

Jungian Psychology and Personal Correlations

Part 5 of 7

Franklin Merrell-Wolff

October 1977

There remains to be considered concerning the Jungian psychology the doctrines of wholeness and the subject of fourfoldness. I shall consider the latter first.

In Robert Johnson's essay he emphasizes this point: he criticizes the Christian conception of the Trinity as inadequate, that it leaves out the feminine element—and in this connection the feminine element is treated as an earthy element—that when this element is added we achieve fourfoldness; and he argues for its primacy. I have serious questions here. He says that the threefoldness is incomplete. On the contrary, there are certain elements about it in the mathematical and mechanical sense that would indicate it is preeminently stable and complete.

The first simplest enclosed figure that can exist as a configuration composed of straight lines is the triangle. Now, the triangle has certain very important properties that indicate a very high stability—even primary stability. A triangle is the simplest and most powerful natural brace. It is a stable mechanical figure when it is constructed with physical materials. And, in addition, if one were to build objects like tables or chairs supported on three legs and others supported on four, the three-legged objects are automatically self-supporting. One does not have to be careful in designing the length of the legs to have a material object that rests on all three points. If there are four or more legs, effort must be put forth to see that the length of the legs is contrived to be equal. Four-legged objects do not automatically rest on the base; contriving must be done in order to achieve this stable resting—not so with a three-legged stool or table. Three legs always rest equally on the floor. This would suggest that threeness is automatically stable and has a basic completion, that fourness involves an addition, a construction, superimposed upon a fundamental base.

And another thought from a different angle; if one reads in the Buddhist *Sutras* the words of the Blessed One, over and over again he repeats important conceptions three times, not four, suggesting a recognition by him of something very fundamental in threeness. And then there is another thought, why not six? If one looks at the symbolism characteristic of the Hopis, and as I understand it with many other Indians, they are oriented not alone to the four points of the compass but also to the zenith and the nadir, and there could thus be a significant argument to attach a fundamental value to the conception of sixfoldness—a feature that also applies to the two interlaced equilateral triangles that produce the six-pointed star.

Now, in Theosophy, both the figure involving three and the one involving four, the triangle and the square, are given importance; and the number that results is the number seven. The orientation of the principles in the triangle is as follows: *Atma*, *Buddhi*, *Manas*—the spiritual triad, the fundamental transcendental base. Below this lies

the square consisting of *Kama Manas*, *Kama Rupa*, *Prana*, and *Linga Sharira*, the vehicle of *Prana*. The square represents the mundane, the triangle the Transcendent. Between the top of the square and the lower line of the triangle there is a connecting band called the *antaskarana*. This is between two aspects of the mind. Now, the concepts in this system that are connected with the vital being, the biological, are wholly to be found in the square. They do not arise at all in the transcendent feature of *Atma*, *Buddhi*, *Manas*. This is a figure that talks to me; but it implies that most fundamental of all is the threeness, and reflected below is the fourness that renders it manifest. Granted, therefore, that four is necessary for manifestation. I have employed it in my mandala, and in the *ashram* that I built up in the mountains which consists of the form of a balanced cross representing the principle of equilibrium as the most fundamental law of all.

I shall next proceed to a discussion of the principle of wholeness as developed by Dr. Jung and by Robert Johnson in his essay. Wholeness here represents the ideal to which the individual is supposed to orient himself as contrasted to the ideal of goodness and of perfection. I have yet to find a clear definition as to how the conception of wholeness is to be understood in analytic psychology. I shall therefore present views of it which I would regard as acceptable and views of it that I would thoroughly reject, as an effort to draw forth a clearness of definition with respect to this conception.

Now, if we are to take it in this particular sense, that all elements whatsoever, every member of every pair of opposites has an equal *factuality*, I would agree with that conception as valid; but, if it implies that one takes the same orientation to each member of a pair of opposites and takes the position of *equal acceptance* in the same sense with respect to each pair of opposites, I would find this position very questionable indeed. Consider these three negative elements: lust, falsity, murder. Does wholeness imply that one accepts into himself performance in these terms equally as in terms of the performance of their opposites, namely, purity, truth, and life preservation? If so, I could not accept such an attitude towards wholeness. They would involve essentially a contradiction, an incompatibility, a deep obnoxious irrationality. To be sure, I can recognize the factuality of lust, falsity, and murder in the whole of human experience, but I would never take the same attitude towards these three elements as I would towards the opposites. I could recognize the fact that each individual is part and parcel with the whole that is in the universe; that each individual, in a certain sense, shares in the guilt of mankind as well as in the virtue of mankind; that we cannot exclude one side and the responsibility for it while accepting the other side. Yes, in that sense, I, too, recognize that I am guilty with the guilty though at the same time share in the virtue of the virtuous. But in the effort to mold the consciousness and the action and volition in a directedness, I certainly would take and proclaim a difference in attitude towards the positive and negative sides. Yes, one may well accept the guilt of lust, falsity, and murder, to the end that it may be transformed, but not as continued in its own direction. The attitude towards the opposites of purity, of truthfulness, and of life preservation would be one of full acceptance in the sense of their directedness.

There is a deep problem here. What is the place of morality? Wholeness seems to be a therapeutic ideal. Morality seems to be an orientation to virtue. That is a moral ideal. Is the wholeness point of view essentially the prejudice of the doctor? Are we to reject or put into a subordinate position the standpoint of the moralist? This is a grave question.

I might give an example drawn out of my own experience involving the facing of an issue of this kind. This was during the First World War. I was a draftee. I complied with the orders requiring me to report at a military installation. I was required to live in barracks and to go through the disciplines imposed by the military education. Now, the military education, or conditioning, was to the end of making the individual into an efficient killer. The experience in the barracks was one of immersion into massive psychical pollution. What attitude should one take toward these things? My personal feeling was one of total rejection of both elements. This was a moral crisis in my experience. My initial attitude towards the whole event was one of rejection; to take the path of the non-killer, the non-relationship to psychical pollution; to do so even though the penalty were incarceration or execution. But I received from a lofty source this instruction: it started with words originally given to us by Christ as represented in the *New Testament*, “Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar’s, but render unto God the things that are God’s.

And here I would like to introduce a footnote. As the term ‘God’ and ‘Caesar’ are used here, they are to be understood in a psychological sense. It is God as the God image in the psyche. It does not imply a metaphysical attitude or a metaphysical determination that a divine being exists as a person in the metaphysical sense, and I would that my Buddhist friends would bear this in mind. I am not rejecting their position of non-theism. I’m dealing only here with these terms in a psychological sense. End of footnote.

This was to me a command from on high. The command was not to render unto God all, but to render unto Caesar, also, that which was Caesar’s. Caesar represented the command to prepare to become a killer, and God’s command was, “Thou shalt not kill.” The instruction said that if these two commands came into conflict, it would seem that God’s command would take priority. I interpret this in practice as an effort to comply with the command of Caesar insofar as I could without knowingly killing anyone. I decided that if I faced the command to kill, I would reject it even though the price would be incarceration or execution, but otherwise I would conform with Caesar’s command. But this introduced a struggle, for anything I did in compliance with Caesar’s command involved contribution to the order to kill even though I myself did not pull the trigger. Therefore, in everything I did, I was involved in guilt which I could not avoid. I tried to carry out my orders consistently and to the best of my ability. And from a certain communication received from my captain at the end, it seemed that I did so very well. But to me it was done at the price of guilt. The experience has never been retrospectively a happy one.

Now, this may be an example of the problem presented by the effort to attain wholeness. There are other instructions to be found in Buddhist literature that would imply that one must not, or should not, give all to the Transcendent Realization, but that he should also render service to the mundane order, that which in the broad sense is symbolized by Caesar. This is expressed in the Kwan-Yin vow and in the Great Renunciation enunciated in *The Voice of the Silence*, a Buddhist *Sutra*. This means that between the purity of the Transcendent and the impurity of the mundane one should take a stand that excludes neither one; and this does seem to be an application of the principle of wholeness when considered in the psychological sense. But it does not mean, as given by the Buddhists, that one should accept and approve of the tendencies in the mundane

unselectively, but rather to accept them to effect their transformation. If one's relationship to the dark and evil sides to be found in the world is that of acceptance for the purpose of transformation, then I would go along with that. But if it means acceptance in the sense in which they are oriented and implies that one should cultivate these dark elements and perform in terms of them, no, I would reject that interpretation of wholeness. I wish that the proponents of the wholistic psychologies would clarify themselves upon this question.

In the forward to Dr. Lilly's volume, *The Center of the Cyclone* there is a quotation from G. Spencer Brown. In this quotation there is a reference to a certain prominent but unnamed psychiatrist who said that if given the chance he would have submitted Sir Isaac Newton to electric shock treatment. The thought arises in me, what did this psychiatrist have against Sir Isaac Newton? What would he have done if he could have dealt with Gautama Buddha or Sri Shankaracharya?

What was Sir Isaac Newton? He was, first, a superb physicist; and, then, perhaps an even more superb mathematician; and finally, a man oriented to depth religion. I have read an article by someone in which it was stated there have been several first magnitude stars that have arisen in the scientific world, but when Sir Isaac Newton arrived, it was the sun that eclipsed all stars since the time of Pythagoras. In dealing with his physical problem connected with the organization of the universe reaching from the ordinary levels of physical relationships in this world to the relationships connecting the stars, he dealt with a problem for which there did not then exist the necessary mathematical tool; so he produced a new mathematical discipline—one of the most important in the whole domain of science, namely, the differential and integral calculus. This was also produced in terms that were easier to handle by Leibniz at about the same time independently.

Now, here we have a mind of more than stellar magnitude. We have a contribution that has affected our thinking concerning the physical universe ever since. There has been, it is true, a modification of the Newtonian relativity in our own time as presented in the work of Einstein; but Einstein, in his own statement, indicated that he viewed his work as simply an additional step. He used the figure of a series of approximations where his own contribution was merely a second term, while Newton furnished the first term upon which the whole series was based. And he indicated that there may be other terms in the future as our knowledge grows. But Einstein was a physicist who applied the mathematics that existed and even used the aid of a mathematician along with his own work. Newton, on the other hand, produced the mathematics that was necessary for the handling of the problems before him. Bell, in his biographical treatment of the leading mathematicians of the world, has listed Newton among the three greatest along with Archimedes and Gauss. Here we have an intelligence of supreme magnitude, and our psychiatrist wanted to give him electric shock treatment. Why?

No doubt, Newton had his eccentricities. In point of fact, all, or nearly all, stellar minds manifest behavior that is eccentric from the standpoint of the philistine. There is a story told, for instance, that once a friend came to see young Newton during the days of his greatest creativity. The sister of Newton, who was caring for his outer needs at the time, took the visitor into the dining room where a breakfast was upon the table. She said her brother would come down eventually. The visitor, it is said, began to get hungry and

nibbled at the breakfast and then a little more until he finally ate the whole of it. Then in due course Sir Isaac came down. He nodded to his friend and then turned to his breakfast, noted the empty dishes, and remarked, "I thought I had not eaten this morning, but I see I must have." Now, no philistine would be guilty of such an error. No doubt, there were other erratic elements of behavior. Is this any reason why a man should be subjected to electric shock treatment?

The fact is that we're dealing with two very different levels of consciousness. There is a consciousness that is oriented to the mundane—all the ordinary relationships of this world; and there is a consciousness that soars above this into the supermundane. The latter, I would liken unto the eagle, who flies higher than all other birds, it is said, and has the keenest sight of all. And I'd like to liken the mundane orientation to a crow, who is quite raucous and mischievous. Now, between these two kinds of consciousness there is an inharmonious relationship. To orient to the one consciousness or the other in its purity may be rather clear cut and essentially simple, but in the contact between these two types of consciousness there are many difficulties. The eagle consciousness tends to soar on high. The crow consciousness tends to be wholly mundane.

Now, if one is acquainted with the soaring of the eagle consciousness, he is well aware that it tends to render less effective his functioning on the level of the crow consciousness. That is a problem that involves some difficulties. But because it involves difficulties, is that any reason for despising the soaring eagle consciousness? These difficulties may be in the form of psychological difficulties. Because those difficulties exist, is that a reason for condemning the soaring consciousness? No, emphatically no. If there had never been those with soaring consciousness in this world, there could be nothing but perdition for those who dwell here. All our hope rests upon the presence of those who can soar in consciousness. What does it matter, therefore, that there should be problems of psychological adjustment? That is a small price to pay for the wealth brought to us by the soaring consciousness. One who soars may at time need help, but would the analytic psychologist destroy the soaring consciousness to produce simply another philistine? I do not envisage as the ideal before us the well-rounded mediocrity. No doubt, well-rounded mediocrity has no psychological problem; but, on the other hand, well-rounded mediocrity brings no wealth of consciousness—only a movement in the domain of the infinitely small and mediocre. We depend upon the soaring consciousness, the consciousness of a Buddha, a Shankara, or a Christ, and of some others, for all the hope that exists in this world. Would the psychiatrist destroy this? Indeed, there is the very irritation of a psychological conflict may play an important part in rendering the work of a soaring consciousness possible. It is a small price to pay for the wealth that that consciousness brings to us.

If the wholistic idea implies that consciousness should not soar, that we should live only on the level of mediocrity and smallness, then it is a pernicious idea. No doubt it is difficult to soar and crawl at the same time, perhaps impossible, but then these two modes of consciousness may be entered into alternatively—to soar in the heights at certain times and then descend to the problems of the mundane order when that is necessary; but, to cut off the soaring is equivalent to the destruction of all hope.

I know that separated from us by a thin but opaque veil there is a domain of absolute perfection. Here harmony rules, here abides unsullied beauty, a delight unbroken

by any grief, and a radiant wisdom that shines over all. I know that to enter here is the supernal experience; but I also know that it is possible to return and endure the hurt of the mundane. Ever it remains possible to return to that supernal region. Always it is possible to deal with the mundane order. No doubt this involves psychological difficulties, but they can be mastered. For the Realization of that supernal domain no price is too high. It is worth all that it may cost and infinitely more. He who knows this domain knows that behind all the problems of this life here below there is a resolution that is completely satisfactory. But that resolution cannot be attained in the mundane order. If the mundane order were all that there is, then death in the absolute sense would be preferable. I know that our psychotherapists have rendered much needed aid to those with crippled consciousness, and to them all honor for this service; but also when some of them assert that the consciousness of the caterpillar is all that there is and that there is no butterfly, they render the greatest disservice possible to mankind.

That there is something more than the normal relationship between doctor and patient involved in this issue between the unnamed psychiatrist and Sir Isaac Newton may be brought out by a reference to an experience of my own when once associated with a psychotherapist in a certain public work. Those who took part in this public work were required first to go through an analysis. In my own experience of this analysis, at a certain point, the therapist made this pronouncement: that we should reject judgment and conclusion though retaining decision. This aroused in me a definite resistance. What seems to be implied here is that the psychiatrist wished to impose, or sought to impose, upon the one he was analyzing his own prejudice as to the psychological process by which one acts.

What is involved in judgment and conclusion? It is a process that is very characteristic of all mathematical thinking. A theorem is proven and that develops a conclusion. When the theorem is proven we have a foundation stone for further thought or for specific application. The proof of a theorem winds up traditionally, in Euclidean geometry, with a QED; that is emphatically a conclusion. And judgment is involved in any situation where you make a determination that so and so is the case. In my own psychological process, the main work is a thinking through of a situation and forming a judgment, and then a conclusion, which most commonly is tentative—not final. In the light of that conclusion, if there is a question of action, then I make the appropriate decision guided by the conclusion. If we then conceive of the possibility of a process of arriving at decision without passing through judgment and conclusion, then we would look for a psychological type orientation. And I can see how this might arise if the individual was, say, an intuitive type with very minor correlation with one or the other of the judgment functions. In other words, in this case, we might have the step from intuition to decision, and the corresponding action, without passing through a judging and concluding process. What the analyst was doing, in effect, was to try to impose upon the one analyzed a process which was akin to his own. This position I rejected. I have always used the method of thinking out any problem first of all, forming from the material that was produced in the thinking process—forming a judgment, and then arriving at least at a tentative conclusion, which, if this was to be applied to an existent empiric problem, led in that case to a decision. I have rejected the process of moving from sheer impulse to decision as being essentially unsound. I have observed individuals who operate in this way, and while at times they may arrive at an action that is valid and works out soundly,

they often leap to false positions, and as Keyserling has pointed out, they are in an unfavorable state for the recovery from that untenable position. They do not know how they arrived there and therefore are not in a position to retreat. I hold that every individual has a right to his own typical psychological organization. He has a right to move in terms of the process that he has found effective. I do employ judgment and value it as a major function. Judgment is essential to thinking, and I base conclusion upon that judgment, and apply it to a decision for action subsequently. I avoid impulsive action or impulsive decision. I thoroughly distrust it.

This experience gives me a key, I think, to what was the real issue between the unnamed psychiatrist and Sir Isaac Newton. It is a contrast in psychological process characteristic of the two individuals. The mathematician par excellence is represented by Sir Isaac Newton. The psychiatrist represented the psychology of the psychologist. We have here the impact between two contrasting individual psychologies with an element of adversaryism—an element of real hostility on the part of the psychotherapist.

Now, this is something I have indicated throughout this tape in several different references. Remember these various points: first of all, that Dr. Carl G. Jung never could understand mathematical thinking, as he stated in his own biography, and that he revealed a certain hostility to it; secondly, my own experience as a student of mathematics primarily with a secondary subject called psychology, and my experience of a certain hostility between the two states of consciousness in the mathematical department and in the psychological department; and here in this case between Sir Isaac Newton and the psychiatrist, the same attitude recurs again. What we have to admit is that in the typical practicing psychologist or psychiatrist there is a type of psychology, of individual psychology, that differentiates them from other individuals. And in the case of the mathematician we have another kind of psychology, and there is a tendency towards an adversary relationship between the two. This unnamed psychiatrist was trespassing beyond the domain that was proper to his functioning. I would not trust any psychologist or psychiatrist unless he himself had had the experience of Awakening, as was true in the case of Maurice Bucke who wrote *Cosmic Consciousness* and had beforehand the experience of the Brahmic Light that led to his research over 25 years to produce that volume. There is a blind spot or a blinding veil hiding the ordinary psychiatrist and psychologist from an understanding of that mode of functioning which is preeminent in the thinking of the mathematician as a type. Perhaps our psychologists need to be subjected to psychoanalysis themselves.

It seems appropriate at this time to say something about intuition. It would appear that the psychotherapist, in order to be a good psychotherapist, must have the intuitive function reasonably well developed in his psychological constitution so that he can read into the patient and determine his needs. One who lacks this would work more or less by rote and tend to fail in truly understanding his patient. This, therefore, is a very important function in these relationships. But intuition is a psychological function. It is not infallibility. This distinction is very important since there is a tendency for the intuitive to speak and act as though he was moving on a basis of infallibility. Just as there is a false kind of reasoning as well as a sound kind of reasoning, there is a false kind of intuition as well as an authentic kind of intuition. A critique of intuition in the same way as Kant made a critique of pure reason would be very helpful for us. The intuitive tends to speak

as though his judgment was infallible; and yet, if one observes intuitives, they are not infallible, at least not so in the cases of those that we meet in this world commonly.

Aurobindo has discussed the subject of intuition at some length. He makes the point that it tends to illuminate a limited field very clearly and sharply; another intuition illuminates another field as clearly and sharply. These may lead to categorical pronouncements which when considered together involve contradictions. A relative judgment concerning the two intuitions could reconcile these apparent incompatibilities; but when they're given as categorical judgments or statements, they may very well involve a radical contradiction. This is the problem that besets the intuitive who is not sufficiently trained in terms of a judgmental function. Aurobindo has noted this fact, but he recommends that instead of using the ordinary trained reasoning capacity for a checking of these intuitions, there's another method that would be more appropriate, that is to wait, in the case of a series of intuitions that are illuminating each one a limited zone, until another kind of intuition comes in that carries the capacity for relationship valuation. In other words, carries the function which is ordinarily represented by our logic. In other words, there is such a thing as a logical-like intuition that handles the problem of relationship. However, if one does not have this particular kind of intuition his resort is to use the corrective power of our well-known, well-corrected and disciplined reasoning for the corrective.

Another characteristic of the intuitive function which I've noted in the observation of intuitives is that in a given individual the intuitive function may be well developed in one specific direction but not in others. Thus an individual may have a capacity for an intuitive perception of the problems of a given human being and have ability to render real aid in handling those problems of human beings, yet may not have that function effective in the field of ideation. There is also the intuition that mathematicians have, and a mathematician may have the strong intuition that a certain theorem exists before he has developed a proof of that theorem. He certainly would not attempt to publish the theorem on the basis of the intuition alone, but only when he has developed the proof. Or again, there is such a thing as an intuition for geographic relationships where one may go in the nighttime to a certain objective that he has never been at before and yet go with assurance to that objective. Thus there seems to be something like a specialization in the intuitive function. Mostly we have instances of intuition in unperfected forms. There may very well be such a thing as training in the use of intuition so that the imperfections are removed from its manifestation; but as we commonly experience the use of this function, it is in its imperfect form.

That is enough, I think, for the present purposes.