

Review of and Reflections on *Yoga and Psychotherapy*

Part 4 of 4

Franklin Merrell-Wolff

May 1976

The preceding discussion, which is related to what may be called the “Mathematical Way,” is related to a problem to which Dr. Carl G. Jung gave some serious attention. It is the question to what extent can Oriental method be transplanted to the West and grafted on to Western culture. Dr. Jung has discussed this at some length in his psychological commentary preceding *The Tibetan Book of the Great Liberation*. The point that he has made again and again is that if a method or orientation which is perfectly normal for Eastern man should be translated over to Western man and taken in the same form as used by Eastern man, the results may be undesirable. Dr. Jung quotes repeatedly a certain aphorism to the effect: the right path with the wrong man leads to wrong results.¹ Dr. Jung insists that Western man is essentially Christian, in the psychological sense, and that he cannot deny his roots, take over a methodology totally foreign to those roots, and get desirable results, however much that methodology may work with Eastern man and act in conformity with the psychical roots which are native to Eastern man.

What are the psychical and psychological roots which differentiate Western man from Eastern man? As I have noted, Dr. Jung finds this difference in an essential Christian-ness characterizing Western man. But this I challenge, for after all, the Christian religion was an importation from the East, in this case, the near East, and was not an indigenous Occidental development. On the contrary, we find that differentiation among the Greeks, and it is preeminent in the case of Pythagoras. In fact, I would suggest that it was Pythagoras who struck the keynote of the West as differentiated from the East. And as I stated before, Pythagoras occupies an honored position among the mathematicians of the West. He was the man who introduced the principle of demonstration or proof and made important discoveries, but combined with this, the spirit of philosophy and an essential mysticism. In other words, it was the scientific way of viewing the world which differentiates Western man from Eastern man preeminently.

Now, the scientific way consists of two aspects: the *normative* sciences and the *empiric* sciences. Of these two, I insist, it is the normative sciences, namely logic and mathematics, that differentiate Western man most of all. Later the empiric spirit was introduced by Galileo, and has taken a preeminent position in Western evaluation, and at the present time seems to be very largely conquering the East. But I insist that the essence of Western man is less to be found in empiricism than in the normative sciences. On this point Jung has virtually disqualified himself from producing an adequate judgment in his

¹ Carl G Jung, Commentary to *The Secret of the Golden Flower* (New York: Causeway Books, 1971), 79: “An ancient adept has said: But if the wrong man uses the right means, the right means work in the wrong way.”

confession in his volume known as *Memories, Dreams, [and] Reflections*, where he acknowledged that he never could understand mathematics no matter how much he tried any more than Goethe could. The point has been, I think, more effectively made by Northrop in his *Meeting of East and West*, where he made the differentiation between Eastern and Western man in the form that Eastern man was oriented to the aesthetic component, whereas, Western man was oriented to the theoretical component—and the very heart and soul of the theoretical component lies in mathematics itself. Therefore, I insist that if we are to evolve a way to yogic Realization which is indigenous to Western man, the orientation to the mathematical side of consciousness is of prime importance. I am not so much concerned with a transportation of Eastern method to the Western psyche as in evolving a way which is indigenous to the Western psyche itself.

What is man? The scientific world seems generally to hold the view, which is essentially in harmony with the position of Charles Darwin, that man is simply another animal that is developed by the process of evolution whether we regard the methods as those of natural selection, sexual selection, and determinant selection; but in any case, that man is no more than just another animal. But I find serious difficulties in this view, for I see no way that conceptuality could be derived from sensuality, and sensuality, epistemologically considered, is the earmark of the animal. In fact, for survival in this world it would seem that we need no more than what the animal has as a sensual being. Conceptuality, rather, is a mode of cognition of a different, discretely other than the sensual, for the sensual is oriented to the concrete particular while the conceptual is oriented to the universal, as Plato knew so well. No, I would offer another suggestion and that is this: that perhaps in substantial degree the Darwinian view of evolution may have its validities so far as animality alone is concerned, but that when we come to the human being, we have the superposition of another principle—something which descends from above. There is in *The Secret Doctrine* a statement which tends to confirm this, namely, it is the conception of the descent of the *Manasaputra*. The thesis there is that when the animal evolution had reached the point of nascent man, there was a descent of another principle through certain entities that introduced another power of cognition, and this I identified with the conceptual power in man. In other words, conceptuality is the supreme distinguishing mark of man as contrasted to an animal.

In most philosophy, both Eastern and Western, there are only two forms of cognition recognized. This is explicitly true in the case of the Buddhist logicians Dignaga and Dharmakirti. In fact, Dignaga has an aphorism to the effect that there are only two organs, functions, or faculties of cognition, namely, sense and conceptuality. But based upon my own experience, I assert this is inadequate, that when one makes the breakthrough to yogic Realization, there is born a new way of cognition which is neither sensual nor conceptual, and for this I invented the term ‘introceptual’ or ‘introceptuality’. And the governing principle in this form of cognition is “knowledge through identity,” a form of knowledge which one finds also in the philosophy of Sri Aurobindo with a term very similar, namely, in the form “knowledge by identity.” There thus emerges the view of man as a triune being—not a one type of entity, a kind of higher animal and no more, but an animal in his objective physical basis; a man in the sense that he is a conceptual entity; and, third, potentially a divine being, or as I prefer to call it, a nascent Buddha. The completely Awakened man, therefore, in his concrete totality is an animal, a man, and a Buddha. The animal nature is simply his vehicle, his instrument for action and

communication in the physical sense. Essentially, inwardly he is a conceptual entity, and potentially a divine entity or Buddha.

The essential manness in man, as opposed to the animalness in man, is to be found in the function or organ called conceptuality. Now, which is the most important instrument or means for the attainment of the yogic Awakening, the sensuality or the conceptuality? There are those forms of yoga which have emphasized the sensuality, namely, the Zen and the Tantra. In Shankara we find the emergence of the emphasis of the conceptuality. Now, I have no reason to doubt that the emphasis in Zen and in Tantra is or at least can be effective, but are the results the same if the emphasis is placed upon the differentiating characteristic of manness in man? Are they the same in effect? I have some reason to question whether the effect is the same.

The contrast is made most clear by a quotation from John White in an article which was published in the journal, *Fields Within Fields Within Fields*. In this article he said in an italicized sentence, “*As man recovers his animal nature, he becomes God.*”² This arouses in my mind a memory of the primitive peoples, including the Egyptians, who deified animals, who sought that which transcended man through deifying creatures such as crocodiles and other animal entities—something which does not appeal to me at all and does not represent the highest possibility available to man. I hold that the truly royal road by which man can become more than man is by the emphasis of the essential *manness* in man rather than the *animality* in man.

I have already acknowledged in what has gone before that a valid approach to yoga by Western man may be through psychology and psychotherapy. There are, however, two other approaches which are of equal and perhaps of greater importance. These are the philosophic way and the religious way. The philosophic way, I have already discussed in the form that might be called the mathematical-philosophical approach. There remains the religious approach. This is preeminent in the form of yoga known as *Bhakti*, but it is also an essential component in all yogas if they are to be fully effective. And it is concerning this latter element that I wish to close this discussion. Religion, in the yogic sense, is not to be confused with religion as ordinarily conceived as a system of dogma and of rituals and ceremonies. It has nothing to do essentially with formalized religion. It is, rather, religion as an attitude of self-giving, surrender, and acceptance of the mystic death. This is an aspect that is particularly difficult for the academic and scientific mind because of what might be called the “scientific ego.” This is manifested in the habit of trying to reduce to classification processes which are studied, whereas the academician or the scientist stands aloof in something like a superior ego and conceit, and imagines that from the perspective of that ego he can comprehend and classify this somewhat which is called yoga. And so long as such individuals occupy that position, they will be forced to remain outside the sacred precincts, for we come into the very presence of sacredness itself. Self-giving means one renounces this overlord of academic egoism. One must be able to offer up himself on the basis of sheer faith and confidence to something more than himself, even though it may imply his own death. And here I do not mean physical death, which is relatively a small matter, but death of the sovereign ego of the scientist and the academician, which involves an admitting that

² John White, “The Highest State of Consciousness,” *Fields Within Field Within Fields* 5, no. 1 (1972), 70.

this egoistic point of view is incompetent to comprehend what yoga really means. This must die in order to be reborn as the accomplished yogin. There is no other way to achieve the breakthrough. There is no avoidance of faith and confidence if one would know That which transcends all the powers of his present knowing. We can become Buddhas only by dying, though continuing to live.