

# On the Psychology of Masculine and Feminine Attitudes

Franklin Merrell-Wolff  
June 2, 1980

This is a dialogue between Rao and myself.<sup>1</sup>

Franklin: This morning I have been thinking, or rather thought came into me, concerning different subjects. One of these was concerned with the event that apparently took place in the fifteenth century B.C. where there seems to have been a destruction of the women who were carrying the wisdom of the feminine side. Now, this thought has come to me: first, that there should be a checking as to the factuality of this event; second, that here we're dealing with something touching the culture related to the Mediterranean area which would influence the development of European culture and the Western culture generally. But, there remains a lot—another portion of the world, a very large portion, that is not connected with this culture, namely that of India and that of China, also the processes that may have taken place in Africa and in the Americas at that early time. Therefore, if there is a distortion in the relationship between man and woman as a result of the event in the fifteenth century B.C., it would seem to apply to the development of European and Western culture, but not necessarily affecting these other cultures.

Therefore, if we were to face the problem in its broad sense to determine what is the natural undistorted relationship between the psyches of man and woman, we could spread out and find what remains common in all of these elements—and undistorted—and we might even go down to the relationships that exist in the animal kingdom. And here we do find some variance; as for instance in the case of the lion and the elephant. The lion seems to have a patriarchal system; the elephant a matriarchal system.

Rao: To answer the first question about the authenticity of it, this information I got from a seminar conducted by Joseph Campbell earlier this year. And Joseph Campbell is certainly an authority on the subject. Just where he got his information—he is a scholar, he is not an intuitive—to my knowledge. He is very much a scholar, and he puts these events at the same time of the eruption of the volcano [on the island of Santorini], in the Aegean Sea in the year 1480 B.C., which produced a tidal wave that was said to be 900 feet high.<sup>2</sup> Now, there's an interesting aspect of this, that there's a series of islands—and I have not looked at a map, it would be interesting to do so—but there are a series of islands in the Aegean called the Cyclades. And the people on the Cyclades [have] vanished. No one knows what happened to them, at least to my knowledge. However, some of their statuary has remained. Pablo Picasso is to have said that they are truly magical figures. Some of them are very tiny. He collected them. Almost all of the figures are female, they are very stylized. And I am told that near the

---

<sup>1</sup> Rao Garabedian was Wolff's caretaker at the time.

<sup>2</sup> Rao is referring to the eruption of Thera on the island of Santorini, which is now dated to approximately 1650 B.C..

*ashrama* there is a head that you have, or a stone—something stone—that is the same shape as the Cyclades statuary. Now, this statuary—the women are all, without exception, in the position of folded arms like this. Joseph Campbell interprets the folded arms on the female figure as representing the complete goddess. So this, evidently, looks as though it would be also a matriarchal society that would have been destroyed by this 900 foot tidal wave.

So that's one thing to consider. The second, he claims—I shouldn't say "he claims" [but rather] his investigations show that the Indo-European males, with the invention of the wheel and of the chariot—the use of the wheel in the chariot—from the north, from the area of the Black Sea (the area between the Caspian Sea and the Black Sea) is the area where bronze was first discovered. They went there and instead of gathering bronze to make agricultural tools—which until this time was what bronze had been used for—they fashioned weapons. And in their chariots they proceeded south.

The Semitic people, at the same time, discovered the riding of camels. And they came from the south, the other way, converging upon the area around the Aegean, which was matriarchal. Now, in this matriarchal society, evidently, the women had the power. There was no question—simply by their very nature of producing offspring.

Franklin: They have a natural advantage there if they wanted to use it.

Rao: That's right. And they did all the planting because when the woman plants the seed, it is her energy that makes it grow, which, of course, is borne out by the myth of Demeter, which is the earth mother.

Franklin: Yeah.

Rao: And this practice—I know from hearsay of a personal friend who was born in 1891 in Dayton, Ohio; that when she was a child it was seen that she had certain powers and certain gifts, and when it was—she lived on a farm—and when they would plant, they would make her take the seed and they would make her plant—not because they needed the work so much, although they needed that, but —because she had the power to make things grow. So, that kind of wisdom has been carried down through the ages.

Now, the men, in order to protect themselves, and in order to establish their own identity within the system of nature, formed secret societies. But they were trying to get power, whereas the women naturally had it. So when these invaders arrived, they killed the old women—old was probably 40—who had the power that had been passed down from generation to generation, and the younger women were brought up in ignorance.

Now, he showed some interesting statuary of that time where the feminine figures—for instance, the sun was considered to be a feminine deity and the moon a masculine deity. The moon, it was said, would die into the sun every month. It was like the male going into the female and then being reborn from her—this was their orientation. After the invasion, the men decided that the sun being such a powerful force would be masculine. So they turned it around and they made the sun masculine and the moon feminine. Now, there are only two societies that I know of—and there may be more in so-called primitive cultures I don't know about—who have sustained in their language the sun as being feminine and the moon as masculine (or certainly the sun as

feminine) and that is in the German language the sun is feminine and in the Japanese the sun is feminine.

Franklin: I see. Now, there is a point I bring up here: ordinarily in symbolism masculine force is identified with fire and feminine force with water and this seemed to reverse that.

Rao: That seems to be the case. That definitely seems to be the case. As I recall also—I don't have my notes here with me, I have them down at the other house—there also was a symbol that was said to be the neck of the goddess. When the masculine took over, they said that very same symbol was masculine and the pillar of the universe.

So there are various—and I believe that this—it continues with the taking—I wish I had my notes with me—because [of] the taking of the feminine symbol and transforming it into the masculine symbol. And women have never been the same since, certainly.

Franklin: In a talk with Senior, who said his last incarnation was in Poseidonis—that is the land referred to in Plato's Timaeus as lying west of the Pillars of Hercules and which sunk on the order of 10,000 years ago—in one occasion, speaking of some of their customs, said that the man alone was permitted to start a fire, and such might be started in their houses. A woman could take fire from that fire to light other places, but not to start it, because of [the] identification of the masculine principle with fire. And, of course, the feminine with water. What, correspondingly, was restricted to women? I didn't think to ask that question. The thought arises that they had charge of the waterworks.

Rao: Yes, they did. But you see it also is true, though, that it was the female who was the keeper of the fire. The vestal virgins—

Franklin: I know. Yes, I know that's true.

Rao: [They] were the keepers of the fire; an insight that I had at one point is that the fire in that instance was the mouth of god, in that when you burn something, you send it into another realm, and that fire, seen in that way, is a doorway.

Franklin: The thought comes to me: do we have a massive enantiodromia where there is a reversal of functions, possibly something designed in the plan of nature rather than simply the accident of a brutal action by certain men. That might have been merely the occasion.

Rao: Oh, yes. I think it was a plan. Oh, I do. I think that the men are the instruments. I mean, this world is dualistic. It does function between opposites—

Franklin: Yes.

Rao: —and we have matriarchy; it swings over to patriarchy. Evidence would point to its swinging back now to matriarchy.

Franklin: Yes. Yes, I agree. You see the signs.

Rao: Yes. Whether it comes in a relatively short time, as it did before, I don't know. I can't say.

Franklin: I even think I see something of it happening in what I view on television. I see today very vigorous young women and some degree of softness in the

corresponding young men that was not the case in my earlier experience of my environment—with people and so on.

Rao: Yes. Yes.

Franklin: I know that—apparently women in the day when I was quite young wouldn't—not only by tradition, but by inclination—would not have manifested that kind of vigor and even aggression that you see on television today.

Rao: Yes. Well, my teacher who was born in your century taught that the female must be very hidden and work with the male only indirectly through mental powers—through occult powers. That it was not safe for the female to reveal herself. And that it is true. I think that that has been true to a large extent that women were, for their own protection—because many men are very brutal and very violent—for their own protection, to remain very unassuming; and, if they had powers, to hide them and to guard them.

Franklin: That makes sense, of course—under those circumstances.

Rao: Yes.

Franklin: Well, now about the further question of what do we find in cultures not affected directly by this event around the fifteenth century B.C., as in India and China, in Africa, and in the New World, which was not yet discovered by Europeans?

I understand the Indian culture here—the North American Indian or the South American Indian—did tend to have a matriarchal structure and that the descent was through the woman rather than through the man. I have been told that, I don't know that of my own knowledge.

Rao: I know a little bit about that. I saw a film once about a Hopi—I believe she was Hopi, or Navajo, I'm not sure which—family. And this woman, the cattle belonged to her, the line went through her. But, my small dealings with Rolling Thunder would indicate that it tends to be masculine oriented. The women are, for instance, not permitted to even be in the presence of, certainly not touch, a man if she is in her moon, if she is menstruating. Now, of course, in Jewish doctrine and in many others—I'm sure in Africa, I don't know that much about Africa—they consider that time to be an unclean time. However, an, Indian woman, Oshana Fast Wolf, when I asked her about that, said that it was a period of power and that the women go away by themselves, not because they are unclean, but because they are so powerful that the men are afraid of them. Now, I don't know any more than that about that.

Franklin: Yes. It's thus I have heard.

Rao: It's thus I have heard. Right. And my own feeling about it was that it still is a way of suppressing women. My feeling was that the women did not have an equal say—my feeling was that they were repressed.

Franklin: Apparently they did not come into Indian councils when the councils met about war. Again, only something that I have heard.

Rao: Yes. And I have also heard, though, Rolling Thunder say that it is only a woman—there was one special woman—who could unseat a chief. She had the power, and only she would have the power to take away a man's position. Simply by saying.

Franklin: That would imply a fundamental matriarchal base.

Rao: That does. It does. And yet, the women, the everyday women, at least the ones that I've seen, seem very shy and retiring and, very weak. So I don't know what that means. Maybe, maybe it was on a more matriarchal level and because of contact with modern civilizations has switched over some.

Franklin: Now, East Indian, of course, in the symbolism, Kali represents the principle of power and of action. She dances, I think, on the body of Shiva. He is—in that case, represents a passive principle, which would indicate that at some time, or at least the time when the myth arose, that it was matriarchal. Modern India, so far as I know, is patriarchal.

Rao: Yes.

Franklin: And by modern in that sense I'd say goes back as far as Buddha.

Rao: Yes. Well now, also though, doesn't Kali, though, indicate that principle when it is being destructive—death? Doesn't she represent death?

Franklin: It's not so simple as that, and—to use the terms of Robert Johnson—it's a dance of life.

Rao: Yes. All right. It's a dance of transitions, then. The dance from birth to life to birth—life death, that whole—

Franklin: The whole pattern.

Rao: —the whole pattern. Because the male would seem at least now, or in our history, to be afraid of the female, of her hidden power, and often, you know, death can be seen as a woman, as a feminine force. Well you take for instance the *I Ching*. You take the yin and the yang. Now, on a higher level, that's one thing, but if you take it on a very base level, we have the negative and the positive. Are you familiar with the *I Ching*?

Franklin: I've only touched it in passing; not enough to really have any important opinion about it.

Rao: Yes. Well, I haven't studied it extensively, but I do see, though, that they attribute there the feminine as dark, as cold, as moist, and the masculine—and she is called the receptive, and the number 2, the receptive; and the masculine as fiery, and warm, and movement outward, and he is called the creative, and everything in it. It always talks about the superior man. It only talks about the woman in terms of as being a wife, or a daughter, or a concubine, or something of that nature. Now, I mean if you take everything up to another level, then all of these distinctions really have a different kind of meaning. But as far as actual living and everyday—for instance the consciousness of a woman—take women in mathematics. We keep talking about women in mathematics.

Franklin: Yes. Yes.

Rao: All right. Women in mathematics: that women for the most part—many women—and it may be changing now because of this turnover into the matriarchy—but many women, women of my generation certainly, and generations prior to mine, would say, “Oh! I can’t do mathematics. I’m not smart enough to do mathematics; that’s a man’s world”. And my own experience, as I told you, not long ago, that simply the confidence, working with other women, and the confidence that I can do this, you know, produced A+ work. If I had not had the confidence, if I had just gone by the male—what is the word that I want—it is an energy field, the male energy that suppresses the female that wants her to be weak and helpless so that he can take care of her. If I had, just stayed with that I never would have been able to do anything in mathematics. So it didn’t have to do with my capability. It had to do with what I was raised to believe, what I saw around me, rather than what I was really capable of within myself. And I think that—

Franklin: Cultural influence rather than innate capacity is implied there.

Rao: That’s right.

Franklin: Well, my own contact is this: that most of those who excelled in mathematics were men, but there are a few exceptions. And at the university at Stanford, we had two departments: one applied mathematics, which was oriented to practical use of mathematics in the engineering and a pure department. The overwhelming number of men who had mathematical skills went into the applied mathematics. Women who had mathematical skill came into the pure department. But also the men in physics, who might have a profounder interest in mathematics, were there, and finally, those who were naturally oriented to mathematics, who might become professional in the field. Now, I found that while there were several girls who signed up in the freshman year that I was in, only one survived to the end of the course. I was the other.

Rao: It must have been some course.

Franklin: And on the most difficult level of all, where it becomes almost impossible to understand, I was the only student, and that was the rule on that level. Not very often a course wouldn’t be given because there was no student. Where thought has no aid from either imagination or intuition, the going is extremely difficult. I don’t know of any feminine entity on that level in the mathematical field.

Now, in the history of mathematics, which is virtually a Western history: there is one book here that deals [with it]—*Men of Mathematics*, thirty-three outstanding mathematicians from Pythagoras to the latest (probably Henri Poincaré)—[and in it] there is one woman appears as the pupil of Weierstrass.<sup>3</sup> Whether she would get in on her own I don’t know. At any rate, there’s no discussion of her contributions. She’s the only one mentioned, but she evidently had unusual ability—there’s only one mentioned in that whole book. And that goes back as far as Pythagoras in picking up mathematical genius. Now, I don’t know of any woman that has chosen mathematics as a career on the university level, but that may be changed since my time.

Rao: Now, I think so, I think there are women now in the university who do mathematics.

---

<sup>3</sup> Bell, E. T.: *Men of Mathematics* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1937).

Franklin: At my time, there were two women professors in Stanford: one was in biology—I think it was in entomology—and one in psychology. I came to know her pretty well. She was one of the early feminists—a very able woman. She did originate a method of research that received the approval of the German psychologists, and at that time Germany had the leadership in psychology beyond all question. In fact, when Miss Martin, or Professor Martin, published, she had her work translated into German and was published solely in Germany; and she was better known there. She made a contribution that was so well valued by these men that she got a very rare honor—an honorary Ph.D. signed by the Kaiser. The only woman in the world who had such, and the only American—male or female—who had it. So, she was a woman of recognized ability—by the very country that is the most masculine of all, namely Germany.

Rao: Now, getting back to this, we're getting back to the subject of the matriarchal societies around the world, and you're suggesting that perhaps [these] matriarchal societies were prevalent in many parts of the world—

Franklin: That could well be.

Rao: —at one time. Now, it's occurring to me that perhaps the matriarchal societies—I don't think that—of course I don't know this, but my sense of it is that the women of the matriarchal societies—I think the most highly evolved perhaps was in the Aegean where the mysteries were performed. But I don't know that the feminine consciousness, collectively, was at a stage, though, of becoming fully conscious, or enlighten[ed]. That these matriarchal societies—the women have power, but the powers are around the growing of crops —around “earth magic” for lack of a better term—rather than something of a higher nature.

Franklin: Yeah, I know that Jung uses the word *autochthonic* in connection with feminine nature, which seems to imply something of earthiness in it.

Rao: Now, what comes to me is that the development of the animus within the female at that time was, collectively, of a lower sort. The strong man is, and then, of course synchronistically, when he developed into the warrior—I mean the warrior came along and said “Okay,” you know, “so much for you” and that was the end of her and of her reign. But we haven't talked at all about the possibility of the animus and the anima developing within an individual consciousness—going from Helen of Troy—going from the Magdalene to the Sophia back to the Magdalene, moving—

Franklin: Yeah. Not Magdalena, but Mary the Mother.

Rao: Mary.

Franklin: Yes.

Rao: Excuse me. Mary. [Then] collectively, does the feminine principle and the masculine principle—are those—the animus and the anima of the collective in fact evolving? If that is true, and the feminine animus is now entering into the stage of the word or of the meaning (“animus”), then it would indicate that she is ready for another kind of transformation rather than just dealing with earth magic, she is going into focused attention rather than spread.

Franklin: I see. Well, now in connection with the suggestion that Ultimate Realization would be through the animus power in the woman, for a woman, you would still imply that it's the male, or the masculine aspect, that has that power. It's not a feminine achievement. It's an achievement by an actual woman, but not an achievement of femininity *qua* femininity.

Rao: Okay. However, if you take a masculine—a male attaining full enlightenment, and I'm not talking about stages of enlightenment, I'm talking about total and complete consciousness.

Franklin: I doubt that's possible on the only human level.

Rao: Well, Buddha did it.

Franklin: Well, he's—still there are stages beyond.

Rao: All right, all right. But he needed to embrace a feminine part of himself—I think it's a mistake when we're talking at this level to speak of masculine and feminine. I wish we had another word, that's the energy of focus and spread.

Franklin: Well, we could use those as synonyms.

Rao: That it is a combination of focus and spread which produces consciousness. It is not just one or the other; and wherein with a male focus [it] has been rather simply implicit in his very nature, he has had to concentrate more on spread; whereas the female, coming from a natural state of spread, needs to focus. So I'm not saying that it is still the masculine principle that does it. It's a combination of the two. It's simply that for her, if we take your dream to be a collective dream pointing in this direction—then it is definitely the intellect in the woman which awakens and forces, almost, or activates the sage principle.

Franklin: Well, still it seems to me that there is a form of yoga, namely, *bhakti*, or the yoga of love, which involves the principle of devotion, self-surrender, self-giving, and the like, that makes particular use of feminine qualities. If it is a man who is a *bhakti* he would be doing it through his feminine side.

Rao: And I would reply, that if all of the literature that has been written, all focuses on the masculine enlightenment—

Franklin: Yes.

Rao: —so *bhakti* yoga is a path for the male.

Franklin: Well, not the prime male path, [which is] the yoga of knowledge.

Rao: Yes. But it is *bhakti* though; *bhakti* is still a path for the male. Perhaps not too many men take that path. Now, I also think that *bhakti* may be appropriate for a woman given that she was living in a society—in a world—where the masculine and the feminine were not at odds. I have never, until I met you, met a man who was on my side. And I don't mean me personally.

Franklin: I know what you mean. Yes.

Rao: There is a natural antagonism. No matter how wonderful the man is, there is, underneath, a natural—there is a tension. Now on the lower levels we can see this, then it



can develop into a positive sexual thing, or you can have a householder, or you have children, or you can work together, or a woman can inspire the man; I mean there are all kinds of things. But essentially there is a tension, and I don't believe for a moment that a woman practicing *bhakti* yoga is going to attain consciousness in this society because the male will say "yes that's wonderful that you feel so loving, and so open, and here, would you please get me my slippers."

Franklin: Only this is oriented to the divine—

Rao: Yes.

Franklin: —not to the man.

Rao: Yes. But she has to live in the everyday world. She has to live in the world. And one of the most difficult things for women is that they orient themselves around men; have—this is changing, but women have oriented themselves around men, and because of that they compete with each other for the male; and he knows that, and he uses that, and it keeps women divided. So that in a world such as that, it seems to me that the path for the woman is the development of her focus, of her focus power and her natural animus, and at times, if we go by your dream, if we say that your dream is a dream of the collective, that the negative animus principle activated and directed, not outward towards somebody else, not in that destructive way, but that kind of energy, directed towards the sage—I'm dealing here in an uncharted territory, so—

Franklin: Right.

Rao: —it's difficult for me to speak—in a world where she is not really helped, would seem to me to be a path for this age. Now, perhaps at another time, *bhakti*; but I still say *bhakti* was developed by men for men.

Franklin: Yes. Yes, that's all we have in the history is a story of men in this field.

Rao: That's right.

Franklin: You'd have to go back to something which you might call prehistory to find something further.

Rao: And, as I said though, I feel that perhaps "prehistory"—the consciousness state in women in prehistory was more oriented towards the earth. Her consciousness was more advanced than the male, [and] her power, just in terms of the earth, just by her biological power; but that was like a whole different stage of evolution for the entire race. And then there comes in the question of various races and the consciousness, or the enlightenment, of various races.

Are all races capable of enlightenment?

Franklin: I doubt it. The most frequent experience seems to be East Indian; at least those that have made a name in history. There's some record in China but it seems to be much less developed; and those are the ones that are old. I don't know what the story in the Egyptian, East Mediterranean area may be. It is not within my knowledge. There is something there. There is something connected with the Great Pyramid of which I made something of a study. There's a realm not too well known, but evidently is.

Well this is interesting. I'm glad we got—

Rao: The Egyptian—the question of the Egyptian—and this comes from my own intuition and some study from my teacher, for she goes back in Egyptian history much, much further than the history books go, but it would seem that there was another race in very ancient times that did spread in various parts of the world— Egypt being one of them—and that they became, you know, later on, were called the gods and goddesses—

Franklin: It might be connected with Atlantis.

Rao: Yes. She said so. She felt so. That, for instance, the god Osiris, who is the god of the other-world [whom you will meet] after you go through something very similar to what *The Tibetan Book of the Dead* indicates. If you make it through all of those doors, you are brought into the presence of Osiris where your actions are weighed against, on a scale, against a feather, which is the symbol for the goddess Maat, the goddess of truth; and if your actions are heavier—if they do not balance with the feather of truth, you get thrown back into this life.

Now, to my knowledge there was no Bodhisattva vow in the Egyptian [tradition]. And it took so many lifetimes in order to know how to pass through the various channels—it's very much like the Tibetan. But this other race had great knowledge. Now, just where they came from, I don't know. There's speculation as to where they came from.

Franklin: Still, I suspect Atlantean.

Rao: Yes. Yes. But then where did they come from?

Franklin: Supposedly, ultimately from a continent in the Atlantic of which Poseidonis was only a minor fragment that went down late. In *The Secret Doctrine* the time is pretty vast, even on the order of a million years, when that catastrophe took place.

Rao: Yes. Is that the same as the island of MU?

Franklin: No, that's another one.

Rao: That's a different one?

Franklin: That would be Lemuria—connected with the Pacific.

Rao: Yes. So that these beings who evidently built the Great Pyramid, or gave instruction as to how to build it—

Franklin: [The] *Secret Doctrine* says it was definitely built by Atlanteans, and not as recently as Piazzzi Smythe figures, but about 78,000 years ago.

Rao: Yes. So, I don't think that; [rather,] it would seem that the question of feminine and masculine enlightenment somehow was irrelevant at that time.

Franklin: Actually I don't know of feminine and masculine relationship of that time [of] Posaidonis say, except for the words of Senior.

Rao: So where does that lead us then in our search?

Franklin: I think we've come against a wall.

Rao: Well.

Franklin: Here is the second problem. In the discussions with Dr. Brugh Joy connected with the departure of Gertrude, there was an emphasis on the personal side of the problem. There's another side and that is its effect upon the work. In my combination with Gertrude, it was as though I had built a citadel which was invulnerable to the action of impending forces, even the force of the activation of the big dream. In that citadel, I was invulnerable in my work. I could produce, and did produce, perhaps half a million words as a result of that combination. When Gertrude passed away, I immediately became vulnerable. It was as though that citadel had become breached and I was the victim of impinging forces that I could not effectively control. It involved passing through a feeling of great vulnerability and essential weakness; and [I] could not produce in the spirit and the form, of the work that I had done before. There was subsequently established a reintegration of the interlock, but on the level of Gertrude, say, probably as a *devachanee*, in which case she is only a three principled being and is not able to give the support that is at present weak. The relationship on that highest level seems to remain, but on the level of actual production, the interconnection is gone, is broken. The result is that in production, there are, as it were, three stages: a stage before ideation; then a subjective stage of spontaneous ideation, which seems inspired; and finally, the stage of producing that objectively—in actual language that exists here on the outer plane involving the complex process of dealing with word selection, syntax, [and] logical formulation. This always has been difficult, but with the presence of Gertrude, it was reasonably possible; but in her absence, has become almost impossible. Maybe this kind of production—it is true that descriptive work can be done, that more or less dramatic material can be produced, all of it of a type which I regard as definitely inferior, but in the terms of the type of production which I used to do, it becomes almost impossible. Now, what is required here? It puts me in a position in which I feel somewhat like a titan who is tied down spread-eagle on the ground and submitted to torture—and what I crave is either power or death. The alternative of continuing life here under these conditions seems wholly unsatisfactory. What is the answer?

Rao: One thing comes to my mind which is quite difficult to do—and, oh, if only I were a mathematician I would have a formula for it—it's a formula to transcend a difficult situation, and the formula requires the person involved to look at their situation, which you certainly have been doing, and you see all the things—you must be ruthlessly honest with yourself—and you say: "What are all the things about the situation that I dislike?" (to yourself). If I had the perfect situation, what would be different, in other words? What is the difference between what I have and what I want? And it cannot be simplistic. It may be very few things, but you must be completely honest and you must go through all of your psyche. This is a very difficult process. When you find—let's say, maybe there are five things that would be different.—then you must look at those five things and say, "What is it that these five things have in common?" When you find what they have in common—maybe they have three different things in common—then you must go through the process again. This takes great intensity and great focus. What is it that these have in common? Eventually you will come to one particular thing. Now, at this point you say that it has to do with the energy flow that can produce your work; I think there's more to it than that. When you find the very thing that is the essence that all of these things have in common, then you turn around and with great gusto, you attack the problem, you attack that very thing. To put it on a very mundane level, because that's

easy to see, let us say that it has to do with the taking of food—nurturing oneself. [Or] that you're lonely. If that is true, then you should put aside, as much as possible, all contact and learn at the very mundane level. We're not talking of higher realms now; we're talking of right here—loneliness. You completely go into that which you are trying to avoid with determination that you will come out the other side, because all this is, is a learning process; that is, the only function it has is to learn. And I know from my experience, not that I have heard it said—I know from my own personal experience—this particular formula was given to me in a flash of inspiration many years ago in New York City, and I've tested it more than once, you will find yourself—once you have gone through this process—suddenly, like magic, what you want, what you really need, will appear. Now, whether that's going to appear for you in the form of another female person who will come and be your wife and support you in that, or whether your own anima, which you have seen, will come to you in some form that gives you the kind of sustenance, or whether some higher integration will take place, I can't say, but I can say that if you examine really what it is that you are resisting now, you will have what you need. It is not just your work. Because if it were just that—or maybe it is—as long as you are looking for, instead of plunging into that which you don't want—am I making any sense to you?

Franklin: Well yes, I can follow it.

Rao: Yes. Because it's a very, very powerful formula. All right, that's on one level. All right, that's on a very personal, very mundane level. On another level though, your work, for all of these years—and certainly, I'm looking at the dream, and you as an agent of the collective, the timing of it in terms of—women, two women—you have spent fifty-eight years with two women, and these two women have nurtured you and have given you the kind of support that you needed in order to produce what you have. And now you find yourself in a desert.

Franklin: Right.

Rao: You have a very strong connection with the feminine. Whether that comes from a past, life which you have indicated that it does, but you certainly do have it. This strong attachment—not even attachment—linkage with the female, in my experience, is very unusual, first of all. Now, I've heard it said that your feminine, your anima, has been almost, you know, put aside and everything. I don't think that's true. I think that you have a very highly developed anima—but it is not anima of the usual sense, in the regular man. We're dealing with something higher; and I think, I feel, that you are connected to the collective. I mean we all are, but because of your work and because of who you are in this life and other lives, this particular point of having fifty-eight years with two women in the outer objective world and now you come—you cannot work any longer—it seems to me that the road points, unless you choose to go in, and it is your choice, but you have been requested by a higher source to stay—

Franklin: Yes.

Rao: —that you still must deal—your whole life you have dealt with the feminine. You have dealt with the feminine outwardly in two wives. You are now being denied that, you don't have that. But you must still deal with the feminine. Certain events in current history—and in your own personal life in terms of certain people who have come

into your life, females—would indicate that your work would be leading you towards the examination of the feminine, but on a spiritual or philosophical level. Your link with your anima has always been strong. But she was objectified in the physical world in the form of Sherifa and then Gertrude. And you are not content to have women such as myself, or Dorene, or whoever comes—who may be close to you or work with you—you want a union. I'm not talking about sex—I mean you want a union. But you're not getting that union, because when you have the union with the outer woman, you are in fact having a union with your own anima, but she's objectified in the outer world. Now she's not manifesting that way. And she is saying, if you want me, you better come and find me, because I am not going to be found that easily now.

Franklin: Now, I did have the experience with her—

Rao: That's right.

Franklin: —but she was near exhaustion.

Rao: I feel that that was a stage of transition. I think that she was, originally, or at least with Sherifa part of the time, in the Sophia phase, and then she became the Mary with Gertrude, and I feel that when you saw her at a state of exhaustion you were seeing Mary at a state of exhaustion, but the Sophia could very well come again. And if the Sophia comes again, the way to make the link with her is through your work, because, after all, what is Sophia? Sophia is wisdom—

Franklin: Right.

Rao: —and the philosophy.

Franklin: Well, I'll put out tape, that's what I plan to do when you leave and I go start on my work for convention. I have not produced since I saw the anima on August 17 in a state of near exhaustion. I've remained rather fallow. I will now make another demand on her.

Rao: But I think you may find that she has transformed and she may in fact be quite strong.

Franklin: Well, we'll find out.

Rao: Yes. I'd be very interested to know what you do find out. But I do feel that, I sound almost as though I'm blackmailing you or I'm bribing you, but I do feel that she will only support you and be strong if you work on the feminine. You must work with the female energy. I feel that's very true. And you worked with the female energy before in the outer, working towards your work. And I think that you are very connected with the feminine, even though—I've looked at your numbers; all of your numbers are extremely masculine. I mean they're all masculine, except one, which is androgynous; however, it expresses itself in the outer, in the personality, as a feminine, as a gentle, refined—all kinds of things, but underneath, it's very masculine, very masculine.

Franklin: I think so.

Rao: Oh, yes. So much so that you must have contact with the female. But that collective energy—there is the anima personal, and there's the anima collective, and you

have worked—the anima has sustained you all of your life and now she wants you to help to bring about a transformation in the female. That’s how I see it.

Franklin: I see.

Rao: And that’s how I see the dream.

Franklin: In the discussion we have had so far, I have felt something that seemed very threatening to masculinity as such—a threat in this form: that masculinity would have left nothing for itself that was worthy of any respect. There is a story that appears in one of the scientific fiction articles that was aroused in my memory in connection with this. In this particular story, it was represented that on a certain planet, not necessarily connected with the solar system, there was a society that was entirely feminine in its domination. There were males that were kept in cages whose only function was that of physical impregnation to maintain the population. Excess males were disposed of. The whole society was feminine. In social life, the males did not participate at all, nor in the political life, nor in the economic life, nor in the intellectual life. They were kept solely for the one function of female impregnation to maintain the population. They had no other use. As presented here in that story, a male entity from another planet, another society, who was competent, did appear to effect a cooperation between the society of this planet in opposing some extragalactic threat. He met with the dominant ruling feminine and tried to work out a cooperative relationship. There was a certain natural hostility on her part, and she tried to test him by producing magical appearances that seemed to carry threat. He was able to counter them much to her surprise because she knew nothing of a masculinity of this sort. It was always an inferior something, valuable only for impregnation. Ultimately, a working relationship was produced. But she had never realized that there could be such a thing as masculine that was powerful.

Now, the threat that I see as potential in what has been suggested is this: that if the feminine achieves command of focus, then the only thing that the masculine would have left that is essentially masculine would be reproductive impregnation, and there would be nothing left for masculinity that would command respect or honor. And when one senses this, I can very readily understand why men should be afraid of it. I don’t think that it is something that comes from you as a personality. I think, rather, it is something being channeled. Now, this is not a matter of reaching a status of simple equivalence between the sexes. It’s a matter of reaching matriarchal dominance. I believe in the equivalence. I would be hostile toward matriarchal dominance. It has been said, or rather Sherifa—in a previous incarnation with me—said that I was at that time the head of the military establishment of some country; she did not know what country or whether it was one that was known to history or not; that I had acquired more power than the legitimate ruling council and head of state had. This kingdom had subject peoples under it. A certain subject people had revolted. The technique I used was that employed by Genghis Khan, namely, the killing off of every man, woman, and child in a revolting country. The governing council did not want such severity. They could not control me. I was more powerful than the government, for I had the army. Sherifa at that time was a dancing girl. She volunteered to take up the problem. She appeared, as she said, before me and produced a highly seductive dance. She corrupted me. The execution of the peoples was called off.

Now, when I hear something that tends to reduce essential masculinity to the status of impotence, something unworthy of any respect, I tend to think in martial terms. I tend to think of monastic withdrawal in fortified quarters. Now, this is something I believe was channeled. I don't believe that you were aware of implications here. I would like to recall something said by Havelock Ellis. He was the first to take up the problem of the psychology of sex and produced five volumes on the subject. He knew the subject very thoroughly. He says it is a mistake to view men and women as equal, but rather to view them as equivalent, complementary, of equal modulus, but not specifically equal in function. The word modulus is this: where you consider only the quantitative value and not the sense of a number, you could speak of equal modulus, thus: +5 and -5 are not equal, but they have equal moduli; +5 and -5 are different, but with equal moduli. In that case, it is just 5. Now, approaching from that angle, there is no competition involved in the case of viewing men and women as equivalent though not equal: equal dignity, but not developing or functioning in the same sense; complementary, but not the same. Therefore there can be a meeting on a level of balance, but not a friendly meeting if it is an effort to achieve power on the part of either one over the other.

That's what I thought, put briefly.