or state of Consciousness descending? It's

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Blavatsky, *The Secret Doctrine*, vol. 3, 362.

an extension of the word and is quite different from Aurobindo's use of the term and of our common understanding of the term.

In other words, the Avatar can be a quality or state of Consciousness, rather than an entity. And this leads to questions re: the High Indifference. Was the High Indifference an Avataral descent? I was not striving to realize the State, since I did not know that it existed. The earlier Realization I had been striving toward since it had been so clearly formulated by Shankara, but I thought that was the end.<sup>6</sup> Then thirty-three days later the High Indifference walked in on me or descended upon me out of the blue, as it were. I have not been able to exclude the possibility that it was Avataral. Then another question arises: Could it have been an Initiation of one aspiring to the Path of the Jivanmukta?

Now bear in mind what Jivanmukta is as distinct from an Avatar. An Avatar is what he is; there's no merit involved. That's his nature. It's a high spiritual Consciousness; not something that was the result of attainment—always was that, couldn't help himself but be that. A Jivanmukta is one who is striving, as through the human form and so forth, to attain the state that is normal to the Being that would be an Avatar. See, in other words, the Jivanmukta attains by effort and merit, and, I think, would generally be rated as therefore higher even than an Avatar.

Then another question arises: Could it have been an Initiation of one aspiring to the Path of the Jivanmukta? In this case the presence of the Guru Initiator was not evident.

You see, one does not enter *Nirvana*, and the same would be true of *Paranirvana*, by his own efforts alone. There's some modification of that. This I'll have to go into as a sort of a parenthetical remark here. The *Pratyeka* Buddhas do enter *Nirvana* by their own effort. But in . . .<sup>7</sup> One arrives at a point by his own merit, his overcoming of all of the temptations of *sangsaric* life, an ascension in knowledge and spiritualization as far as he could by his own effort, by his own virtue; but virtue will not unlock the door of *Nirvana*. But what it does do, and this is a paraphrase of the words of HPB, lead to the guru who already is possessed of *nirvanic* Consciousness, who can initiate him into it. That, in general, is the way of him who's going the path of the Masters of Compassion. But the *Pratyeka* Buddhas have attained spirituality selfishly. They do enter *Nirvana*, but without. . .<sup>8</sup> Now the key to *Nirvana*, and you have a right to try for it; it's a state of an almost inconceivable Equilibrium between all pairs of opposites that you'll find in the *sangsaric* world, including good and evil. The key is Equilibrium—not goodness. Now in the Tibetan you'll find a figure used illustrating the kind of equilibrium it is. Imagine a string, and you balance a pencil on that string, and get that pencil to roll down and stop

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> The audio recording is missing, ". . . was the end."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> There is a recording error at this point.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Again, there is a recording error at this point.

and not drop off the string. If you can do that, you'll maybe get some practice for entering Nirvana. Imagine maintaining that kind of equilibrium throughout all of the pairs of opposites within your consciousness. That's the key to nirvanic Consciousnessnot goodness. Goodness only gets you to heaven; it doesn't get you out of Sangsara. Now this is some of the shocking things that are involved in all of this discourse. To think that goodness is not the key to everything that's fine is a bit shocking. Equilibrium is the key to the Transcendent. A very virtuous man, a saint-like man, may earn a million years in a heaven world, such as Devachan, but he'll come right back to birth again and be in that circling process in Sangsara, still bound, just as truly as the sinner who differs from him only in that he circles through some hell world and back again here. And that leads to a further conclusion, that the saint as well as the sinner is in need of redemption. The redemption is from a locked-in *sangsaric* state, not a movement from hellish experiences to heavenly experiences, for the heaven conception is no more than a sangsaric conception. Get that point clear. And most of religion that is concerned with this is only the kindergarten stage of religion; and that's most of the religion of the world. I'll say a little more about the problem of redemption later.

Another question arose: Could it have been an Initiation of one aspiring to the Path of the Jivanmukta? In this case the presence of the Guru Initiator was not evident. This possibility, however, also I cannot exclude, especially as I lean to the way of self-induced effort and self-devised means. Finally, could there be something of both?

Now I do not know how one leaves the state of the High Indifference. There was no compulsion in it. I felt perfectly free to leave it if I so chose, but this was the last thing I wanted to do. The Will seems to be all powerful. What is willed will eventuate.

Terrific sense of power up there.

But there was no desire nor reason to will. I knew this was the eternal home, though forgotten, not only of myself but of all creatures, down to the last electron. And there was no reality in the supposed suffering of creatures.

All of the suffering just seemed to be a bad dream lasting one eye-wink in length. Hence, since no creature was doomed, there seemed to be no need of the office of Compassion.

Hence, the motivation of Compassion had no force since there was no need anywhere. It was quite possible to leave the State but there was no basis for motivation to do so. And ever since, I do not feel that I have ever really left it and have always abode in it though not knowing it, while now I do. It seems now to lie in the background of relative consciousness, whereas it had been for a few hours in the foreground. For the past thirtythree years it has seemed as though I dwelt in a zone, which in the beginning was knife-edged but has become broader and easier since, lying between two worlds of consciousness connected by the relationship of inversion.

Now this principle of inversion is very fundamental. I found it over and over again, and I find that in reading Aurobindo he gives it a very important place. You don't go in a straight line, but there's an inversion like this, and that happens if you move through to different states you get another inversion. It's not in the same direction; if one direction is here, the beyond is not that way, but an inversion as it were.

For the past thirty-three years it has seemed as though I dwelt in a zone, which in the beginning was knife-edged but [this] has become broader and easier since, lying between two worlds of consciousness connected by the relationship of inversion. In one, the 'self' or 'I' seemed like a *point* contained by an environment, while in the other the 'Self' was a *sphere* embracing the whole universe.

You get the inversion there?

In the transition between these two there was a momentary blackout and try as much as I could, I could not render that momentary blackout conscious. But is this place of the momentary blackout the place where indeed I dwell? Is it perchance the zone of the High Indifference, (*Paranirvana*?), the three zones arranging themselves in the form of a triangle, *Sangsara* and *Nirvana* forming the base and *Paranirvana* the apex? This is quite different from the image I had before 1936 in which the three zones lay in a vertical line. Mayhap, he who dwells in the state of *Nirvana*,—

Now, look at this, this is very heretical.

Mayhap, he who dwells in the state of *Nirvana*, who is not also a *Paranirvanee*, is locked-in, in a way analogous to the familiar locked-in condition of the dwellers in *Sangsara*.

Now you'll find statements like this: that he who enters *Nirvana* stays in for a *Maha Kalpa*, he who enters *Paranirvana* stays in for a *Manvantara*, a period that's given as 4,320,000,000 years. I'm saying here that he who's a *Paranirvanee* can become liberated from the locked-in state either in *Sangsara* or *Nirvana* but can be a free mover between them. That was contained in the Realization itself, that sort of information, way back; and was reported in *Pathways*. It gives you a very different picture altogether.

Then only the Paranirvanee could move at will between the two states or be conscious at the same time in both. Is this heresy? I know that I am on dangerous ground, but so my thought has grown. For this certainly contradicts statements in *The Voice of the Silence* and "The Mystery of Buddha."

A few months ago it dawned upon me that the year beginning either on the 7th of August, 1968, or September 9, 1968 was the thirty-third since the same dates in '36.

That means thirty-three years now.

After the event of 1936 I was warned to watch out for a cycle involving the number thirty-three. After thirty-three days the High Indifference walked in. But may the cycle of thirty-three years have significance?

On the hypothesis (the better way to write of it I think)—

Now this is kind of esoteric, it's part of our technique of communicating to those who have ears to hear, while others who hear don't know what's been said.

On the hypothesis that a former pseudopodal projection of the entity of which this person is now a pseudopodal projection was the junior partner in a *tulku* combination of which the Blessed One was the Senior Partner, certain consequences follow. That junior partner, it is said, committed suicide by act of will at the time of the dissolution of the combination, thereby invoking the *karma* of violent death against his will at the same age, which was thirty-three years. The hypothesis asserts that this did occur in a subsequent pseudopodal projection when there was another *tulku* combination with the same Senior Partner, also at the age of thirty-three years. The thought comes that the thirty-three years since the August and September dates possibly have important significance and probably have something to do with the transition. If not actual death then, perhaps, an initiatory equivalent. In any case, important thoughts are coming into my mind in this thirty-third year.

Now, I've told you a lot of esoteric things in that if you could understand what was said. The pseudopodal theory of the interpretation of reincarnation is something I developed myself and it seems to be pretty pat. It seems quite compatible with what Buddha said on the subject. I wonder how many of you knew about amoebas and the way they travel? How they stick out a projection from their bodies which are like legs or arms, and pull back, and another one will come out that's not the same one again. They call those pseudopods. Well, now, use that to indicate what we mean by an incarnation; that the real entity that we are is the entity behind that never is seen here. It actually is the Monad or the *Karanopadhi*, and the pseudopodal projections are from that *Karanopadhi*. So it's not correct to say that this person is a reincarnation of another person historically, but it is correct to say, can be correct to say, that this is a pseudopodal projection from an entity that sent forth another pseudopodal projection, a ray, at another time and so on down the way. That's the way you all work. That's a valid way of viewing reincarnation, what's really meant, and the reason why so much understanding of it is mistaken. This personality does not reincarnate again, but there is a karmic relationship between one pseudopodal projection and another.

And *tulku*? How many of you are not familiar with the concept of *tulku*? Those who are not. It's going to be very important now. It was not much referred to in the last quarter of the last century, although there are references, but it wasn't played up. In the case of the Great Buddha, the last normal incarnation in which he actually owned the body, the physical body which he occupied, he grew from babyhood, on up-that last time was as Gautama. Since then he's appeared many times but always in tulku combinations. In a *tulku* combination, another entity, presumptively a *chela* of the greater entity, provides the vehicle, then certain principles are replaced. According to the statement in "The Mystery of Buddha," HPB, it was the intermediate principles. The intermediate principles consisting of lower and higher mind, and Kama. Incidentally, Kama, in its purity is a high function. It's the base of Compassion. We know it only in its lower, degenerate stage. And that in the case of Shankara, for instance, this Brahmin baby belonged to another entity than that of Buddha; that the intermediate principles were the intermediate principles of Buddha, the purist at the time; and that there was, thus, that combination that made that very brilliant life, but the responsibility for it, the great power in it, is the Great Buddha. Now, I called the Great Buddha, in that case, the Senior Partner and the one that provided the body as the junior partner. Now there was a withdrawal of the Buddha's principles at the age of 32, and the replacement by the corresponding principles that belonged to this entity that had meanwhile been kept in what you might call cold storage. There's a question there, how they are preserved and so forth. I've only heard one little item bearing upon how they can be carried or maintained for a time, but we may call it cold storage as a figure of speech. Naturally, they were not developed, because they were in storage during that incarnation. The effect of their replacement could mean a very heavy depression from brilliance to at least seeming stupidity, and an inability to deal with the problems of your chelas, your disciples. So, it is said, Shankara went into a cave and was never heard of since. The esoteric statement is, he entered the cave and committed suicide by act of will-he couldn't take it, or thought he couldn'tinvoking *karma*, therefore, that required death against his will by violence at the same age in a later life. The implication is that, in as much as we know the Compassion of the Great Buddha, who said when the Brahmans persecuted his disciples, they have sinned, but I am the cause of their sin, and therefore I shall come to them. Man suffering wrong had his Compassion, but also man doing wrong had his Compassion. And so he came as Shankara. And you can see, although this is not said, how in the case of Shankara, who committed suicide, he would say he has sinned but I am the cause also of his sin, so I shall come to him again. And it may well be that that is the reason why there was the incarnation of the Christ. It may not have been that it would have taken place otherwise.

The statement with respect to the Triple Crown,-

Now this is something I might possibly read to you.

-has a premier or causal place in the line of thought that is here developed.

Early in the first volume of *The Secret Doctrine* there is a statement which runs as follows: "He who enters *Paranishpanna* without *Paramartha Satya* is in a state of extinction for Seven Eternities." This I read as being

in a state of absolute unconsciousness. *Paramartha-satya* is defined as the self-analyzing consciousness and so has a certain similarity to 'Introception', which was defined spontaneously—

'Introception' is my own word. It was introduced into *The Philosophy of* Consciousness Without an Object:

as "the power whereby the Light of Consciousness turned upon itself towards its Source."<sup>9</sup> Questioning the meaning of this it dawned upon me that the 'Light of Consciousness' was the cognitive aspect of consciousness, in contrast to which the Pure Consciousness is the substance of which all things are composed and could, therefore, be called Substantive Consciousness. Correlate this, then, with something I found recently in the footnotes on pages 96 and 97 of The Tibetan Book of the *Dead*. It says there: "*Rig-pa*, meaning 'consciousness' as distinct from the knowing faculty by which it cognizes or knows itself to be."<sup>10</sup> The cognizing faculty is called *shes-rig*. Ordinarily *shes-rig* is the power that cognizes phenomena, but when turned upon itself I can see that it becomes what is meant by the definition of Introception. I have long been aware of this Consciousness of Consciousness. In footnote number 3, page 96 above, we find the following: "From the union of the two states of mind, or consciousness, implied by the two terms *rig-pa* and *shes-rig*, and symbolized by the All-Good Father and the All-Good Mother is born the state of the Dharma-Kaya, the state of Perfect Enlightenment, Buddhahood."<sup>11</sup> This I found simply dumbfounding. From all the foregoing, it would appear that the Absolute Unconsciousness (which it is not in reality) becomes realized as Absolute Consciousness when the Light of Consciousness turns upon itself toward its Source, or when

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> H. P. Blavatsky, *The Secret Doctrine*, vol. 1, p. 84:

Paranishpanna, remember, is the *summum bonum*, the Absolute, hence the same as Paranirvana. Besides being the final state it is that condition of subjectivity which has no relation to anything but the one absolute truth (Paramartha-satya) on its plane. It is that state which leads one to appreciate correctly the full meaning of Non-Being, which, as explained, is Absolute Being. Sooner or later, all that now *seemingly* exists, will be in reality and actually in the state of Paranishpanna. But there is a great difference between *conscious* and *unconscious* Being. The condition of Paranishpanna, without Paramartha, the Self-analysing Consciousness (Svasamvedana), is no bliss, but simply extinction for Seven Eternities. Thus, an iron ball placed under the scorching rays of the sun will get heated through, but will not feel or appreciate the warmth, while a man will. It is only *"with a mind clear and undarkened by personality, and an assimilation of the merit of manifold Existences devoted to Being in its collectivity [the whole living and sentient Universe]*," that one gets rid of personal existence, merging into, becoming one with, the Absolute, and continuing in full possession of Paramartha.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> W. Y. Evans-Wentz, ed., *The Tibetan Book of the Dead* (London: Oxford University Press, 1960), 96. <sup>11</sup> Ibid.

*Paranishpanna* is combined with *Paramartha-satya*, or when *shes-rig* is united with *rig-pa*.

For the first time in this thirty-three years I have found a number of confirmations. But why, it may be asked, is confirmation necessary, for the assurance of Realization is unequivocal with respect to the ground covered by it? The answer seems to be that the assurance is valid so long as there is no interpretation or transcription even to one's own mental consciousness. But when there is transcription so that one may understand or communicate, error can enter. *The Secret Doctrine* states that confirmation is fundamental to occult science. These confirmations give me an increased assurance. But further criticism is not only welcome but is solicited from whatever source is competent to do so. As I see it, all this is not only important to me, but has a general importance since, if the above thought is valid, then a line has been established in the Western psyche or collective unconscious that leads to Enlightenment.

That was the letter. Two very busy people came up for a one day stop only because of that. And this has developed into other implications. I'll have to rush this because this is taking up time. One is-I've partially spoken of it-that it changes the whole meaning of redemption. The Christian thinks of redemption as redemption from sin, that the saint certainly doesn't need redemption, he's redeemed, that to get to the heaven world is all that's required. But what is implied here is that redemption is more than that. It implies the capacity to leave *sangsaric* zones, including the heaven worlds and the hell worlds and all this cosmos that we know, that the scientists deal with—the capacity to leave it. And that therefore, the saint, particularly he who is attached to his saintliness, is in need of redemption as truly as the sinner. Secondly, how about the Pratyeka Buddhas? Those who are locked in Nirvana. This conception, of a locked Nirvana and the intimation I had in the High Indifference of a state that could be entered and left is confirmed in the Tibetan material that has come to us through the editorship of Evans-Wentz, of which there are four volumes. It confirms, in the Tibetan Yoga and Secret Doctrine, the conception of a difference between a fixed nirvanic state and a nonfixed.<sup>12</sup> The *Pratyeka* Buddha is locked in to *Nirvana* through his spiritual selfishness as

There are thus two stages, or degrees, of *Nirvanic* Enlightenment. The first arises in virtue of having transcended the *Sangsara* and overcome all *karmic* need of further *sangsaric* being. The second is dependent upon realizing that this mighty accomplishment is but the stepping-stone to a higher evolution; the conqueror must

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> W. Y. Evans-Wentz, ed., *Tibetan Yoga and Secret Doctrines* (London: Oxford University Press, 1935), 360-361:

Or, as in Book II (p. 149), 'the Unabiding State of Nirvana'—that state of *Bodhic* Enlightenment which is not a state of finality. The Mahayanist regards the goal of the Sravakas, with whom he classes the Theravadins of the Southern School, to be self-perfection like that of the Pratyeka Buddhas, and not the greater goal of those who tread the Path of Selfless Altruism of the *Bodhisattvas*. If the Sravakas employ *Upaya* without *Prajna* (born of the *Bodhisattvic* Ideal) they realize only that *Nirvana* which is attainable by the *Arhat* while still in the fleshly body; and, upon their final decease, they are liable to be fettered to the state of transcendental quiescence concomitant with such realization.

truly as ordinary men are locked in to *Sangsara*, and he presents, therefore, a problem for redemption. The fully redeemed state is a state of complete Liberation, then, if you follow this conception, in which one is a free mover between the *nirvanic* and the *sangsaric* state and that therefore there need not be, when one at least has reached a certain point, any more of the renunciation, a forgoing of *nirvanic* Consciousness while functioning as a redeemer; however, what would be implied is that one must attain not simply the power to enter *Nirvana*, but the power to enter *Paranirvana*, before this becomes possible. I know that there are very few of the whole of humanity who have entered *Nirvana* or who have had the power to do so, and still fewer who've known *Paranirvana*.

And now comes some things that even those who have been here and have heard me speak before have not yet heard. Whenever we talk of anything whatsoever, we either implicitly assume or explicitly designate a base of reference and whatever is said is to be judged as true or false with respect to that base of reference and with respect to any other base of reference is simply irrelevant. An illustration is this: the shift from the base of reference in astronomy where your coordinates are taken as fixed with respect to the earth. That gives you the Ptolemaic system, and the movement of the sun and all the planets is in the form of certain cycloids, epicycloids, or epi-epicycloids around the earth. This statement is valid from that base of reference. If you make the Copernican change and establish your base of reference or coordinates as fixed with respect to the ecliptic, which is the path of the earth and would thus be fixed with respect to the sun, and the path of the earth and of all of the planets to a first approximation is an ellipse around the sun, a vast simplification that is true from that point of view. To say that the path of the planets and the earth is an ellipse around the sun is not true from the Ptolemaic point of view; it's simply irrelevant. And do you get the point? Something is to be judged with respect to its base of reference.

Now, *The Secret Doctrine* is a statement presented to man of the structure of the cosmos, evolving cosmos, with very minor references to the *nirvanic* side, oriented to the base of reference called *Sangsara*—the only possible form in which it could be communicated to humanity; and, therefore, with respect to that base of reference, time and space are pertinent. There are vast distances in space; there is a past and a future in time, and we look at these enormous periods before you can lay your head down in rest—4,320,000,000 years or 311,040,000,000,000 years. Perfectly valid statements, no doubt, from the standpoint of a base of reference taken in *Sangsara*, but suppose we take our

realize, once the conquest is made, that the conquest is not of itself enough, that it must be utilized as a means to a still mightier end and not merely enjoyed as by the Pratyeka Buddha. The Svravaka Buddhist mistakenly regards the first degree, as realized by him, to be the full realization of *Nirvana*. He therefore makes no effort to progress beyond it, with the result that he becomes fettered to it. Had he employed *Upaya* united with *Prajna* instead of *Upaya* alone, he would have attained the second degree, or *Nirvana* in its completeness, and, like the Mahayanist, would have escaped the last of all possible fetters and entered upon the Highway of the Supramundane Evolution. The Mahayanist recognizes a degree of *Nirvanic* Enlightenment which is even lower than this first degree. It appears to be an imperfect realization or rather a foretaste of *Nirvana*; for, as our text says, 'a being once attaining that *Nirvana* remaineth therein for 84,000 maha-kalpas'.

base of reference in *Nirvana*. *Nirvana* is timeless and spaceless. That's implied in the very statement that it's not a location but a State. From a base of reference that is timeless and spaceless, there's no such thing as distance in space. That which is far here is not far there. That which is past here is not past there. And that which is yet to come in the future is present now. I had that experience in the High Indifference where it was the beginning and the end and all between at once, here, now. So, one can see, he who has the power to enter and to leave the *nirvanic*  $\dots$  <sup>13</sup> can enter the *sangsaric*, since time is irrelevant, at any point in the past or any point in the future as well as at this point; and that provides time travel without mechanism. And also since distance in space is meaningless, he can enter, in principle, the far and the near equally well because far and near have no meaning there, and this without any mechanism but just by a movement in consciousness requiring, no doubt, technical equipment in consciousness; but you can see how it is in principle possible, and thus renders this moon travel to a position that's rather insignificant, for the Nirvanee who is not locked in can pierce anywhere and gain knowledge directly without ships, without a lot of physical technology. And these are some of the rather startling conclusions that are all implicit in what you've read in Pathways Through to Space, if you've understood what you have read.

There's more that I could say but time has passed and my voice is vanishing, so I think we'll close with the concluding portion of our meeting this morning.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> This missing word is unclear on the audio recording.