

# Conversation with Franklin Merrell-Wolff, Dr. Rein'l, and Others

## Part 2 of 2

Franklin Merrell-Wolff  
April 30, 1970

Rein'l: —so what, is there anything comparable to that among present, say, astronomers? Or is this—

Participant: You mean in terms of—

Rein'l: Yes. You said these are mystical in character.

Participant: For example in cosmology there are some theories is in terms of—and these are very sound theories based on mathematical rigor—for example, when you have a body undergoing gravitational collapse—

Rein'l: Uh-huh.

Participant: —produces a mathematical singularity. Well, the applied mathematician, say a theoretical physicist, have worked their way out of this into different interpretations. So one interpretation, which is a topological interpretation, involves the, of course, matter closing in on itself, nothing leaks out, it's like a bottle and the energy can't even escape from the system so it just collapses in the intense gravitational field. It's got to go someplace. If it goes out of existence from our visible universe, I mean in terms of what we can see, that there was an equally startling aspect here, was one of the logical conclusions based on some of these theories, was that the matter could spring up like a spring gushing forth in another part of our universe, or topologically connected to another universe which may be closed. So we may be living in a holey universe essentially. And there's—

Rein'l: Is it like waking up in a dream state? I mean . . . one's space.<sup>1</sup>

Participant: This kind of thing enlarges our view; it shatters, each concept starts shattering the older concepts and the older concepts crumble. They're getting more—

Rein'l: What I meant—do you know anything about, you know, the cosmologists, or the mathematicians, or physicists as persons? Do they regard this in a theoretical way or not, because people like Newton and of the century before him were very much involved in mystical things? It doesn't seem to appear in the history of science yet as having any significance.

Participant: Well, Einstein had a lot of mystical attributes and Schrodinger had a lot of mystical attributes.

Rein'l: Hmm.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ellipses have been inserted into this transcription to indicate missing text due to the poor quality of the audio recording.

Participant: And also, all the theoretical people that I know, they have a leaning towards this—

Wolff: Yeah.

Participant: —quest. It's an unknown, you know. It's a driving force. They realize that science just doesn't yield all the answers. It's just overwhelming. They're pressing on and, of course . . .

Rein'l: They may be more open now than philosophers. I mean in . . .

Participant: Well, there's this . . .

Wolff: . . . that while our psychologists are going materialistic, or positivistic, and so on, the physicists are becoming the mystics of the day.

Participant: Particle physics now, there's some people that . . . giving thought to a particle that's faster than light, which gain . . .

Wolff: I ran across that in "Scientific American."

Participant: Well, they gain mass as they slow down to the speed of light. It's all mathematically, you know, sound. And all they have to do is experimentally verify it and try to . . .

Wolff: Yeah. I ran across a reference to a collapsing star, and they even use the term a hole in space.

Participant: Yeah. Yeah.

Participant: Would that be an implosion?

Participant: Well, that would be one way of looking at it.

Wolff: Hmm?

Participant: Because it's also another thing that I was thinking about the other day, that gravitational collapse—which is according to Einstein very strong, I mean, that's where it comes from, Einstein's theories—that if you take a particle and accelerate it faster and faster and faster, let's say an electron, it will eventually gain mass—Einstein's equation—and also increase in size in the direction of the light would travel.

Wolff: Of travel, yeah.

Participant: And it will eventually reach a point where it's . . . have gravitational collapse if it gains a sufficient amount of energy.

Wolff: Mm-hmm.

Participant: And it will for all practical purposes disappear from our universe . . . And there's all sorts of things like this that can be applied by our physicists, and as far as I can see they haven't looked into that yet—cause the energies to that are very great.

Wolff: This makes *Alice in Wonderland* seem like ordinary common sense.

Participant: Yeah. There's more to *Alice in Wonderland* . . . But the science today is very mystical. I think more of the empiricists have a tendency to be skeptical, extremely skeptical, and they just do the plodding work and they don't do the fantasizing.

The fantasizing is really a theoretical field. And that's where fantasy helps, but fantasy is the prelude to reality in terms of actual consistency.

Wolff: You know, uh . . .

Participant: In some ways fantasy is closer to the truth than someone else is.

Wolff: Jung gives a very high place to creative fantasy in his psychology.

Participant: Well, science fiction of today is almost a physics, really. A lot of the science fiction, you know, is really a, I think, a foreground . . .

Wolff: It has been.

Participant: Yeah.

Wolff: Thirty years ago I read about the atom bomb, or more than that, in science fiction.

Participant: We begin to wonder whether or not, when you get into an idealistic kind of thing, where ideal is . . . to the hard core reality.

Wolff: Mm-hmm. Well, Jung says a mere idea produced the atomic explosion.

Participant: Yeah. Or what's the probability of a television set evolving, you know, just from nothing in a very little time on the basis of probabilistic constituents of the atom?

Rein'l: Could it be that, you know, that the transition from a sleeping state to a waking state is a source for inspiration?

Wolff: Mm-hmm.

Rein'l: And the other way around.

Wolff: Mm-hmm. Have you ever been able to watch yourself go to sleep?

Rein'l: No. Just, sort of going back and forth while waking up.

Wolff: Yeah. Waking up, you can get it.

Rein'l: . . . than going to sleep.

Participant: You know, Aurobindo stresses as an excellent exercise for developing, remaining conscious as you go to sleep—trying to remain conscious.

Rein'l: Trying to . . .

Participant: The only thing I've been able to do with that line is, more or less, you just free-float and imagery just sort of passes and you don't hold on to anything. Eventually a dream starts coming up. But you're still awake, and you can slip into the dream consciously that way. It takes a little practice, but anybody can do it. And when you get a little more, you can get it to where you can . . . then you lose, not consciousness, but you lose your place. You don't know—you forget that you're dreaming—

Wolff: Mm-hmm.

Participant: —and get involved in the dream.

Wolff: Yes. You start in with a dream where you know you're dreaming—

Participant: Right.

Wolff: —and then gradually you drop out of the memory of all of your past life and you're back in just ordinary dreaming.

Rein'l: Oh, I forgot something. You asked me that question and, yeah, I'd say yes in one sense; but it's not like a dream in the ordinary sense, because a dream in the ordinary sense is like waking, I mean, you're involved. You're seeing something within a point of view. But, it's a little like watching pictures. You're detached as you are in a moving picture theater.

Wolff: Mm-hmm. Mm-hmm.

Rein'l: You know, you are perfectly aware of being . . . but you're seeing pictures, strange—and it seems like . . . And that's . . . you might enter into one of these pictures, so to speak, and that would be being in a dream. But, just, you know, being aware of them.

Wolff: I remember one—

Rein'l: If you were really awake, in one sense, you wouldn't realize where you are.

Wolff: I remember once lying in bed going to sleep. I was thinking about traveling over a certain road. It was in Arizona in the days of the Mormon Dugway and Lees Ferry, then particularly about passing over, I fell to sleep there I found myself actually driving the road, but another factor came in I hadn't foreseen. That's a very crooked road, I don't know if—

Rein'l: You mean you found you were actually driving in your sleep and then you woke up while you were driving . . .

Wolff: Yeah. I was thinking about it and then I was actually driving when I fell asleep doing the thing I was thinking about but actually doing it in the dream. But a fellow that I hadn't foreseen came into the picture. Now, this is a terrific road—very narrow, very winding. It's no longer used because they have a bridge across instead of Lees Ferry. But, many drivers lost their nerve going over that road. And I came out of a turn and I was going up. And up here came another car. A magnificent racing car coming at full speed and Mephistopheles was at the wheel. And, ultimately, when we collided I woke up. But he was a magnificent driver—an impossible road at a tremendous speed coming down. Oh, I admired him. I hadn't figured on him.

Participant: I remember having a dream once where I was standing behind myself and a little above myself looking at myself. That was many, many years ago. I think it was one of the first things that got me to thinking about meditating.

Wolff: Mm-hmm. Well, it's quite possible.

Participant: And I was trying to decide which one of those was "I." Was I two people?

Participant: Aurobindo says, too, that, you know . . . entering into the dream or not that you can see thoughts approaching, and through discipline and all, you can get to

the point where you can see them approaching and then you can accept or reject them. It would be quite a . . .

Participant: I've had some of that experience along that line, because sometimes I would see thoughts that I didn't want to see coming but I was powerless to accept or reject them. I would just have to take them as they came, and, uh, and, uh, it was very, I was sort of, I would say just out of phase with time— I don't know—something was happening—and I was foreseeing about a few jumps in the future, maybe two or three minutes. I was just slightly out of phase with time. This is the way I felt I was experiencing. When I'd see something, then all of a sudden bam, it would happen. It would just keep doing this, and I was seeing thought processes. I was seeing what was going through peoples' heads, and then their reaction, and their emotional effect on the body, and everything else; and, again, you know, I was sort of startled by the whole thing. I didn't know what . . .

Rein'l: In *The Voice of the Silence* there's something not even their shadows would approach . . . And, I think, you know, when a person first hears a statement like that “seeing thoughts approaching,” you know, it's represented pictorially, and of course it doesn't mean that at all. It's a feeling, you know, if it develops it would be a certain thought.

Participant: Yeah. It's almost like—well, it's very hard to describe; it's like: I see someone do something, and I know that, let's say, someone did something and I see it, the physical . . . Then I see the effect of this action has on the person before it even comes into see this other person. And so I can see the interaction before it even happens.

Wolff: Hmm.

Participant: And, this event—then I see the interaction. Well, at that time, the interaction I saw was an unpleasant one, but I didn't care and it made me sick—it almost, you know, physically ill. I feel pain when I encouraged disharmony. And when I saw this clash it was almost like the potential between—in terms of lightning. As something such as a charge would build up between the present and the future, and then it just came together.

Wolff: Interesting.

Participant: Unusual. Very unusual.

Wolff: I understand that Professor Humphreys takes a rather pejorative attitude toward mysticism? If I hear reports right.

Rein'l: Well I suppose that at times. I'm not sure about that really. Well, I'm inclined to say that.

Wolff: I think he ought to have been here tonight.

Rein'l: I wish he'd come. Yes. He's babysitting. It's sort of hard to get babysitters sometimes. His wife, she . . .

Participant: He felt that he had a major philosophical breakthrough a few weeks ago. He was going to deliver the first real lecture in philosophy since Thales; and whereas Thales hypothesis would have been all is water—

Wolff: Was he dreaming?

Participant: No. This was in real life. He announced it in class.

Rein'l: I want to hear it.

Participant: Whereas Thales had a hypothesis that all is water, his hypothesis was that all was strawberry jam, because everywhere in his house that he looked there was strawberry jam.

Rein'l: Ah yes, that's . . .

Wolff: He was having some fun.

Participant: But, no, that was just off to the side. Actually, I think he had some ideas.

Rein'l: Well, he has some interesting theories about Kant, for instance.

Wolff: Mm-hmm.

Rein'l: He was saying the other day that he thought that Kant felt that there was, you know, a real succession in the world, but not time. It's easy to go there. There are a number of people though, at present. I think, Sellars. I don't mean the older Sellars, but his son is quite famous now as a philosopher.

Wolff: A real succession, but not time.

Rein'l: A sort of realistic interpretation of Kant.

Participant: A real succession, but not time.

Rein'l: Well, I suppose you might say that in mathematics there is succession, you know, but they're not temporal.

Participant: In mathematics they have . . . at rest but there's no succession. It's an instant at rest, and just like there is a point and there's no next point. Every moment is at rest. This is a mathematically sound concept in terms of what we would call time in mathematical way. Instants of time are just like mathematical points.

Participant: There's no flow.

Participant: There's no flow. It's just instants at rest.

Wolff: Mm-hmm.

Participant: Like a movie.

Participant: Yeah. Like a move, right, right. And that's all it is.

Rein'l: No. Theirs was the sort of thing that was spatialized time.

Wolff: There is an Indian theory, I understand, that follows that pattern. The universe exists stationarily from an instant and disappears and returns. Well, how about Weierstrass' conception which parallels that? He's a mathematician. Namely that our time is being merely in certain different points in space at different point in time without any motion between. It's essentially the same thing.

Participant: Yeah, well this theoretical nuclear physicist I know about said something to me that was interesting. He said that we could be, in a fourth dimensional

sense, we could be going backwards—living backwards and we wouldn't know it because each distinct point in space-time is a distinct point and you would not know whether you were going forward or backward.

Wolff: Mm-hmm.

Participant: And I don't have enough command to really question that.

Rein'l: Well, I think that Bergson had a point there, that—. I don't mean that we can't think of something timeless, but in, for instance, well, you have states of the universe, and he would image each one somehow depicted on a playing card. And you might say that this is an unusual deck of cards because between any two there are an infinite number of others too. Well, imagine them spread out in some sense, then he'd say that the time in the sense of change has disappeared. It's, you know, if your formulas could apply to something that is not in real succession as well as to something that you might say is succession, in non-mathematical sense, that then they really don't give you the essence of change. They don't give you the essence, even the essence of duration. And that's why you can distinguish between the structure of time and, or, you know, of complicated changes in time, other than physical theory, and, you know, the actual process.

Wolff: I think the concept of duration could be used in contrast to the concept of time. 'Duration' meaning that in which nothing is lost—

Rein'l: Yes.

Wolff: —whereas our ordinary time separates us from the future and the past by the present, as it goes into the past it's lost. And I spoke about this inverse consciousness, which impresses you with a sense of depth, of duration, of vast profundity; the word 'hoary' seems to apply. But there's very little that you can say about it. Only nothing is lost there. In duration, nothing is lost, all is recovered. In time, the opportunity of this moment which is not used is lost forever. That's the reason why that Spengler called it tragic.

Rein'l: I was thinking as a possibility is that, your mentioning duration brought up, that you can conceive of the whole of time and, if you like, it works itself out, or to use that expression "*karma*," when the *karma* is worked out, the time is worked out.

Wolff: Mm-hmm.

Rein'l: And then, if you like, it's as if, in a sense, it hadn't been a process of change. It's completion, which is . . .

Wolff: I worked up an imaginary concept one time which I hoped wasn't true, but Erma says it is. And you may run across the conception of *Akasha* as being a record of everything that ever has taken place and perhaps even of that which will take place; and it is possible to superimpose the consciousness of another state upon your own state so you experience it with full force. I did a little experimenting with that. Like for instance I had the problem of a person who was an alcoholic and couldn't understand why he was that way. I penetrated into the problem, oh, for quite some time and finally induced a superposition of the state of consciousness of a very advanced alcoholic. And in that state I felt as though my own an enormous craving possession by it—so strong that I would go for the drink of liquor even though death was the price I'd pay beyond or I'd have to kill to get there. That's the intensity that I felt.

Now, I went through a division of the sense of self—one as a witness that knew that this was a superposition and then a participating self that went through the whole experience as with the full intensity of feeling and craving as though it were your own. Although, it appears that this that is called the *Akashic* record is not something like a written record, or a tape, or anything of that sort, but is a reliving actually with all the felt quality as well as the other qualities as though it were you present experience.

Well, this is the story or fairytale that I invented. There was a chap who had entered into the *savikalpa samadhi*, which is the *samadhi* in which you deal with phenomena, and had learned how to project himself back into a previous incarnation. So he threw himself into this state and he projected himself back to some certain incarnation and he found himself having food in his mother's arms. From that he went on living the whole life with all of the feelings and all of the experiences as though they were his own, only there were these two phases—the witness Self that knew this was living another life, living over a life, and knew that it wasn't his present life in apparent real time. I'll use the word 'apparent' for a reason that will appear later. Well he came up to young manhood, ultimately married, and of course filled his part in life. Along came a catastrophe that was literally beyond words so I cannot describe it; however, the result of the catastrophe was that he lost his wife and family, and there's a great gap, when after awhile he woke up in an institution where the white-coated attendants are. He gradually regained control of himself and was released from the institution, took up another life afterward, married again, and lived, say, up to about ninety-four. I mean now this person who was going through all of these experiences. He died and went through the bardo, finally over into what we call a *devachanic* interlude where he projected, of course, his environment. And he had a very nice rustic residence in a forest with a grass meadow in front of him, and a bubbly stream running through, the wild creatures were all very gentle, and here his first wife was and he had his children there at any age he wanted them. Very delightful. But he also could flip and there he had a castle on a cliff over the sea, and his other wife with his other family were there. And he could flip back and forth between them. He spent a thousand years in objective time there, and then he finally started to go to sleep more and more, and presently he was gone to a newly married couple, and he woke up and found himself back in his apparent real time coming out of his state of *samadhi* in which he had been one half hour going through this experience of a ninety-four year old life with a thousand years in *Devachan*.

Well, he decided that was a little bit too strenuous for him, he'd be a little careful about delving into the . . . that way. It's one thing to look at things; it's another thing to feel them. But, presently one day he flipped again and found himself again waking up from a state of *samadhi* in which he had been for fifteen minutes. Now, he thought he had been in real time, but it was only apparent real time. But in his final state what assurance has he that he is now in real time? The thought comes to him then. Am I perhaps just living over and over again in an endless treadmill lives which I've lived in the past, and that that is the nature of *Sangsara* from which we wish to attain freedom? I said I hope that isn't true. Erma says it could be.

Participant: Really, I've had similar experiences that come pretty close to it though. I don't particularly care for that.

Wolff: Hmm?



Participant: That's too close to reality for me.

Participant: Any explanation to such a squirrel-cage sort of thing?

Wolff: That's what it would be. Yes.

Participant: . . . had one.

Participant: Wake up.

Wolff: That would fit Shankara's disgust for *Sangsara*.

Participant: There's an episode from the . . . of a man who is in a cavern deep underground; he takes a drink of a certain liquid and wakes up on the surface of the earth, and, uh,— How is that now?

Wolff: Well, you've got it wrong—in a desert, he met a camel train, as I remember it, he got some provisions and so on, but presently a cold wind began to come. It had been pretty hot. The wind turned to a cold wind, but it got colder and colder; and finally he turned the other way to try to get away from the cold. But it caught up with him. It was an ice age, and he was caught in the ice. And he persisted just as an immovable consciousness in that ice, until a warm cycle came and the ice vanished—

Participant: It was five thousand years.

Wolff:—after thousands of years. He had taken a drink of this liquid that was grown in a kind of a mushroom down there, and there was a guide with him. Then he woke up as he came out of the ice age and he found himself kneeling before his guide and he started to belabor the guide for this terrible experience he had been through, and the guide said you've only just now dropped to your knees as you took that drink. It had been a couple of seconds.

Now, that leads to the suggestion that time might be more than one dimensional. You had spoke about going sideways through time.

Participant: Yeah. Yeah, well that's not very pleasant. Well, it can be, but it has a lot of moral problems that I haven't worked out yet.

Participant: Ouspensky talks about— Well his pet theory was that the moment of death is also the moment of birth and you keep living the same life over, and over, and over, again.

Participant: That's the whole . . . thing that I've ever run into. I saw that one, too. That's not very pleasant. I even saw an infinity of . . . I was totally nauseated.

Rein'l: What Dr. Wolff suggested was— is that like Chuang Tzu's butterfly dream?

Wolff: Hmm?

Rein'l: Chuang Tzu's butterfly dream, you know, he dreamt he was a butterfly and when he woke up he said, perhaps I'm a butterfly dreaming that I am awake. You know, being trying to find out which way is it.

Participant: What is the solution? Break out of time? Break into another . . .

Rein'l: It is to break out of bondage, not of—well, why must we assume that there is a stoppage of movement in some sense? In seems to me that, you know, in the *Gita*, for

instance, that one rises above the bonds of action. You might rise above the bonds of action and there might still be a lot of motion, but it would be motion that involved bondage.

Wolff: No. Well, now there is a consciousness in which you rise out of the relativity of time, and at once you're at the beginning and the end, and . . . And it is neither motion nor the absence of motion. It's one of those paradoxical things that we can't grasp with our concepts.

Participant: That point which what we might call beyond time which has another set of rules and symbols, where how long you stay there really has no meaning because—

Wolff: No.

Participant: —you can go back into time anytime, anywhere, any place, any configuration, and it's the— Someone says that it, well, you might call it *Nirvana*, is just a resting point on a highway to eternity . . . and we're occupying time every now and then and then as one grows in terms of spiral, *e*, whatever you want to call it, the mathematical symbol of what we call growth, evolution, this gives you, growth gives you, I think, if you want to call it growth, gives you a choice in conditions that you want to impose upon yourself.

Wolff: Hmm.

Participant: But, why anyone would want to impose upon himself a loop. Now, let's say you're going along in time, let's say successive things, if you recycle, go back into a past life, it's like a loop. And you can go around that loop until you jump out of it again into something else.

Wolff: Mm-hmm.

Participant: But that loop, you can go through that loop a number of times. But why anybody would want to go through, realizing he's going into a loop, but some may do that. If you want to look at it that way . . .

Wolff: You might get caught in it involuntarily.

Participant: Yeah.

Wolff: It's a good thing we don't have some of the more materialistic psychologists in this room.

Participant: You can say that again.

Participant: You make life sound more like a dream.

Participant: Knowing that institution with the white . . .

Wolff: With the white coats, yeah.

Rein'l: I was thinking in for philosophy these days there's more, you know, when it's being rather way out, is to say that there is a difference between subject and object. In one sense, people would like to say it's all object, and that would be a form of positivism or behaviorism. You know the idea of subjectivity seems to be something that people regard as most outlandish, now. But what objectivity would be apart from subjectivity, I don't know.

Participant: Alan Watts says . . .

Wolff: No, it's part of a dualistic experience.

Rein'l: Yes.

Participant: Alan Watts says that, I don't know if you've read much of him but—

Rein'l: No, I haven't.

Participant: —he'd rather call a chair—instead of calling it “chair,” call it “chairing,” “lamping,” or “rugging”; in other words, it gets rid of this objective-subject kind of dualities that we impose upon things.

Rein'l: Mm-hmm.

Participant: He's sort of developed a language of being, kind of a language of being actually with no objects and subjects.

Participant: His word is tree, treeness.

Participant: Treeness or treeing. Or is it, it's treeing. It's, you know, building false analysis terms that we use in everyday life which are a part of us, our being. The analysis of these things and what problems it gets us into by cleaving this . . . The moment we cleave it here, we separate it, we've made this lesser and this greater. And in mathematics we do the same thing. But it's part of life and reality. This is all happening and it's rather interesting. Some . . .

Wolff: Who is this?

Participant: Alan Watts. He's written a number of books on Buddhism.

Rein'l: Well, Zen.

Participant: Zen Buddhism. But also . . .

Participant: Isn't that what makes the difference between this world, this world of duality and *Nirvana*?

Wolff: Well, of course without, uh— all of our conceptions are based upon the principle of dualism, contrast.

Participant: Contrast. Yeah. And it's a very interesting subject in itself, on a pure level philosophically, I mean. It's very interesting. Hegel goes into that to some degree. I guess he was a sort of a master . . .

Rein'l: Well, that's why I asked about, originally, about how the objects . . . Hegel has his method of . . .

Participant: Yeah. He has his method.

Rein'l: And someone like Sartre has too.

Participant: Uh-huh.

Rein'l: I've been very much impressed by him. I had not read *Being and Nothingness* until this year. Sometimes there's a feeling that you almost see, you know, the origin of Dennis Hopper when you're reading him.

Participant: Well, I usually go through cycles or phases where I swing from a strongly materialistic, very, very ultra-skeptical position to one of extreme altruism and idealistic position. And I look at the whole thing as heads and tails.

Rein'l: With your experiences what do you mean by a skeptical position?

Participant: Well, when I get into a skeptical position, I don't believe anything. I . . .

Rein'l: You mean you don't believe that you exist?

Participant: No, I don't believe any of that. I don't believe any of my own experiences. I don't believe anything, as such. I become, in other words, the universe takes on a flat grey character of no purpose or meaning. And . . .

Rein'l: But is that really skepticism, or is it despair?

Participant: Well, it's almost—yeah, it's really despair; really, that's what it is. And it gets, uh, it's . . . All you do is reach the bottom of the pit, which is just annihilation or nothing.

Rein'l: Well, it that what, you know, Camus would call the absurd, or Sartre.

Participant: Yeah. Well, when you echo or bounce against this thing. I don't know the terms to use to apply to it . . .

Rein'l: Well, I think to the ancient Greeks, skeptics were really, you know, they could really be unshakable because they didn't assert anything. I mean that's the condition of being absurd. Every time when something comes up, you know, is this true, is it false, well, you suspend your judgment.

Participant: Yeah.

Rein'l: And you let other people make the assertions—

Participant: Yeah.

Rein'l: —and then you may trap them. But you don't let yourself enter into this.

Participant: Yeah. You're correct just because you're not entering into it. Yeah.

Rein'l: There's a sort of interesting imitation of being liberated in that skepticism.

Participant: Yeah.

Participant: I think that's a bit cowardly.

Participant: Well, putting them all together is the interesting thing, except that . . .

Rein'l: But the skeptic in that sense of the ancient Greeks, who would not make an assertion, he's so simplistic. I mean that the connection—

Participant: Which is pretty close . . .

Rein'l: —because you see the one who makes an assertion has to negate, he has to exclude the contradictory.

Participant: He either negates the first, and—

Rein'l: Yes. So it's a sort of projection on the plane of . . .

Participant: . . . fits in very nicely there.

Rein'l: But, it's beyond that. So you see you're really not in those moments as non-mystical as you think.

Participant: It's like a . . . I pay less attention to, in other words, I'm getting to the point where I do not believe or disbelieve. It makes no difference one way or the other. It's just, it's just a part of—the same as red is a part of the color of the rose, in that sense.

Rein'l: But you know Dr. Wolff brought up the question of authenticity. You know, is it possible to be fooled by experiences like that, and there's a certain skepticism which should be . . .

Participant: Yeah, well I'm sure that's true. I'm sure you can be, yeah.

Rein'l: What, uh . . .

Participant: William James. William James.

Rein'l: Well, take, you know, William James with his great variety of religious experiences, you see, and he says . . . But his particular method of deciding between them is a sort of pragmatic moral method, that is, the great mystics are those whose experiences have utterly changed their lives.

Wolff: Yeah.

Rein'l: And Bergson says so of the same thing; only I think that he doesn't understand the Indians either. I mean he's influenced by Schweitzer's interpretation . . .

Wolff: Mm-hmm.

Participant: But do we have to decide is another question, which really gets back to that other point here.

Rein'l: Do we have to decide?

Participant: Do we have to decide? Having to . . .

Rein'l: Are we free?

Participant: The having to decide is an attachment, as well as not having to decide.

Rein'l: Well, is that—I know. But is that, you know, a sort of attitude or feel you have of decision, or is it that you are really in control of your decision? You know, I think you can—. See, I think you can fool yourself by decision.

Participant: Well, it's like a magnetic field and you align certain—. When it comes together it aligns up a certain configuration of the wave patterns of the atoms such that this happens, and the alignment occurs when you put these things together. And then you take it away and the alignment may still retain itself; but if you heat it up then it disappears, and the heating might be an experience which sort of dissipates this.

Rein'l: Here's a place where perhaps philosophy has some value, because, you know, you're completely objectifying the situation and you're looking at yourself as an object.

Wolff: That's right.

Rein'l: You know, it seems to me that you can put this into philosophical perspective, and say can you really treat yourself as an object. I don't know anyone who can, you know, who can treat himself as an object. You might treat somebody else as an object.

Wolff: You can treat your organism as an object.

Rein'l: You can treat your organism as an object. But yourself? Yes . . .

Participant: You mean putting yourself as you call yourself within yourself, your consciousness, or your observing point.

Wolff: You can treat all of your functions: your thoughts, your feelings, and so forth, as an object, but there's something that takes them as an object.

Participant: Yeah.

Wolff: And I am that.

Participant: Yeah.

Wolff: By the way, you know in going through this multitude of technical conditions that you have, and so on, if they went on of themselves, you'd get pretty tired of them. If you couldn't stop them.

Participant: Oh, yes.

Wolff: And, apparently, according to Keyserling in Ceylon he found that same thing happening to him. Apparently, in that climate were you would have jungle-like growth, the psychological life goes on of itself till you become miserably tired of it. And one hope is to get away from this everlasting process going on, and on, and on.<sup>2</sup> Well, I can imagine what you've been describing, if it kept on at you without your being able to stop it or not, that it would become very wearisome after awhile.

Participant: Yeah.

Wolff: And, you would almost—might even welcome annihilation to get away from it. Well, Keyserling says he found among the Buddhists in Ceylon that there actually was an attitude of that kind: that they sought annihilation in order to get away from this endless psychic involvement or process—a process that didn't mean anything.

Participant: Well, meaning is another thing. It depends upon what you want to make of it. You know, I'm of such a nature myself as a chameleon more or less is. I take the shape and form, and I have certain patterns that, they echo of the people that I'm with. And, my meaning and intent takes on various shades, and also the purpose and function within myself takes on various shades depending upon where I am and what environment I'm in; but, as this keeps going on and on I'm finding that in the midst of all this happening, whatever is going on mentally and physically there are certain things of this unchangeable character—

Wolff: Mm-hmm.

---

<sup>2</sup> See the audio recording "Random Thoughts on Spontaneous and Directed Thinking and the Problem of Evil" for a description of this process related by Keyserling.

Participant: —that I'm beginning to . . . And that's the thing, the resting point.

Wolff: Seek the permanent in the impermanent. In permanence . . . and there you get release. Bruce, would you get the copy ready? Would you give it to Dr. Rein'l?

Participant: Yes.

Rein'l: I'd be very happy to have it.

Wolff: Thank you.

Participant: You've got a week, haven't you?

Rein'l: Uh-huh. Well, we see each other.

Wolff: I am very grateful to him for starting this ball rolling. I didn't know it would ever get published. It might get around sufficiently for some publisher to pick it up. I'd say a manuscript will never pay its way, but with—

Participant: How about a university press?

Wolff: That is possible. They sometimes have funds. Possibly a foundation or the right person.

Participant: Maybe some university would use it as a text book.

Wolff: I think it might do something if the students got to wrestling with the ideas, and it doesn't matter whether they accept or reject, just so that they deal with them. I think it would do something to them.

Participant: We made 100 copies of it. Maybe about 40 of them sold and paid for now.

Wolff: They are to be congratulated. But I don't think that if they knew how long and what a job it was, they wouldn't have taken it up.

Participant: We thought we'd get it out in about a week.

Wolff: It's about 200,000 words.

Participant: Two and a half months, I guess.

Participant: No, I kind of think they would have gone ahead with it even if they knew how long it took.

Participant: It was fun. It was really fun. Every minute of it.

Wolff: Now, did you have a chance to get any ideas out of it while you were dealing with it or were you just dealing with words.

Participant: Here and there I got some ideas. But I haven't read it straight through. I've only read the part that I typed.

Wolff: So you were, you were dealing with the externalities of it probably—like a proof reader. This is the duller kind of reading. I can't do it. I get caught up with the ideas.

Rein'l: . . . is it about 700 pages?

Participant: No, we condensed it. Well, by condensing, in typing on the stencil to 400.

Participant: 372.

Wolff: I have a master copy that was in the form the publishers want—

Rein'l: Mm-hmm.

Wolff: —with broad margins and that's 900 pages. But they put it down with narrow margins and single space and reduced it more than 2 to 1.

Participant: There's the other project that's about the Theosophy paper.

Wolff: Hmm?