

Challenge to the Concept of the Unconscious

Part 2 of 2

Franklin Merrell-Wolff

June 25, 1981

As has been noted in the preceding tape, the conception of the psychical unconscious is very fundamental in the work of Dr. Jung. This is understood as existing in two senses: one, a personal unconscious with the particular idiosyncrasies of the individual, and a collective unconscious in which all men share. This conception is here very fundamental. I do not find it very clearly determined by Dr. Jung whether he means this unconscious in the sense of being unconscious to itself, or simply that it is unconscious from the perspective of the relative or subject-object consciousness. I get the impression that he intends it to be understood as essentially unconscious even though psychical. There is implied here psychical process which is not conscious.

Now, I have found in my studies that there is a general prejudice among the thinkers of the West to view the processes which exist in this universe as essentially independent of consciousness. I have found writers who have even taken the view that the rising of consciousness in man and other creatures as a kind of accident which might have just as well never happened. Indeed, someone, whose name I now fail to remember, has said that consciousness is merely an accidental bump on the stream of evolution. This is a point of view very characteristic of the West with which I register fundamental disagreement. In the philosophy to which I gave expression after the event of August 7, 1936, I virtually reverse this position and view Consciousness in a most fundamental sense as the constitutive element, most fundamental constitutive element, in the whole development of the universe. But this Consciousness is not the same as that other *relative* consciousness which is subject-object, as I called it. The picture that I drew was this: a subject to consciousness, and an object of consciousness, and as the Root Source from which these two poles or aspects were derived was essential Consciousness itself. Thus, Consciousness, in my philosophy, is viewed as essentially *substantive* and not merely a relationship between a knower and a known. The implication is that before any creature *becomes*, Consciousness *is*.

At the time of producing this statement, I was not aware of a certain statement, or group of statements, in *The Secret Doctrine* referring to what is there called Absolute Consciousness.¹ There is to be found only a dozen or so references to this principle. It is clearly spoken of as a combination of unconsciousness and consciousness. Quite clearly then, it is not identical with the consciousness that stands as contrasting with unconsciousness, but a sort of blend of that dichotomy. It quite clearly, then, is not the ordinary type of consciousness which is a relationship between a knower and a known, but a universal principle. There is one implication, that one could approach the study of Absolute Consciousness from the perspective of thinking of it as a sort of Cosmic

¹ See the audio recordings, "Absolute Consciousness." parts 1 and 2.

Unconsciousness. Thus there would be both a positive and a negative approach to this subject matter. I heartily endorse the approach given in *The Secret Doctrine* which is positive and implies viewing the ultimate state of all that is as a conscious state, but not therefore consciousness as we most frequently refer to this subject, but another kind of Consciousness.

Now, when we introduce the conception of another kind of consciousness it could be purely speculative, but in my case as a result of the imperience on August 7, 1936, it was part of a Realization, and thus not merely a speculative concept. It is, therefore, a principle of utmost importance, even of the most primary importance, in my philosophic statement. Now, unless one has a Realization or imperience of Enlightenment, I see no way by which the individual student can deal with this subject from the perspective of immediate Realization. But that does not preclude the possibility of dealing with this approach in what I might call the mathematical spirit. And here I may say a few words about what the mathematical spirit is in this respect.

The creative mathematician pronounces a system of postulates. He is not concerned with how those postulates are derived; that is a psychological question. As a mathematician he is not concerned with that psychological problem. He is concerned simply with the consequences which follow from his formulated postulates. From those postulates, and certain necessary definitions, he proceeds to build a system. The question of whether that system really exists is not whether it fits popular experience or not, but is the question of whether it does not introduce self-contradiction. If there is no self-contradiction in the system that is constructed, then that system exists in the mathematical sense. Very often the creative mathematician will make such a production in the spirit of a pure artist. He is not concerned with possible applications in the mundane order of the world, but he is simply concerned with the development of a self-existent system of thought. And it has been the experience in mathematical history that mathematicians are generally not flattered by finding that their systems do have applications. Theirs is the spirit of the true artist. Nonetheless, it has been found to be true historically that virtually always any self-existent mathematical system ultimately finds a use in the field of application, and this brings up a very fascinating question. How can this be true?²

In my system, the most fundamental postulate is: *Consciousness is original, self-existent, and constitutive of all things*. This I maintain grew out of the Realization and carries for me the force of truth and is not merely an arbitrarily postulate; but for him who has not had an imperience similar to the one which I knew in 1936, it stands as a postulated statement, which he may ultimately be able to verify, but to do so he would have to imperience a state of Fundamental Realization or Enlightenment. But lacking that, he can treat this statement in the postulational sense that is employed in pure mathematics. So in a certain sense, my system is a mathematical system, though I rarely use the special technical language of mathematics.

Now, what is the meaning of this fundamental postulate? First, *Consciousness is original*. This means that in this system, I assert that Consciousness in this Root sense is not derived but was always there—it is the first principle, the ultimate divine—and that

² See the audio recording, “Statement Regarding Transubstantiation,” part 2, for a consideration of this question.

from it everything else is derived. Consciousness in the Root sense *is*; it does not *become*. Although, there are other derivative forms of consciousness that are derived—among these our familiar subject-object consciousness.

Now, I do not attempt to force the reader by coercive argument to accept this thesis blindly. On the contrary, I ask him to assume this position, just as the reader of a new system of mathematics would be asked to assume it, and note what follows from it. This contrasts with the typical prejudice of Western man, who assumes that the universe, that which is given, is essentially unconscious—an unconscious process of material substance connected with appropriate energies which are also viewed as unconscious—and then, as I said before, it is viewed that somehow consciousness arose in the process of the universe though it need not to have done so, that it is an added incidental that might just as well never have been. This is the materialistic prejudice; and if there is a devil in my system, I view it as just that materialistic prejudice. I see in Materialism, in this ultimate sense, the source of all wrongness, all evil in the world.

When I say that *Consciousness is original*, I mean quite simply that Consciousness in the Root sense is not derivative from something else. I mean that it is not a product of evolution, but that it is the stuff from whence all that is comes. This is quite a different view, as I have pointed out already, from that which is commonly held. Now, no doubt there are forms of consciousness which are derivative, which are the product of evolution, which are affected and molded by the effort of creatures, but Root Consciousness is the very stuff from whence this universe, and that beyond this universe, comes. It's a radical view, but I assert it on the basis of the Realization which broke forth within me on August 7, 1936; and I affirm that he who cannot himself verify this, he can at least assume this position and see how it affects his world orientation. Root or Absolute Consciousness is not a function of creatures; but, rather, creatures are a function of Root or Absolute Consciousness. This reverses our ordinary order of valuation. It is a way for viewing the world in the case of him who has not known Fundamental Realization. Consciousness is also *self-existent*. In other words not dependent upon anything else. Not a resultant of any process whatsoever, but the Root Cause, or Base, or Fundamental Cause of all that is—all form, all affect, all volition.

As a result of the imperience of August 7, 1936, the metaphysical problem which concerned me deeply before that time was resolved. For me, I have found the ultimate answer, and I give formulation to this with the hope that something here may be of help to others. But whether they find this helpful or not, let all men realize that in this I have found the ultimate answer; and let them not waste their time trying to convince me otherwise, for I know whereof I speak.

But whether this can be an answer for the metaphysical problems of others is another question; and whether it can be an answer with respect to the humanistic problems of life in this world is another question altogether. I have found a way of release, a way whereby it is possible to depart from this domain and all its pestiferous problems into the imperium of the beyond; but there is always the question of whether this domain in which we dwell here below can also be transformed with all its creatures so that the mundane problems of this domain may also find a resolution. It is possible to depart from the domain—that is known as the *nirvanic* withdrawal—but their remains the

question: can this domain be so transformed that it also may be redeemed. That's the problem that lies ahead.

In the system which grew out of the imperience of August 7, 1936, there is no room for a being or personal entity which might be regarded as the Root Source of all that is. There is no place for such a God. But instead of that, beyond space, time, and law there is Root Consciousness—a self-existent Principle which is the Source of all that is. The ultimate word is not that of a kind of blindness from which an unintelligent process emerged, but of an ever-existing Consciousness from whence all that is descended. The materialist sees all emerging from darkness. I see all emerging from the ultimate Light of Fundamental Consciousness. The materialist has an orientation to a mere content of Consciousness, a something which is cognized, and thus is only an effect. That makes him no more than a primitive idol worshipper.

1. Consciousness-without-an-object is.
2. Before objects were, Consciousness-without-an-object is.
3. Though objects seem to exist, Consciousness-without-an-object is.
4. When objects vanish, yet remaining through all unaffected, Consciousness-without-an-object is.
5. Outside of Consciousness-without-an-object, nothing is.