

# Discussion of the Commentaries on the Aphorisms on Consciousness Without an Object

Franklin Merrell-Wolff  
March 27, 1960

There were some questions raised last time we met. Maybe we should give some attention to them first this afternoon. There was a question raised as to the meaning of the word 'radical'. Of course that's a question you could answer for yourselves by using a dictionary because its etymological meaning is "root." Anything that is fundamental or involves an element of basic change or action is radical. That's the true meaning of the word. It is used of course in mathematics as the name for the sign of the root of a number. It is used in philosophy and it is only partly used and incidentally used by social movements. Now is that clear? A radical change or a radical consideration would be one that was fundamental, that went at the root of things rather than at the surface.

Participant: It doesn't necessarily mean that it's not a complete change though from what is there to another?

Wolff: Complete?

Participant: Uh-huh, a complete change over, changing over from one thought to another.

Wolff: Well, I don't think that you equate the word radical with complete change. It does mean something that affects the very root of action, as the activities or the discipline that leads to yoga is radical, thoroughgoing. That's one of the meanings of radical, thoroughgoing. And we should not . . . from the text, by the way. I cannot help but recommend the use of the dictionary. Some of these questions can be answered from that, and bear in mind that I'm more apt to use the word closer to its root meaning rather than to its popular application.

Now here's a question, "Where does the unity of the self come in? Does it stand behind the subjective?" I don't altogether get the bearing of the question. You know the self is one. That's our experience of it. The universe which stands in contrast to the subject—I use the self as synonymous with subject—is multiform, manifold, but that manifoldness becomes unified through the self of the apperceiver. It is unified as *my* experience: I am one; the universe many. I think you can get that from analysis. Ultimately, in your search for the pure subject, you'll find that which is present in all individuals, and it's on'. Oneness is its characteristic and manyness is characteristic of the universe of objects. Bear in mind, I use the word universe to represent anything that's objective, whether subtle or gross—whether what we ordinarily think of as things or as ideas. That makes up the universe. That's the sense in which Shankara uses it. It's equivalent to the sense of *Sangsara*, yes, of the Buddhists. The self is the subjective pole. The unity of the self implies duality. Well, of course, you can't say "one" without implying two, or many.

Participant: [Difficult to hear.]

Wolff: You can. It's one pole of the subject-object consciousness, which is our familiar consciousness—a self aware of a world around it. Now in your yoga, and this has particular reference to *jnana* yoga and its technique, you're first effort is the isolation of the Self and establishment of identification with it alone. The Self is known by different names. It's known as the witness, and it is that which gives the sanction or rejects. Your practical technique when you have learned to take the stand of the witness or of the self in effecting any change is simply applying the rejection without willed effort. If you reject any course in the nature, sooner or later that tendency in the nature runs out, loses its force, because it's no longer sanctioned by the Self or the witness. Bear in mind I mean by witness and Self the same thing, they are not two entities, but just two facets of meaning. It's the giver of the sanction as well as the witness. It is the center of the consciousness of all beings.

Here's another, "Would you say that as long as we dwell on finding subjectivity we never can get beyond that point?" Well, if you really, if you really arrive at the Self, as distinct from the ego, you don't need to worry. I found that autonomous process, or spontaneous process took on from there.

Participant: Here comes Charles . . .

Wolff: Hmm?

Participant: Here comes Charles . . .

Wolff: Let's wait for a while then.

Participant: [Difficult to hear.]

Wolff: We're reading a manuscript that I have which has been put upon tape and is available for use here and in Chicago and to some extent down at Douglas and Tucson.<sup>1</sup> But as it's listened to, questions arise, and that's one thing I can contribute is some answers to these questions. Otherwise, they haven't. Now, here's a question. "Is it wrong to be preoccupied with the Divine, to be so preoccupied with the Divine that that is what we see in everything?" Well, I'd say what could be more right than that? I don't know how in the world a person could suggest any wrongness in that. Lucky you are if you see the Divine in everything at all times. Well, you've come a long way.

Participant: Isn't this what we are really striving for? This is the teaching isn't it?

Wolff: Yes. That's one picture—

Participant: Uh-huh.

Wolff: —one way of viewing it. Seeing the Divine in all things belongs more preeminently to *karma* and *bhakti*—to yoga. Seeing all things as a *maya* and the Divine as transcendental, and as Realization being essentially a departure from all worlds, is more characteristic of *jnana*. The full integral yoga involves both features and as either *karma* yoga or *bhakti* yoga seems to be more available to the people, the, practice, the effort to see the Divine in all things is one of the most important disciplines. No, you can't overdo that.

---

<sup>1</sup> The audio recordings, *The Philosophy of Consciousness Without an Object*, parts 1-25.

“How would you describe the content of consciousness as used in the document?” Well, the content of consciousness is everything of which you can be conscious: the universe, your system of ideas, your feeling-toned states, all modifications of consciousness. ‘Contents of consciousness’ is used in that sense in the manuscript. So it’s everything of which we are usually aware. It’s only as you advance in yoga that you become cognizant of the fact that there is a subject or a Self that is aware of all of these things and that you have arrived at the true subject only when you no longer seek to make it into a subtle object. Yes, if that which you call the “self” can be a content of your consciousness, it is not the Self. You’ve got an ego or you’ve got a surrogate of the Self. But the true Self can never be a content. It is that on which all content rests, depends.

Now, anything more? Any comment or any further questions upon that section which you read last time, or heard? This by the way, Charles, is a “Commentary on the Aphorisms,” the first general commentary which is Part II of this manuscript. It consists of several subsections, about 16 or 17, in which I generally discuss an idea that’s bound to be more or less strange. It is followed then by a commentary upon each aphorism by itself.

Now, I have a figure here in the next section that begins to be a little technical because it’s drawn from modern physics and its value lies in this: that it should make the basic concepts in the aphorisms not so strange as they might seem at first sight. If you remember, the first five run this way:

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

Now, it’s just those five, most people who have read them say that they arouse no meaning at all. It didn’t correspond to anything thinkable. Now, at this particular subsection, I think I can show that a similar idea already exists in the thought of the physicists, and thus it is not so strange in its logical schema. But this you may find a little difficult and the language here was corrected to fit modern physical technical terminology, by Melvin, Dr. Melvin, who had been a professor at Columbia University, was a trained theoretical physicist and was teaching in the Columbia School of Mines prior to the time that he came to live with us for a time.

Modern physics and astronomy have developed a speculative conception which is, in some respects, an inverse reflection of the view elaborated here. This interpretation is derived from certain facts which have come to light in recent decades, partly as the result of development of instrumental aids to observation and partly as the result of progress in interpretative theory. It now appears, quite clearly, that the older conception of matter as

being composed of unchanging and indestructible atoms does not faithfully interpret the facts derived through experience.

[Here's a footnote.] It would be more correct to say that the older conception can no longer interpret the facts as *simply* as the newer conception. It is always possible to make the older conception work by adding intricate interpretations through *ad hoc* hypotheses, but this is done at the price of clumsiness and complication. It is not change in the factual picture that compels change in theory, but the greater logical beauty and efficacy of the new theory.

Now, I don't know whether what I'm saying here can be very clear because you have to be up a bit on scientific methodology and in the philosophical interpretations that are forced by science to appreciate what is here said. So if you have a question that I might be able to answer, bring it up at any time.

It has become necessary to conceive of the atom . . .

All right, I might elaborate a little further on this very point that facts don't force a change of conception so much as the conception of simplicity and beauty forces it. Now, we could treat the whole universe in its relation of motion from the earth as a base of reference as is done in the Ptolemaic system. In that case the motion of the planets takes a complex form of cycloids and epicycloids and epi-epicycloids, building up altogether a very complicated figure of motion; but, nonetheless, it's logically valid to so approach the universe, and in that case you would say the sun goes around the earth every twenty-four hours. In fact the whole stellar universe goes around the earth every twenty-four hours. There is no logical difficulty with it. But there's enormous complication if you try to handle the problems of building a thinkable picture of the total universe. But on the other hand, if you take the sun, or perhaps even more exactly, the sun with the ecliptic, that is the path that the earth follows, as your base of reference, then you can see the earth and the other bodies that move around the sun as following relatively simple curves. They are either circles or ellipses modified with certain perturbations due to the presence of more than one gravitational field in which they are moving. And carrying that on more fully, we can get, by taking the Milky Way as our base of reference, get a simpler picture of the whole stellar universe and the galactic universe, including the extragalactic systems, simpler than if we took either the earth or our sun as your base of reference.

Now, your base of reference is really a mathematical conception, and logically you can take any one of these, but one is simpler, one is more workable than other alternative ones; and that very fact of simplicity becomes the governing factor determining which you take. Now, that's very fundamental in the scientific development of the theory. It is not correct to say that one gives you truth and the other doesn't. The picture from the earth as a base of reference will be true from that perspective if it's worked out correctly from that perspective. And the one with the sun as the center would be true from that perspective if you worked out the—

Participant: I think the Harvey's—

Wolff: Hmm?

Participant: I think the Harvey's are coming.

Wolff: Oh. Oh yes. Well, somebody's coming. Nick.

Participant: Oh, Nick is coming too. Nick . . . All three of them are coming.

. . . as composed of still finer units, such as electrons, protons, positrons, and so forth, and these in turn as being subject to transformation under the appropriate conditions. When the transformation takes place it appears that ponderable matter assumes a state of radiant energy.

Thus, in other words, when an electron meets a positron, both are destroyed and become a flash of radiation. That is your ponderable matter, which is in the form of the electron and the positron have become a vibratory propulsion that is of the nature of light, though light in that sense is not restricted to what we call visible light. Light is identical in the physical sense with the whole range of electromagnetic waves which extends from the longest radio waves, which are miles long, all through infrared waves, the visible waves, the ultraviolet waves, the x-ray waves, the radiant type of waves, and ultimately the several octaves of cosmic waves. Altogether something like sixty or more octaves which make up the whole range of light of which only one octave gives us visible light. All of that is radiation. When your matter is destroyed it becomes some complex of waves in that radiation, which extends throughout space traveling at the rate of visible light, something on the order of 186,000 miles a second. That's energy. The ponderable matter becomes in that case sheer energy. Now, that's important to grasp that in connection with understanding this figure.

This process, seemingly, is proceeding in the stars continuously and is the source of the energy derived from them upon the surface of the earth. Apparently, then, the stars are disintegrating in the sense that matter concentrated in bodies at widely separated points in space is being transformed into radiant energy which spreads throughout all space. All of this suggests that the various systems of stars will ultimately disappear as masses of ponderable matter, and in their place will be a space uniformly filled with radiant energy. On the other hand, observation of numerous extragalactic nebulae suggests, very convincingly, that both stars and systems of stars are generated by an aggregation of more or less homogeneous and amorphous matter into concentrated and more or less organized form. These various facts from observation, combined with theory, suggest the following conclusions:

- a. That if the history of the stellar universe were traced back far enough in time we would find a stage wherein there were no stars, but only a more or less homogeneous matter and radiation spread uniformly throughout space.

[Then there's a note.] According to latest theory, the radiation density at the early highly condensed stage of the expanding universe was much

higher than the matter density. What matter there was present was, however, spread out uniformly. At a later stage of expansion the radiation density had dropped to equality with that of matter, and at this point “gravitational instability” set in and the galaxies began forming.

I meet so seldom with this group that I’m trying to contribute the one thing that they haven’t got. They have my manuscript on tape. This is an unpublished manuscript of about 800 typewritten pages. They have most of it on tape, but a number of questions come up from time to time and that’s the one thing that I can contribute is perhaps some suggestive answers to these questions. The particular part I’m in now is a general commentary on the aphorisms of Consciousness-without-an-object.<sup>2</sup> And as those aphorisms are rather strange to most readers and tend not to arouse meaning, I have here developed a rather elaborate figure from modern subatomic physics that employs a logically similar conception which should therefore make the aphorisms more thinkable. I had already gotten to the point of outlining certain conclusions that come from our present knowledge of subatomic physics. I’ll reread the first point.

- a. That if the history of the stellar universe were traced back far enough in time we would find a stage wherein there were no stars, but only a more or less homogeneous matter and radiation spread uniformly throughout space.
- b. That if we could follow the life of the systems of stars far enough into the future, we would come to a time when most matter, if not all, would be reduced or transformed into radiation extending throughout all space.
- c. That the two notions of conservation of mass and of energy must be united into the conception of a persistent Energy which may appear in the forms either of ponderable mass or of field energy, the latter including that which is termed radiation.

Some of the terminology here has been validated and corrected by a trained theoretical physicist, so that’s one reason why it may be a little bit technical and obscure. Now, what is common, if we have this universe changing as it were from a radiant state where there is no matter and into another state where there is a substantial of ponderable matter what is common? What remains unaltered or invariant—that’s a technical term he gives—throughout that process? Now, bear in mind, the invariant is the important thing for it corresponds to Consciousness-without-an-object, which is treated in this philosophy as the invariant element. It is that which persists whether there is a universe of experience or not. Whether we are drawn into the state of pure subjectivity where there is no form or

---

<sup>2</sup> See the audio recording *The Philosophy of Consciousness Without an Object*, part 7, which is this section of the book: Part II, “The Aphorisms on Consciousness Without an Object,” Chapter 3, “General Discussion of Consciousness Without an Object,” Section 7.

whether we manifest in a universe of expression, something remains unchanged, unaltered, or, in other words, invariant in the process. And the symbolic name I used for that was Consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject. But here we're showing that there is a similar conception used actually in physics—logically similar.

But both conceptions leave us with but one constant or 'invariant', namely, Energy.

[Now, there's a note on this because 'Energy' here is technical.] Actually, the more generally valid space-time 'invariant' concept is that of the directed quantity 'Energy-Momentum', of which 'Energy' is merely that part lying along the direction of increasing time. For the sake of simplicity of illustration we use only the more familiar term 'Energy'.

So this familiar term 'Energy' here would have two phases: the state of radiation and the state of ponderable matter, but in both, we have Energy. Now, the atom bomb is the proof that ponderable matter can be at least in some degree reduced to energy, and it's that reduction of a very small proportion of that ponderable matter that makes the explosive power of the atom bomb. That was the tangible proof. The theory existed before the demonstration. In fact, the whole demonstration, an investment of two billion dollars was made upon a gamble that the theory was correct; and it worked out.

Participant: Could I ask a question? I don't know what subatomic means.

Wolff: The atoms which—we have entities which we used to think were the fundamental units as building blocks of the matter, which we call atoms. The Greeks called them atoms. Today they are merely the chemical atoms. They themselves, however, we know have a structure, and are compounded of still more ultimate components of which: oh, you're familiar with the term electron and of protons—some 1800 times heavier than the electron—and the positron which is a positive electron, and the neutron, neutrino, and a vast family of mesons. All of these are components in the total structure of what we used to think was the simple entity—an atom. So, the atom itself is a compound. The physics that deals with this inner structure of the atom is what is called subatomic physics.

Participant: I see. Thank you.

Wolff: It's the field of physics that has prospered in the twentieth century. It is the physics of the twentieth century. It is what has made the atom bomb possible. It is what has made a great deal of the modern electronic development possible.

Participant: Well, do I understand this correctly? Now, this radiant energy that you mentioned is the same as consciousness—would correspond to Consciousness-without-an-object?

Wolff: No.

Participant: It would not?

Wolff: No, it doesn't. I'm glad you bring up the point because we can clarify that. We're bringing out the point here that the universe at one stage was predominantly radiant energy and at another stage is predominantly ponderable matter. The ponderable

matter can become radiant energy and the radiant energy, somehow, we believe, can become the ponderable matter—that you oscillate between the two; but there is something that remains unaltered in that process—the invariant. The invariant is the all important thing to isolate. The invariant there is here called ‘Energy’, which is a simple name for what is more technically ‘Energy-Momentum’ . . . we don’t want to be that technical. Now, it’s this Energy, this invariant that corresponds to Consciousness-without-an-object. Actually, as I’ll point out later, the radiant state corresponds to *Nirvana*; ponderable matter corresponds to the universe of objects.

Participant: But then you have a difference between when you say radiant energy and now when you speak of Energy.

Wolff: Yeah, the radiant state of Energy and the ponderable state of Energy, which is matter. This, this we say is the ponderable state of matter. The light by which we see is an example of the radiant state of Energy. But the one can become the other. It’s the basic concept of our modern physics. It’s the portion of the matter that becomes radiant energy that gives the explosive power of the atom bomb.

Now, if now we substitute for “Consciousness-without-an-object” the notion of ‘Energy’; for the “Universe”—in the sense of all objects—

And by all objects I mean not merely things for sensation. I mean also the whole field of ideas, the whole field of feeling-toned states of consciousness, everything whatsoever that can be differentiated, individualized, or made to stand in contrast to something else. All of that is meant by the term universe, *Sangsara*, or universe of objects. Now, if we substitute for the “Universe”—

the notion of ‘ponderable matter’; and for “*Nirvana*” the notion of ‘state of radiation’, we can restate our first aphorisms as follows:

Now remember the first aphorism “Consciousness-without-an-object is” would be stated in this form:

1. Energy is.
2. Before ponderable matter was, Energy is.
3. Though ponderable matter seems to exist, Energy is.

It’s invariant. She’s unchanged. It’s the one thing remaining unaltered in all of these changes.

4. When ponderable matter vanishes, yet remaining through all unaffected, Energy is.
5. Outside of Energy there is no matter.

And I also brought in the eleventh aphorism, which fitted this context very well.



11. Within Energy lie both ponderable matter and radiant energy, yet for Energy these two are the same.<sup>3</sup>

Now, you have a conception there—a little hard to grasp. But you do find a parallel of it in the Buddhistic *Sutras* when they speak of the state of the “Clear Light” or *Shunyata*, which means Voidness, or *Alaya Vijnana*, which means Root Consciousness. They will say this, there is no difference between *Nirvana* and *Sangsara*. Now, actually in the Realization itself you find that to be true, that these supremely sweeping states or conceptions actually make no difference to the integral root from which they spring.

I know that I refer in *Pathways Through to Space*, and also earlier in this text, to the experience in the High Indifference where one course of action or another course of action had precisely the same significance. Whether one moved into the field of activity in the universe or withdrew into *nirvanic* peace had precisely the same significance. There was a sense that all creatures, all things, down to the last atom or electron was already there, that there was no suffering anywhere, that the play of duality simply was for that state of consciousness non-existent. You were aware of the invariant substratum underlying all of this play. Now, that can be realized. We are not dealing simply with an arbitrary conception, but with an interpretive conception here.

Participant: Could you give us a little illustration and just a little more explanation about *Nirvana* and *Sangsara* in our own language?

Wolff: *Nirvana* corresponding to the radiant state, the state of consciousness, pure subjective consciousness where the categories of space, time, development, change, and so forth have no bearing, but a timeless peace and bliss—*Nirvana*. And there’s no body, no entity, no going from here to there. It’s just a timeless bliss. The universe, or *Sangsara*, is the play of duality, of manifestation, of becoming and ceasing, of birth and death, of day and night, all of that periodicity, all of that process going on, on its own level, ceaselessly. Now, these two stand as the two poles of the ultimate. But what is a symbol of that ultimate of which these are poles? Various symbols have been used: Lao-tse used the expression *Tao*, or they have among the Buddhists *Shunyata* or Voidness or *Alaya Vijnana*, *Tat-Sat* with the Hindu. But in my own work and for reasons that should become clear as one reads this, I use the symbol of Consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject and as I approach it more from the angle of consciousness. Von Hartmann would use the Unconscious as a symbol of that—this is the word as employed before Jung—but he says specifically it’s only unconscious from our point of view. From its own point of view it’s superconscious. And thus there have been different pointing terms indicating this something that is invariant in all things,

---

<sup>3</sup> In Wolff’s reading of this passage in the audio recording referenced above, the following footnote appears:

This analogue is not employed to suggest that the aphorisms gain their authority from the physical conception. Physical conceptions change and so constructions based upon them are vulnerable. The real point made is that the aphorisms, as concepts, are not nearly as strange as they may seem at first. The above is a conceptual pattern which already exists and is used, though in a somewhat different sector of human knowledge. Of necessity, any conceptual symbol must be composed in terms of the conceptualism of its milieu, however unthinkable its roots may be in conceptual terms.

and I have simply used Consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject to express that invariant. In other words, as you find in this philosophy, neither the Self nor the Universe nor God is the ultimate, but the Pure Consciousness is the supporter of all selves, of all gods, of all universes.

Participant: Thank you.

Participant: Yogi, going back to this Energy, say, Energy is, that Energy has no source, but what operates upon it to make radiant energy or ponderable matter?

Wolff: Mm-hmm.

Participant: It's clearly not a duality here. It's almost as if that Consciousness is a third factor.

Wolff: What was that?

Participant: It's almost as if that Consciousness was a third factor and radiant energy and this other factor were just something that was a pole of it.

Wolff: The radiant energy and the plain ponderable objects are two poles of that root source, yes.

Participant: Well again we find that the evasive third factor.

Wolff: Hmm?

Participant: —that there seems to be a third factor there, this Consciousness-without-an-object, even when you apply it to physics.

Wolff: The third factor, well the third factor of course is here Energy—up here, radiant energy down here, and ponderable matter; Consciousness-without-an-object up here; *Nirvana* and *Sangsara*, or the pure self and the object, the universe, down here. There are three there. Now, remember that there is a certain distortion just as soon as you try to express that down here. The moment—you can get the truth only so long as you do not speak and do not think.

Participant: That's what the Zen Buddhists say. Why are they so evasive in Zen Buddhism? A disciple asked the master for a definition of *Nirvana*, and he kicked him in the shin; and another one pointed to a dog.

Wolff: I think they're laughing at you. I don't get very much out of Zen Buddhism. They try to avoid making anything intelligible as much as they can, but I do go along with the point that the moment you try to convey or to express, you have distorted, and in that very distortion you have introduced a new duality. But now imagine that the expression was dissolved, and you are in the ultimate state now without reflection, no communication, a Pure Consciousness, not self-consciousness, then you would be free from duality. The moment self-consciousness arises in it, then you have a contrast with the pure primordial consciousness and a consciousness conscious of itself. However, I conceive that a desirable development.

Participant: Well, wouldn't some people call that other state an annihilation risk?

Wolff: Yes. That's very commonly done in Buddhism, but it is a very unhappy procedure and one of the main reasons why Buddha's doctrine has been misunderstood.

I don't suppose he used the word nihilism himself, but what he described seemed so much like nothing at all that it was interpreted as nihilism; and it wasn't what he meant; and the point was that any conception distorts and you have to say, if you're going to be strictly correct, it's not this and it's not that; it's not anything whatsoever which you can conceive. Now, I'm quite frankly taking a position that it's worthwhile trying to transcribe and convey, for it may arouse an interest; but there's always the warning that anything said—and this goes for every Scripture whatsoever—everything said is also a distortion because it is drawn, let us say, from an *n*-dimensional consciousness and put into our two or three-dimensional consciousness here, and in that very act distorted and falsified. But in it there is a pointer, and if one can use that pointer to carry on, it helps. If he hangs on to that pointer he can be stopped. That's why the so-called fundamentalists or literalists are misusing religion. I use this figure at different times. Suppose you're traveling along a road, you want to go to some city, let us say it's Las Vegas, taken at random, and you come to a sign which says Las Vegas so many miles and a pointer down that way, and then you treat that sign as the actual point of arrival and get out of your car and wrap yourself around the post of that sign and say now I have arrived and I'm going to cling to this. You wouldn't have arrived at all. Well, that illustrates a misuse of Scripture.

Participant: In other words, not get attached to Scripture and take it for the true way.

Wolff: Just as a sign and a pointer, a pointer to go on. Never hang on to the symbol or the concept as an ultimate, and that is the way I view these concepts here. I have made that point explicitly in the text from time to time.

There's just about a page more and we'll finish this one section.

This physical conception has a high order of theoretical beauty, and I regard it as one of the finer products of scientific art. It effects a very great conceptual simplification, and enables us to picture a wide range of transformation in nature as experienced within the organization of an essentially simple unifying concept. However, what we have is a construction of the creative intellect, in part operating upon a material given through observation, and in part conditioning the observation. We have no right to say that this theory, or any modification which may take place in the future, is nature as it is apart from the consciousness of all thinkers. Any question of the truth or reality-value of the theory must be judged in relationship to a conscious thinker. Further, we have no right to assert dogmatically that, even though for our science this theory should prove to be universally valid, then it must necessarily be valid for any competent thinker whatsoever. In fact, it is entirely possible, nay more, quite probable, that the scientists of an entirely different culture, although of comparable capacity and supplied with comparable resources for investigation, would nonetheless construct an entirely different theoretical structure for the organization of their corresponding experience. Yet, this would not discredit the relative validity of the foregoing theory for our present culture.

Now that finishes Section 7, and I think that's enough for this afternoon. What is the time?

Participant: Just about the hour.

Wolff: Fay would you give us a song?

Participant: Do we have enough tape for that?

Fay: We've been using our minds for the last hour or so. I think I'd like to play a simple message taken from Proverbs, from the Bible. "May the words of my mouth and the meditations of my heart be acceptable unto thee."

Wolff: Let us close with our usual closing words.

Let there be Peace within the Universe.

Let the Power of the Warriors of Light be made manifest.

Let Wisdom guide us and Love protect us throughout our lives.

Peace be with you.

And with you, Peace.

[Introductions and conversation.]