

Is the Intellect the Devil?

Part 1 of 4

Franklin Merrell-Wolff
June 18, 1980

This tape is designed for the Convention of next August of this year.

Recently, in following a program of rereading the material which I have on hand that was produced by Dr. Carl G. Jung and his associates, in that program I was reading in a volume called *The Integration of the Personality*, and I came upon a phrase that I regard as one of the most shocking and improbable statements that I have ever heard. It is this, on p. 126, halfway down the page: “No doubt, the intellect is the devil....”¹ Never have I heard a statement more improbable than that—not even the statement that the moon was made out of 14 yards of green cheese. What does this mean? Is it a personal confession on the part of Dr. Jung himself, or is it a general statement supposed to be universally valid? If it is the former, then it would imply something in the experience of Dr. Jung himself, which would call for sympathy and even pity from me. But apparently he intends it as a universal statement. I shall read the paragraph from which this quotation was taken so that the context may lie before us. The quotation starts at the bottom of the p. 125. The discussion that is there proceeding is in connection with a certain individual’s dream, so the reference is to the context of that dream.

At the last moment, the friend with the pointed beard appears upon the stage as a *deus ex machina* to help the dreamer, and averts by a spell the threatened destruction by the momentous ape man. Who knows how much Faust’s calm curiosity before the apparitions of the classical Walpurgis Night was indebted to the helpful presence of Mephisto with his contemporary, matter-of-fact standpoint. We could wish for many a person that he would bethink himself in good time of scientific or philosophic reflection, of the much-abused intellect. Whoever abuses it comes under suspicion of never having had the experience that could show him what the intellect is good for, and why humanity has forged this weapon at the cost of unprecedented effort. Not to notice this requires an extraordinary remoteness from life. No doubt, the intellect is the devil, but he is “the whimsical son of chaos” to whom we would soonest grant the capacity to deal effectively with his mother. The Dionysiac experience gives the devil, who seeks employment, enough to do, for the coming to terms with the unconscious, which now follows, far outweighs the labours of Hercules. It seems to me to present a world of problems that the intellect cannot settle even in centuries, for which reason it has taken frequent vacations to recreate itself with easier tasks. This is why the

¹ Carl, G. Jung, *The Integration of the Personality* (New York: Farrar & Rinehart, 1939), 126.

psyche is forgotten so frequently and for so long, and why the intellect so often makes use of the apotropaic sorcerer's wand and calls the psyche "occult" and "mystic," hoping that even intelligent persons will take this accusation seriously.²

Let us return to the pertinent part of this quotation and read again the entire sentence: "No doubt, the intellect is the devil, but he is "the whimsical son of chaos" to whom we would soonest grant the capacity to deal effectively with his mother." Now, the intellect, as generally understood, is the organ, function, or faculty by which cognitive thinking, in the conceptual sense, is possible. It is a principle of ordered, logical thinking. But in this quotation from Jung, this function is viewed as the son of a mother known as "chaos." Now, 'chaos' has various meanings, and these we may find profitable to consider as given in the *Dictionary*: first, "A vacant space or chasm; empty, immeasurable space." The second meaning: "The confused or formless elementary state, not fully existing, in which the universe is supposed to have been latent before the order, uniformities, or laws of nature had been developed or created: the opposite of *cosmos*."³ There is something very strange here, for the intellectual organ, or principle of conceptual cognition, is precisely the function by which science, philosophy, and, particularly, mathematics is possible. Without this function, all of the technology which plays such an important part in our life today would be impossible. It is a principle of organization and of command that contrasts strongly with the instinct which governs and protects the lives of animals. It is a function which no animal *qua* animal possesses, but is characteristic of man and is the principle differentiation between a man and an animal.

Now, there are many questions that arise in connection with this statement of Dr. Jung. First, if the intellect is viewed as the son of chaos, namely, that chaos is its mother, then it has the characteristics that are diametrically opposite to those of its mother; for chaos is the state of confusion and disorder, whereas, the intellect is the function, more than any other, whereby the principle of order, dependability, calculability, reasonableness is introduced into our domain of life and consciousness. Therefore, it appears as the diametric opposite of the mother as conceived by Dr. Jung. There is mystery in this; usually the offspring carries the characteristics of the progenitor, but here the offspring is represented as being the diametric opposite of its progenitor. What does Dr. Jung mean by this? I find it really quite baffling.

Let me present the problem by the use of an imaginary situation. A man has a sailboat. He goes to sea in the sailboat without the necessary instruments such as a compass and a device for the locating and measuring relationships of the stars, without charts, and without mathematical tables. He goes beyond the place where it is possible to see the land. A storm arises, and he is driven far out to sea and confused by the circumstances produced by the storm, so he finds himself completely disoriented. Now, what are the prospects before him? Instinct will not tell him where land is. He cannot survive on the sea. A fish might, by the power of instinct, be capable of surviving in the

² Ibid., 125-126.

³ William Dwight Whitney, ed., *The Century Dictionary and Cyclopaedia*, vol. 2 (New York: Century Co., 1911), 923.

water, but not the man. He is lost. Starvation and death lie before him. But a ship appears, and from this ship he receives a sextant, compass, charts, and necessary mathematical tables, which he knows how to use. And by means of these aids, he determines where he is and how that point is related to the point which he wishes to attain in connection with the land. He directs himself in the appropriate direction, and his life is saved. Now, these aids are the product of the intellect. Are we to say that he was saved by the devil? Jung's statement would imply that he so regards it, that somehow, the state without those aids is the not-devil. I don't follow Dr. Jung at all here. It looks as though he's built a topsy-turvy world in which the devil, himself, is the savior, not the Divine.

I have assumed that Dr. Jung has used his terms in the sense that they are commonly used as determined by the dictionary. As a result of a search, I have found five words representing the principle ordinarily meant by the word 'devil'. These are respectively: Devil, Satan, Beelzebub, Mephisto, and Lucifer. Unambiguously, four of these terms—Devil, Satan, Beelzebub, and Mephisto—mean the principle of darkness, the adversary. He would, for instance, be opposed to the principle of light, order, beauty, and truth, and all of the rest of the positive values; in other words, oriented to darkness, disorder, ugliness, and falsity. This seems to be, unambiguously, the character of the words: Devil, Satan, Beelzebub, and Mephisto. But there's a different meaning connected with the word 'Lucifer', and this may throw a light upon our quandary.

'Lucifer' etymologically means, the bringer of light. It seems that in past history Lucifer was the name of the planet Venus when it was the Morning Star. It is not the name of Venus when it was the Evening Star. When Venus is the Morning Star, it announces the arrival of the sun. It therefore can be thought of as the bringer of light; and, in fact, in itself, it is the third most luminous object in the heavens, next to the sun and the moon.

Now, there is an ancient myth respecting the fall of Lucifer. The myth was that Lucifer was the brightest star of the morning, but, because of inflation, fell, and became the Satanic principle. The reference in the Bible is to be found in Isaiah 14, 12th verse, as follows: "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning? How art thou cut down to the ground?" This seems to have been the basis upon which theological speculation deduced the idea that Lucifer became the principle of evil. There is another possible interpretation which I shall suggest later. But here we have a principle of light denigrated, and this might be a confusion that grows out of perspective, out of a certain relativity.

For the point that I wish to make here, I refer to a rather familiar experience. If one turns over a rock that is embedded in the ground, he often discovers creatures under it—usually insects. I have found under such stones, in addition to the insects, scorpions, centipedes, and spiders—generally a group of creatures that are not attractive to us. When the stone is turned over during the light of day, these creatures have a tendency to run away and find, again, darkness, where they are comfortable. Thus, from the standpoint of these creatures, the light might very well appear to be devilish.

Now, to what do these creatures correspond in human nature—quite clearly, the elements of lust, the dark impulses that could be murderous, the inclination to intoxication, the things of which we are not proud, the very elements that form the basis

of the Dionysian orgy where one gave reign to all of the lower impulses in his nature. From the standpoint of this, no doubt, light could appear as the enemy. If, then, we take the perspective of the Dionysian spirit which abides in man as the one from which we make our evaluation, then Lucifer might very well be called the devil, the evil one. But I deny that that is the proper basis of evaluation. No doubt, if one regards only those characteristics in him which he has in common with the animals, they are rendered uncomfortable when they are submitted to the discipline imposed by the intellect. To regard this imposition from the intellect as devilish implies that one assumes that the elements in the human being that he holds in common with the animal are the ones to be encouraged, and that those elements which come from a luminous realm and which would impose development toward light are to be discouraged and devalued. I do not agree with that position at all. I think of the path of animality, which it is so easy for man to take because animal traits occupy such a large position in his total nature, that these are the very elements that he must overcome if he is ever, ultimately, to realize himself as the God.

There are two primary, or magisterial, positions or principles by which man can orient toward the world and that which lies beyond the world. These two principles are, first, the principle of life, and the principle of thought. Between these two, there is a certain dichotomy or a certain degree of hostility. And we can trace this in the story of mankind.

Robert Johnson wrote a book *He*, which is a statement of the principle psychological development of the Western male child. He took as his guiding principle, the Grail myth in its French form. The typical path of the male child is the path of the knight and the maiden. There is, however, a statement of an exception to this, namely, certain males who follow the path of the hermit; this, however, was not developed in his thesis. Now, in the case of the path of the hermit, the governing principle is thought; in the case of the path of the knight, the governing principle is life.

When a male child is born in this world, he passes through a preliminary stage in which his thought is simply a reflection of the influences that may be about him, such as his family, such as his companions, the school, and the religious institutions of which he may be a part. When he comes to the period of adolescence, something happens to him. In his earlier period, he may have been hostile to the feminine entities of his own age, but now he tends to become interested in them. But he may also find thought, which is his own thought, awakening in him—a thought which is not merely the reflection of the influences about him, but his own reaction. There thus lie before him two possibilities: the path of the girl, which is the path that the overwhelming young males follow, and which is also the path of the warrior, for as the Greeks observed long ago, there is a close connection between Mars and Venus. But among these males, there is a few who are drawn to the path of thought. They may face the call of both paths, but the path of thought has won in the contest.

Now, it is true, of course, that there is a form of thought that serves the path of life, but it is a servant thought, a thought that is purely instrumental to the path of the vital nature. But in the case of the hermit path, we have a manifestation of thought in its magisterial, or royal, form. Now, as we look back over mankind, the overwhelming majority follows the path of life, but there is a few who follow the path of thought, of the royal thought; these are the philosophers, the scientists, the mathematicians.

Two examples of this latter type stand out in peculiar degree: one a representative of the West, Immanuel Kant; and one a representative of the East, Sri Shankaracharya—both were ascetics. One, Immanuel Kant, developed thought, perhaps more than anyone else in known history, in the sense of its critical acumen, its capacity to differentiate and distinguish between the false, improper use of thought and the true thought. He never produced a metaphysical view of the world and of human destiny, but he cleared the ground for such production which came later by another thinker. He called his work the *Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics*. The other, Sri Shankaracharya, was an ascetic to the end. His thought was positive. While there was critical acumen there, there was discrimination in high degree; in fact, his best known treatise is called *The Crest-Jewel of Discrimination*. But it was intended to eliminate the debris of false orientation so that the goal of ultimate Illumination might be attained. It was a path left by him that opened the way for the highest, liberating Illumination available to man—the treasure beyond all price. Is all this no more than the work of the devil, as Dr. Jung would have us believe?

A question that might be asked by the investigator is: does this *yoga* presented by Shankara really produce the results claimed for it? This requires individual testimony. I have tried to give an affirmative answer in the report I produced in the two volumes, *Pathways Through to Space* and *The Philosophy of Consciousness Without an Object*. I knew a value which was supreme, in my own consciousness, by following this way. It may well be that this *yoga* that employs the method of analysis and philosophic formulation presupposes earlier propaedeutic practices of a more sensuous type, for this *yoga* is designed for him in whom, already, the identification with the animal nature has been broken; and, there may still remain identification with the intellectual being. It really is designed to take the further steps from this latter identification up to the true spiritual identification. And when that is attained, the heavens open. The delight of the Eternal is showered down upon one, transcending all power of imagination by the sensuous man. The release is known and certain. The goal is attained. One may go beyond this, on the path known as the *Arya* path, where these values are renounced as a personal possession, or Realization, and are offered to all of humanity and all creatures. It is the place of choice between the withdrawal of the individual into the realm of unbroken delight, or the path that leads to the release of all creatures. Indeed, this way does work.

The yogic method recommended by Shankara is known technically as *Jnana* yoga, or the yoga of knowledge. Now, the state attained is not knowledge in the sense of intellectual knowledge, but the primary means employed is intellectual knowledge, or the method of discrimination, which is called by Shankara the Crest-Jewel. The state of knowledge attained may be regarded as spiritual. Its principle of operation is difficult to describe. It is different from either sensuous knowledge, or perception, and different from intellectual knowledge, or the conceptual process of discrimination. Thus, we have to distinguish between knowledge in the sense of the attainment and the way of knowledge as a methodology. This distinction is important. I, myself, have gone over this path and can affirm that it is effective.

Now, there are other forms of yogic procedure which are to be found in the literature, and these are the *Karma* yoga, or the yoga of works, connected peculiarly with the action of the will; *Bhakti* yoga, or the yoga of love or devotion, connected particularly

with the feeling side of man; in addition, there are certain technical forms of yoga such as *Hatha* yoga, which makes important use of the physical body as a means, and *Raja* yoga, which is a technical form developed by Patanjali. There is, in addition, another technical form, essentially biological in character, known as the *Tantra*, which makes primary use of a force in the body known as *kundalini* and the raising of this through various *chakras* to the crown *chakra* at the top of the head known as *sahasrara*. One could form a true judgment as to the effectiveness of these various yogas only by applying them himself and observing the results that follow from them. I have not applied these other yogas in a practice, but simply the yoga of Shankara. I give the presumption that these other yogas also work, but cannot testify as to their efficacy from personal experience.

There is the question: do they eventuate in the same condition or state of consciousness which the yoga of knowledge does eventuate in? This question can be answered only by an actual practice of all forms of yoga. I have considerable reason to question whether they eventuate in the same state of consciousness. It is certainly true that Shankara viewed the yoga of works and the yoga of devotion as propaedeutic to the yoga of knowledge, the latter being the sole yoga which attained true Liberation. Other forms of yoga may be employed for the attainment of *siddhis*, or powers, or for the attainment of states of consciousness, but according to Shankara, the yoga of knowledge, or *Jnana* yoga, is the sole yoga that leads to a definitive departure from *sangsaric* consciousness into authentic Realization. I have given my report of my experience, and *imperience*, in this field and can authenticate, to that extent, the efficacy of the Shankara method of yoga.

Now, the pertinence of this point is that the method employs, most heavily, intellectual capacities—the very thing that was called by Dr. Jung, the devil; and because of the high effects achieved by this method, I challenge, most emphatically, that characterization by Dr. Carl G. Jung. I regard it as essentially false.

In the next tape, I shall go into a discussion of the essential meaning of the term ‘Lucifer’.