

Three Fundamentals of the Introceptive Philosophy

Part 6 of 16

Franklin Merrell-Wolff

December 20, 1973

As in the last tape, this also is a discussion of a question apart from the series on the three fundamentals of my philosophy.

The question has been asked, “What is Realization?” And I shall attempt in this tape the almost impossible task of trying to convey the idea to those who are not familiar with the philosophy underlying the whole conception. Actually, to understand in any adequate form, even just intellectually, the meaning of Realization, calls for not merely the acquaintance with a single book, but actually with a whole library of books, and in addition to that, almost a lifetime of either meditation or reflection. But here we shall attempt to convey some understanding of what is involved when we speak of Realization. But for this purpose, since we are dealing with a statement of only an hour-or-so’s length, we shall have to make certain fundamental assumptions, and these are as follows: that there is an evolution in some sense; second, we shall have to assume what is known as the law of *karma*; and third, we shall have to assume, also, the idea of reincarnation. I introduce this part in the form of an assumption and thereby imply that these questions are not here to be argued, but simply assumed. To argue them or to develop the evidence for them calls for an enormous amount of time, at the very least a lecture on each subject, but more adequately, a whole volume on each. But we shall present a simple statement which is to be assumed for our present purposes, and therefore not here to be argued.

Now, with respect to the assumption of an evolution, this is to be understood in a broader sense than that of the Darwinian theory of organic evolution. The Darwinian Theory is fundamentally based upon the principle of observed variations in species and a principle of selection of those variations which lead to the best adaptation to the environment, in other words the selection of variations that are favorable for survival of a given species. And in the strict Darwinian point of view, the process is unintelligent and purely arbitrary—variation being introduced without any determining purpose in it, thus essentially a mechanical and mechanistic process. The evolution which we shall assume is much more complex than that. It implies, first, that out of a state of complete silence or quiescence, there is at a certain time a movement in that which is ultimately to become the Cosmos which leads to a involving of consciousness in a state of apparent non-consciousness; and then, having reached that point, there is a following process which is the true evolution whereby this involved consciousness, which in the beginning is a state of non-consciousness on the surface, leads to an emergence of this consciousness in growing degrees.

We shall also have to assume here, in addition to the three listed assumptions, the idea of a Monad, which journeys through the whole process of evolution; that the Monad is the reality of every entity whatsoever, and that it passes through the journey of necessity. And the Monad is to be conceived of as a microcosmic reproduction of the

macrocosmic whole. Every entity whatsoever, from entities in the form of rock up to the most evolved being beyond man, passes through this journey of necessity in which the involved gradually emerges to a state of more and more complete consciousness on the surface. Conceive of the consciousness that lies behind the surface as itself being full, but appears on the surface, in the beginning, as an inconscient state, as in the rock or mineral. The process of evolution, then, is a moving from that state in the mineral into the most primitive form of vegetable existence, which has been given as the lichen which grows upon the surface of rocks, and is very dominant in the Arctic regions. The Monad then passes through various stages of the vegetable kingdom up to the most advanced forms, such as the deciduous type of tree. Then beyond this the Monad finally moves into the animal kingdom and passes through stages of development from the most primitive animal form up to the most advanced animal form, which is, nonetheless, something less than human. Finally, there is a stage in which the human factor enters into the evolution, and on this we shall have to say something more when we come to this point. Then, finally, beyond this the evolution continues up into that which is more than human, the transhuman, such as the completed Buddha, and into the domain that is known as ex-men or *Dhyan Chohans*, who, relative to men, seem like gods. The picture here is already relatively complete.

Now with respect to the second assumption, that there is a law of *karma* that governs all that is. The law of *karma* is to be viewed as the principle of equilibrium as it is manifested in action. It is the law whereby the stars are held in their courses, but also the law that governs all the details of life here in this world or any other world that there may be. It governs the sequences of all of the kingdoms. But that which concerns us most particularly is its action with respect to man.

But before we can say anything about this, we must consider the third assumption, that there is a reincarnation of the entity which we call the individual here and now. This assumption is that every human entity that is born today has lived before, in some sense, and that the conditions into which he is born here at this time is the result of causes which he has set up in the past. It is not simply an accident that one individual may be born into favorable conditions, into a family, for instance, that is rich in wisdom and perhaps in material wealth, while another individual is born in very humble conditions where there is a great lack of wisdom on the part of his parents and a great limitation of resources. It is maintained, and it must be here assumed, that these differences of circumstance are not a result of mere chance, mere fortune, but they are the result of causes set up by the individual and by the collective whole.

There is a question of what is it that is incarnated, and here we have different theories, particularly the contrasting points of view of those who hold to the doctrine of permanency of the subject or self, which is called *Atman*, and those who hold to the conception of the *Anatmic* doctrine. These two points of view are represented in the first case by the philosophy of the Vedanta, of which outstanding representatives are Sri Shankaracharya and Sri Aurobindo. For our present purposes we will take a point of view which I have, myself, formulated which seems to fit the statements concerning the process which we find in the literature. This is known as the *pseudopodal theory of evolution*.¹ It starts with the assumption that there is the Monad which is passing through

¹ Wolff may have meant to say . . . pseudopodal theory of reincarnation.”

the cycle of necessity and which, in its entirety, is never manifested, but only in part of its nature is it manifested in outer form. Now, if we take the example of the amoeba, which is one of the most primitive forms of life, we have this fact in connection with it and this is what gives us the basis of our figure. The amoeba is a single-celled animal organism which can crawl by throwing out from its body, arms—which seem to be like legs or appendages by which it can crawl from place to place. But these appendages are drawn back into the body and new appendages put forth. In other words, the appendage is not a permanent part of the organism, but is something that is produced for the occasion and then drawn back into the body. They are therefore called “pseudopods,” meaning that they are not permanent appendages, but only *seem* like appendages. Now, think of an incarnation as being like a pseudopodal arm or leg thrust forth into incarnation—and that that constitutes the individuals which we see here, whereas the total being behind that individual is the Monad. At death, and after whatever interlude there may be following death, that particular pseudopod is withdrawn and another one put forth in the next incarnation which is the *karmic* resultant of the preceding pseudopod, and, in fact, of all the preceding pseudopods in the total history of the individual. So, in a certain sense, it is not the personality we see here now who is incarnated in the future, but another personality which is the resultant of this personality and of those that have gone before; and yet something is persistent, and that something which is persistent is what we have called the Monad.

Now, what we call Realization may be viewed, and has been viewed, in different ways. There is the sense in which Realization is viewed as a development or breakthrough whereby one destroys a condition of immersion in a *maya* or illusion; and thus is a correction of what might be viewed as a fundamental mistake or error. Much of this could be found in the thought of Sri Shankaracharya. But a way of viewing this process which is more completely in conformity with my own Realizations, and with the thought of certain others such as Sri Aurobindo, would be to think of the Realization as a step in the evolutionary process. In this connection, we consider evolution as a development in terms of consciousness-forms. Now, it's entirely possible to view evolution as a development of sensible forms that are existent before consciousness, as the evolution of bodies, for instance, of which the human body would be the most advanced form of which we are commonly conscious, but there is implied a development of such forms beyond that of the human which, nonetheless, are not visible to the purely human consciousness; but for our purposes we shall view the evolution as a development in terms of consciousness.

So far as we can determine, the state of the mineral, on the surface, is one of complete inconscience or unconsciousness. But when it then steps into the stage of the vegetable, there is the beginning of consciousness on the surface. We have today evidence to support the idea that there is something of a sort of consciousness in the vegetable. The polygraph that is used in connection with testing the truth of the testimony of an individual has been applied to vegetable entities, and there have been reactions recorded in the polygraph that are akin to what with us would be a conscious reaction; for instance, a sort of dread or something like shrinking when a portion is cut off of a vegetable entity, or a sort of shrinkage in the presence of certain human beings and of expansion in the case of the presence of other human beings. But in the direct sense, we are not aware of consciousness on the vegetable level.

Now, when we come into the next step in the evolutionary series, namely, the entering into the animal kingdom, we begin to find action very evidently developed which would be akin to a conscious process in man, and which, therefore, we may legitimately assume is a conscious process in the animal. Actual proof of consciousness in the animal would require the superposition of the consciousness of a human investigator upon that of the animal so that he experiences what the animal experiences. I take strong exception to the behavioristic point of view that we have no consciousness in the animal but only behavior and assume as most reasonable that their action, like conscious beings, implies the presence of consciousness. We have the same difficulty in judging the presence of consciousness in another human being besides ourselves. We know directly our own consciousness, and because there are reactions in other human beings similar to our own when our actions are conscious, we assume that other human beings are conscious. Although one, as a strict behaviorist, would be forced to the conclusion that you have only behavior in other human beings and that the investigator was the only conscious entity there. I do not agree with this position at all. I think there is a good deal of egotistical conceit involved in it. So we can assume, in the animal, consciousness; but we can recognize also the fact that while it overlaps certain parts of our own consciousness, it does not include certain other aspects of our own consciousness. Thus, taking the whole side of our consciousness which we call sensory, we find that the animal possesses this. He evidently can see. He evidently can hear. He evidently can feel pain and other kinds of sensations, such as warmth and cold. And we are also possessed of these forms of cognition. So we may say that the whole side of cognition which is sensory—perception through the senses—is something shared by both man and the animal, and, indeed, that in many respects the animal may have a more acute sensory cognition than we have. There is evidence that he can hear and see more easily and completely than we can, and even that these qualities may be more acute in primitive man than they are in the man of advanced cultures.

But when we come to the step from the animal to man, there is something more added that is not of a sensory nature. This is the power of cognition known as conceptuality—the power of cognition that renders communication in verbal and symbolic forms possible from individual to individual—and this involves an important advance over the animal consciousness; and is in fact, I maintain, the distinguishing factor in a differentiation between animal and human. In other words, I would say that the view that man is merely another animal is in error. He does have an animal nature; he does overlap the animal; but, in so far as he is a human being, he is definitely more than animal. There has been here a sudden jump into another dimension of consciousness, and this is the important point: animality is sensationality; humanity is conceptuality.

Now the question may arise, “How is this step effected?” There is a statement in a volume known as *The Secret Doctrine* that is very suggestive in this connection.² I shall not advance it as the only possible view, but I consider it a view that could be of major importance. This view is that when the evolution of the animal had reached the point where he emerged as a sort of animal-man—it has been called an ape-like creature, but not a true ape—there was the imposition into his consciousness of another way of consciousness carried by certain beings who are called the *Manasaputra*, a sort of

² H. P. Blavatsky, *The Secret Doctrine*, vol. 2 (Wheaton, Ill.: The Theosophical Press, 1893), 176-178.

incarnation superimposed upon the primitive animal-like human incarnation, and that with this the power of intellectuality was born as a radical jump, not a development by tiny variation from the animal form, but by the injection of a higher principle. This means that we have now entered into a different phase of the evolution where the essential center of gravity is the development in consciousness from sensuality to conceptuality.

This has made possible an enormous step in our progress so far. As an animal being man is essentially weak and could not compete with many forms of animal life if he were limited to his purely sensual, physical resources. He's manifestly a weakling as compared to the elephant. But, in point of fact, he is the ruler of this world, on the surface of our history, not because of his superior sensual consciousness or his superior muscular efficiency, but because of the development of conceptuality. Conceptuality made the development of the weapon possible whereby man made himself more than the equal of the most powerful animals. Now, the development here has made up the most of our known history. But what we have at our present time, reaching into our unfoldment of technology to the point where we have been able to travel in space and to master communications over distances like that of from the Earth to Jupiter, just to mention a couple of items, all this is the result of the development of conceptuality. Man is superior over the rock, over the vegetable, and over the animal, not because of qualities that are in the rock, the vegetable, and the animal developed to a higher degree, but because of the introduction of a higher principle of consciousness, that which we call conceptuality.

Now, it is posited that this step in evolution is not the final step but is an intermediate step, and that there is beyond this a still vaster movement in consciousness that calls for a second discontinuity—using a mathematical term. And this second discontinuity is the step from conceptuality to the form of consciousness which is broken out in the event of Fundamental Realization or Enlightenment. Thus we will have superimposed upon all that has gone before, namely, the vegetable consciousness, the animal consciousness, and the human or conceptual consciousness, a still later form of consciousness which I have called *introceptual* consciousness, or which may be called *spiritual* consciousness in a rigorous sense. It is conceived that the evolutionary process implies this development into the introceptual consciousness for all human beings and ultimately for all Monads whatsoever, even those that are now in the animal stage, the vegetable stage, or the mineral stage. But what concerns us is the immediate step that is possible for man. The manifestation of this next stage has been recognized in a few individuals among the human whole. It is most commonly, in the West, known as Mystical Unfoldment, but a better term for it is Fundamental Realization or the Buddhist term Enlightenment.

This breaking forth into another form of consciousness by a very few individuals among the human whole has been studied by other individuals, and one of the most interesting studies of our time is that which was done by Maurice Bucke and put forth in the volume called *Cosmic Consciousness*.³ He there distinguishes three forms of consciousness, namely, "Simple Consciousness," which is characteristic of the animal, and which the human being has as part of his animal nature; second, "Self Consciousness," which corresponds to what I have called here conceptual consciousness; and third, "Cosmic

³ Richard Maurice Bucke, *Cosmic Consciousness* (Philadelphia: Innes & Sons, 1905).

Consciousness,” which was his term for the kind of consciousness which is broken out by Fundamental Realization or Enlightenment. This has been a valuable production and whether or not it will stand examination in all details without correction is not a relative question. It is a fundamental recognition of the fact that there are steps in the development of consciousness; and it is viewed by him—as it is by me and also by Sri Aurobindo, by Gopi Krishna, and others—as a normal, evolutionary process. But the instances in which there has been a break forth of this consciousness in humanity are very rare to the present time, even though it is a step that is indicated for every human being and ultimately of every creature as it passes through the human stage to the threshold of a more than human stage, or that which we might call “transhumanism.”

Now, the distinguishing characteristics of these different forms of consciousness can be represented. Sensuous consciousness operates through sense organs normally, and is integrated in the Vedantic psychology in the form of what is called the sense-mind or *manas*. It is there pointed out that there can be a development of this kind of consciousness into higher forms that would be the direct action of the sense-mind without the intervention of the sense organs, rendering possible, thereby, sensuous-like perception of events in the past and even of events in the future, rendering thereby a degree of prophetic power possible, also perception on other planes of being, various forms of clairvoyance, and of telepathic communication. Then the next step is known as the direct action of the pure reason or called the *Buddhi*, which is the development with which man is peculiarly endowed, in contrast to the other creatures that are known to man. Then beyond man, in another stage of evolution that we would call “transhuman,” there is a new kind of consciousness, a new way of cognition, which is grounded upon the principle of *knowledge through identity*, a state in which the knower and the known are fused together and one knows, not through conceptions, not through sensations, but immediately by identity with that which is known—a third form of cognition. This is what is meant by Realization. To be sure, very few in the history of humanity so far have broken forth into this type of consciousness. I would say not one in a million at the present time, though there is a number who have adumbrations of it in the form of imperfect Realizations, or premonitory Realizations, or what we might call propaedeutic Realizations, or mental Realizations, to use a term of Sri Aurobindo, in which there is not yet a shift to a different self-identification, but an enrichment of our already existent forms of cognition.

For myself, I have known three of these propaedeutic Realizations, which I have discussed elsewhere, namely, the one, *I am Atman*, which did not change my philosophic position; second, the one, *I am Nirvana*, which did change my philosophic point of view; the third, *substantiality is inversely proportional to ponderability*, which changed my view of the nature of the *real* as contrasted to the *apparent*. Then there were two Realizations, the one on the 7th of August, 1936, that reaffirmed the identity with the *Atman*, but in such a fundamental way that the meaning of the subject to consciousness became permanently changed, as has been described elsewhere; and then, ultimately, the Realization known as the High Indifference, in which the shift was made from an orientation to the *nirvanic* consciousness to an orientation in which the *sangsaric* consciousness and the *nirvanic* consciousness were seen as equivalent to each other, though different in sense—a radical shift of point of view.

Now, the goal of this work, and of the work of others moving parallel to us, is the stimulation of the awakening of this third function of consciousness. It is the Mystical Awakening, the Transcendental Awakening, the Awakening through Realization or through Enlightenment, which implies that the human being becomes something more than a human being; that he becomes essentially godlike, even though he may still retain a human nature, and an animal nature, and a vegetable nature, and even a mineral nature in his bones. Here is the meaning of Realization stated in capsule form.

What has been the function or office of those individuals that have had Fundamental Realization, and especially of those individuals who have been fully Enlightened? Without attempting at this time to justify the statement, I will say that because of these we have today the great religions of the world and the spiritually oriented philosophies. If men and women of this sort had not existed, we would have no basis whatsoever for a release from the bondage to outer life and the travail of existence in the world. It is through the work of such entities that we have hope today, nay, more than that, positive assurance that redemption from the condition of suffering or of ignorance, in the spiritual sense, can be achieved. This is the importance of it for mankind. If there had not been a Moses, who is listed as a Cosmic Conscious case in Dr. Bucke's book *Cosmic Consciousness*, we may say there could not have been the development of Judaism; without a Christ, there could not have been the development of Christianity; without a Mohammed, there could not have been a development of Moslemism; without an Enlightened Buddha, there could not have been a development of the Buddhism which we know today; and again, without a Shankara, a Ramakrishna, a Sri Aurobindo, and a few others, there would not have been the development of the Vedantic religio-philosophical outlook. These men thus perform the most important service ever rendered unto mankind. Without the men and women of Realization, all that this world could have achieved with the use of unilluminated conceptual consciousness would be possibly the development of the empires in the political field, which are based upon brute force of war and political manipulation. We might have had a substantial economic development involving the needs of the living creature, the living human creature. We could perhaps have the most of our science today and its child, technological development. But we would see no possible resolution of the problem of suffering in humanity, no resolution of the inherent spiritual ignorance of humanity. There would be no hope beyond death, which today is a certain hope because of that which those of Realization have brought to us. Thus the resolution of the most important problems that concern mankind, the resolution of those problems that are most fundamental in his life, the answering of the question: what is the meaning of life, to what end does it lead, and the questions as to the transcendence of death of the body—resolution of these questions would not exist for us, save for that which is brought by the men and women of Realization. This is their importance in this world. They contribute to us the most supremely important value of all.

But how many are there of such men and women in the past and in the present? There is no way to achieve a really satisfactory answer to this question. We simply do not know in any positive sense. We do know that those who are visibly present before us on the pages of history and in the present day are very, very few in number. But there are reasons why we may feel assured that the larger number of such entities are not known to the pages of ordinary secular history. I will list a few of those who are known. There is

Lao-Tze in China. There is Gautama Buddha, as the root source of the Buddhistic movement. There is Sri Shankaracharya, of whom four definite Realizations have been listed. There is Ramakrishna. And almost in our day, there is Sri Aurobindo. Just a few names. There is also Christ. There is Moses and certain others among the prophets of Israel. There are figures unknown to me that are to be listed in the Moslem religious movement. And there is reason to believe that some of the greatest contributors to our science have also been men of at least some degree of Realization. There is evidence of this, for instance, in the case of Sir Isaac Newton. But, one may ask, how many proportionately? And the answer is, we do not know. But knowing the power of this kind of consciousness, I would say that if there were so many as one in a million, which would mean on the order of 3,500 such individuals in the world today, we would not be in our present state overcome by insoluble problems; we would not still be living on a basis of war or near war between the nations; we would not today have so much of criminality. There would be a strong manifestation of Spiritual Light, which, in point of fact, we do not have. Therefore I would say that the proportion is considerably less than one in a million at the present time. However, it is inevitable that in the end every creature will go this way or fail in the path of evolution, that Realization is the next step for humanity, and that for the redemption of this humanity and the redemption of all creatures, including the animals and the creatures that are less than animals, there must be a vast increase of those who will have won Fundamental Realization of the sort that would enable them to enter into the *nirvanic* release, and yet who have renounced that release in order to labor for the redemption of all creatures. There is nothing more important than the attainment of Fundamental Realization. It is our purpose to render it accessible to man as far as is possible. We work along with those others who are achieving in this same direction. This is the meaning, the significance of Fundamental Realization.