

Concerning Dr. Carl G. Jung

Part 2 of 2

Franklin Merrell-Wolff
May 24, 1975

This tape will be a continuation on the subject "Concerning Dr. Carl G. Jung."

Since the development of the last tape, my mind has been so filled with thought that I face the embarrassment of real difficulty in producing the material in the linear form that is necessary for verbal formulation. I shall proceed by giving the different items without bothering about organizing them into logical sequence for the moment.

First, one thought arises. I had pointed out in the preceding tape that the development of our science generally required the action of two factors, namely, that which is called "empiric" and that which is called "theoretical", and that the theoretical factor, when it is well perfected or developed, is always mathematical. I also pointed out the fact that by his own confession Dr. Jung is a radical empiricist, and approaches his field, which is not the external field of science but a subjective zone, in a purely empiric manner. But in as much as we have found that a reliable science, in the ordinary sense of our objective sciences, is the resultant of two factors, namely, first the empiric and second the theoretical, and that the theoretical when well developed is mathematical, would it not also be true that in the investigation of the subjective zone the science is incomplete if it is only empiric, that what is needed, in addition to Jung's contribution, is the theoretical or mathematical element? Through the mathematical element it has been possible to reach to fact and event which was not possible or capable of determination by purely empiric means alone. There is the principle of relationship, of the syntactical element in our knowledge, which is contributed by the theoretical component, and that unless this element is applied also to our subjective field of research, our science remains incomplete. And this may be reflected in certain features that are evident in the chapter on "Late Thoughts" in the book. There Dr. Jung presents different possibilities as something to be entertained, but as something on which careful, definite decision could not be made. May it not be that to arrive at that definite decision requires this theoretical or mathematical element?

But now turning to another point, taking the principle of synchronicity and formulating it with the approach of Leibniz, we were able to derive a consequence that was very startling, indeed, if one appreciated its consequence. What we arrived at was virtually this, that by self-analysis one can reach to knowledge of that which is symbolized in the Christian world by the word 'God'. In other words, by sufficient knowledge of the Self, we can acquire knowledge of the Transcendent by simply adding the right function of transformation. Thus when Angelus Silesius says, "I am as great as God and God is as small as I," he is not manifesting gigantic inflation, but formulating a

basic truth.¹ In other words, that that which is in the Transcendent is also within the psyche and from the psyche the Transcendent may be reached.

Another point, a third point, which I would introduce here is one derived from Sri Aurobindo in his chapter on “The Methods of the Vedanta” in his [*The*] *Life Divine*.² There he says, we do not cognize anything satisfactorily or completely until we have known it in two ways, one being the direct way of immediate cognition and the other being, usually, a conceptual approach. Now, through the mathematical treatment that we produced in the last tape, we had reached the point where we were able to say that the microcosm can know the macrocosm by the use of the appropriate transformation; that would be knowing this truth in a conceptual way. The other way of knowing this truth would be by direct Realization, a function which corresponds to the function of sensation in the ordinary field of exoteric science, but which is neither sensational nor conceptual, and which, therefore, I have called by a name which I had to invent, namely, “introception.”

A fourth point which I wish to establish is that Immanuel Kant, in accepting the possibility of pure mathematics, actually left open the door to the Transcendent which he claims to have closed once it is realized that mathematics, in the sense of pure mathematics, is the counterpart of the metaphysical. It gives the form, but not the substance, of the metaphysical. To realize the substance of the metaphysical calls for Fundamental Realization or Enlightenment; but, through the mathematical power, we can achieve the counterpart of this Realization. Now, it is a fact that much of our mathematics, in the sense of pure mathematics, transcends presently known application. The very method of proof that in applied mathematics leads to the prediction of a fact or event which can later be empirically verified also continues beyond into zones that correspond to no empiric or sensuous determination at all. Yet the method of proof is the same. In this connection, I would suggest reference to one relationship capable of as rigorous mathematical proof as any other, which, nonetheless, does not correspond to any sensuous understanding, and that is $e^{\pi i} = -1$ —something which is known to be true because it is rigorously proven, but its meaning escapes our ordinary understanding. May not this be a profound metaphysical truth?

A final thought is connected with the contrast represented by *aesthetic yoga* as representing an alternative to *noetic yoga* as was discussed in the series on this subject.³ We have two types of orientation in the *empiric* form that we have discussed so far and the *theoretical* form. We may say that the empiric orientation is primarily an orientation to fact or event, whereas the noetic or theoretic is oriented to relationship. In the one case you have simple immediate cognition of fact, state, or event; in the second, you have cognition involving relationships of entities with respect to each other. Now, the aesthetic yoga which Northrop has identified as the orientation typical of the Orient might very well take this form: that one rejects judgment and seeks a state of identification with that

¹ The full reference reads, “I am like God and God like me. I am as large as God. He is as small as I. He cannot above me nor I beneath him be.”

² Aurobindo Ghose, *The Life Divine*, vol. 18 of the *Sri Aurobindo Birth Centennial Library* (Pondicherry: Sri Aurobindo Birth Centenary Library, 1970). The chapter is actually titled “The Methods of Vedantic Knowledge.”

³ See the audio recordings, “Tantra and Zen,” parts 1-6.

“other” without a sense of relationship between this and that, but simply a state of pure identity. If this is so, then it could explain the heavy disparagement which is found in Zen Buddhism with respect to all judging processes—a process which is discouraged by the use of many conundrums which lead to no possible rational explanation. On the other hand, a noetic yoga would be strongly oriented to the relational principle, not an orientation to entity, but an orientation, rather, to law.

Still another point was involved in the complex mass of thought, and it is this: that both the empiricist and the theoretician are oriented to reality and truth, but not with equal emphasis. We may say that the empiricist is more particularly and intensely oriented to reality, whereas the theoretician is oriented to truth. This is a different usage of the two conceptions of reality and truth from that which appears to be characteristic of the Oriental thinker. Someone has pointed out that the Oriental tends to regard these two terms as essentially synonymous, and the use of the word ‘truth’ as I find it in the writings of Sri Aurobindo seems to confirm this. But with us there is a very important distinction as noted by Immanuel Kant. Immanuel Kant makes this point: that the senses never give a falsity or a truth because they do not judge at all when operating in their purity. They simply give you a somewhat which remains indeterminate so long as no judgment enters into the picture. When judgment enters into the picture, then we have the possibility of truth or error—a true judgment on one hand and an erroneous judgment on the other. If the judgment is erroneous, then we produce a state of illusion, whereas, if the judgment is true, then we have a state that is valid, essentially.

Now, in the Oriental use of the notion of *maya* the illusion seems to be not so much the result of erroneous judgment as it is the simple impact of the sensuous world itself. In this case I am following the presentation as given by Sri Shankaracharya. The world about is viewed there as essentially an illusion or *maya*. And one may have this experience if he follows the discipline of Shankara, as I have had it; that you can actually find that world beginning to disappear, to be wiped out of the consciousness, not only in its present impact upon the consciousness, but also in the sense of wiping out the memory of it. I found that it was necessary to stop the latter process if I was to maintain a relationship to the empiric order of sensation. In our Western use of the conception of illusion, it is not simply a statement that the impact of sensation is illusory, but rather that it is introduced when judgments made concerning that impact are erroneous. Where there is no judgment, there is no illusion, but, likewise, there is no truth.

As a personal confession, I would say that my own personal consciousness is more strongly oriented to truth, therefore to judgment and discrimination, than to sheer factuality or reality; although, of course, both are valued. In contrast it would appear that Dr. Jung, in using so often the expression of orientation to reality as marking the cured position of a patient, is much more oriented to reality than to truth. In fact, he seems to find sheer myth, where the question of truth may be quite questionable, as valid if it brings about psychological health, a procedure which to me seems inadequate. Actually, I would regard psychological health or mental health, as understood in the relative world, as of secondary importance; and that, very possibly, the awakening to a transcendent truth might involve a disorientation with respect to the sensuous order, and yet be an authentic awakening to that which was of premiere importance. No doubt, the ideal is to be able to function in both orders at will, but the question as to which is the most

important is one on which I have no uncertain ideas. By all means, the transcendent, which transcends the relativity of birth and death, and all other relativities, is the most important thing for man to achieve. And if for a time there is a distortion with respect to the relative order, that is only a minor matter. The real sickness of humanity is a sickness that grows out of his one sided orientation to the merely mundane.

Perhaps it would be of interest to say something at this time concerning the experience of multiple ideation appearing in the mind at one time. Of late, I have had this experience fairly frequently, and I'm inclined to call it "massed ideation," but this reminds me of the same phrase used by Sri Aurobindo which he identifies with the ideation connected with the "Overmind" in his terminology. I do not know, naturally, what his inner experience was which he designates by this term, but my own experience leads to the use of the same term and would suggest that there is some similarity. It is characteristic of this form of ideation that a number of ideas appear in the mind at the same times with the sense of their being interconnected, but not necessarily logically interconnected. They may be in part logically connected, but in part involving some other principle of interconnection. Sometimes the ideation involves a complete judgmental form, while at other times, in an earlier stage, it may be a mass of incomplete judgmental forms, and thus wholly beyond the possibility of formulation in the terms that are necessary for our present verbal communication.

The massed form of ideation seems to be an intermediate process which follows upon a still more primitive process which could not be called ideation at all, which seems, as it appears in my own consciousness, as a kind of flowage. It's useless to ask flowage of what; it is simply a flowage in consciousness, and one has the sense that this is essentially noetic in character, rather than affective or connotative; that, then, in a process which is very difficult to trace, it becomes, as it were, crystallized into ideas, but rather in the form of a massed crystallization interconnected as one would find the crystals in a granitoid rock; that in some cases it is as though there was a partial crystallization connected with an amorphous bed in which crystallization had not yet been completed. The figure from geology seems to fit the process rather well. As the massed crystallization appears, it seems to develop gradually into clear, fully judged ideas that are related, but they all exist at the same time in the mind with the sense of their interconnection, but not necessarily, as I have said, logically connected, though often they are. Then the problem is to pick out the ideas in some sort of order for the purposes of linear ideational presentation, a process which at times is rather difficult. I have known instances in which only part of the ideation could be withdrawn from the matrix in which it is presented to the mind, and then developed as a linear conception, while the total matrix was not as yet sufficiently developed to give that delineation to it as a whole. I have the impression that our formulation here might be regarded as one-dimensional or linear, whereas the massed ideation is many dimensional, at least two or more. Behind the ideation, or relative crystallization, there is, as I've said, a fluidic state.

Now, here we have a fundamental problem. The root cognition as fluidic is not a static truth. It is a truth that is ever developing or becoming other than what it was. Yet, as it enters into the ideational or crystalline form, it manifests as more or less static, and then in its ultimate form where we have the linear presentation, it is quite static, where each concept is what it is defined to mean and not other than that. Now, here we have a

transformation of fluidity into crytallinity. Now, if we view this as the essential process by which a metaphysical truth is born into outer consciousness, we have certain facts that are not easy for us to accept. It is the fact that we have a crystalline or definitive statement as an end term, which we conceive as meaning what it is defined to mean and no more, growing out of a fluidic condition where everything tends to become other than what it was. Thus, inevitably, in any formulation there is a degree of distortion, for the fluidic can never be wholly represented by the static. And yet for our use here, it is necessary to have definitive concepts, but we must remember that every definitive concept, while in part a revelation of the fluidic from which it came, is at the same time a distortion of that fluidic matrix. Hence, every *sutra*, *shastra*, or scripture has a restricted validity and a validity that becomes less valid in the passage of time. This means that every construction that comes forth from out the metaphysical depths has a limited period of valid application.

One of the most important facts, and I would say the most important fact, in connection with the experience of Dr. Carl G. Jung as revealed in his book *Memories, Dreams, [and] Reflections* is his acknowledgement of his possession of a *numinosum*. I would have guessed this from his work alone, but his acknowledgment is a fact of outstanding importance. What the meaning of ‘*numinosum*’ is, is given in his “Glossary” and the statement is as follows:

Rudolf Otto’s term (in his *Idea of the Holy*) for the inexpressible, mysterious, terrifying, directly experienced and pertaining only to the divinity.

Jung very frequently refers to the *numinous* element in deeper experience. ‘*Numinous*’ is the adjective form of the *numinosum*. And another term for it is the ‘*daimon*’, as used by Socrates. It may be remembered that Socrates was driven to do what he did by his *daimon*. Now, here is a certain fact in the consciousness of certain individuals that is both mysterious and of the very highest importance. It involves the idea of an energy, or entity, or a form of consciousness having the value of holiness or of super-important direction in the individual who has such a *numinosum*. There is some reason to believe that the presence of this principle is that which makes the difference between genius and superior talent. Superior talent may, by use of the advantages offered by the university, produce great values for human beings, but they are limited. Genius, on the other hand, often is able to take the step in many directions—even in the development of a science, or the development of a religious orientation, or as a great moral leader—which is impossible for merely developed talent. Developed talent may use thought, in the sense of speculative thought, and reach to a considerable distance, but it cannot make the well-nigh impossible breakthrough that is possible for genius. A *numinosum*, or the *daimon*, is something added on to the ordinary developed consciousness which may be trained here.

Now, the experience of this does occur in the literature. Jung has pointed out that Jacob’s wrestling with the angel was a case of the presence of a *daimonic* power; and further, that the order received by Abraham to sacrifice his own son Isaac was a sort of test imposed by the *numinosum*, which you will remember was called off at the last moment when Abraham demonstrated his obedience; and the wrestling and struggling of Job as another instance. Now, as one goes through the story of Dr. Jung’s inner life, one finds that he moved through a period of great difficulty that stirs him

with deep emotion, in fact, so much of it that only the strength of a strong man could have stood it, as when he was confronted by the unconscious. He presents this as part of the terrifying aspect of the *numinosum*.

Now, I would like to present the fact that I know something which may be related to this principle. There broke forth into my consciousness in 1936 a quality, a state, or a function which I called the “Current”; and that has remained with me active most of the time during the 39 years since then, and it is the element that makes all the difference in the world between what I formulate, in point of fact, now, and what I would have been able to formulate if I’d had only the advantages of academic training. I can describe my experience and imperience of this quality. In the beginning I experienced it as a sort of current in consciousness, which, however, did not flow from the past to the future and yet involved the principle of flowage. Perhaps the conception of “circulation of the light” might be a just representation of it.⁴

Of late, I have viewed it more as a function in consciousness which may well up spontaneously or which I may invoke, but certain conditions are required for the successful invocation of this function. One must live in a state of peace and emotional quietude most of the time. The presence of strong affect is adverse with respect to its manifestation. But I have never found it terrifying or forcefully compulsive as the literature indicates that it may be. On the contrary, I have found it uniformly benign and essentially cooperative. It is, as it were, the basis of an inspiration from time to time, but the work that is done is performed as a cooperative product between something within and this outer consciousness of mine. There seems to be something like a communion that is always very happy and a sort of give and take in which this outer judgment with respect to formulation will be given acknowledgment by the inner function, and the substance of what may be said is given by the function itself. There is thus a give and take between substance of a communication and the art in formulation contributed by the outer consciousness. There is a mutual giving way in both respects. It has the force and value of a highly valued companion which supplies the essence of guidance. There may be times when I feel impelled to formulate ideas that are really shocking in their impact upon values that have been generally accepted, and I’ve hesitated at times to give them formulation, and yet seemed to receive the impulse from this function to go ahead and say it, and so I have done.

It may function at times when most unexpected. Thought may well up in me that is pregnant with value at times when it cannot be expressed because the facilities are not available, and there is a very curious quality about this thought. It leaves a very light impress on the mind and can easily fade away. If the opportunity does not exist, as is frequently the case, for its immediate formulation, the only way I find that it can be retained is by a repeated reformulation in the mind, a kind of circulation of the idea in the mind over and over again until the impress is established with some degree of firmness until such time as it is possible to produce a formulation. Yet, nonetheless, when the formulation can be made immediately, there is a power in it that is lost, in some measure, when it is carried in the memory to another period when formulation may be made.

⁴ See Richard Wilhelm, trans., *The Secret of the Golden Flower* (New York, Harcourt Brace & Co., 1931).

There are effects produced by this type of formulation upon individuals other than myself which are never produced by purely academic statements. Early in our work, we discovered that individuals became warm, even uncomfortably so, the perspiration rolled down their faces, their faces became red, and they all frequently removed their coats. We identified this as the psycho-physical heat. And then further, we found that certain inductions took place in the consciousness of the hearer that were of the sort that are reported by the mystics.⁵ The credit for this goes to this transcendental function, not to a speculative form of ideation. It is a sort of objective evidence that there is more here than a system of ideas.

⁵ See the audio recordings “Induction Talk,” “On Tulku,” part 2, and “General Discourse on the Subject of My Philosophy,” part 8.