

Sangsara, Nirvana, and Paranirvana

Part 2 of 2

Franklin Merrell-Wolff

October 26, 1969

Yesterday I listened to the discourse of last Wednesday and noticed that most of the time was devoted to the foundation or base of the knowledge, which consisted of a series of five rather progressive Realizations, and that this took up most of the time. Now, there's a reason for this. In our day, and ever since Immanuel Kant, the basic question in any presentation of philosophy is the question of how do you know and what is the reliability of the knowledge, to what extent can it be trusted, and so forth. And ever since the work of Carl Jung, there has been added to epistemological criticism, psychological criticism. It is important to know just how far one's concepts are valid. Before Immanuel Kant we assumed the validity of our knowledge in a rather naive sense. I apply the same principle to this other kind of knowledge which I have called, tentatively, "introception," and defined it as the power whereby the light of consciousness turns upon itself towards its Source, the light of consciousness being clearly the cognitive aspect of consciousness. And now I find the question was not completely covered last night, and I'll give some time to a question of how far is Realization a valid source of knowledge. The question has arisen, and there are critics. I don't mean merely adverse hostile critics, but even sympathetic critics, and there are valid questions raised to which I feel I should give some attention.

There are men of good will, such as John Dewey, Bertrand Russell, Starbuck, James H. Leuba, with whose writings I am more or less familiar, and also to others, a man by the name of Coe and another by Delacroix, all of whom have investigated mystical states of consciousness. Those that I have read are sympathetic to this degree, that they acknowledge that it has contributed a great deal to feeling and generally to an elevation in the moral will, but they discredit it as a source of knowledge. And there are reasons. This is not an arbitrary matter. I think it was Delacroix who said, the knowledge the mystic brings out of the mystic state is the knowledge he takes into it and nothing additional. Now, in support of this, if you read the literature you will find that there's a tendency, and a very strong one, for a Catholic mystic, for instance, to confirm the Catholic theological ideation, and for the Protestant mystic to confirm the Protestant teachings, and for a Hindu mystic to build a picture in terms of the traditional background of the Hindu, and the same with the Buddhist, they using however the term Enlightenment. In my own experience—oh, I might go on to say, however, that certain other students, namely, Maurice Bucke, the writer of *Cosmic Consciousness* and William James, who gave the Gifford Lectures that were published as *Varieties of Religious Experience*, do credit the state as a source of knowledge in a noetic sense. The severest critic I have read is James H. Leuba, in his *Psychology of Religious Mysticism*, and I found it necessary to deal at length with his critique in the fourth part of *The Philosophy of Consciousness Without an Object*—the part you don't have here.

I go back to my own experience. It is perfectly true that in two of the Realizations there was no change in my philosophical position. I am *Atman*, for instance, was a position I had accepted as an idea without any resistance beforehand. The Realization simply added an authoritative quality to it, but there would be no change in the philosophy. And the same was true of the Realization on the seventh of August, because it followed and confirmed the philosophic position of Shankara. I wouldn't have changed my conceptual picture as a result of the Realization, but it gave authority to it and there were all those other values that are not noetic, that is, metaphysical knowledge—the values that touch feeling, that touch the moral sense, the values that you describe as beauty. There really is very little criticism as to the fact of those values. But, substantiality is inversely proportional to ponderability presented a new point of view; and finally, the High Indifference produced a philosophical revolution, totally unexpected, changing my viewpoint concerning not merely the universe, but all of the relationships of the universe to the non-universe that we call *Nirvana* and *Paranirvana*. And thus, an essential part of my own philosophy comes out of the Realization and not out of the literature, with a surprise, even converting me to a position with which I was not sympathetic, namely, the *Anatman* position of Buddha. So for myself, there is no doubt that mystical states of consciousness can be a source of knowledge and that one does not necessarily bring out merely that which he brings in. I admit, sometimes that is the case.

Now, another thing, it is important for you to know this. In fact, I advise if you have the chance to make a study of all the reports of mystical states of consciousness you can get ahold of. There is a vast variety of them. Awakening is the important thing. In fact, I much suspect that the purpose back of *The Secret Doctrine* is more to arouse an awakening than to give formal information. In fact, that formal information is at present, I suspect, not much more than a mass of words for most of the students without any corresponding Realization of the thing it points to.

There are two way of knowing, and this was illustrated in the discovery of the planet Neptune. A British mathematician calculating the orbits of Uranus noticed certain perturbations that could not be accounted for by the action of known planets. He assumed that it meant the existence of another planet further out that had not yet been discovered telescopically. He calculated its position in a given point in time, sent his data to the British astronomer at Greenwich, suggested that he point his telescope at a certain place in the heavens at a given time, and that he would find a new planet. The astronomer had the sense to do this and he discovered Neptune. Now, there were two cognitions. The cognition of the mathematician, a purely conceptual cognition of Neptune, and the astronomer acquired a sensuous cognition, an actual perception of this object in the sky that was ultimately called Neptune. Now, until other faculties are awakened, the material you are dealing with in *The Secret Doctrine* will be of the first order, conceptual only, and when other faculties are awakened you may come to know the referent of those conceptions. I suspect the technique involved is that of "induction." You think a lot about the conceptual ideas, which are just up in the air, until there is aroused sympathetically the capacity to be cognizant of the referent. But when you have that, you will have had an awakening of some degree of Realization.

Now, there is another important point in connection with cognition that has bearing here. When we make any statement, we explicitly or unknowingly take some

base of reference—mostly unknowingly. And that statement is true or false only with respect to that base of reference. With respect another base of reference, it's neither true nor false, but simply irrelevant. This is an important point to keep in mind. I'm going to give illustration. If you study the solar system from a base of reference, or system of coordinates as Einstein phrases it, fixed with respect to the earth, you'll get the Ptolemaic system. The sun will go around the earth with respect to that system of coordinates, and that will be a true statement with respect to that system of coordinates. The planets will follow paths that are very complex known as cycloids, epicycloids, and epi-epicycloids. Now, if you shift your base of reference to the ecliptic—or the sun, which amounts to the same thing, the ecliptic being the path the earth takes around the sun—then you find that the earth with respect to that system of coordinates rotates around the sun in a roughly elliptic orbit and so do all the other planets. It is a true statement from that base of reference to say the earth goes around the sun. From the first base of reference, it's correct to say the sun goes around the earth. And most of us, most of the time, use the Ptolemaic system because we say the sun rises and the sun sets, and with respect to the Copernican system, the sun never rises and never sets.

Now, unless a statement is taken in the context of its base of reference, you cannot judge whether it's true or false. It's neither true nor false; it's merely irrelevant. I want to drive this point in. It'll become pertinent. I want to point out that *The Secret Doctrine* is written from a base of reference which is *sangsaric*, because that's the only kind that can communicate to the understanding of our humanity. Therefore, *Sanghara* being conditioned by space, time, and law, you have great distances in space and great distances in time. A little later, I'm going to suggest another base of reference where that won't be the case. All that's implied here is the relativity of our conceptual knowledge—relativity to the base of reference. I want to drive that home. Nothing we can say is true in itself apart from its base of reference.

Now, this comes into these Realizations. The *nirvanic* state is timeless, at least timeless in the sense that we know time here—a timeless, spaceless consciousness. And the High Indifference is a timeless, spaceless consciousness where at one moment you are at the beginning and the end and all between—not in concrete detail, but in a sense of essential knowledge, formless in a peculiar way. This is inconceivable if you are so bound by time conceptions that you can't think without the notion of a past, and a future, and a present. Remember there is one statement of K.H. in *The Mahatma Letters* where he said he was irritated by the necessity of expressing his thoughts in a form of these temporal relationships.¹ Now, I'm saying it's possible to realize a state in which the distant past and the distant future are not in an essential sense far away.

I want to bring in another point, one that I didn't the other day. In the shift from the ordinary consciousness to that state where there was the sense of transcending time, space, and law, in the sense that one became "one" with the root source of these, that these were forms set up for the *sangsaric* play, but were not ultimate essentialities in

¹ A. T. Barker, ed., *The Mahatma Letters* (Adyar: The Theosophical Publishing House, 1923), 29:

I feel even irritated at having to use these three clumsy words—past, present and future! Miserable concepts of the objective phases of the Subjective Whole, they are about as ill adapted for the purpose as an axe for fine carving.

the nature of being as such; and that because one stood there in consciousness above time, space, and law he was liberated, free—a *karmaless* consciousness, a spaceless consciousness, a consciousness free from time conditioning. I can't give you a picture of how it's like. I can only give you these consequences. The movement into that state and back into the outer state was one which I went over many, many times, back and forth. As the *shastras* say, go within, or in other words, introvert—introvert deeply. I found that as you penetrate and go within, you reach a critical point where there's a momentary blackout. I call it a point of discontinuity. Then you're on the other side, and there has been a fundamental inversion in consciousness. And incidentally, that inversion occurs again and again. This one is described in this way. This was the form of yoga that is based upon self-analysis, the isolation of the subjective moment in consciousness, not the isolation of the ego, but the true subjective moment. I was stuck on that problem for some years because I found I was putting the subjective moment before consciousness, making of it a subtle object. When you stop and think, that which stands before me which I call "I," what is observing that? The real "I" was never put out there. So, here, this that observes, I put out. And you get back into a kind of an infinite regression—a whole series of "I"s that have objectified. You haven't found the subjective moment. The key was to sink back in the pure subject to consciousness without trying to place it before consciousness. The door opened with that little shift, it's a subtle one; so subtle that's where the difficulty comes.

Now, when that I is finally stripped of every quality that can be an object of consciousness—you strip it first, the body is not it because that body stands before me. I am aware of the body. The body is not I therefore; it's external to me. It's not the mind; it's not the feelings; it's not anything whatsoever that you can designate and place as an object before you, that you can in any way see as an object. You strip it back, strip it back until you arrive at what you might call a mathematical point—something that has position, the basic power of awareness and all—that's all. And all qualities whatsoever are other than I. This is the *neti-neti* path by the way. There's an *iti-iti* path which goes another way.

Now, the transformation or inversion in consciousness at this critical point took this form: that whereas that "I" was a point in an environment—the environment being the whole universe that was all objective to it, or in other words, *Sangsara*—a something contained, on the other side, after the inversion, the "I" became a sphere that embraced all that was. The whole universe was within me; and from that is the sense, I am not other in reality than any creature whatsoever. They are all part and parcel of me. There's no such thing as my gaining and another losing. I gain in the gains of all others, and I suffer a loss in all their losses. The wealth of all is my wealth, and the poverty of all is my poverty. That's the quality of consciousness on the other side of the point of discontinuity. You shift back—and this I watched time after time—you shift back, you go again through that point of discontinuity, and you come back to the ordinary way of thinking and behaving—an ego-self that is here in an environment, very small in that environment. On the other side, it's the all-embracing *Atman*—including not a center, but a sphere. I don't know whether anyone else has had an experience like this or not, but, I hope so. You always feel good when you find confirming experiences of this sort. But the quality or the base of a universal brotherhood lies right in that sense that I am identical with the "I" of all creatures, that I can not gain by their loss. Egoistically, I

might gain by their loss, but in this sense, I can not gain by their loss. The attainment of someone else is just as important to me as my own attainment. My own particular interest as distinct from other interests, don't have any more importance than the interest of others. That's the consciousness over on this other side. It's normal to it. It's not a moral discipline. It's the normal consciousness to it. You swing back, and you come into our ordinary normal sets of relationships.

Now, another thing I applied in my technique was a deliberate schizoid break in consciousness. You could go through this by the process of blackout *samadhi*, where all the consciousness in the relative field is blacked out, but there are reasons to be cautious about that. First of all, don't do it if you don't have a competent guru there to see that you wake up again. It is said that Sri Ramakrishna got into such a state and was locked in it for six months. In *The Secret Doctrine* or some other portion of the literature connected with Theosophy, the story is told of a *yogin* who was found in a forest in, I presume, the *padma asana* posture, and he had been in it so long that the roots of a tree had grown around through his legs. He was locked in and couldn't get out. It means the heart stops beating. There is no breath. No vital processes going on. And in that posture, the closed *padma asana* particularly, the blood doesn't drain down into the legs; it's held in the torso having the practical value that when the heart starts beating again it beats in the midst of blood instead of in a vacuum. Animals don't touch them apparently when they are in that state and whether they would ever die or not I don't know, but this was obviously there for many years. It is said that some of the natives that found this figure cut him out and in trying to awaken him, killed him. They did not have any proficient operator there to work on him. This is, I think, in *The Secret Doctrine*, but at any rate some—

Participant: *Isis*.

Wolff: Hmm?

Participant: *Isis*.

Franklin: Oh, it was in *Isis*, yeah. All right. Now, that illustrates I knew of these things and I knew therefore that by oneself, one should resist the tendency to go in—or any effort to go in to a blackout *samadhi*. But somehow I knew a technique that took the place of it. Now, how in the world I knew that I have no idea. But that was to divide consciousness and to keep this relative consciousness, the lamp in it burning though turned down dim, and it watched on the sideline while another part of the consciousness went through the process. It had in addition to the advantage of making a blackout *samadhi* unnecessary, the further advantage of being able to make a recording in this consciousness that was on the side, and out of that the *Pathways* was written. Otherwise you could go through those experiences in a blackout, come back, and you might not be able to report anything.

Now, of late, my thought has returned to that critical point. It's suggested in this diagram: the point of contact of the two lower circles, the one to the right representing *Sangsara*, the one to the left *Nirvana*, and the one on top, the High Indifference, or, at least tentatively, *Paranirvana*. These are sign concepts, not truly symbolical in the sense Jung speaks of symbols because symbols come from the unconscious and they cannot be exhausted by your analysis, but these are simply simple signs I devised to make the

concept more graphic. And I draw particular attention to this vertical line which passes through the point of contact, the point of transition, or inversion of consciousness, the blackout, or the point of discontinuity. Note the relationship of the circle on top, that it covers that zone that I want you to particularly notice—the zone of the transition. There's another one I'll pass around that conveys another part of the total conception. This is the conception of the *paranirvanic* consciousness embracing within it both *sangsaric* consciousness and *nirvanic* consciousness.

Now, what I'm asking you to pay attention to lies in connection with the material that's given in *The Voice of the Silence*, particularly the last half of the portion on the seven portals. That point of discontinuity, in my mind, seems to be the gate that closes off *Sangsara* from *Nirvana* and closes off *Nirvana* from *Sangsara*. *The Voice of the Silence* assumes that, and says, he who has reached the threshold of *Nirvana* and accepts the opportunity to enter in is cut off from *Sangsara* and though liberated himself, can render no help to suffering humanity; that therefore there is a higher path such that when one has reached the point where he can enter the *nirvanic* state, he rejects it, not because of any question as to its value, but because he realizes that the liberation of an individual is not enough; that there is a suffering humanity, nay more than that, that there are suffering creatures, human and subhuman, and simply nonhuman, that need to be redeemed; and he who has attained to this point has the power to do something about it, and if he accepts his own release, he leaves these others without the benefit of that which he may do for them. So, it is suggested that he renounce the *nirvanic* state and the *dharmakayic* robe that goes with it, and accept instead the *nirmanakayic* robe, which is a subtle embodiment. Is that one up there?

Participant: Mm-hmm.

Wolff: And it doesn't mean that they cease to function if they're invisible on this plane, and that they are not any the less functioning here because they cannot be seen. People in distress, maximum distress, have often reported the appearance of figures—in the West in the form of the Christ, in the East in other forms, whatever the form is to which you are oriented—that gives a comfort and a help, that can give a guidance. And the literature also says that the *Nirmanakaya* is like many raindrops, it can appear in many places at the same time. This is part of the function there. What is the realm in which they dwell? That we do not know, but it's subtle and it is concerned with *Sangsara*. But it is pictured as a renunciation without compensation for an interminable period of time. And that prospect to him who stands on the threshold of *Nirvana* may be pretty grim. Think of a million years—I give you a concrete figure so as to—I'm not saying that's any specific cycle, but just a big number. Think of a million years of organized consciousness with no dipping into the pure *nirvanic* consciousness, which is a basis of refreshment. I think it would be, even with the best will in the world, an impossible task if it were as grim as that—that there would be exhaustion.

Now, I come to the thing that I'm proposing. First of all, I was impressed with the teaching of *The Voice of the Silence*. I sampled the *nirvanic* state—I know its wonder—and turned my back upon it because that seemed the only proper thing to do. But I wasn't too happy about it. Now, I was told by one who had a good deal of knowledge to watch for a cycle of thirty-three. I didn't know how long a time, but in thirty-three days this that I called the High Indifference walked in on me. It was obvious it transcended the *nirvanic*

state. That was in its content. And it transcended *Sangsara*. It gave the impression that you could move freely between the two without being locked in. Now, there comes this point. Do you see this circle bridges this critical zone, and that a consciousness established here is no longer subject to being separated, locked in to these states respectively because its bridging value. It suggests a bridging value. Well, that struck me as a revolutionary conception. I hadn't seen anything like that in the literature. Later when Evans-Wentz' book, or the book he edited, *Tibetan Yoga and Secret Doctrines* came out, I found references to the fixed and the non-fixed *Nirvana* and there was a partial verification of the two ideas. In other words, that after having established one's basic center of consciousness here, the *nirvanic* state is no longer a fixed state, but is a non-fixed state—that that possibility therefore exists. And therefore, that renunciation is not without compensation.

Now, I can see that it might well be that this opportunity would come to everyone, but it might be that the consciousness couldn't take it because the High Indifference involves certain very great subtleties; and furthermore, it involves another inversion in consciousness. My old picture of the relationship of *Nirvana* to *Paranirvana* was that of being more of the same. That *Paranirvana* was vertically above *Nirvana* and *Nirvana* above *Sangsara*. But I have to change it here into this pattern which you see is very different. That was not justified by any literature I had read. That came out of the state. Well, now, the movement from *Nirvana* to *Paranirvana* was a relative extraversion—another inversion in consciousness; the *nirvanic* state a heavy inversion,² very deep, then a relative extraversion, where one stood in the middle ground between an extraverted *sangsaric* consciousness and an introverted *nirvanic* consciousness. The keynote of this state was equilibrium of which the three facets are balance, harmony, and symmetry. The consciousness was one of a great equality or indifference in the sense that it looked upon the *sangsaric* state in the same way that it looked upon the *nirvanic*—no closer to *Nirvana* than it was to *Sangsara*.

Now, there was another revolution takes place here as compared to what you find in exoteric Buddhism, in the exoteric Vedanta, and Christianity. Buddha's orientation as given exoterically was to—or Buddhist literature's orientation—to the state of Enlightenment and all *Sangsara* is depreciated by being called again and again "voidness." And you get the impression that there's only one reason why one should linger in *Sangsara* and that is for the redemptive effort, but that *Sangsara* has no real value in itself, that if there were no creature left who needed redemption there would be no reason whatsoever to stay there. Now, that's the impression I get from reading the *sutras*. I'm not saying there isn't an esoteric doctrine that's different, but that's the exoteric. And the same thing with Shankara: it's all a *maya*, get out of it, junk it, throw it overboard. And Christ says my kingdom is not of this world. *Sangsara* gets quite a beating. You just take every creature out of it and then let it go out into the dump. But look here. That figure doesn't give any preference to *Nirvana* as over *Sangsara*. It embraces both. And the implication is that *Nirvana* is the complementary opposite of *Sangsara* and that there is no such thing as a *nirvanic* state if there is no *sangsaric* state. I'm not speaking about *Paranirvana*—*Paranirvana* is self-existent—but that the *nirvanic* and *sangsaric* states are interdependent. One is the complementary opposite of the other.

² Wolff probably meant to say "introversion."

Therefore, not one only, but both have value. The trouble today is *Sangsara* is sick. It need not be sick. It can be transformed, and it does have value. As a matter of fact, except for the journey through *Sangsara*—and that means going all your rounds and all your races, and so on—except for that journey involving first an involution where there is an obscuration of consciousness and its slowly emerging again until it becomes strong enough ultimately to be conscious of Pure Consciousness, then it has transformed universal unconsciousness into universal Consciousness; and without that journey through *Sangsara*, that would not be possible. Hence, contrary to my earlier inclinations, I do not now suggest the junking of *Sangsara* by calling it a worthless *maya*.

Now there are reasons why the *mayavic* doctrine—now don't forget, I'm the one that one time very strongly propounded the *mayavic* doctrine, and it's a very attractive—it's so easy to cut a thing off—just an emptiness, a dream that has no power. You can plop yourself into the *nirvanic* state with such great ease, it's quite a temptation to do it. And the ground for it—there is a certain experience in crossing this critical point, point of discontinuity: when you cross it to the upper side, the *nirvanic* side—well I'm not using up and down, I'm using left and right—but when we cross to the *nirvanic* side, your impression of the whole *sangsaric* domain is that it's only a dream, that it has no worth, that it has no force over you at all. But here's something I have not seen said anywheres, that equally truly when you return from this state to the other, this upper state seems like a dream. I confess that I discounted that feeling and I wouldn't have it. I wouldn't have *Nirvana* a dream. I liked it too well. But if in the philosophic justice I must—and in psychological justice, I'm afraid that sense that this lofty consciousness was only a dream when you returned to the *sangsaric* state is just as significant as the sense that *Sangsara* was a *maya* when you're in the *nirvanic* state; that it is not a true philosophical principle, but rather a psychological effect. This means that I must so modify the philosophic statement as to give a persisting value to the *sangsaric* zone of consciousness. You might call it the great school, the place of learning. It's not a place of the ultimate values, but it is the discipline of *sangsaric* existence can ultimately eventuate in the possibility of one's being able to be conscious in a *paranirvanic* sense; whereas, the unprepared individual, creature, and so on shoved into a *paranirvanic* state, as I understand takes place in *pralaya*, or a great *pralaya*, is in a state of unconsciousness. There's a lot of difference being in that state unconscious and being in it conscious—all the difference in the world. And that is the reward of passing through the cycle of necessity or of evolution. It may not be all of the reward, but that much I see and I see that as enough.

Now, there are various bearings of this conception. One bears particularly upon the problem of redemption. That's not the whole of the story, but it's the one that I will elaborate now and that will probably be all we can do tonight.

The purpose of the renunciation of the *dharmakayic* robe or the *nirmanakayic*³ state of consciousness and taking the *nirmanakayic* robe was, as I said before, in order to do something about this suffering humanity—something that is permitted within the limits of *karmic* law. But the way it apparently has worked out is that laboriously one individual is brought to Realization here, another there, slowly, one by one, and from all the evidence we have, but a handful perhaps, relatively, among the billions of this

³ Wolff probably meant to say “*dharmakayic*.”

humanity. The problem with humanity in our day has become massive. We have the possibility of rendering life in this world impossible with the atom bomb. We live with that threat over our heads. I think we get along mostly because we refuse to think about it. There's also another threat, maybe as great and even greater, that by our population explosion we are threatening to so greatly disrupt the ecology of the earth that we'd be unable to feed these people, that indeed, our crops will decrease in productiveness, and massive catastrophe lies ahead. One ecologist, one at Stanford, has said that already in the United States the human population is by 50 million too great to maintain ecological balance. We are polluting our air, our water, and our land with our waste. Though knowing the folly of war, this humanity seems unable to avoid it. And there are all sorts of tangled cruelties. There is miserable sickness in these bodies. There are the quandaries of human beings; so much so that the truly thoroughly healthy and happy soul, or principle of consciousness—I bow to the Buddhists so I put that in since they don't have any use for souls—a thoroughly happy and healthy one is rare indeed if there is one. In effect this problem is massive. It certainly isn't the way things should be in a universe that's governed by the principle of equilibrium. And what I say now is this humanity is starving for that which is abundant in *Nirvana*—cut off from that wealth. The flow of that wealth of consciousness molds the motivation of human beings. You can't feel hostility in *nirvanic* bliss. Get the point? You can't feel selfishness. You can't feel that I win by causing another to lose. The whole orientation changes under that influence. So, open a door rendered possible by the coalescence of this with these two so that this realm may be bathed in the *nirvanic* refreshment. Might we not, instead of having a few units here and there attaining to Liberation, be able to handle this problem massively?

Thirty-three years ago I said to Senior, it's laid down as a principle that anything that's broken out on this plane as a new possibility can be used in a higher, a more spiritualized sense, that this is the plane of seed planting and of initiation of processes. Now we have acquired the capacity of mass production. Why wouldn't it be possible to apply the principles of mass production to the redemption problem? He said there's not an objection in the world. Why not try it? Do you begin to see what I'm getting at? It's the unlocking of that point of discontinuity which requires the Realization of the High Indifference, which we are now calling *Paranirvana*, and then by dwelling in a state that is both *sangsaric* and *nirvanic* in one's individual consciousness, and a growing number of entities dwelling in such a state, such a flowage, or ventilation of the *sangsaric* zone may indeed become possible. It makes me think of Hercules and his problem of cleansing the Augean stables. He ran a river through; and I'm suggesting this is possible. *Nirvana* is not simply a place of escape as it has been pictured in so much literature. It is the other of *Sangsara*, dynamically equivalent. The two exist in mutual interdependence, and so far as this humanity is concerned, there is a lock between them that keeps the refreshment of *nirvanic* consciousness away from a starving humanity. Thus a redemption of multitudes, a real redemption—not this hocus-pocus of believing in somebody who died on a cross and thinking that everything will be cared for afterwards, hoping that you'll possibly have a chance to spend 10,000 years playing a Jew's harp on a cloud. You maybe will have that experience, but you will have projected it out of your own consciousness, and I assure you I'd be bored.

Now, there's the picture. That's not the whole of the story, but I've spoken long enough. It's an hour and ten minutes and that's about as long as you should take it. So, we'll let that go for tonight.