

Jungian Psychology and Personal Correlations

Part 2 of 7

Franklin Merrell-Wolff
September 1977

In Theosophical literature, as well as other sources of Oriental origin, there is to be found a division of the states of consciousness or being that are six or seven in number. There is our ordinary, waking consciousness, which we may call a surface consciousness; below this, the dreaming consciousness, which involves a departure from the waking consciousness. He who dreams may find that he has no memory of the fact that he has a waking consciousness while he is in the dream. Beneath this, there is the consciousness as dreamless sleep; then still deeper, a fourth consciousness which is called the *Turia*, which means fourth; and beyond this the consciousness of *Nirvana* or *Moksha*. Then we have a still further state which is called *Paranirvana*, which is not the same as *Nirvana* at all; and in some literature one finds a reference to a state which has been called *Mahaparanirvana*. This would give us, altogether, seven states.

Now, the depth psychology, as I know it in what I have read, seems to deal almost entirely with the dreaming sleep level of consciousness and the information that may be derived from that. All the rest belongs to the field of yoga carried on to various degrees of depth, and as I've said before, here the state that corresponds to these experiences or imperiences¹ is that of trance of various degrees of depth rather than something related to the dream of ordinary sleep.

Now, it's interesting that Shankara in the *Crest Jewel* makes a very important reference to the meaning of dreamless sleep. He says that he who is in dreamless sleep experiences the consciousness of Brahman. Now, to carry forth the awareness of consciousness without content, which would be the meaning of dreamless sleep, is difficult. To be conscious of consciousness when there is no content is an advanced achievement. It calls for very acute subtlety. Ordinarily we are aware of the fact of our consciousness by the content of the consciousness rather than by the awareness of the consciousness of the consciousness. It is this subtle awareness that would be the consciousness of Brahman; Brahman being a state of consciousness where there is no content. But on the other hand, these deeper states of consciousness may very well *permit* contents. But the contents would not be a delineation of an environment that's already given as something into which we appear to be born or to which we awaken when we come out of sleep as something already existing here, as something which conditions our life practices; but rather, the content in a state which is normally without content would

¹ For the definition of 'imperience', see audio recordings "General Discourse on the Subject of My Philosophy," part 10, and "On My Philosophy: Extemporaneous Statement." In speaking of introceptual knowledge, Wolff says, "The third function therefore gives you imperience, not experience. It is akin to sense perception in the sense of being immediate, but is not sensuous."

be self-projected and deliberately so done. So we may say of these deeper states, they are essentially states without content, but which may permit contents.

In what state is an individual here who succeeds in penetrating into something of these deeper states beyond our ordinary name and form? Analyzing the consciousness, it would seem that such a one would be in a state in which he is not fully awake nor fully asleep, but in some way participates in the two levels so that it is a waking-sleeping state—consciousness not fully extraverted nor fully introverted.

I might illustrate some of this inward penetration by giving an example of a type of experience which I have known. This experience had the following form: first, there was a sense of flowage; the nature of the flowage was cognition but it was non-sensuous and non-conceptual—did not agree with any of the forms of either our sensuous or conceptual cognitions, but just a sense of flowage in consciousness. Then it proceeded to go through a process analogous to that of crystallization in which pure flowage became fixed in crystalline form. This crystalline form was like a mass of crystals with multiple meanings at the same time which were as yet not conceptually articulate, but approaching the state of becoming nearer to the possibility of conceptual articulation. To formulate from this required a selection of a particular type of crystallization which could be produced in a linear form such as is necessary for our typical mode of expression on this plane.

To illustrate this I can employ a figure from geology. When a magma from the depths of the earth penetrates upward into the layers of more or less firm rock it is in its initial state liquid, but as it forms in a cavity in the rock structure of a mantle it begins to cool; and as it cools, the different component mineral entities in it begin to aggregate and grow as crystals. If the process is carried through completely, you will have a rock which is completely crystalline. This is what is meant by the granitoid rocks. But intermediate between the fluidic state and the fully crystallized state there is a state of partial crystallization which may be produced if cooling process is too rapid, and we have what are known as the porphyries, where part of the material is crystallized and part of it is frozen in an amorphous form. If there is a cooling that is very rapid, the initial fluid material may freeze without any crystallization and this is known as volcanic glass.

Now, if a seer was aware of this process only in part so that he was aware of what might be called the porphyritic stage, he would realize a limited crystallization and he might tend very well to produce a formulation based upon a limited ideation; and it is very probable that many of our imperfect religious outlooks are based upon that imperfect ideation. But if the process is completely developed 'til we get the condition of full articulation in the form of crystallization, we have a massed ideation. This is the sort of state that Aurobindo identifies with the “overmind,” which is the directive principle in the production of a cosmos.

Now, bear in mind I'm using a figure to express a process which in reality is neither sensational nor conceptual, but I have to use either sensational images or conceptual symbols to convey the essential idea that actually takes place in a deep part of the consciousness. Now, here we have many stages of depth. What is it that concerns analytic psychology? It appears to be almost wholly the dream consciousness which predominantly arises from the subconscious and may be occasionally colored by the

subliminal. The higher levels belong not to dream, nor to information that comes out of sleep, but to the information that comes out from some degree of trance consciousness which is the means of developing those levels that lie beyond the dream. The dream seems to be most concerned with the development of man as a whole as a biological entity, and not with man who is oriented to the principle of Light, as Aurobindo identified “Light” as the keyword of the superconscient.²

In summation of this discussion of the concept of the unconscious, I wish to make the following points: first, I have interpreted the term ‘unconscious’ in the blanket sense comprehending not only that which is subconscient, but the whole range of the subliminal and the superconscient as conceived by Sri Aurobindo. Is this the sense in which Dr. Jung understood the term? Some lines of evidence points to an affirmative answer, but other lines of evidence indicate a negative answer; and I am therefore forced to the conclusion that I may be using the term in a somewhat different sense from the meaning which he attached to it. There is plenty of evidence that analytic psychology as we know it, including not only Dr. Jung but the other analytic psychologists who are oriented to a different system, is a concept coextensive with the concept of life, and that brings in a very definite limitation. And it renders necessary a discussion which will reveal the sense in which I understand and use the concepts of life and the concepts of consciousness.

If we turn to the system of the *Taraka* yoga, the lowest *Upadhi* is said to consist of *Prana*, or the life principle, *Linga Sharira*, or the astral body, which is to be understood as the vehicle of life, and the gross physical body. In the strictest sense, the concept ‘life’ covers this *Upadhi*—quite obviously. That would mean it covers everything that touches the physical body up to its death and on beyond to a second death involving the *Linga Sharira*, or astral body. The next higher *Upadhi* is said to consist of the principle of *Kama*, or desire, and the principle of *Kama Manas*. Here we have something that could well fall within the range of the concept of life, and yet it has elements that tend to reach beyond the limits of that conception. Desire, as such, all craving is indeed vital, but there is a higher meaning attached to the word *Kama* which is that of the basis of compassion which may very well go beyond the connotation and denotation of the conception of life. And there’s the conception of *Manas*, but in this form it is *Manas* either in the sense of a mentation that is guided by desire, and therefore embraced in the concept of wishful thinking, and also of *Manas* in the sense of the sense-mind, that is, as the ruler of the senses.

Now, there is an intimate interrelationship between life and the sensuous being so that in this sense we have the concept ‘life’ including an aspect of the mental principle, or *Manas*. But there is something here that tends to reach beyond, and so I would view this *Upadhi* as occupying an intermediate position as a sort of *antaskarana*, or connecting principle, between that which properly belongs to the domain of life and that which transcends the domain of life. When we come to the principle of the *Karanopadhi*, or *Buddhi*, or that which is called the pure intellectual mind, we have something that falls outside of the concept of life. *Atma-Buddhi* is more than life, but it is not more than consciousness in the root sense of consciousness such as Universal Consciousness, Absolute Consciousness, *Rig-pa*, or as Consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-

² See the audio recording, “Jungian Psychology and Personal Correlations,” part 1.

subject. Thus, I submit that the concept ‘consciousness’ has a greater connotation and denotation than the concept ‘life’. If analytic psychology is strictly oriented to the limitations imposed by the concept of life or biology, then the unconscious in that case and used in that sense is not a blanket term, an all-inclusive term, but belongs to a restricted domain; and that domain, I submit, is the domain of the mundane and not of the supermundane, the transcendent, or the truly metaphysical.

In reading Dr. Jung, I have found that the vast mass of his material is oriented to the needs of the man in the world, not to the yogin who is seeking Liberation; although, there are points at which Dr. Jung skirts this deeper domain. But I do not find that he authentically enters into it so that he could be classed as a yogin, but rather as one who has reached the court in front of that passage which is called the path to the transcendent. In this case the material of analytic psychology in relationship to the unconscious dwells with the problems of human beings as a whole, but not with the problems of him who has stepped into the stream *Strotapatti*.³ There is no doubt that which may be called a psychology in this connection, but I suggest that it should be called “meta-psychology” and is such that only a qualified adept could delineate its nature.

He who enters the path goes essentially the ascetic way and the essential meaning of the ascetic way is that he aims to overcome the imperative command of life in its various manifestations so that the impulses, the desires, the claims, and the demands that are essentially vital shall not rule him, but shall come under his command and that a higher principle shall govern henceforth. This does not mean the deliberate destruction of the physical and vital instruments. It does mean that they are reduced to instruments under his command. He thinks of the empiric entity not as himself but as his instrument, as something like his vehicle. And in the end, when command has been attained, when the compulsions of the vital nature have been brought under control and tamed, he then may render unto that nature the privilege of continuing as a servant of him, but most emphatically as not himself. Bear this point in mind: henceforth, all that which is subsumed under the conception of life becomes instrument—not lord.

All of this implies that that which is meant by biological psychology covers only a part of the total domain of the developing consciousness; that consciousness in its higher reaches does not fall within the comprehension of this conception of the collective unconscious. It transcends myth as well as craving. The *Atman*, with his prime minister the *Buddhi*, reign supreme over all that lies below.

The second point in connection with this summation is embraced in the question: is the conception of the collective unconscious ultimately adequate or is it a conception that is valid only from the perspective of a limited point of view? Let an individual proceed but a few thousand miles from the earth in a direction parallel to the axis of rotation and he will experience no more the alternation between light and darkness—the sun will shine, giving light continuously. Now, in our general symbolism, light is always

³ H.P. Blavatsky, *The Voice of the Silence* (Los Angeles: The Theosophy Company, 1928), 40.

Strotapatti or “he who enters in the stream” of Nirvana, unless he reaches the goal owing to some exceptional reasons, can rarely attain Nirvana in one birth. Usually a Chela is said to begin the ascending effort in one life and end or reach it only in his seventh succeeding birth.

a symbol of consciousness, darkness a symbol of unconsciousness. For him who dwells upon the earth there is a continual alternation between day and night, between light and darkness. Thus the light would represent the state of our surface consciousness and the darkness represent the unconscious aspect into which we enter during sleep. Yet, at the same time, the sun shines continuously, and the sun is the source of our light.

Here we have the distinction that is represented very well, I think, by the shift from the Ptolemaic conception to the Copernican conception in astronomy. The old Ptolemaic conception viewed the planetary universe from the perspective of the earth, and from that perspective the sun seemed to rise and to set, and the planets did not move in elliptic orbits around the sun but seemed to move in complex epi-epicycloid curves; and the total picture became very complex indeed. But when Copernicus made the shift from the base of reference of the earth to that of the sun and of the orbit of the earth, then everything became simplified. The sun did not rise or set but shone continuously, and the orbits of the planets appeared as relatively simple modified elliptic curves; and this opened the door to a rich development in astronomy.

The same thing has happened essentially in the history of philosophy. Immanuel Kant brought a step which might be called a Copernican shift in the way of viewing our consciousness. The earlier position analogous to that of the orientation of Ptolemy dealt essentially with the objective order, that which I have called the object in consciousness. But this led to certain problems which I have delineated elsewhere,⁴ and the resolution of these problems was achieved by Immanuel Kant through shifting to that which is conscious rather than to the content of the consciousness; and this led to a rich expansion in philosophic understanding.

Now, what I'm suggesting is that in the field of psychology a corresponding shift is possible. The standpoint of our present therapeutic psychology, including all that's meant by analytic psychology, may be said to stand on the level of the Ptolemaic perspective; and from that perspective it would appear that the sun of consciousness rises and sets and that in its place there is an unconscious even though the sun shines continuously. From the Copernican point of view, we take the standpoint of the sun, and there light is continuous. In other words, consciousness is viewed as never ceasing, and that there is no real unconscious, but only movement from plane to plane of consciousness. If we view our problems from this point of view, we may abandon the concept of a collective unconscious completely and approach the problem of the psychic life of man from a different perspective.

When one moves from one plane of consciousness to another, the effect is such that the plane just left seems to be unreal and the new consciousness from the achieved plane is all that ever was real. The seeming unreal is analogous to viewing the contents of the earlier plane as being unconscious, but, in point of fact, from the perspective of that plane there is no unconscious whatsoever, but only a different way of consciousness. We move from plane to plane by this process, and all we ever deal with is consciousness in a different form or organized on a different plan of organization.

⁴ See the audio recording, "Mathematics, Philosophy, and Yoga," part 3.

Another way of viewing this is to take the two perspectives of the empiric man in the world, on one hand, and of the transcendental component, on the other.

Here I put in a footnote. See my discussion of the transcendental component on another tape.⁵ End of footnote.

From the perspective of the empiric man, we have that point of view which corresponds to the Ptolemaic point of view; from that perspective, there is the experience of consciousness on the surface and of an unconscious psychic mass which influences from the depths. But from the perspective of the transcendental component, all is Light—all is consciousness. From the latter perspective, all myths fail and mathematics takes their place. I shall discuss the office of mathematics more, later.

This completes our discussion of the Jungian postulate of the collective unconscious. We shall next proceed to the discussion of the postulate concerning psychological types.

⁵ See the audio recording, “Purpose, Method, and Policy of this Work,” part 6.