

# Statement Regarding Transubstantiation

## Part 1 of 2

Franklin Merrell-Wolff  
April 24, 1973

I have been given a commission to make a formulation concerning an approach to the problems that face this world by methods other than those which would be the normal procedure. This is a problem with respect to which my own knowledge is limited, and I have felt somewhat appalled at the task it presents to me, but as this commission has come from a source for which I have the very highest respect, I feel myself obligated to produce all that I may be able to do. But in this case, instead of trying at this time to produce a finished statement, I will present all of the probing, all of the scaffolding structure behind the scenes that goes into dealing with a problem in working toward a more or less finished presentation. Later, a finished presentation may be made.

Let us begin with the background of the commission that has been given to me. On the 21<sup>st</sup> of April, an individual, whom I shall refer to here as 'A', not being authorized to name names at present, told me that there was a very strong impact from the world of the Brothers, as we know them, to present a formulation of a step which has become necessary in dealing with the critical world situation. The commission came not only from A, but was insisted upon by one of the Brothers I greatly venerate, who will be referred to here as 'B'. The simple statement was this: that the world condition today is so critical, the threat of serious disaster so great, that as a result there was not time enough to effect change by transformation, but that a different method to approach the problem had to be employed, that the method that would here be indicated was one which could be called transubstantiation. But how would this work? What would be the apparent effects of it upon the people in this world? As I have thought into the problem, it seemed to me we could approach it by first considering the significance of the difference between transformation and transubstantiation, also review the world situation as it appears to us here in what might be called the outer view.

To deal with the difference in the significance of the approach represented by the two terms 'transformation' and 'transubstantiation', we will start with an examination of the dictionary meaning of these two terms. From *The Century Dictionary*, we have the following:

The act or operation of transforming, or the state of being transformed; a change in form, appearance, nature, disposition, condition, or the like.<sup>1</sup>

And in the logical sense, taken from Baldwin's *Dictionary*, this statement:

---

<sup>1</sup> William Dwight Whitney, ed., *The Century Dictionary and Cyclopedia*, vol. 3 (New York: Century Co., 1911), 6430.

The change of any statement into an equivalent statement in a different logical form. Such changes as occur in *a is always b = every a is b = a implies b = a is surely-followed-by b* are changes of expression only, and not of logical form.<sup>2</sup>

We will turn, then, to the definition of ‘transubstantiation’. In this case we are not concerned with the Catholic doctrine with respect to the Eucharist, but with the general meaning of the term, and that is very simply stated in this form: a change of one substance into another.

The distinction seems to come out rather clearly that transformation is not a change of fundamental substance, but rather simply of qualities, appearances, and forms. A condition or state of any given substance or entity may be malformed, ugly, or whatnot, yet without changing the substance it may be transformed into a beautiful appearance, as a crude rock acted upon by a competent sculptor. In contrast, transubstantiation implies a change of the substance itself into another substance. It is therefore much more fundamental. In a certain sense, in transubstantiation we have an entity becoming other than what it was; whereas, in transformation, the entity becomes changed in its appearance or its way of acting or attitude, but not in its essential substance.

A very simple illustration may suggest the difference. Let us imagine a man who has the need very quickly for adequate transportation. He has an old car which has fallen into disrepair in several respects. It is not fit for immediate use. It would have to be put through an extensive repairing operation, but time is the essential factor in the situation. Instead of repairing the car, which may be likened unto transformation, he goes to a car dealer and buys a new car. Here is a substantive replacement, something to replace the old which will effect the functioning which is required, namely, immediate transportation. This is very simple, but may suggest part of the difference in the meaning.

Let us, next, make a review, as far as we are able to do so from the perspective of our common consciousness, of the problem which renders more imperative action necessary. One who has kept abreast of the developments in this world will note these facts that present problems of supreme difficulty. First of all, we live with the threat of a destructive power represented by the atom bomb and the hydrogen bomb. We are living, as it were, with these bombs hanging over our heads. This humanity’s technology has reached a phase of such supreme ability that we have tapped powerful forces that abide in nature that threaten our own existence. In the relationships of nation to nation, this power stands as a continual threat. The only resolution we have been able to produce is a situation of mutual terror. Nations that have this power stand in a relationship such that neither would be wise to attack the other because the other, even after attack, could produce a counteraction so destructive that it would be unacceptable to the aggressor. It has been called a balance of terror. But it is a balance requiring individuals who are in position of power to think twice, or more, before acting that is of questionable reliability. To be sure, so long as the nations of this world, or more specifically the atomic nations of

---

<sup>2</sup> James Mark Baldwin, ed., *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*, vol. 2 (Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1901), 711.

this world, are governed by men of cool calculation, the balance of a terror may be effective; but, suppose that some atomic nation came under the governance of an individual who was not mentally balanced as did happen so recently in Germany. Cool calculation might be thrown overboard and disaster be the result. The power of these weapons is such that it could make life in this world, of any form, impossible.

But that is only one of the factors with which we are presented. Another is a serious damage that is produced as the result of our development of our applied sciences that has injured the ecological balance of this world. That we are polluting this world at a rate that is too great to be handled by the forces of nature is a fact of which we have become quite conscious; and many are working toward a handling of this problem, but often with too much of a single-pointed approach—an approach that takes into account only one problem and fails to take into account the effect upon another problem. Thus, there is also a problem of exhaustion of energy resources, which are very fundamental to the maintenance of our modern civilizations. The production often of energy resources in certain forms involves a substantial probability of aggravation of pollution. Therefore, those who are oriented to one phase of the problem, namely the pollution, with a point of view that is too much single-pointed tend to close off energy resources which in turn imply blackouts, brownouts, and failure in the operation of our modern technological civilization. This is a time when there is a great need for broad, responsible thinking, a give and take, a being willing to accept a modified result in one direction because too great an emphasis of one evil and an effort to correct it, can lead into the magnification of another evil.

And there is still another factor of very great importance interconnected here, and that is a population explosion. Sometime in the last century the population of the world reached one billion people. It is now three and a half billion. The students of population growth foresee the possibility of a doubling of that within a matter of only a few decades. Thus there is presented to us the possibility, very real possibility, that there may be more people in the not distant future in this world than the world can support with the bare minimum of necessary sustenance. And then it takes very little imagination to foresee that with starving masses there will be the upsurge of violence for sheer primitive survival.

The total picture has become very ugly with threat. It is one of enormous complexity. It calls for an attitude of cooperation among nations and races that requires the maximum of wisdom and tolerance; and yet, there is a great dearth of such wisdom and tolerance. It does not take much imagination to see that with the unregenerateness of such a large proportion of humanity, that with the great selfishness in this humanity, that with all of that and these problems superimposed upon it, the intelligence and power of those who guide our destinies in the outer sense here, may well prove inadequate to handle the problems which lie before us. One might predict that if there is no intervention from beyond our visible resources, disaster for this humanity lies not too many years in the future.

But awesome as may be the picture so far drawn, it is yet not the greatest power of darkness that has sprung up and become a force within our world. This that we have reviewed so far portends the possibility of a merely sensational disaster, a sort of universal physical death, but that is not the worst that can happen to man. Death in the

physical sense is but a turn of phase in the movement of consciousness, and he who dies physically and is also clean, in the deep sense of the word, goes on to other unseen possibilities. This other element is a shameless denigration of all decent morality. We live in a time when there are those who proclaim a way of life that is a radical repudiation of all moral restraint and the advocacy of indulgence in sheer lust in various forms. Partly this is a reaction to an overly severe moral code which we in this country have inherited from the Puritans.

We have lived through several generations by a code that valued character, valued wisdom, valued the sense of responsibility; and while it went too far in a devaluation of the aesthetic side of the human whole, nonetheless, built character and strength. No doubt, this code went too far in the devaluation of the aesthetic side, which has its definite positive features. It devalued music and all art. And that there should be a shift from this is understandable enough. But today we see the shameless advocacy of fornication, either with or without the aid of chemical substances, leading into some of the vilest possible forms of radical repudiation of all moral control, not only permitting but advocating the indulgence of the various lusts—the most ugly side of man. It is a day when murder and violence of various sorts and indulgences of various lusts are openly advocated, and this brings to the forefront the ugliest development imaginable. This means death of character, death of the best in man. Far worse is this death than the merely physical death of a worldwide disaster. This is the death of the “good.” Beyond this we have governments today that establish themselves in positions of power by use of the instruments of murder, torture, and brainwashing rendering the governed into a position of complete helplessness.

Looking at this whole picture with all of its darkness and threat, one might well conclude that if this humanity has no help from unseen sources, but is dependent wholly upon the tangible resources of our unilluminated men in this world, men and women in this world, then the picture is virtually hopeless. But there is excellent reason for believing that we are not alone and not without aid from beyond, and this leads us to the very crux of what we are here presenting.

To be sure, the dark picture which I have drawn is not the whole of the story. There is also nobility, there is generosity, there is compassion, and there is also authentic righteousness within this human whole. But the point I wish to make is that the problem is such that the forces of righteousness within this world, if taken alone, have not the power, the ability, the mass of wisdom necessary for its resolution, and therefore from beyond there must be help or disaster almost certainly lies before us.

If one peruses the appropriate literature, it would appear that always this humanity has had a tradition that there are powers unseen to ordinary men which surround us and that among these powers there are those which are beneficent and highly intelligent. The tradition persists that by the appropriate means communication with these powers is possible and that also these powers may be led to intervene; yes, powers that are in part human, entities that oversee and observe the functioning in this world, which nonetheless are advanced human beings. But, more than that, there is the sense of those whom we have called the Buddhas—Buddhas who are the crown of the human cycle of development—and there is reason to believe that we are under the hidden supervision and direction of such entities. To most this is a tradition, perhaps,

and no more, but I know that verification, in some measure at least, is possible. Although I cannot here say how I know it, but the Blessed One lives and he can communicate. We are told that not only such entities that we can contact by the appropriate means, but still vaster entities, products of evolution beyond that level known as man, dwelling in realms unseen by us but, nonetheless, active here. I can testify that I have known communication with some of such.

To be sure, this is proof only to the experiencing individual. Testimony is not proof to him who has not had experience. It can build only a presumption for him. And here we deal with a very fundamental problem. It is very easy for the human being to become a blind believer in a power which he does not know simply because he has been taught in his childhood to believe in it. I do not recommend belief based upon such insubstantial basis. Blind belief, blind credulity, as well as blind non-belief and incredulity, are to be eschewed. We must build as best we can upon knowledge, but it is not easy to achieve certain knowledge. So we build upon the best that we authentically know and dare on the basis of faith and confidence toward a still greater knowledge; but, never should the principle of discrimination be laid aside. Always seek to know in terms of an authentic knowledge, not rejecting blindly nor accepting blindly. This attitude is fundamental.

Now, the statement made to me by A and B was to the effect that there was an imminent inpouring of a substance into this world-field that would effect changes in the entities of this world that were not to be understood in the sense of a transformation but in the sense of a transubstantiation, that the effect of this inpouring of substance would lead to a change in consciousness including human attitudes. This presents us with a problem of credibility, a problem also of philosophic view that is not easy for our science-oriented Western consciousness to accept. This renders necessary a certain interlude in which we will discuss the nature and effect of our science with the possibility of another way of viewing the whole of this world, this universe, and the system of our consciousness. This may become somewhat technical.

To understand our science, it is necessary, first, to be acquainted with the history of that science, the various steps by which it has evolved, and, second, to have an acquaintance with the history of philosophy from the earliest Greek philosophical thinkers up to the present, for science is one of the flowers on the tree of philosophy; and then having grasped this much, to view it as one of the ways whereby man has achieved a relationship between himself, as an entity, and that vast other, which is the whole of the seen and the unseen. To do this, we should contrast the picture of this development of our science with the Oriental development, in a totally different direction, first, that of the East Indian in its two predominant modes known as Buddhism and as the Vedanta, and then beyond this, to the principles underlying the development of the culture of the Mongolian races. All of these have led to a viable culture, an adjustment that works up, at least, to a point.

Now, in the case of our science, the achievements have been so impressive that they may be well-nigh overwhelming and tend to cause us to think that here is the sensible and rational way of achieving a relationship between the identical, or self, and the not-self, or the other; but, this we must bear in mind, that the very problem I outlined earlier was itself an outgrowth of that science in predominant degree; that the science,

while leading to vast positive achievements, at the same time produced problems that threaten to destroy us, and therefore implies that it is insufficient—not that it is something false, but that it is only one facet of the whole of truth.