

Instructions by Franklin Fowler Wolff before Surgery

Franklin Merrell-Wolff

May 27, 1973

In view of the fact that I, Franklin F. Wolff, otherwise known as Yogagnani, am facing an operation which could result in a fatal way, I am leaving some final instructions as to the interpretation of the philosophy I have put forth in *Pathways Through to Space*, and in *The Philosophy of Consciousness Without an Object*, and in a number of tapes. Part of this material is technically philosophical, which may not be well understood by the untrained philosophic student; and with respect to possible interpretations, I am now giving certain instructions which may be applied by two persons who have technical philosophical background, namely, James Mugridge and Bruce Raden. Is that right?

The first basic assumption here is that whenever any individual whatsoever in this world, has had that which is known variously as a Fundamental Realization, a profound Mystical Unfoldment, or Enlightenment, that something is done in the collective psyche, and it may be picked up and form the basis of a religious movement which can be a distortion of the original intention. I will say here that my original intention is not to produce a dogmatic religion of any sort. And by a dogmatic religion, I mean any religion that is based upon categorical assertion such as: this, and this alone, is the truth. But since that tendency exists, I want to leave certain protections or guardings as against that possible development. And for that purpose, I'm particularly directing this to two young men who are philosophically trained and understand the technical side of the material I've put forth here.

The purpose is to awaken immediate religious experience. The formulation is primarily philosophical—in a small measure it has been poetical, but primarily philosophical—and it involves three fundamental theses. First, and in a certain respect the most important, is this: that there are not only two organs, faculties, or functions of cognition—sense perception and conceptual cognition—but also a third and possibly more. The third I have suggested entitled “introception.” This particular function is not within the range of ordinary, unillumined experience, and does not have general philosophical recognition; although one can trace its influence into the past as having been philosophically influential, as in the case of Plato. But in Plato's reference to this in the “Seventh Letter,” he indicated it should not be referred to. On the other hand, I have been directed to give it as complete and explicit formulation as possible. The thesis here is that if we recognize only two organs or faculties of cognition, we have, inevitably, an incomplete knowledge, particularly with respect to any philosophic statement, and that, therefore, the third faculty should be given recognition in order to get that necessary completeness. This function or faculty is based upon what is known as Fundamental Realization, Mystic Unfoldment, or Enlightenment, and it opens the Door to the Transcendent. That is the important point. The Door to the Transcendent, which we once supposed was open, was shown by Immanuel Kant not to have been opened through those two functions known as sense perception and conceptual cognition, that that could

give only the kind of knowledge that was valid within the empiric field. Here it is suggested that by this third or more functions or organs of cognition, it is possible to attain a transcendent knowledge or, in other words, a metaphysical knowledge, which would lead to more or less clear answers on the great metaphysical questions which I conceive to be the most important, including the three listed by Kant: the question as to whether there is a God, or, in other terms, whether there is such a thing as a supreme Buddha; whether there is also such a thing as real freedom; and finally, as to whether there is an authentic ground for believing in immortality. These we cannot answer if we limit ourselves to the two common organs of cognition.

Now, I am suggesting to these young men, that they be alert with respect to any future discussions that may be aroused by the current publication of *Pathways Through to Space* and *The Philosophy of Consciousness Without an Object*, plus material in a vast number of tapes, to guard against that misinterpretation, to guard, especially, against any interpretation in terms of a dogmatic religion. What is asserted here in this body of material is the consequences of five Realizations—three of them propaedeutic, two of them transcendental—which are authoritarian to me, but are not therefore authoritarian to anyone else; that therefore, no one is to be required to believe anything which I have ever affirmed just because I have affirmed it. That point is of enormous importance. What I seek is the Awakening, in as many as possible, of the capacity to have direct religious experience themselves. The formulation is philosophical, not dogmatic. And that point is of supreme importance. Everybody is perfectly free to challenge any of the philosophy, and I do not regard that as hostile so long as it is honest; but, I insist it should be competent.

Now, you two, who have a considerable understanding of this—and I would include Lee as the third among the young ones who are familiar with it as also competent with you—I would wish that if you feel so inclined to be on guard against such misinterpretations in this part of the work. There are other parts of it that are not so much philosophical, that bear upon a more esoteric side with respect to which one known as Erma Pounds would be more competent to pass judgments. I think that's enough for a preliminary statement.

Beside what has been discussed so far, there are two other fundamentals in this philosophy which are ultimately of equal or greater importance than that which has been so far developed. The emphasis upon the third organ of cognition has been given a special place because it is the position, or the point of view, that may be most disputed.

The next fundamental is this: that Consciousness is original, self-existent, and constitutive of all things. This is the meaning of Consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject. Although I did not know the term at the time of original writing, it seems to be the meaning intended by the Tibetan term *Rig-pa*—a non-phenomenalistic consciousness; a consciousness which is not centered in a subject, but preexists all objects or things and all cognizing subjects; is not itself created, manufactured, produced, but is original, preexistent, and may be viewed as the ultimate Reality; that all objects whatsoever and all cognizing subjects exist within this Consciousness, come forth from it as a kind of precipitation; and one might even think of the *subject to consciousness* as

being the “*First Logos*” and the *object of consciousness* as being the “*Second Logos*.”¹ Bear in mind very clearly here, that this statement involves the idea that no meaning attaches to the notion that there are totally non-conscious things or things outside of consciousness in every possible sense which may come into consciousness; but that all things whatsoever have an existence as objects in consciousness, and that we are not justified in predicating any other kind of existence, for on analysis we find to predicate existence of a thing outside consciousness in every sense is really a meaningless proposition—just as meaningless as Buddha’s reference to “a barren woman’s son” or to “a hare’s horns.” It’s a habit we have, a habit to be corrected, but does not stand up under analysis. On the other hand, there is objectivity here. This Consciousness, in the sense of Consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject, is a universal, objective Consciousness, so that within it there can be appearances, existences, and so forth, which are not the playthings of the individual, subjective consciousness. And I have elsewhere dealt with this subject, so that I won’t go into it more fully now.²

The third factor—and this is the one where it’s possible the Buddhists may get up on their hind legs and paw the air—and that is this statement, based upon Realization, that the subject transcends the object. There is evidence that the early Buddhists, at least, regarded the object as having a reality that the subject did not have, and was involved in the doctrine of *anatman*. I maintain, however, that the existence of the subject is relative. It has a higher order of relativity in this philosophy than the object. And to illustrate this we might take a figure from mathematics. Take, for instance, the equation of the first degree in rectilinear coordinates, $ax + by + 1 = 0$, which is the equation covering any straight line in a plane. Obviously your x ’s and y ’s here are absolute variables. Now, you’re a ’s and b ’s, however, are not absolute constants. They are absolute constants only when you give them a specific value such as 1, 2, 3, and so forth. When you do give these constants that specific value, you define a specific line. But since they can be given any value, you can get the sum total of all possible lines, so that your a and b enter into a position which is neither that of a complete variable nor a complete constant—participates in both qualities—and the term used for them is that of ‘parameters’. I view the subject as having a parameter status, which renders it more fundamental than the object, relatively more invariant than the object; and this would be a point of difference from that of traditional Buddhism. But in the last analysis, only Consciousness is the absolute invariant. In the end, the subject to consciousness, I found in the final Realization, disappears, as well as the object of consciousness, and only the Eternal, in the form of Pure Consciousness, remained.

Now, that I think covers, in brief terms, the picture.

¹ H.P. Blavatsky, *The Secret Doctrine*, vol. 1 (Wheaton, Ill: The Theosophical Press, 1893), 44.

² See the audio recording, “On Space,” part 2.