

Three Fundamentals of the Introceptive Philosophy

Part 11 of 16

Franklin Merrell-Wolff

February 21, 1974

I wish this morning to put forth an effort at a greater degree of precision in our formulation of the present philosophy. This is done for two reasons: first, the point was raised by one of the students at one of the meetings, that the reference to 'consciousness' had obscurities because of a lack of distinct, clear terminology. The point, I feel, is well taken. Second, there is a publication put out by the *Scientific American* called "Altered States of Awareness" in which there are references and statements made that have a bearing upon this problem. I would like to quote from this publication, but the prohibition of such quotation is thorough-going, listing a forbidding of all mechanical, electronic, or other quotation from it without permission. My reference, therefore, will be to the substance of statements made by writers here, as I understand them. The hearer may have some difficulties here since most of us are not trained in the use of language in a precise way. Yet, precision serves clarity, and by study one can achieve, I think, a better understanding.

Now, we will consider what I here will posit, that is, affirm as primary principle or means of action in our development of the thought. While this is in my own case grounded upon a Fundamental Realization and is therefore not for me an arbitrary assumption, yet for many, and probably most, it can be entertained only as a posited assumption. Doing that is a form of thinking which is familiar to us, especially in the field of mathematics. A mathematical system in the modern sense starts not with axioms or supposed self-evident truths, but with a group of assumptions, and then the process of thinking is developed as a result of those assumptions applying the principles of logic, in this case as they belong in the field of mathematics. We are not, then, concerned with how the assumptions were found or what led to their affirmation, but simply with the consequences that grow out of them. This is a well-recognized method of procedure in our most precise discipline, namely, that of mathematics. It differs from the methods that apply to empiric science where determination is made first by observation or experiment, and then creative projections are made that would seem to account for the observed events or facts. These are hypotheses that are used and applied to infer future events or facts. If they succeed in doing that they become more and more trustworthy, becoming first, after a hypothesis, a theory, and if well-established over a period of several years, they are finally viewed as laws of nature. But we know from our previous experience as recorded in the history of science that these supposed laws are merely better established hypotheses or theories because we have had the painful, even traumatic, experience of finding that such formulations, even though they have proved reliable for many years, ultimately tend to fail in the light of later more refined observation. Therefore, all of our empiric science is tentative and not a source of certain truth. In fact, critical scholars of the subject have affirmed that all we derive from this method is probable truth or

warranted assertibility. I shall apply here the method that is characteristic of mathematics rather than of the of the empiric sciences.

First, we posit that the most Ultimate Principle, or Ultimate Reality, or *Paramartha-Sat* in the Sanskrit, is a pure, eternal, unmade, unconstructed, unformed Consciousness which is the Root of all that is, that beside this there is none other. But this is to be viewed not in the sense of our ordinary conceptions concerning consciousness, but rather in the sense of a Field Consciousness, as that which I have called Consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject, as a Consciousness which is not concerned with phenomena though it is the source of all phenomena, that it is identical with the conception of *Alaya Vijnana* or Root Consciousness.

Now, a point may be made here. This is a deviation from the standpoint taken by the logical Buddhists Dignaga and Dharmakirti, for they assert that the Ultimate Reality or *Paramartha-Sat* is point-instant sensation. And while this involves the principle of consciousness, I view it as a form of consciousness only, namely, that form which is sensational, and that the total meaning of consciousness is much more than this.

This Root Consciousness is not to be viewed as merely a relationship between a knower and a known, but rather as a sea or space of illimitable Consciousness which is original, self-existent, and constitutive of all things. It may be viewed as Substantial Consciousness in the sense that it is in its full nature the substance of all things that are known and knowable as well as the source of all the cognitions of that which is known and knowable. It contains, therefore, both the substantive side of all that is as well as the relational aspects, that which is known as syntactical. Bear in mind, and do not forget this, it is not viewed as in any sense derivative, but as original. It is not a being or entity, but the source of all beings and entities. It is not conditioned by time or space or by anything else, but is the source of all conditioning. Itself is beyond conditioning, and therefore in a profound sense not knowable in the way we know those things that are cognized by a self or entity. This defines a point of view that is in radical divergence from the standpoint of most popular religions wherein the source of all that is, is viewed as a being possessing consciousness. That position must be reversed, and think of the Root Consciousness as possessing all beings, including the entities that are suggested by terms such as God, Yahweh, Allah, Parabrahm, Tao, and so forth. But while the Pure Consciousness is not knowable in the way that we cognize in a dualistic zone or domain in which there is a self or center which cognizes that which is other than the self or center, namely, all objects whatsoever. Despite the fact that it is not knowable in this sense, yet it is knowable by being *identical* with it and becoming conscious of that fact. This Root Consciousness, in addition, is to be viewed as neither subjective nor objective, but rather as that from which both subjective and objective consciousness is derived.

We have now our second postulate: that there is in addition to the Root Consciousness and derived from it another kind of consciousness which is divided into a subjective and an objective part. As to the question whether there is a derivative consciousness which does not have this division is not here considered and is left open as a possibility not yet determined. But for our purposes, we have in this second postulate the fundamental principle whereby consciousness as we are familiar with it is derived from the Root Consciousness. It is not here conceived that this derivation is something which takes place at a certain point in time. This could not be for the reason that the Root

Consciousness is itself the container of time and is not conditioned by time; rather, time would begin with the derivation of the dualistic consciousness consisting of a subjective portion and an objective portion. The Root Consciousness is first in the ontological sense, not in the temporal sense. We may even conceive that there never has been a time when the derived or subject-object consciousness did not exist. We think of the Root Consciousness as first, let me repeat, in the ontological or hierarchical sense.

We have with the combination of the Root Consciousness and the subject-object consciousness the first or ontological trinity. In this we may think of the Root Consciousness as the Causeless Cause of all that is, and that the subject to consciousness is the first Cause, or first Logos, and that the object of consciousness is the second Logos; or in other terms, we may think of the Root Consciousness as corresponding to the Oriental conception of *Paranirvana* and the subjective aspect of the subject-object consciousness as corresponding to *Nirvana*, and finally, the objective aspect of this second consciousness as corresponding to the Buddhistic conception of *Sangsara*. Also, we can set up a correspondence between Root Consciousness and the Tibetan conception of *Rig-pa*, second, the subject-object consciousness would correspond to the Tibetan consciousness of *shes-rig*. In *The Tibetan Book of the Dead* it is stated that these two forms of consciousness are inseparable, and that would tend to confirm our previous statement that these two forms are coexistent and that there is no point ever in which the Root Consciousness exists without the subject-object consciousness also existing.

Our third postulate is that this derived or subject-object consciousness is capable of indefinite, perhaps infinite, self-reduplication producing thereby a series of zones, worlds, states, or spaces of consciousness, and that these constitute the formation of the cosmos as well as the formation of the diametric opposite of the cosmos, namely, the subjective or *nirvanic* pole. This system of potentially infinite self-subdivision of states, or modes, or spaces of consciousness may be called the third Logos. It is a fact of our experience and thought that there is an object before our consciousness which is truly objective in the sense that it is not simply a creation or projection from our subjective imagination. What this object is in its ultimate nature is a question which we shall consider presently, but it is a fact that we have to come to terms with our environment, which consists of all of the geography of this world, of all of the so-called material objects of our culture, and the entities which make up the cosmos as a whole. Concerning these entities, our common point of view is that they are external, non-conscious existences, which under some conditions come within the field of consciousness, but are not dependent for their being or existence upon that consciousness. There are some philosophies that are very explicit on this point. I would have you note particularly here that form of philosophy known as Neo-Realism.

Now, it is here postulated that the real nature of this objective element in consciousness is itself composed of the substance of Consciousness, but is not subject to the manipulation of our empiric or personal subject-object consciousness because it is rooted in another space, zone, or department of Consciousness and is therefore objective essentially to the particular space of consciousness in which we are functioning. This is our fourth postulate. It is therefore, to us, a subject matter to be studied with respect to its various properties such as those which we call physical and those which we call chemical. But, nonetheless, our “consensus space”, as it were, to use a term suggested by

Dr. Lilly, does have creative possibilities, and can superimpose that creativeness upon this other consciousness so that what we deal with is a compound result of something not produced and created, and therefore truly objective, on one side, and of something that is created and superimposed upon the former, generally without our realizing that we have done this. Therefore, what we actually deal with in our experience of this world is a compound resultant of something not molded but given with respect to our consensus consciousness and something superimposed upon that by our creativeness, namely, our conceptual thinking with respect to it. And this, I submit, is the basis upon which our whole science is developed. Our science is dealing practically with a system of concepts related to something which transcends those concepts, and yet we have the possibility that a conceptual system indigenous to totally alien cultures could develop a worldview dealing with the same identical objective element plus a different form of creativity, and thus develop a worldview that is not identical with our current scientific point of view. We would have, therefore, to conclude that our scientific worldview is not the truth, or does not give the truth as it is in itself, but gives a possible construction of the truth having as one of its components a truly objective element which is derived from another space of consciousness plus the creativeness of our special conceptuality. We may concede that with other cultures equally valid worldviews could be developed, and even have been developed. We thus live, practically, in a world which we have made through the preconceptions of our culture, and yet which in part is truly objective—a compound of these two factors.

Now, let us consider two zones of consciousness of the potentially infinite number of zones of such consciousness the first of which will be our common consensus consciousness or space in which we commonly move and which we may call consciousness *a*, and then another zone of consciousness which has produced an impact upon the first, and which we may call consciousness *b*. Here is a consideration which will be well for us to entertain. If any entity had reached the point where he could be fully conscious both in zone *a* and zone *b*, he could have creative potential, not in zone *a* alone, but both in zone *a* and zone *b*. Then, that element which is truly objective to those who are conscious only in zone *a*, would not be thus objective to him who was fully consciousness in both *a* and *b*, and he would therefore have the—potentially—the power to be creatively active in both; and that which would appear as objective and incapable of being disregarded by those in zone *a* would be nonetheless to him also capable of creative manipulation. He then could say to that object, even though it is a mountain, “Be thou removed,” and it would be removed. This would lay the basis for a science of magic, not a superstition, but a real science; but one which is not available to him who is creatively conscious only in zone *a*, but only to him who is creatively conscious in both zone *a* and zone *b*.

Here a footnote may be helpful. In *The Philosophy of Consciousness Without an Object*, I have equated Consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject to the conception of the unconscious of von Hartmann and also of Dr. Carl G. Jung, and this has caused some confusion. The point that I’d like to make is that it appears in the writings of both these men that the conception of the collective unconscious is a blanket conception covering every possible mode of a psychical sort which is not conscious in its operation in zone *a*—which remember is our consensus consciousness or our ordinary waking consciousness—and it is conceived by Dr. Jung, in particular, that the dream object is an

emergence from this collective unconscious where our zone *a* consciousness cannot trace it to its roots, but merely has the contents of the final product emerging in the zone *a* consciousness. If this is a blanket conception which covers everything that is not ordinarily conscious in zone *a*, then the conception covers everything meant by not only every zone other than *a* in the derived forms of consciousness, but also the Root Consciousness. It therefore would be a conception more comprehensive than that of Consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject because this unconscious would cover both this Root Consciousness and all the zones of consciousness other than *a*. It is treated as a blanket conception for the simple reason, which has been made explicit by Dr. Jung, that we do not trace this other side, and therefore we call it the unconscious. It would be incorrect to equate the unconscious of von Hartmann with Consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject. It would be correct to say that von Hartmann's conception embraces Consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject, but has a wider extension than that. I think this comment may clarify the matter. There is also the further point to be noted that whereas Dr. Jung treats the dream as arising from the collective unconscious, I extend the conception to include the arising of the whole cosmos by essentially the same method. Thus, in a certain sense, the whole cosmos, consisting of all objects whatsoever, may be viewed as a kind of world dream.

As a second footnote, I think a reference to an experience which I had not long ago may be of interest here. Once I was lying in bed passing through the stage of deepening consciousness which precedes the full falling to sleep. Through this zone, I have often noticed that there is an overlapping of the zone *a* consciousness with that zone into which sleep is the introduction. In this state there is a process of conceptual thought related to the material of zone *a* consciousness overlapping a quality that belongs to authentic sleep. Gradually in the deepening process the remnant of the zone *a* consciousness gradually weakens and at some point vanishes. In this particular instance, I had while still carrying a minor quality of zone *a* consciousness entered into a kind of space in which there seemed to be an objective field appearance that might suggest a forest, and there arose in my mind the thought that there was some point here that should be made clear to Gertrude. Therefore, I seemed to shift to another zone of consciousness which I thought was *a* consciousness—the *a* zone—and started to speak when I made another shift to the authentic *a* zone and was aware of the normal environment of the room. But I felt slightly frightened here, for I saw a certain possibility that there could be a condition where one could think that he was entering the *a* zone and make an error and enter some other zone which we will call *m*. If, then, one entered such a zone *m* with an overlapping of *a* zone consciousness so that he thought that the *m* consciousness was the true waking consciousness of *a* zone, then he might be in a state which would be regarded as pathological. He could be making judgments colored by both the *a* zone and the *m* zone producing a sub-zone which we might call m_a , and if locked in it, he would be in a pathological state since he would be predicating facts related to *m* zone as though they belonged to the *a* zone. This would be a condition which we may call the inferior analogue of that higher condition of an adept consciousness which commanded the materials of two or more zones at the same time and knowing what he was doing and thinking. In this inferior state we have produced a condition of confusion; and, furthermore, it is here that we may have an explanation of the meaning of 'hallucination'—a confused consciousness as the resultant of a combination of two forms

or zones of consciousness without the subject being aware of that fact and in control of it. And what we also can note here is that the resultant of this combination produced a sub-zone m_a that was an addition to the original lists of zones, and suggests a possibility of endless subdivision such as that which is possible with infinite manifolds.

We shall continue this material in the next tape where we'll enter into something of an interpretation of the etiology of the hallucination and deal with the distinction between the consensus space, or that which we may call the normal state of consciousness, along with other forms of consciousness. But this will be enough for today.