

# Meaning and Purpose of Yoga

Franklin Merrell-Wolff  
January 1980

Richard Moss: Dr. Wolff, who I'm honored to have with us again tonight, has spent his lifetime, developing the articulation of, as he puts it, things that are not easy to speak of. Are any of you not familiar with Dr. Wolff? He made the remark at dinner tonight about having survived most of his disciples. But, Dr. Wolff, I suspect that you will discover part of the reason for this particular journey and touching in as deeply as you have with certain people is that something is being imparted from you to a whole other series of disciples who are preparing to enter or who have already entered into, the work here. And I suspect that among us are a few of those. So without any further remarks from myself, whatever you care to share with us tonight will be listened to quite attentively on many dimensions.

Franklin: Thank you Dr. Moss. Fellow travelers on the way, I shall speak extemporaneously tonight as I did last night. And if I were to give a title to what I propose to say, it would be "The Meaning and Purpose of Yoga."

When William James was conducting his search of the religions of the world for the Gifford Lectures which were delivered in Scotland at the close of the last century, and have since been published as *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, he made a search of all the religions of the world with which he could achieve a contact, to find those elements that were in common and he found only two: first, an agreement as to a wrongness in the world, and then an offering of a solution. The wrongness may be and is variously interpreted and the solutions offered are quite various also. Thus, when Buddha went forth on his first journey outside the gates of the city with his charioteer, for the first time he became acquainted with human suffering. His father had guarded him so that he should not become so acquainted because it had been predicted that if he ever knew the condition of humanity he would not become a great ruler, but would become the Blessed One serving the good of mankind. The experience shocked him. He left his wife and child in the dark of night and went forth to find the solution. The problem, as he saw it, was suffering—the suffering that is preeminent throughout all [of] this world. And he then sought the cure; and this he ultimately found under the Bodhi tree when he attained Enlightenment. Here the problem is viewed as suffering and the offered solution is the cure of suffering.

But a later figure, who in point of fact is the successor of Buddha, namely, Sri Shankaracharya, saw the wrongness in the world as ignorance and that the cure was knowledge. This is not ignorance in the ordinary sense; it's a deep profound ignorance that leads to "mis-orientation." And the curing knowledge is not our ordinary knowledge, but a spiritual knowledge known as *jnana*.

In the case of Christianity the identification of the wrongness was formulated by St. Paul: I do those things which I would not do and I leave undone those things I would do. Here the wrongness is defined as a perverse will and the cure is the elimination of that perversion.

What we have here in these three cases is an approach to the wrongness in the world from the standpoint of our three most important functions: feeling, knowledge or knowing, and willing. How do we cure this problem is the great question of all religions. The crown of religion, the aspect which is most profound, most intelligent, most scientifically developed, is that which we call yoga or the mystical awakening. Now, as I see the problem I would recognize all three aspects—those that are emphasized by the Blessed One, by Shankara, and by St. Paul—as valid, though my own emphasis is the same as that of Shankara. I see the solution of the wrongness in the world as essentially a question of the attainment of right knowledge. So my lifework may be called a philosophic approach to the fundamental religious problem. Therefore, in this whole field of religion in the broad sense, there is an element of therapy involved. Correction of wrongness is essentially a therapeutic problem. It is therefore quite understandable that so much effort should be given to the problems of mankind as essentially a question of therapy, but it is not the only approach and it was not my approach.

I began the search when things were going my way. I was not suffering. A career was opening before me and I was happy in the prospect. So the problem did not come to me as a therapeutic problem, but rather this: that if this which is represented as true on the level of yoga is in fact true, then no philosophic integration which leaves out this aspect could be complete. Is that which is claimed for yoga true or not? It called for a search. I left the potential academic career and began what proved to be a 22-year search and often feeling that I had made a mistake. Mostly groping, but ultimately I found these words in *The Secret Doctrine* concerning Sri Shankara—that he was the adept of adepts, that he was the greatest Initiate in historic times. And I ultimately found his works,<sup>1</sup> and as I read them they sounded very, very familiar. I started sentences and knew what was coming before I read it. One day I felt a call to read the portion on Enlightenment or Liberation. I read it, then afterwards I sat down on a porch swing and a thought came to me: I am already that which I seek—and the search here is the search for the true self, not the false self that we call the ego, but the true self which is called the *atman*—and if I'm already that which I seek, then there is nothing to be attained. I gave up the search and at that moment, as it were, the heavens opened and the bliss beyond understanding enveloped me. I found myself standing on sacred ground and the ultimate divine was surrounding me on all sides, an experience of transcendent beauty, sweetness, and delight that would make one cry out, "Though this cost a thousand lives of suffering, yet the price would be low." To know this, is equivalent to having the door to *nirvana* open at the end of life; no more incarnation, no more experiencing or even having knowledge of suffering, but a knowledge—a union consciously and eternally with the ultimate divine, but no longer any capacity to render any assistance to mankind.

That is the path of the Pratyeka Buddha, not the Buddha of Compassion. Those of you who know the Kwan-Yin vow know that there is another way. This vow runs this way: Never will I seek nor receive private individual salvation; never will I enter into

---

<sup>1</sup> Works by Shankara found in Wolff's library include: Paul Deussen, *The System of the Vedanta* (Chicago: Open Court Publishing Company, 1912), which is a translation of Shankara's Commentary on Badarayana's *Brahma-Sutras*; Manilal N. Dvivedi, *Mandukyopanishad with Gaudapa's Karikas and the Bhasya of Shankara* (Bombay: Tookaram Tatya, F.T.S., 1894); and S. Venkataramanan, trans., *Select Works of Sri Shankaracharya* (Madras: G. A. Natesan & Co., 1911/1921).

final peace alone; but forever, and everywhere, shall I strive for the redemption of all creatures throughout the world. And from *The Voice of the Silence*: Make not of that stream which flows from Sumeru a private pond, but make of yourself a streambed whereby this stream may flow out for the benefit and redemption of all creatures.<sup>2</sup> I had not taken the vow beforehand, and I was debating it. To forgo the wonder for unnumbered *kalpas*, laboring for the redemption of all creatures, seemed an impossible choice. But one day the word came: “A great Master is coming.” I was nervous. It was channeled through my wife, who had that power. He only repeated a simple phrase three times, “I have seen thee.” But the flood of affection from that source would have melted a heart of stone, and I decided to go the way of the Kwan-Yin vow.

He who has attained to the breakthrough has [a] capacity that can make a difference with respect to the problem of humanity. He can bring, at least glimpses, foretastes, inductions of the blessed vision or consciousness. If such depart from this humanity, who shall there be to bring the light and the wisdom and the affection that may redeem these creatures; not only the human creatures, but the younger creatures as well—the animals, the plants, and the monads still in the rocks? This is the path that leads to the Buddha of Compassion. The Pratyeka Buddhas do not go this way. They go the way of withdrawal into *nirvanic* bliss, and thenceforth know nothing of the suffering of creatures.

But the way of the Buddha of Compassion is not as grim as it sounds, for there is, what we might call, a feedback and there is something that returns from those creatures. The words in *The Voice of the Silence* are a bit extreme. It says for unnumbered *kalpas* and without compensation, but so far I have not found it so. There is compensation. One can indeed find happiness in that path. This is the path of transcendent love, and it’s not merely impersonal. But the way is not only a path of love; it is one of wisdom, and executive power. In *Savitri*, which was written by Sri Aurobindo—his great epic poem—there is a section devoted to the Madonna of love, and the summation of the meaning given here is that love alone can solace but cannot save.<sup>3</sup> There must be wisdom also added unto the compassion, and power; then it will have the power not only to solace but to also save. The Madonna of love alone may bear upon her back the sharing of suffering creatures, the pain of the belabored beast, or of the dungeon-bound human being; may suffer with them and give solace, but cannot command the correction of that condition without the guidance of wisdom and the possession of power. So, love alone is not enough. It is necessary, therefore, to garner as much of relevant knowledge as is possible; not to eschew philosophy and science, but to add this to one’s equipment, and then also to build the will of commanding power.

---

<sup>2</sup> See H. P. Blavatsky, *The Voice of the Silence* (Los Angeles: The Theosophy Company, 1928), 72:

Would’st thou thus dam the waters born on Sumeru? Shalt thou divert the stream for thine own sake, or send it back to its prime source along the crests of cycles.

If thou would’st have that stream of hard-earn’d knowledge, of Wisdom heaven-born, remain sweet running waters, thou should’st not leave it to become a stagnant pond.

<sup>3</sup> Aurobindo Ghose, *Savitri*, vol. 28 of *Sri Aurobindo Birth Centennial Library* (Pondicherry: Sri Aurobindo Birth Centenary Library, 1970), 503-508. The reference here is to the “Madonna of suffering,” and is found in Part II, Book 7, Canto 4 of Aurobindo’s poem, which is titled “The Triple Soul-Forces.” Wolff reads this section in the audio recording, “On Love.”

Yoga completed implies all this. The culminating end is not simply the redemption of one's self, but a mastering power that can command and bring about effects that are adequate. Do not therefore despise the gaining of relevant knowledge. Do not despise or eschew the building of a determined will, but add these to the motivation that is directed by your affection. The commanding part—the impressive part of my experience, when the great Master spoke, was a most beautiful and overwhelming affection. But it was from an entity of power and wisdom.

I think the word that I'd like to leave with you is this: this approach to a complete yoga [is] not a yoga of escape alone, but a yoga which eventuates in authentic mastery. If you look at the *trimarga* of the *Bhagavad-Gita*, it consists of a yoga of knowledge or *jnana*, a yoga of action or *karma*, and a yoga of devotion or *bhakti*. I agree with Sri Aurobindo that the complete yoga requires all three. To escape, the yoga of knowledge is enough, but to be able to function as one of the saviors of mankind you need all three. Yes, there is a sense where the problem of this world is a problem of therapy in a profound sense; a healing of a wrongness. But as I said at the beginning, it's not the only approach. One may be drawn to this way out of a happy condition with no sense of wrongness in himself, but just because he loves the truth. That is my message for tonight.

Richard: I was wondering if you might be willing to comment a bit about something that intrigues me, and that is: What is the relationship of what I have been sharing, which Dr. Joy awakened in myself, which was termed “unconditional love,” and that which in Buddhism, and in Tibetan Buddhism in particular, is termed compassion? Could you, do you have a sense of how to relate the two—because I have a feeling there is some difference?

Franklin: I think there is. I find the pattern of the *chakras* too restricting. To say that there is only a choice between emotional affection and impersonal affection in terms of feeling without emotion—one being individually oriented and the other collectively oriented—I need more room to say what I see. Now, my experience of the great Master was not impersonal. There was something that spoke to the uniqueness of an individual and it wasn't emotional.

Man has two aspects: in one respect he is an instance of *Homo sapiens*, just another animal. You could substitute one *Homo sapiens* for another quite impersonally—and this, I understand, is the approach that nurses are trained to take when they are dealing with patients so that they don't become personally interested. But the individual is also something more. He has done something with his equipment. With a very primitive entity it may be minimal; with others his uniqueness may be of such a sort that it affects history. Thus there is a sense that—in which we are not merely substitutions in a universal formula. Now, the treatment of the *anahata* love as merely impersonal—that it looks alike upon a Christ or a Hitler, or a stone for that matter—fails to bring out the value of this uniqueness aspect which every one of us has in greater or less degree. And, I'd say from the hospital point of view, that the impersonal efficiency of a nurse may not be enough to arouse in one the will to live, but that in an orientation to his uniqueness as an individual could very well arouse that will. I'm referring to [an] experience I went through. And here is something that I don't find adequately handled in the sequence of *manipura* and *anahata*. I'm treating *manipura* as being emotional in the sense of only emotional—there's a certain denigration involved—and that the only other step is an

absolute universality. There is a need for recognizing the uniqueness element in the individual. We see that he is something more than a mere substitution in a formula.

Now that has been my criticism of the approach to this subject exclusively through the sequence of the *chakras*. I think we have more here. Remember that Buddha had his favorite disciple, Ananda. And yet he is the greatest of the great; the supreme expression of compassion so far as we know it in this world. Shankara had his Padmapada—the one that looked after him when he was indifferent unto to himself.

I might tell you a little story as a side issue. It is said in this biography of Shankara that he met some practitioner in some weird discipline who said that if he could sacrifice the head of a sage, he could make progress in his discipline, so he asked Shankara if he could have his head, and Shankara said that was alright with him. Shankara was really quite detached. It didn't matter to him whether he had a head or not. But he said, "Come up where we sleep, you can take the head then, but I warn you my disciples might have other views on the subject." Well, Padmapada sensed something was going on and the story says he turned himself into a roaring lion and that practitioner never got near to Shankara. You can take that literally or figuratively if you please. Now, there was a uniqueness element there in the relationship between Padmapada and Shankara, and we're the better off because Shankara's head was not taken. That head was able to give us wisdom after that which we would not now have. I'm making an argument for a higher valuation of the uniqueness principle in the field of affection; that it is not abstract impersonality only. That's, the point I want to make.

Richard: It just seems to me that if we look at it from the bottom up, unconditional love or compassion is impossible because our affections are motivated by very polarized likes and dislikes—preferences; and so, we will relate to the unique quality in an individual that we uniquely prefer and eschew that which we don't like and thus we're in reaction to. And so as I've tried to—in my mind, or in my deeper being—[to] sense: Are compassion and unconditional love the same thing as I suspect that they are? Because, for me, any pure state of love has also had the delight of the hug; has also had the . . . I sense that . . . had the issue of unconditional love been a conceptualized thing in my mind, then I would be forced into a kind of isolation, apathy or neutrality in which a Hitler and a Buddha could be the same, or a Hitler and a stone, or a Hitler and a beautiful warm friendly child could be equivalent, but in direct experience that's not the case, as I can see both compassion or unconditional love for myself. First there has to be a realization of divinity that is not selective. It doesn't belong only to objects I prefer, but belongs as a pervading principle in all things, and then my love can be unconditional, or—and I feel also that there is a—I don't know why I've struggled with it. It was triggered in me by a remark of Carolyn that the compassion referred to by Tarthang Rimpoche is different to her in her relationship as a disciple and friend to Rimpoche, as the unconditional love state is, as shared and inducted by Brugh Joy, and in her relationship as friend, assistant, teacher, disciple to Brugh Joy.

So that got me to pondering and that's where the question came from. I have to say for myself, I can't find a difference. As long as the state of unconditional love is, or compassion is, based on a realization of the All, then when you are in a hospital the uniqueness of each object delights you uniquely and is honored. If there is no unconditional love or compassionate realization of the divine, then the object pleases you or displeases you. [If] you appreciate its courage, you're pleased, and you perform well.

[If] you don't appreciate its pain or the vulnerability it expresses, then you avoid and don't perform well. And this, of course, is neither love nor compassion, but just emotional reaction. And in this sense I have separated the domain of emotion from the domain of the heart or of the *anahata*. But the minute I come to a realization that encompasses both, then I no longer bother to separate. I make the separation for those who I see who have not had the encompassing realization so that they are thrown into a paradox: well if it's not love and it's not emotion, where am I? And I've allowed that, for myself, unconditional love was a paradox or a koan that eventually precipitated something else—or maybe didn't—but somehow something else was precipitated and then these words are structures on which to understand the experience. [It would be] interesting to hear your comments.

Franklin: I think the unconditional love—I used the word universal benevolence and Dr. Joy accepted it as a valid synonym—is like a force in nature; like the force of gravity; like the shining of the sun upon the just and the unjust equally, or the rain which falls upon the just and unjust equally, but that there is also this other principle that recognizes the uniqueness element in the individual, and that it is valid and not simply inferior.

Richard: And, in fact, as I feel into it, [it is] a more highly evolved state than just acknowledgment or recognition of universal benevolence. Thank you.

Franklin: You're welcome.

Richard: Is there anyone that wants to ask or initiate an exchange with Dr. Wolff? Do you feel ready to field a few thoughts from others?

Franklin: Oh, I think so.

Richard: Okay.

Participant: Dr. Wolff, you talked about the necessity of both developing the state of love or affection and knowledge, and we have talked about that before, and today you talked in a way that I hadn't heard you talk before about power and about the will . Power has been a word that has many connotations and I sense that you were talking about a different power. I'm not exactly sure what my question is, but I would like you to talk a little bit more about the development of the will.

Franklin: Well, determine what you will do and do it. Yes—

Audience: Laughter!

Richard: Be discreet in your determinations.

Franklin: Hmm?

Participant: Richard said, be discreet in your determinations. Richard just said under his breath—kind of—be discreet in your determinations. And I guess that—

Franklin: Well, decidedly, that is good advice. It has been said that both love and knowledge are essentially pure, but that power is subject to corruption and that I think is quite evident to us. But the forces of light without power are impotent. And those who would be effective in this world must be willing to accept the responsibility of power. There is the temptation to misuse. We see that on every side. But without power, the

redemption of the world is impossible. Therefore there must be those who are courageous enough to bear the responsibility of power. That is what is involved in true mastery. Love and knowledge alone are not enough.

Participant: I guess my question is in the area of discernment. Because I have obviously seen that power is corruptible—

Franklin: Oh yes, definitely.

Participant: —so my own concern in taking responsibility for using power is how does one discern whether one is being corrupt in the use of power?

Franklin: Yes, I know, and there's no simple answer to that. Be ever alert. Watch your own motivation. Watch for the subtle element that may come into one that would divert him from a truly honest use of power. No, there's no simple answer to it. You have to be willing to go forth and dare the chance that you may make a mistake, and I see no other way.

Richard: It's very interesting that this evening for some reason—just before you arrived—I opened up the *New Testament*, and came to the section on Christ's forty days in the desert and the temptation of the devil. And rereading it, it states that one of the tricks of the temptation was to offer the power in such a way as to assume it was your own. To which Christ's response was: "We are taught above all else to honor only one Father." There are other things in it and I remember the feeling I had that this was probably the only place in the *Bible* where the discussion of power is really entered into in terms of the Christian model. And then of course, there is the remark that by their fruits they shall be known. And it may be that that's how you have to watch also, by the consequence of your action.

Franklin: Yeah. You have to take the responsibility of your action. But you've got to also have the courage to face that responsibility.

Richard: In your, experience as a yogi and as a teacher with disciples, did you ever have to inflict or share an energy of power that precipitated pain in the life of one of your disciples or associates which was part of a true process? Did that ever happen?

Franklin: I don't know whether it has ever happened. Not to my knowledge. It may have happened without my knowing it.

Richard: Part of what I have often seen—at least less so here, but in certain places where I've seen certain teachers working—and when I was in India at the Bhagwan Shree Rajneesh ashram—was the delivery of blows of such power at a key knot in one's psyche that would literally throw the person, when delivered in right timing, into a chaos of dissolution and pain out of which they might be consumed or reborn. And that the use of power in that way became exaggerated in some respects in the therapeutic groups run by his disciples, so that the power became actual physical brutality of which occasionally some were brought to a *samadhi* or *satori* state as they encountered the fullness of rage. Now, I saw clearly that there was a validity to the delivery of a blow that separated an individual from a delusional pattern or a dream pattern in their being and threw them into pain that was potentially destructive. And in my own life I've taken actions that I knew I had to do for my sake that eventuated in tremendous pain in another.

I might throw the parallel that if there was any part of Gertrude that consciously chose to leave, or, from your own example, [as] some have suggested, that perhaps she was removed in order to precipitate you into a new level of realization; that from that perspective then forces orchestrating the evolution of our being are delivering experiences to us which are extremely painful and yet necessary to be integrated.

Franklin: Yes, that is so. I can report that to be perfectly true.

Richard: So, my sense has been that this is one of the most difficult areas of discernment for anyone in the position who has genuine power, not just the power of muscles to move the world, but the power of presence to affect a psychic reality within another and that this is the most difficult space I've ever encountered for me.

Franklin: There's no doubt about that.

Richard: Both as something done outward and—I'll make this as a comment and see what you feel—for myself before I ever attempted to exercise power in a teaching or explanatory situation that might create pain, I had first been taken to an experience where had I not been able to gather the power of my own rage I would have been swept into madness. And so, configuring this incredible sense of rage and power and directing it inwardly, I finally was able to do much like you described in your battle with the takeover: I was able to finally simply release out of—I stood there and I knew that I would go crazy if I continued this process even another minute; that I would be consumed and finally destroyed, and so the rage and the *satori* that followed the rage, and the clearing of the pattern could not be separated and the pure power of that [which I] directed inwardly at a place which created tremendous pain had a value. I think I still do not feel comfortable with the idea of using power that creates pain as a mechanism for precipitating change or growth.

Franklin: No, I wouldn't feel comfortable either, but it might happen.

Richard: I think it does happen.

Participant: My experience with having at times received a type of blow is that it must be offered in absolute clarity; that it must be totally unconditional, and that both people must be in absolute trust. And I'm not necessarily meaning a physical blow, but this is in the way of an action from someone who is holding the power or is seen in a position of mastery toward someone else. That's what you're speaking about, Richard, when you're talking about containing the rage.

Richard: I have heard it stated that Enlightenment is impossible in someone who has not also owned rage, their rage, [and] the *satori* or *samadhi* states, the *samadhi* states are not available to those who have repressed the most carnal levels of their own power. I don't know whether that exists anywhere in the teaching, but it has a truth in my own life.

Franklin: Certainly an entity that's strong enough to attain the Realization would also be strong enough to rage. He has that potential, but he might hold it in control.

Participant: The rage somehow—what it triggers in me too—is the whole idea of betrayal, you know. [For example], Christ, on the sword, “Why hath thou betrayed me”? And to allow the deepest sense of one's own feeling of betrayal to bring the deepest sense



of trust—that deepest, that infinite sense of trust—it’s like you have to own that doubt to come to really know who to trust.

Participant: I’m wondering about humor and, for me, humor is very wonderful because it seems to hide in *dhyana*, and it hides in *karma*, and it hides in *bhakti*. It’s none of those. Sometimes I think it balances; it completes the triangle. It’s been very important in my life. Sometimes I mechanically use it for power, but more and more lately it feels like a balm. Humor. Woody Allen feels like a balm to me. I wonder if you could talk about humor.

Participant: Did you hear what he said?

Franklin: No. I can’t hear.

Participant: That’s very funny.

Participant: He asked you if you could talk about the place of humor.

Franklin: Oh, what did he say?

Participant: I delivered that in a very sober . . . and he couldn’t hear it . . . perhaps with wisdom but without power.

Audience: Laughter.

Franklin: Let me see. Someone said that what is the greatest—oh, yes, I think it was H.P.B—need for him who would attain [is] a sense of humor; not to take yourself too seriously. Yes, humor definitely has a place. I bring humor into the picture, I think, quite frequently.

Participant: You do.

Franklin: Bernard Shaw was another one who may have used humor. Let’s see if I can think of some. Oh, yes—

Participant: Bernard Horn is...

Franklin: This was something from Bernard Shaw. Let’s see. He was talking to one of the fashionable women who was quite proud of herself, and he asked, “Would you go to bed with me for ten thousand pounds?” She thought she would. Then he said, “Would you go to bed with me for five pounds?” And she got indignant and says, “What do you think I am? And he said, “We know already what you are, we’re just figuring out the price.” Bernard Shaw could [use] wisdom and mix it with humor alright. Oh, yes there’s a valuable place for humor.

Richard: Shall I open up one more can of worms?

Participant: Sure, Richard. Go ahead.

Participant: Which one?

Richard: This is for you.

Participant: No, I think it’s for Dr. Wolff, but go ahead.

Richard: Dr. Wolff, what I wanted to ask you about—or share with you and hear your feeling—you’re familiar with Carl Jung’s work?

Franklin: Yes.

Richard: —particularly, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*.

Franklin: Yes.

Richard: In *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* he discusses the heart attack that he had and his hospitalization. And the state of consciousness he touched in there, which was partly a realization of his relationship to his wife and that his full attainment couldn't be achieved while she was alive, which became—his full attainment of realization of his own being was not possible while she was alive—this became [so] clear to him that he began a deeper path for himself—as he says it in the book—after her death in the latter years of his life.<sup>4</sup> What we see happening now is a sense in us, at various ages—younger and younger ages—that there is a primary—now of course Dr. Jung expressed it as spirituality was polar opposite to sexuality—

Franklin: Right.

Richard: —and that in a deeper sense, after having had a lifetime relationship in marriage he talked about it, as not being able to achieve a certain quality of relationship to himself while she was alive.<sup>5</sup> We find in our lives—I find in my life—that this is a very real issue of a sense of losing a certain feeling or a certain connection to wholeness at one level as one enters deeper and deeper into intimate personal relationship and sharing, particularly with someone of the opposite sex—specifically with someone of the opposite sex—and that this needs to be balanced continuously with a meditative relationship to self which seems antithetical to the intimacy, to the personal sharing, to the closeness. If both are to be full human beings—if both are to be seven-dimensional, sevenfold rather than one being threefold and one being fourfold and getting one seven out of twos—that there is a very great difficulty and, as you know in our time, a tremendous difficulty in the whole issue of marriage and in the whole issue of relationship.

I don't know what you would like to say, but recognizing that marriage and the role of the man and the role of the woman is very different, I believe—and this may not be true—but it feels to me to have been different in the past than it is right now, and that in my mind and my interpretation of the disintegration of marriage, and the conflict and the issue of relationship as people embark on the spiritual path, is part of the reason why marriage is disintegrating. Yet a minister friend of mine has said quite clearly that in Christianity the surrender process, or the sacrifice that allows you to own into Christ

---

<sup>4</sup> Carl G. Jung, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* (New York: Random House, 1961), 296. Editor's Note: When reading this material one does find that Jung makes a reference to a vision of his wife after her death, but one might question whether he meant to imply that her death was necessary for his "full attainment of realization." In any case, Jung had a heart attack and a near-death experience in 1944, after which he wrote many of his principal works, and his wife did not die until November 1955.

<sup>5</sup> Editor's Note: Again, Dr. Jung refers to a great sense of wholeness, objectivity, and emotional detachment that came after his heart attack and again from the withdrawal of projections realized during a vision sometime after his wife died, but it unclear whether he is saying that this could have come about *only* after the death of his wife.

consciousness or Christ state is marriage; that that is the discipline. What do you have to say about that?

Franklin: Hmm.

Audience: Laughter.

Richard: There's my can of worms.

Franklin: I suppose that marriage can be a discipline, but it also can happen to be an unbroken delight.

Participant: Yea.

Participant: What are you talking about?

Richard: Would you just talk about what you read or felt when you were reading *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* when Jung discussed this?

Franklin: Yes. Various things. One was astonishment at his gross failure to understand mathematics.

Audience: Laughter.

Participant: Someone say anything about humor?

Participant: You may have to elaborate [on] that one.

Franklin: Well, have you read the section on that?

Richard: Yeah.

Franklin: Where he said he came to the mathematics class with the sheer feeling of terror?

Participant: Somewhere in there was this problem in relationship, too.

Franklin: Yeah. Apparently he didn't have the capacity for abstraction that is required in mathematics. It really is a funny section that comes in the early part of the book. And I wondered about it. Here is a master psychologist, and he bought his Waterloo in mathematics.

Now, it so happens in my own academic career my major was in mathematics, pure mathematics, and my principle minor was psychology; and I used to soar in the transcendental zone of the infinities, and then I'd come over to psychology where they would say, "Oh! That is nothing but something very much less than soaring in the infinitudes." And I just wonder if there is a dichotomy between psychology and mathematics. Because there certainly was that "nothing but" element when I got over into the psychological class, where [they] said: "Get out of your bloom, get down here and crawl with us."

Audience: Laughter.

Richard: That's alright. The psychological mind which thinks that way would take a look at the things that happen in this room and with this group of people, and I don't know what words they'd come up with. They would run and you would see the smoke going down the hill.

Audience: Laughter.

Participant: One of the things that I think you would—if you'd noticed in this morning's paper—be thrilled with is that they now have a computer that will do 750,000 computations a second. They discovered the largest absolute number, which now has 13,985 digits to it, and it takes three months with this computer to figure out that that's right. (An absolute number is a number that you cannot divide anything else into but 1 and then that number).<sup>6</sup> And you know, if these guys would—

Participant: Boring.

Participant: The only reason I bring that up is—

Participant: All I know is seven . . .

Participant: That somehow seems removed to me from what you're talking about in love, and wisdom, and will, and yet it turns somebody on; and there is something that works in the universe that turns people on [in] different ways. And I think that if—or I find that if—I listen to that, for me, my life gets exciting, and I have the power to do what I need to do to get to where that voice inside me says, "Go". And somehow I feel that we're listening to that for ourselves and sensing the community; that other people are moving in the same direction and that there is the same togetherness with things. And whether it's mathematics, or psychology, or whatever each of us is doing—that's our uniqueness. But somehow there's something underneath us that's putting us here to share this.

Richard: Well, Dr. Wolff, as I said to you, part of the experiment was hopefully to share energy with you directly, if you feel open to that, and then you can tell us what that felt like for you, because we'll really want to know.

Franklin: Well, what, what felt like?

Participant: What you're about to experience.

Franklin: What I'm about—Oh!

Participant: You can tell us afterwards.

Richard: There's only one problem, you'll have to take your shoes off for a few minutes.

Franklin: Have to take my shoes off? Well, my socks are alright.

Richard: Let me describe what I'd like to do and see whether you feel comfortable with it. What I'd like to do is set up a table here in the middle of the room, and move into rapport with you; and have the whole group focus their consciousness in the way in which, I think, Rachel has been sharing with you at the other house; except this time we'll have everybody here; and an energy will be brought through into the center and shared through me and then shared through everyone; and we'll go into a silent ritual with you for about a half hour; and at the end of that time, if you're still here—

Audience: Laughter.

---

<sup>6</sup> Dr. Moss clearly meant to say "prime number" here.

Richard: —you can tell us what, if anything, that was like. Someone help me with the table. Lynn will be joining with me; you'll have a masculine and a feminine energy taking the vortex and splitting it.

Richard: Yellow to yellow. Correct. Well alright. This is what we call sometimes, instant *samadhi*. Well, every now and then, every now and then it's amazingly true. That's exactly what happens. I think Dr. Joy has probably shared energy with you in this way, has he not?

Franklin: No.

Richard: He hasn't? Okay. Do you feel alright to do this? To let us share with you?

Franklin: Well, I just don't know what's going on.

Participant: Well, it's not very different than what you have been experiencing with me and with Rachel and with Cora.

Participant: You know when you get . . .

Franklin: Get what?

Participant: That's what you guys call it?

Participant: When you feel people giving you energy and you feel real good. That's all we're going to do.

Franklin: Oh, I see. Alright.

Richard: We've practiced doing this. Everyone here does this not only in their own work as therapists but in their own lives, and we've done this as a group hundreds of time and, well, we rarely get the opportunity to go into an energy field like your own.

Franklin: Alright.

Richard: That's part of what I called "the experiment in accelerated learning."

Franklin: Oh, I see.

Richard: By dissolving with you, I believe we learn to receive each other in a way that . . .