

# Abstract of the Philosophy

## Part 6 of 14

Franklin Merrell-Wolff

December 21, 1974

The question has arisen as to whether thought is an aid or a barrier to the attainment of the liberating Realization. There are statements to be found in the traditional literature which suggest that one should silence all thought, that thought is a barrier and should be brought under control so that other functions in consciousness may take over. While these statements can be found, it is by no means the whole truth. There is a vast amount of mysticism which may be and has been called *alogical*, and I would suggest that it is in connection with this form of mysticism that the instruction to silence thought applies. But this is not the whole of mysticism. There is a manifestation of mystical consciousness which is highly *rational*. Here, particularly, I would direct your attention to the work of Sri Shankaracharya. But not only that, I would direct your attention to the work of the great figures in ancient Greek culture who have made contributions to the awakened Consciousness, as for example Plato, Plotinus, and Pythagoras. No doubt the larger development so far as numbers of individuals is concerned would lie among those who have developed in terms of the alogical mysticism. This is preeminent in the case of the Persian mystics and of most Christian mystics, but not all of those who regarded themselves as oriented to the Christian current. There is a definite development of a rational orientation in the imperiences of Meister Eckhart; and though his language was far from clear, there is a profound underlying reasonableness in the thought brought forth by Jacob Boehme. It is thought that here some clarification may be made, and I shall proceed to a discussion of the various kinds of thought. I will suggest that certain thought is a barrier while other kinds of thought are premier aids.

As we are commonly familiar with thought, it is oriented to practical objectives, in other words, to the satisfaction of our interests or our cravings. Here thought is purely instrumental in terms of a value that lies outside of thought and, in general, below the level of thought. This is the use of thought for all practical affairs: the making of a living, the defending of oneself from the elements and from hostile entities, or the defending of one's country from its potential enemies. This is thought used in an instrumental sense. It is not thought directed to the attainment of truth for its own sake, but thought in the sense of the appropriate or effective use of activities or energies to affect a mundane object. And among other things, there is thought which simply serves the cravings of the nature, even the lusts of the nature: the indulgence of one's appetites such as the appetites of drink, of food, of sex, and of the gambler, and even of those who derive satisfaction from the witnessing or imposing of death and suffering. Thought in this sense is instrumental, and in the classification of the principles of man which is to be found in *The Secret Doctrine*, there is a recognition of this as a certain type of mental activity which is called "*kama-manas*," or desire mind, which we may interpret as mind being used to satisfy a mundane desire. Then in addition to this we have a kind of thinking that is not directed at all. It has been called monkey mind, and I might add one could call it also kitten mind. It

is mind being stimulated by the casual perception of objects, and as different objects are perceived, the mind jumps about in the interest in them. One is drawn to this object and to that object. There is no concentration of thought. There is no directed purpose in it, but just a jumping about.

Now, when it is said that mind must be controlled or silenced in order to attain the great insights, it is no doubt true that mind in this sense of the monkey mind must be brought under control; and that mind which is operating towards the fulfillment of desire or the protection of one's interests, like the attainment of a living or of protecting of the household, this is not mind oriented to the achievement of truth for its own sake, but the use of mind for a practical end. This kind of thinking no doubt would interfere with an authentic meditative activity aimed at the Realization of a fundamental truth. Not that all object oriented thinking or thinking directed to interests, is of no value, it has its place, its legitimate place in the whole. It is necessary if one is to preserve this organism that it shall have certain nutrition, that it shall be protected from the elements, and that its activities should be facilitated, and thought in connection with this has its place, but it is a subordinate use of the principle of thought. And all of this, it must be admitted, can serve as a barrier to the attainment of fundamental or transcendental insights or Realizations.

But this is not the only use of thought, and in the schema of the principles of man given in *The Secret Doctrine*, we find this recognized in the designation of a higher form of thought known as "*manas*" or "higher *manas*." Thought in this sense is thought directed to the attainment of truth entirely apart from one's interests or cravings. An example of this is the thinking in which one engages when he tries to solve a mathematical problem. The true student of mathematics is not at all concerned in what the answer to the problem may be. He has no preference. All he wishes to know is what is the *true* answer to this problem? He therefore directs his thought to the resolution of the problem whatever the outcome may be, and he is completely happy with whatever that outcome may be just so he has found a resolution. This is thinking freed from the distortion of a craving or an orientation to interests other than that of finding out what the truth is whatever it may be. This is a different kind of thinking, and this kind of thought has a very different relationship to the problem of attaining ultimate Truth in the metaphysical sense. In my experience, thought in this latter sense has proven to be the greatest aid of all in the attainment of that which broke forth on August 7, 1936. When there was the development of the correct idea, the rest followed immediately. Thinking correctly was the fundamental key. This being so, I cannot agree with those who take the position that thought is always a barrier. I admit thought oriented to craving and mundane interests and thought that jumps about irresponsibly is a barrier, but thought directed to truth for its own sake is not a barrier but can be a supreme aid, as it was in my own experience.

Another use of thought which is beneficent in its effect and highly helpful is that which is directed to rendering available to the *sadhaka* the attainment of the liberating Realization. The putting forth of the effort which shall aid in this attainment does call for serious thinking of just how the problem of the *sadhakas* can be solved. This is thought directed to a lofty motivation. Here the point comes out that the determining as to whether a thought is an aid or a barrier lies in the objective with which the thought is concerned and the motivation underlying it.

Now, I wish to direct your attention to another analysis of the characteristics of different human beings which tends to show why the rules which apply to one individual may be quite different from those which are most appropriate to the needs of other individuals. In this connection, I direct your attention to the Jungian theory of typology. Dr. Jung has found from his study of human beings that not all human beings are psychologically organized in the same way. He has found that there is a group of possible psychological types, and generalizations that are valid for one type are very often far from valid for other types, and, in fact, the rules by which one type may achieve his highest good may work as a definite barrier for an individual of another type.

The broad statement as presented by Dr. Jung is that there are four functions and two attitudes which determine our consciousness modes. The two attitudes are those of *extraversion* and *introversion* with which nearly everyone today is now familiar at least as words. The meaning of these attitudes is related to the two primary poles in the organization of relative consciousness, namely, to the subject which cognizes and to the object which is cognized. An extraverted individual is an individual whose primary orientation is to the object of consciousness. Such individuals if they are philosophic in their form of expression tend to become Realists. They find reality in the object in some sense. In the crudest form it is a viewing of the object as an independent thing existing outside of consciousness essentially. Here we have the forms which are essentially materialistic. In a subtler form, there is a recognition of the fact that the only object which we know is a psychical existence. It is not a non-conscious, external thing. Here we will dispense with the question as to whether there is an external thing which is non-conscious, but will face this fact, that if there is such an external thing, we never know it. We only know an object in consciousness. And as a result we have the subtler, more sophisticated, psychologically self-conscious form of Realism which recognizes the fact that all the objects which lie before consciousness are only *objects* and not *things* as non-conscious entities. The extraverted thinking is oriented to these entities as objects.

Now, an introverted consciousness on the other hand is oriented to the subjective pole in either minor or major degree—oriented to the self which cognizes; and this develops in a multitude of different ways in the various types that are recognized by Dr. Jung. Here I would interject a point which is very important in the literature relative to the breakthrough to Realization. Over and over again, it is said that the key to attainment is found by going within. In other words, by a movement towards the subject, and in point of fact, this is a very intensive and profound movement when it is successful. It involves conscious and deliberate introversion in a profound sense.

Now, another point made by Dr. Jung is that not in the case of every individual is a clear differentiation of type developed. With the majority of human beings, it is a sort of inchoate jumble of these different factors—a kind of chaos. Only with those who are beginning to advance in self-culture is there a definitive development in attitudes.

Now, in addition to the attitudes Dr. Jung identifies four functions of consciousness which are called: thinking, feeling, sensation, and intuition. Thinking and feeling are regarded as *rational* functions in that they are concerned with relatedness in some sense. Intuition and sensation are called *irrational* functions because they are oriented to what might be called sheer fact apart from relatedness—fact in the case of sensation which is objective and evident, fact in the case of intuition

which is in the sense that is not apparent to ordinary perception but to a subtle and hidden kind of perception. Now, the individual may be oriented primarily in most of his time and activity to one or another of these functions with the result that we have four functional types called the thinking type, the feeling type, the sensational type, and the intuitional type. This means that the individual is differentiated in terms of the function which designates his type. It does not mean that he lacks the activity of the other functions, but they play a subordinate role and are generally not differentiated as clear powers which he can use with intelligence.

We could take for example the thinking type as an instance. Here thought is the primary instrument of psychical adjustment to the world, to others, and to one's self, and to that which is above the world. Here ideation tends to be clearly organized—that is the meaning of differentiation—the sense for logic is clear and definite, the sense for order in ideational relationships is of fundamental importance. A feeling type, on the other hand, is oriented to another way of cognition that is relative. It feels its way into relationship. There is an order here, the order that is important, for instance, in the protocol of nations or the social relationships of peoples is something which can be handled best by one who has a fine development of this particular type of function, namely, feeling. There is a system or order in it analogous to that in thinking but of a different sort. It's governed by a different principle. Its order would not be called logic in the sense that logic applies to thinking. Nonetheless, when well developed, it is orderly, it can distinguish, for instance, the propriety of certain color schemes in decoration, and may have a bit of difficulty in giving the why and wherefore which will be satisfactory to a thinking type, but nonetheless would not have difficulty in giving the why and wherefore to another feeling type.

Now, the law which governs both feeling on one hand and thinking on the other have some incompatibilities with each other. The result is that when one is differentiated in terms, let us say, of thinking, his feeling is relatively repressed; or if he is developed in terms of feeling judgment, his thinking is relatively repressed. This does not mean that the thinking type lacks feeling or that the feeling type lacks thought, but it does mean that the thinking type is differentiated or cultured in terms of thinking, whereas the feeling type is differentiated or cultured in terms of feeling, and in both cases the repressed function is relatively undeveloped, more or less primitive, because it is driven back, to some degree at least, into the unconscious and is not under objective conscious control or direction.

There are also those whose primary orientation is to the irrational functions. Those in whom sensation is primary, sensation carries the values which are worthwhile, and those oriented primarily to intuition which carries its own values, namely, those which are not obvious on the surface in any situation, but which are hidden beneath the surface. The intuitive sees that, or senses that, which is not revealed but hidden.

Now, our picture begins to take some complication, for every functional type is also present in one or the other of the two attitudes. Thus, a thinking type may be oriented to the object, in other words, predominately extraverted, and, on the other hand, may be predominately introverted. Dr. Jung gives examples of these two types. For instance, the thinking of Charles Darwin would represent an example of a very good extraverted thinking type, whereas Immanuel Kant would represent an excellent example of the

introverted thinking type. Charles Darwin was concerned with biological phenomena as seen objectively. Immanuel Kant was concerned with the organization of human consciousness, particularly with respect to its thinking, and thus he produced an epistemological statement; and this could be achieved only by the capacity to analyze the functioning within one's own reflective consciousness, not a primary concern with the objects before consciousness. This is just an example. There would be other examples with respect to the feeling type and with respect to the irrational types as well.

Now, there is a further complication coming into the picture, and that is this: that each functional type has also a preferred auxiliary type; thus there could be a thinking type in which the auxiliary function was sensation. If this was, say, extraverted, it could be the type that would make a good practical engineer who is dealing with problems connected with seeing things that are sensed and thinks concerning them. On the other hand, the function of thinking may be combined with intuition as the auxiliary function, in which case the thinking would tend to penetrate into some degree of the unseen. And then you'd have both in the extraverted and introverted phases, and this would also apply to each of the predominant functional types. This tends to make the picture fairly complicated. I will take a given type as an example. Suppose we have an introverted thinking type whose auxiliary function is intuition, he would tend to become the metaphysical thinker. On the other hand, if he was oriented in the extraverted sense, he would deal with problems that are related to the world field. He might be good in analyzing the problems of individual persons, their life problems, and so forth. His tendency would thus be to deal with the mundane and practical in its hidden aspect, whereas the introverted thinking intuitive would tend toward a metaphysical orientation. I'll not carry this out with the other types because the problem would become highly complicated, and I'm not so capable of dealing with the types that are alien to my own.

Now, there are certain questions that are not wholly clear with respect to the auxiliary functions. There is some reason to think that the degree of repression of the counter-function in the case of the auxiliary function is less intense than it is with the primary function, so that there is a possibility of crossing over in understanding to another type through the auxiliary function which is not possible through the primary function. Dr. Jung has discussed this at some length. And there is also the possibility, which my own examination has led me to suspect, and that is that the attitude of the auxiliary function is not as definitive as the attitude of the primary function. In other words, an introverted thinking type would not be so definitively introverted in his auxiliary function as he was in his primary function. So that there is possible a cross correlation through the auxiliary function that is not possible in terms of the primary function.

Now, in order to make things still more complicated, Dr. Jung has noted this fact, that every individual has not only a conscious typical psychology, but he has a sort of shadow psychology which would represent his unconscious personality, which would be just the diametric opposite of his conscious pattern. Thus, if we take a thinking intuitive with the introverted attitude, the diametric opposite would be a feeling sensational type in the extraverted attitude; and the same principle would apply to all of the other types. And Jung has pointed out that if a thinking individual were to classify a given individual before him and derived an introverted thinking intuitive, an

intuitive individual approaching the same individual in his analysis would find an extraverted feeling sensational type. This makes the picture pretty complicated as I think everyone will admit. But this is as far as I'll go in the general statement, and now I wish to bring out the applications.

With a thinking type for example, the feeling can be good, and sound, and constructive if it is guided by thinking, but if the feeling erupts on its own, not guided by thinking, it becomes primitive or barbaric. With a feeling type, on the other hand, the thinking may be good if it is guided by feeling, but if it erupts on its own as a thinking which is not guided by feeling, it again is barbaric and primitive. This leads to some real complications. In the total life of any individual, there are moments when the repressed function breaks away from the discipline of the developed or guiding functions, and in such a case we have manifestations of real inferiority and of destructive effects. The feeling that erupts from the thinking type without the guidance of thinking becomes an expression of prejudice, or rather of resentment; and the thinking that erupts from a conscious feeling type without the guidance of feeling, becomes a purely prejudicial destructive kind of thinking. This you can observe sometimes in the darker moments of any individual. This is something to be borne in mind.

Now, this is the point that I wish to employ in our general application here. If an individual were predominantly of the feeling type, thinking not guided by feeling would tend to be of a destructive sort, and in his discipline in yoga, thinking that broke loose in this way would be something he would have to repress or control, and in that case the rule to silence his thinking would be valid. On the other hand, the thinking of a differentiated thinking type would be a very different sort of thinking. It is constructive and developmental. Thus, we would have to say for one type, silence thinking, and for the other type, silence feeling, because the feeling which erupts in a differentiated thinking type is a destructive feeling. The feeling that is good with him is a feeling that is guided by thought, just as the thinking that is good with a feeling type is that which is guided by feeling and not the type that erupts out of his relative unconscious.

The implications of this discussion of the types which is relevant to our purposes is this, that certain rules are important in the discipline of one type but do not apply to the discipline of a counter-type, and this must be borne in mind. And I would think that many of the older practitioners of yoga have not been self-conscious with respect to their own typology and have tended to universalize the rules that were valid for themselves as applying to all human beings; whereas in truth they applied to those who were of the same type but not to those who were of a counter-type. This is a matter of very considerable importance. I have become familiar with my own type through self-analysis and by applying the principles of Dr. Jung, and I have reached the classification of an introverted thinking type with intuition as the primary auxiliary function, also functioning best when in its introverted phase; and thus my orientation tends toward the metaphysical and particularly the ontological. I do not say that this is a pattern for all men. I can speak effectively to those who are of my own type or of a type similar to mine. Any influence that extends to other individuals would have to operate more or less through the unconscious; but this does happen, and I will illustrate this with the experience of my own past on the platform. I've oriented my material to the thinking type. I expressed for it. I got a large response from feeling types. A mystery you might say, but what would be

shown here is, when we understand the matter psychologically, that I spoke to the unconscious attitude of the feeling type. This is something to bear in mind.