

Dear Brother Wolff -- Thou Sage of San Fernando:

Mar. 24, 1937

At last I have finished reading your great book. And when I say "great" I truly mean it. This book, I fancy, will never be popular, but I believe it will be immortal and that all future students and teachers on these lines will refer to it. As an utterance in the Western ~~World~~ World on this subject I believe it stands alone. Whether it has ever been excelled by any thing written in India I do not know, but I doubt it. It must be published. That is a matter of immense importance.

You have honored me greatly by letting me see this Ms., and asking my comments. I feel that I am in but a poor position to do the latter, for I do not stand on your plane of attained Consciousness. Some have hailed me as Cosmic Conscious, but is it true? My "Dawn-Thought" was a sudden mental and spiritual illumination, it is true, but I saw no subjective light, nor radiated any, nor did I experience any of the Transcendent Bliss which you seem to have known so vividly. But all my mental boundaries did seem to enlarge as if to infinity, and there came a quiet joy and peace and increased serenity that have never left me. But I feel that I rather glimpsed Nirvana, and received Rays from it, than ever actually entered it. Nor have I ever felt, yet, that the time had come for me to even attempt to go in. All that in the Divine time.

My work, I feel, is on quite another plane than yours and I must do my own work for the needs of my own.

But I may give you, I suppose, a few of my thoughts; What you say on page 259, about the primary universe being "a valid part within the whole and relatively real" pleased me greatly, for I have always asserted that, and that is perhaps what I meant when I said I was a Neo-Realist, I cannot help feeling that most mystics have made a mis-

Letter to Franklin F. Wolff # 2

take in their defamation of this physical world, either declaring it non-existent, so far as any reality went, or else attributing all evil, sin and misery to its malign influence. I have always affirmed that the physical world had a ~~notion~~ certain reality of its own, and that it was created for a purpose, and had a function and service to perform; that it was a part of the Divine whole and therefore justified; and that it was man's duty to receive it with gratitude, ^{appreciate it} ~~appreciate it~~, and cultivate an enjoyment of it, and of the senses given wherewith to enjoy it. I have defended the body against the contempt and contumely heaped upon it, with all the passions, emotions, including sex. In my gospel the body was to be honored as potentially a Divine ^{tool and instrument} ~~temple~~, its health cared for religiously, and all its passions and emotions and feelings and appetites used wisely, in innocent intention, under full control of the intellect and spirit, as helpfully as one's knowledge could direct. And I have affirmed that such a healthful, child-like delight in and use of the body, with philosophical non-attachment and religious spiritualization, would give man the happiness in this life that he was ever seeking, and was intended to have, and would be his best apprenticeship, and preparation for any life to come. This has been my message to the world of men always, and this is the life I have idealized and tried to live. And whether I have been merely lucky, and self-deceived, I know not, but so far it has worked, and I have been happy to a degree that I have seldom found in anyone else. I confess it has rather pained me to find that you also blamed and degraded this world, and regarded it with aversion as a necessary source of bondage, hindrance and misery.

If you will forgive me for speaking personally, I must say that I was, and continue to be, nonplussed by the fact that you, after your marvellous bath in Nirvanic Bliss, which I fully believe you experienced, (or would you say introceived?), yet do not radiate that overflowing

Letter to Franklin.F.Wolff # 3

happiness, peace and joyousness which I would have supposed would inevitably result from it. I would think your face would always shine, till men would be struck by it, and every motion of your body reveal and unspoken but irrepressible inward content. But in just the same way I have always wondered that Jesus should have been "a man of sorrows". Why did he weep? What good would that do to anybody? A joyous countenance is such a tonic, inspiration and uplift to anybody, no matter in what zone and snare of trouble. It is a medical treatment in itself and can interfere with no service of compassion, or work of benefit. And no matter how much I honored Buddha, I could never be his disciple because of his ~~view~~ regarding this beautiful world as only a disease-nest of misery. It always made me wonder whether a hot climate had not ruined his liver, and this poisoned his mind.

Emerson seems to have been serenely, sweetly, delightedly happy all his life; and Thoreau much the same; and Alcott; probably Channing, tho I don't know so much about him; and Whitman, despite his great misfortune; and Bucke; and John Burroughs. This American school of philosophy seems to me to have made a real advance in spiritual evolution over the Oriental philosophers and the general run of mystics. They appear to have pretty well solved the problem of earthly happiness. And I undoubtedly belong to their school, tho I seem to have worked into it from the outside, so to speak, and spontaneously, from inward impulse, not knowing much about them or their ideas until my own were pretty well formed.

I was greatly pleased with the tribute you gave your wife, and your recognition of the need of the feminine influence in a balanced life, tho I fancy a great many yogis will demote you and the value of your teaching because of it. Yes, woman stands for the value of Form, for the value of the Senses, for the value and necessity of this world and its love and loveliness in the Cosmic Whole, and that is why Eud-

Letter to Franklin E. Wolff # 4

Buddha abandoned his wife and baby, and why Jesus did not marry, and why all the Christian Apostles and fathers looked with suspicion, if not actual ~~mutual~~ hostility, upon woman, for, against those who want to destroy the sense-world, woman has been placed, in the Divine plan, as its Defender. Her intuitions do not tell her that the senses are unreal, or necessarily impure, and she never believes it, tho, if her husband holds that view, she may try, for his sake, to make herself believe she does. woman has her own mentality and her own spirituality and, in her normal state, her spirituality infuses her sensuality and all the functions of her sexuality and family life with her maternal love and idealism, her faith and joy in the goodness of life. Woman stands for Love as much as man for Thought, and each can learn from the other, and needs the other, just as the spirit-world needs the sense-world in a balanced universe. Man's life, without woman's, becomes one-sided, unbalanced, sterile, cold, an inevitable monstrosity -- and her life, without his, is, ^{conscious} mutilation and endless loneliness.

What you say about the "Point-I and the Space-I", if I rightly understand you, pleases me also. I have always felt that Nirvana would be as you describe it, and that the individuality of the one reaching it would be merged into it with complete absorption but without any feeling of loss or destruction, but rather one of increase, fulfillment, and infinite enlargement and bliss of consciousness. You would be God, and know it, and Home and know it.

But I confess that I cannot like the term "High Indifference". I cannot even understand such a thing. How can Bliss be Indifference? How can Knowledge be Indifference? How can one be indifferent to the insanities and sufferings, to say nothing of the joys, of humanity? Buddha was not able; Jesus was not able; nor do you seem to be. This term will repel your readers.

Letter to Franklin F. Wolff # 5

Concerning the new terms, "introception" and "introceive" -- I like them very much, but your definition gives me pause -- "penetration to profundity through the affections" and, further, as the "kind of insight aroused through music, poetry, and the fine arts" -- seeing that with ordinary readers the word "affections" always suggests only the personal emotions of love, friendship, etc. Would not, possibly, a more understandable definition be "penetration to profundity through the esthetic emotions"? This is only a suggestion and may not be sufficiently thought out.

And here is a query: If all God-Conscious men are "equal", what does this claimed equality consist in? To the subject-object man, at least, they seem to be unequal even in the degrees of recognition and knowledge that they claim; in their power to work "miracles"; and to be subject to mistakes, problems, disease, fear, with inequality in their power to adjust to these, much like ordinary people. And how is such equality compatible with a spiritual Hierarchy?

Your final poem is a noble one, with sublimity both in its expression and spirit.

Please do not think, dear friend, that these comments are made in any invidious spirit. You are more like my ideal of a Master than any other man I ever met in the flesh, and I would have gladly been your disciple if I could, but it would seem that we must each take his own Road. I have a real affection for you and I have read every word of your Ms. with care, loving interest, and admiration, and rise from it with a deep respect for your ability.

Most cordially your friend --

J. William Lloyd

REVIEW OF "From Point-I to Space-I"
by Franklin Merrell-Wolff

J. William Lloyd*
March 24, 1937

Dear Brother Wolff—Thou Sage of San Fernando:

At last I have finished reading your great book. And when I say "great" I truly mean it! This book, I fancy, will never be popular, but I believe it will be immortal and that all future students and teachers on this line will refer to it. As an utterance in the Western world on this subject, I believe it stands alone. Whether it has ever been excelled by anything in India I do not know, but I doubt it. It must be published. That is a matter of immense importance.

You have honored me greatly by letting me see this manuscript and asking my comments. I feel that I am in but a poor position to do the latter, for I do not stand on your plane of attained Consciousness. Some have hailed me as Cosmic Conscious, but is it true? My *Dawn Thoughts* was a sudden mental and spiritual illumination, it is true, but I saw no subjective light, nor radiated any, nor did I experience any of the Transcendental Bliss which you seem to have known so vividly. But all my mental boundaries did seem to enlarge as if to infinity and there came a quiet joy and peace and increased serenity that have never left me. But I feel that I rather glimpsed Nirvana, and received Rays from it, than ever having actually entered it. Nor have I ever felt, yet, that the time had come for me to even attempt to go in. All that in the Divine Time.

My work, I feel, is on quite another plane than yours and I must do my own work for the needs of my own. But I may give you I suppose, a few of my thoughts: What you say on page 259 about the primary universe being "a valid part within the whole and relative real" pleased me greatly, for I have always asserted that, and that is perhaps what I meant when I said I was a Neo-realist. I cannot help feeling that most mystics have made a mistake in their defamation of this physical world, either declaring it non-existent, so far as any reality went, or else attributing all evil, sin and misery to its malign influence. I have always affirmed that the physical world has a certain reality of its own, and that it was created for a purpose, and had a function and service to perform; that is was a part of the Divine Whole and therefore justified; and that it was man's duty to receive it with gratitude, appreciate it, and cultivate an enjoyment of it, and of the senses given wherewith to enjoy it. I have defended the body against the contempt and contumely heaped upon it, with all the passions, emotions, including sex. In my gospel the body is to be honored as potentially a Divine Tool and instrument, its health cared for religiously, and all its passions and emotions and feelings and appetites used wisely, in innocent intention under full control of the intellect and spirit, as helpfully as one's knowledge could direct. And I have affirmed that such a healthful, childlike delight in and use of the body with philosophical non-attachment and religious spiritualization, would give man the happiness in this life that he was ever seeking, and was intended to have, and would be his best apprenticeship and preparation for any life to come. This has always been my

*J. William Lloyd was the author of *Dawn Thought on the Reconciliation: A Volume of Pantheistic Impressions and Glimpses of Larger Religion*, *The Natural Man: A Romance of the Golden Age*, and other works. A brief biographical sketch of Lloyd can be found in R. M. Bucke's *Cosmic Consciousness*.

message to the world of men always, and this is the life I have idealized and tried to live. And whether I have been merely lucky and self-deceived, I know not, but so far it has worked, and I *have* been happy to a degree that I have seldom found in anyone else. I confess it has rather pained me to find that you also blamed and degraded this world, and regarded it with aversion as a necessary source of bondage, hindrance and misery.

If you will forgive me for speaking personally, I must say that I was, and continue to be, nonplussed by the fact that you, after your marvelous bath in Nirvanic Bliss, which I fully believe you experienced, (or would you say introceived?) yet do not radiate that overflowing happiness, peace and joyousness which I would have supposed would inevitably result from it. I would think your face would always shine, till men would be struck by it, and every motion of your body reveal an unspoken but irrepressible inward content. But in just the same way I have always wondered that Jesus should have been “a man of sorrows.” Why did He weep? What good would that do to anybody? A joyous countenance is such a tonic, inspiration and uplift to anybody, no matter in what zone and snare of trouble. It is a medical treatment in itself and can interfere with no service of compassion, or work of benefit. And no matter how much I honored Buddha, I could never be his disciple because of his regarding this beautiful world as only a disease nest of misery. It always made me wonder whether a hot climate had not ruined his liver, and thus poisoned his mind.

Emerson seems to have been serenely, sweetly delighted all his life; and Thoreau much the same; and Alcott; probably Channing, though I don't know so much about him; and Whitman, despite his great misfortune; and Bucke; and John Burroughs. This American School of Philosophy seems to me to have made real advance in spiritual evolution over the Oriental philosophers and the general run of mystics. They appear to have pretty well solved the problem of earthly happiness. And I undoubtedly belong to their school, though I seem to have worked into it from the outside, so to speak, and spontaneously, from inward impulse, not knowing much about them or their ideas until my own were pretty well formed.

I was greatly pleased with the tribute you gave your wife, and your recognition of the need of the feminine influence in a balanced life, though I fancy a great many Yogis will demote you and the value of your teaching because of it. Yes, woman stands for the value of Form, for the value of the Senses, for the values and necessity of this world and its Love and loveliness in the Cosmic Whole, and that is why Buddha abandoned his wife and baby, and why Jesus did not marry, and why all the Christian Apostles and Fathers looked with suspicion, if not with actual hostility, upon women, for, against those who want to destroy the sense-world, woman has been placed, in the Divine plan, as its Defender. Her intuitions do not tell her that the senses are unreal, or necessarily impure, and she never believes it, though, if her husband holds to that view she may try, for his sake, to make herself believe she does. Woman has her own mentality and her own spirituality and, in her normal state, her spirituality infuses her sensuality and all the functions of her sexuality and family life with her maternal loves and idealism, her faith and joy in the goodness of life. Woman stands for Love as much as Man for Thought, and each can learn from the other, just as the spirit-world needs the sense-world in a balanced Universe. Man's life without woman's becomes one-sided, unbalanced, sterile, cold, an inevitable monstrosity, and her life without his life is conscious mutilation and endless loneliness.

What you say about “Point-I and the Space-I,” if I rightly understand you, please me also. I have always felt that Nirvana would be as you describe it, and that the individuality of the one reaching it would be merged into it with complete absorption but without any feeling of loss or destruction, but rather one of increase, fulfillment and infinite enlargement and bliss of consciousness. You would be God, and know it, and Home, and know it.

But I confess that I cannot like the term “High Indifference.” I can not even understand such a thing. How can Bliss be Indifference? How can one be indifferent to insanities and sufferings, to say nothing of the joys, of humanity? Buddha was not able; Jesus was not able; nor do you seem to be. This term will repel your readers.

Concerning the new terms, “introception” and “introceive”—I like them very much, but your definition gives me pause—“penetration to profundity through the affections” and, further, as the “kind of insight aroused through music, poetry, and the fine arts.” Seeing that with ordinary readers the word “affections” always suggests only the personal emotions of love, friendship, etc., would not possibly a more understandable definition be “penetration to profundity through the esthetic emotions”? This is only a suggestion and may not be sufficiently thought out.

And here is a query: If all God-Conscious men are “equal,” what does this claimed equality consist in? To the subject-object man, at least, they seem to be unequal even in the degree of Recognition and knowledge that they claim; in their power to work “miracles”; and to be subject to mistakes, problems, disease, fear, with inequality in their power to adjust to these, much like ordinary people. And how is such equality compatible with a spiritual Hierarchy?

Your final poem is a noble one, with sublimity both in its expression and spirit.

Please do not think, dear friend, that these comments are made in any invidious spirit. You are more like my ideal of a Master than any other man I ever met in the flesh, and I would have gladly been your disciple if I could, but it would seem that we must each take his own Road. I have a real affection for you and I have read every word of your manuscript with care, loving interest and admiration, and rise from it with a deep respect for your ability.

Most cordially your friend,

J. William Lloyd