

Dear Brother, friend and Teacher:

March II, 1937

Your saying yesterday that you were "lonely" touched me. I want you to know that if in any way I can relieve that loneliness I hope you will use me. Write to me, or visit me, whenever you feel inclined and you will always be welcome. Any way always feel that I have the truest affection for you, as well as respect and admiration for your mental ability and the beauty of your character.

I want to thank you for your criticisms of my "Interpretation". There can not be the slightest doubt that I must seem to a man of your metaphysical technique and Hindu training as a very crude thinker, and I do not pretend to say that I am not such an one in fact. Indeed it could hardly be otherwise. My extremely scanty education, my tendency to radical and irreverent skepticism, and my life-long habit of taking my own way across lots to conclusions, with little regard for revered authorities, would almost ensure this -- anyway would make it appear so to those who adhered to some accepted cult or philosophy. But you must not forget that I do not profess to be a vedantist, any more than I do to be a Christian. I seem to be an eclectic, taking my own wherever I think I find it.

Now to your ontological criticism. Here it seems to me you fail to get my point of view. I was aware, as you remind me further on, that the word "person", in its derivation, meant a "mask", but words grow, and get away from original meanings, and nowadays when a believer speaks of his belief in a "Personal God" he does not mean a masked God, or one who is only a mask and a Maya, nor does he necessarily mean that his God is in human form. I have tried to make this little book not so much satisfactory to metaphysical casuists as understandable to the man in the street. And to me it seems that the essence of personality is not so much <sup>in</sup> any particular form as in self-consciousness, will, in-

Letter to Franklin F. Wolff # 2

telligence and love and it is with these qualities that my mind endows my personal God. My mind cannot seem to accept the Hindu doctrine of a "Brama" separate from a "Parabrahma". In my perhaps crude thought I feel that every whole must have a center, a nucleus, and my Personal God is that Nucleus <sup>and</sup> Center, and yet mystically immanent in every particle of the Whole. Does not Haeckel say somewhere that every atom of the universe is alive and conscious? Anyway that is my view -- that God the Person cannot be separated from God the ALL, but is present as life and consciousness in every particle of the Universal Substance. But that this life and consciousness is largely latent life, and a consciousness that has not yet reached self-consciousness, is potentiality rather than activity, but can be awakened and set in motion, with any desired degree of consciousness, at any instant by that personal self which is both central and universally immanent. You say that Brama is "dependant" upon the "Unseen", and is therefore a "Maya", but as I see it, in the final sense the principle is as dependent upon the person as the person is upon the ~~principle~~ principle, where all are one, even Maya must be included in the ~~whole~~ complete reality -- all these distinctions, metaphysical and scientific, are only arbitrary efforts of our own minds to make things somehow usable by those minds. But I may be very stupid.

Yet I want you to get my idea that God, to our minds at least, is a Paradox, and must always appear such, and therefore must always be to us a Mystery, and in this view arguments as to whether God is Love or Love is God, or anything else, becomes more or less casuistical and of no practical value. And a working faith, as reasonable as may be, is all I am after, for all human arguments about God, seem to me more or less fantastic and self-defeating.

Very affectionately your friend --

(Over)

J. William Lloyd

Realizing that my use of the term "the personal self", might puzzle some, I included in the Ms. that Romney prints a footnote (that was not in the Ms., as you read it) which should apphicate my usage.

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, <sup>appreciate it</sup> ~~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 <sup>tool and instrument</sup> ~~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 ~~man~~ 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, 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 Bud-

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 <sup>conscious</sup> 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



Dear Brother Wolff:

December 29, 1937

Your "Aphorisms" is a striking little book in appearance and content. It is full of your thought and perhaps only you could have made it.

Yet I feel that it is very Buddhistic, and probably contains or implies the very essence of esoteric Buddhism.

My own reaction to it is hardly one of complete agreement.

Consciousness without an object is something that my every day sort of mind fails to grasp. The question always arises -- Consciousness of what? If you say consciousness of itself, then itself becomes an object. If only consciousness of consciousness, then consciousness becomes an object. If consciousness of some subject, then the subject becomes an object. As I see the Divine Consciousness it is always, of its potentialities, at least of some of them, and I do not believe there has ever been a period in all eternity in which it has not been actively conscious ~~of~~ of plans and purposes and creative achievements, of subjects and of the tearing down and re-creation of objects, and as a consciousness within each object. As I see it, every object is potential within Consciousness, proceeds from it, created by it, retains its due proportion of it, and if "destroyed" simply changes form, or returns to it again as a latent potentiality. Therefore all objects are in Consciousness, latently or actively, and inseparable from it. This may seem foolishness to your extremely introspective mind.

consciousness

"Consciousness of absence of objects is Nirvana". Perhaps it is, but my concept of Nirvana, as you know, is the final enlargement of human consciousness to emergence into and complete merging with the Divine Consciousness, in its paradoxical Peace and Rest with Eternal Happy Creativity. You agree that it is "ceaseless creativeness", yet "Unending Rest".

I do not believe there is any real "void", or vacuum, in the Cosmos, which contains and is Space and the Divine Consciousness and all the subjects and objects within the Divine Consciousness.

I seem in many things close with you and in others far apart -- differences in words, no doubt, explains much of this, at least in part. But there is a radical difference in our ends of striving. You, like Buddha, renounce the world as hopeless, and seek a mental state of bliss outside of and beyond it. I feel there is real danger of self-hypnotism to self-deception about this. I believe man has given him the powers to gradually turn this earth into a heaven, and I am mainly concerned with that. I would like, if possible to be a Utopian-Prophet.

Tho I have great reverence and respect for Buddha, in a way, yet I also cannot get away from the feeling that he was personally a sickly being, afraid of life and its battle, and seeking only to creep out of it and create an ecstasy of inaction and forgetfulness. To a certain degree this may be possible to some people, with favorable constitutions and circumstances, or after great effort, but would be finally nullified by Cosmic laws and is really no solution. To acquire a mental state in which one, by rising above emotion and controlling it, using or rejecting it, pitting one emotion against another to conquer, may be able to accept the Universe and its Law of Change cheerfully and live happily within it, seems to me a better form of philosophy.

Wishing you and your wife a Happy New Year, I remain your friend -

Cordially -

J. William Hughes

San Fernando, Calif.,  
Jan. 4, 1938

Dear Brother Lloyd:

Permit me first of all to thank you for your criticism of the Aphorisms. It means that you have given to them serious thought and that is part of what I wish to have accomplished. No one is asked to believe them blindly. Nothing is more foreign to my wish nor to the Buddhist spirit. I am quite at one with the Buddhist principle which not only demands of no man blind acquiescence but, in fact, insists that the mature aspirant shall accept no authority, whether human or Divine, but shall prove everything by immediate Knowledge individually attained. I believe that the Aphorisms are capable of guiding many toward Liberation, but they are by no means necessarily the road for all.

It would be impossible for anyone to give the Aphorisms a greater compliment than you do when you say they "probably contain or imply the very essence of esoteric Buddhism." I am not making any claim here but simply let the Aphorisms speak for themselves. However, I am in a position to appreciate at least something of the soul of esoteric Buddhism and so know better than most, perhaps better than you, how much you have said.

Now, for the difficulties. I am not at all surprised. Prior to the cycle from Aug. 7 to Sept. 8, 1936, I could not have understood, in the sense that I now understand, Consciousness-without-an-object. I might have been even appalled by it as up to that time I could neither grasp nor like the Buddha's doctrine of Anatman. It was the Path blazed by Shankara that I found effected. But it lead to a position from which I could reach to Anatman. Now it is quite true that consciousness operating within the universe of objects (samsara) is always in the form of a self concerned with objects. Many philosophers can conceive of no other kind of consciousness. From the samsaric base consciousness-without-an-object is inconceivable. It can only be assimilated by the principle of consciousness which is temporarily embodied in man shifting its base to a very high transcendent level. From the base of reference of your criticism you are quite correct. But there are other bases.

Consciousness-without-an-object is Primordial Consciousness which is not consciousness conscious of itself. But to recognize Consciousness-without-an-object implies the action of a modification of this supreme consciousness which is the self-analysing power. This is Paramarthasatya. The latter is attained, the former ever is. Of course, the very fact that I could write the Aphorisms implies that I was conscious of the Consciousness, but I could distinguish between the Primordial Root Consciousness and the attained Self-analysing power. When the Aphorisms are finally completed this point will be noted.

I distinguish between Consciousness-without-an-object and Divine Consciousness in the sense of consciousness of a Divine Being. It is conceivable that a Divine Being may have purposes, though hardly of a type that is within the range of merely human conception. But it is impossible to predicate purpose

of Consciousness-without-an-object. Further Divine Beings are dependent upon and derivative from Consciousness-without-an-object as well as all other creatures.

When you say that every object is potential within Consciousness it seems to me that you are quite in accord with an implication growing out of the sixth Aphorism, but it would be incorrect to predicate creative activity of Consciousness without an object, for This has no attributes though all attributes and powers depend upon It. I quite agree with you that objects cannot be separated from consciousness, for thus separated they are real voids. Yet Primordial Consciousness is independent of the presence or absence of objects. It is a one why dependence. However, while Consciousness without an object is non-creative, yet consciousness as subject is a creative potentiality. With this modification I think I must agree with what you say in the latter part of the fourth paragraph.

The difference between us on the next point is more than apparent. It is a real difference. And here my own insight has not only the support of the enormous authority of Buddha, Shankara and Jesus but, as well, of all the experts on Yoga as far as I am acquainted with them. Here we are dealing with something that is not merely a matter of opinion or of method, which may vary quite widely, but of what we might call the mathematics of Yoga. Jesus said "Ye must be born again", and there is no point that I insist upon in my class work and my writings than just this. Yoga or the mystic at-onement with God is not attained by an expansion, but by a metamorphosis of the human being. It is the symbol of the caterpillar and the butterfly that applies here. Man dies as man in order to be born a God. The price of attainment is renunciation. But however severe the renunciation may seem before the new birth has been attained, afterwards it seems trivial when compared with the new ineffable grandeur. Not only has the Pilgrim now become a denizen of a new World, but in addition he recovers all that he renounced as powers which no one, not even the Gods, can actually take from him. Yoga is far, far more than mere melioration. The bulk of western thinkers simply do not see clearly on this point. Melioration may be good and I am not opposed to it in principle nor has Buddhism been opposed to it. For he who lives according to the Buddhist ethics will tend to transform even this world toward an Utopia. But all this is a by-product, not the main achievement. And, indeed, it may frequently happen that melioration acts as a delay rather than an advance. For the tragic hour is the hour of greatest opportunity. The soul then may turn to supreme values, instead of being content with half-values. But this varies with individuals and so wisdom is required in order to know whether more or less pain is best. There times when the highest Compassion will appear to the undiscerning as though it were hard-boiled. This is tough on the Guru as well as the Chela.

When you say that you do not believe that there is any real void or vacuum in the Cosmos not only am I in agreement with you but so also is the Buddhist, Vedantist and Theosophical philosophy. The Void to which I in common with the preponderant mass of mystics refer is a Void only to the subject-object type of consciousness. It is not the void of nothingness. Yet until the candidate has passed the crisis it is a psychological

necessity that he aim at that which seems to be Nothing, and negate everything that formerly he regarded as something. When he arrives he finds that the formerly seeming Void actually is substantial Fullness and the objects which he formerly believed to be real are, indeed, relative vacuums. It is interesting to note that the van-guard of our modern physicists are actually reaching substantially this view in the effort to reach a consistent interpretation of the facts they are now uncovering.

Now, how about the ultimate value of objects? Neither I nor Buddhism denies to them a relative validity. Consciousness-without-an-object permits the presence or absence in complete indifference. There is a post-Nirvanic stage of Yoga wherein no difference exists between Samsara and Nirvana. But one must attain Nirvana first before he can go on to this culminating synthetic stage. You see renunciation is a matter of psychological technique, and not a philosophic denial of the relative validity of any stage of consciousness in the whole series. Renunciation is merely the inverse of attainment. Asceticism is not virtue but technique, and the latter is dropped when it has accomplished its work. Yes, I do believe that the situation of the world is hopeless so long as Nirvanic values are not filtered into it in ever increasing degree. But if those values are filtered in in sufficient degree then it is not hopeless. The greatest workers for Utopia are the Bodhisattvas and the Buddhas of Compassion. For these refuse a private Nirvana for enormous ages so that they may serve the good of all creatures.

How greatly have you misunderstood Buddha, the great compassionate One! The One who beyond all other men may rightly be called the conquering Lion! None of those born of woman is less a sickly man than this One. For here is a man born as a prince and given every advantage in a worldly sense that the king and his counsellors could devise. He was trained in all princely virtues as well as being himself a prince in fact. He had every advantage of enjoyment that could be devised, and He did enjoy. He was happily married and had a son whom he loved. He was carefully kept from knowledge of pain in His own experience or as something experienced by others for 29 years. Then, one day He became acquainted with the fact of suffering on the part of others, and was so moved in his heart that he could no longer enjoy His private felicity so long as the problem of human pain in general was not solved. He then went on the search for the solution which required seven years. He went to the learned and quickly pierced through to the inadequacy of their teachings. He learned of the method of rigorous asceticism and made a thoroughgoing experiment in this which lasted six years, carrying Him to the door of physical death, and the final convulsion that that road was only a cul-de-sac. He then carved out His own Road and Attained as none others ever have among men. He forgot His own convenience and carried His discovery to men, not only for the rest of His natural life, but ever since to this day. The latter part most would call tradition, but I have succeeded in verifying it directly. No, here is no sickly soul, but the greatest of the great, the most heroic of the heroic, and the most compassionate of the Compassionate. It is western scholarship that has failed to understand.

Again, thanking you for your letter and good wishes and reaffirming my high regard for you, I remain

Dear Brother Woolf:

Jan. 10, 1938

I thank you for the fine spirit in which you have received my criticisms, which doubtless to you seemed shallow enough. In fact I must confess I am, and always have been, more taken by the sweetness of your spirit than by the attractiveness of your doctrine.

For I still find myself unable to understand your Consciousness-without-an-object. The question still sticks: "Consciousness of What?" I cannot separate Consciousness from awareness, from awareness of something, if only it-self, and that latent awareness which you give it in Aphorism 6. I can conceive that there might be potentialities in the ALL that even the Primordial Root Consciousness had not yet become aware of, but I cannot conceive of its being unconscious ~~more~~ of anything it was aware of, and whatever it was aware of would become to it an object. That Primordial Consciousness must include, and be aware of, all forms of consciousness with their objects. So it seems to me. Nor can I understand how "all attributes and powers depend upon It", as you say, without its having created them and continuing to support them, and therefore being eternally conscious of them. Nor can I comprehend how that primal Consciousness can be "indifferent" to anything that has proceeded from it, or which can exist in any form ~~within~~, or any degree, of fact, absolute or relative, within the Cosmos, which is Itself. Perhaps the difference between us, after all, is that you would insist that a subject can never be an object, while to me, when I contemplate a subject it becomes a true object of consciousness. Unless I can explain it that way, your hair-splitting seems to me to be a pure Nihilism.

As to being "born again", you give that mystical utterance one interpretation and a Fundamentalist friend a quite different one. I rather suspect that Richard Maurice Bucke would have said it meant attaining Cosmic Consciousness. Jesus, I believe, was a poet, or at least lived among a people who spoke habitually in figures and parables. My own guess is that he may have meant a complete change from the private-profit motive to the social-profit motive, for we know that he continually preached that change and reprov- ed those men who clung to selfish riches. He was certainly a Uto- pian, who wished the Will of the Father to be done on earth as in heaven, that there might be peace and good-will on earth, and weap- ons of war changed into tools of production. And such a radical change in motive and life might indeed be called a re-birth, might it not?

How much anybody knows about the real Buddha I do not know. It seems we have only very scanty and doubtful legends about him. You may have better sources of information, or think you have, and may be quite right. But I see nothing in his being a prince that would prevent his having been a neurotic, nor anything in his neurosis, if a fact, that would prevent his having been a great seer and teacher. Neurotics have played a tremendous part in the world's history, and are still at it. As I am always both a believer and a skeptic, it seems, I naturally look at him from the outside, and try to explain him like any other man, not irreverently, but scientifically, seeking the fact. Well, I guess that this is all I have to say, except to give you and your wife my very kindest good wishes.

Most cordially your friend --

J. William Lloyd

San Fernando, Calif.,  
Jan. 17, 1938

Dear Brother Lloyd:

Why shouldn't I be thankful for your criticism? There is nothing malicious in it. It is simply criticism in the better sense of the world. Now, such criticism seems to imply one of the other or a mixture of two things: it either reflects a failure adequately to understand the idea, or it brings out a real defect in either the formulation or content of the idea. In the former case there is certainly nothing to be offended about, and in the latter there is certainly something to be thankful for as it helps toward the realization of that distant goal of perfection.

It is not at all my wish to force upon you an unpalatable idea. But I am quite convinced of your ability to protect yourself, should that be necessary, and so, if I may, I should like to continue a discussion which is helpful to me as it broadens my understanding of concrete human need. Undoubtedly most will not understand the significance of my thought and, of those who do understand it in some measure most, I suspect, will find the same difficulty which you find. Many of the latter will not have the ability to formulate themselves while you have that ability in high degree. So I do value very highly what you say.

So you do not find the doctrine attractive. Well, I have no right to feel surprised for at one time, with all my mathematical training I felt the same way. It became attractive after a fundamental transformation in my own consciousness. This transformation removed in a profound sense the tragedy of time-bound consciousness and opened the door to an ineffable Joy and Assurance. I have no doubt whatsoever as to the value attained, and I wish that as many others as possible may also know it. What I offer of philosophy has simply the value of clearing away barriers and providing something of a key.

Now, with respect to the 'I' which is not metamorphosed into a subtle object as a 'me' - I wish to say that this problem is probably as profound as any. I was stuck on it for many years. Undoubtedly the 'I' does become a 'me' for most analysis. But let me ask, What is it that observes the 'me'? It is that which I mean by the 'I'. The 'me' that is observed is but a reflection. It is not through this 'me' that Nirvana is attained. One must learn how to 'sink' into the 'I', as it were, without transforming it into a 'me'. When I learned the trick of how to do this the transformation was immediately effected. The affective state of Bliss, the volitional state of Freedom and the noetic state of Assurance followed as precipitates into the relative consciousness. Make no mistake, these values are just precisely those which Dr. Bucke has discussed in 'Cosmic Consciousness'. But Dr. Bucke knew nothing of method or its significance. There is no Nihilism here, though many have felt as you do about it. It seems like Nihilism to the the subject-object form of consciousness, but is not so in fact. Perhaps it is impossible to dispense with faith here. I am constantly striving to so clarify understanding that the sector which faith must cover may be reduced as much as possible. How far this may be carried remains to be seen, but it seems necessary to try as the western mind is not strong in the quality of faith. But he who wants as much understanding as

possible as the precedent condition of action must pay the price of facing Reality expressed in rather naked form. The Reality behind the subject-object consciousness is beautiful when realized directly, but to consciousness bound by objects it does seem to be appalling.

Now, take your own case. Would you be willing to drop your skepticism and, metaphorically, take a Guru by the hand in an attitude of complete confidence and faith? The intellectual western mind does not find this easy to do. I did not. In fact it became my job to pioneer a course, which necessitated my being conscious all the way. This involved a rather stern desert-phase that lasted for some time. But it afforded the advantage that now I know how I got there and hence can write about it. Can you face the desert which the philosophy seems to be when viewed from the below? If not, then Faith must take the place of skepticism. There are different Roads but the necessities of whatever Road taken must be met.

Yes, I agree that the second-birth is a birth to Cosmic Consciousness, as Dr. Bucke called it, though he uses the term in a rather more general way than is technically justified. The Peace and good will on earth of Jesus is an effect of the second Birth rather than the essential meaning of it. Jesus repeatedly said 'My Kingdom is not of this world.' It is possible for a man to be born into that Kingdom and choose to continue to function in or for this world by voluntary incarnation or otherwise. Please understand I am not talking about these matters in a merely theoretical or speculative way. Not long ago I would have, but now I have been through the course and so I assert the importance of the second-birth not merely because Jesus and Buddha, among others affirmed it, but because I am directly familiar with the necessity. On this point I agree with these Teachers as one scientist agrees with another, through making the same experiment. So with me it is not an academic problem nor one of blind faith as with the 'fundamentalist'. There are points where I have dared to differ from these Teachers, but they are points of method, not of principle. With different peoples different methods seem of necessity to be indicated. On such points it seems to me we must be pragmatic.

To be sure, the fact that Buddha was a Prince would not prevent his being a neurotic. Also it is unquestionably true that some of the greatest social values have come from neurotics. But upon what ground can neurosis be predicated of Gautama? We cannot validly predicate neurosis on the basis of the philosophy or way of life propounded and lived by an individual. The diagnosis must depend upon definite symptoms. What possible symptoms are there in the life of Buddha that would indicate such a diagnosis? This is something on which I am rather insistent, as I shall certainly fight any suggestion of neurosis in connection with Buddha that is based merely upon a distaste for his philosophy. I want to know the facts, if any, so that I can submit them to examination myself.

In my opinion it is really the average citizen of the world who is really neurotic, for the simple reason that he is extremely unsided. The whole world, and especially the West, is one-sided in its over-emphasis of objective consciousness. Even the bulk of our so-called introvert are actually predominantly extrovert



in this fundamental sense. Otherwise, they would not have a physical body, but would be a Nirvanic; Consciousness-without-an-object represents the neutral position which is ~~either~~ neither introvert nor extrovert. To even approach a balanced position we will have to drive on the subjective pole very hard, perhaps for thousands of years. The norm of life, particularly of the West, is actually a very one-sided position. It is an utterly false basis for predicating neurosis. Our norm is actually the norm of an insane-asylum. If the Middle Way of Buddha is not the way of that most rare thing, a genuinely normal consciousness, then I know of nothing in this world which we may rightly call normal.

Please understand that that which is attained by Recognition is not something poorer but incomparably richer. It does not close the door to life in the universe of objects but rather increases the power of one who wishes to specialize in that field. However, it opens also a door to an entirely different domain, i.e., Nirvana, and this for my part I consider much the richer. But there is excellent reason to believe that the center of emphasis of different realized men is not the same. Realization is Freedom, and this includes the freedom to focus attention upon form and action. The discipline of the Path must not be confused with the nature of Life or Consciousness at the Goal. I speak from inside knowledge of something richer, not poorer. I would that others may know of this also, but I would not, if I could, force this on any man against his wishes. However, I claim the right to clear the philosophy from misunderstanding wherever possible.

At the present time I am writing a fairly extensive commentary on the Aphorisms in which I outline the philosophic implications in certain fundamental respects. When they are finished I should like to have them read critically with a view to uncovering weaknesses in the discussion and points that are not sufficiently clarified. If it would meet with your interest and convenience I should greatly appreciate having you do this. What I am seeking in this is not gentleness but real stiff criticism, for a philosophy if it is real and true must be able to 'take it'.

Thanking you again for your help as a critic and friend, and re-affirming my high appreciation of both you and your writings, I am

Very cordially yours,



Dear Brother Wolff:

Jan. 26, 1938

As usual I have to thank you for the beautiful spirit of your letter. You have the true attitude of a great teacher in your kindness and patience under criticism.

I do not know that I have anything more to say regarding Consciousness-without-an-object. You see that I am not particularly a metaphysician. I have my own ideas concerning Ultimate Reality, God, soul, heaven, Nirvana, but still these subjects do not interest me as pressingly important. These all can take care of themselves, without any help from me, but all around me are people who cannot take care of themselves, apparently, who do need help, for they are destroying themselves by their insanities, and rendering me very uncomfortable by doing so. I suppose I might be described as a pragmatic philosopher and moralist, and as near as I can make out, my philosophy agrees in some points with Buddhism, and in other, opposes. I speak somewhat doubtfully, for when one begins to try to find out anything about Buddha, or Buddhism, one at once gets into a welter of vague, doubtful legends and myths, and the utmost confusion of interpretation, from believers, unbelievers, and critics. And after all I don't care so terribly much what he thought or what he taught, tho it is certainly interesting. His kindness, his compassion, his abolition of the infamous caste system, I certainly joyously agree with, but for the rest of his ideas and practice, if I understand them, I mostly disagree.

You challenge me to prove that Buddha was neurotic. Of course I cannot do that with any scientific certainty. We know too little about him as a person. A good picture might help, but I do not think that we have one. When I think of the Buddha, I always instinctively think of a slight slender Hindu, with a vivid, idealistic face, radiating sympathy, but when I am shown, instead, a fat, sleepy-eyed, Mongolian-looking creature, squatting aloof, he seems more like a toad than a man to me, and I am repelled, and say, no, he could not have looked like that. But practically all the legends agree that he broke away from the normal course of life, because he was horrified and frightened at his first recognition of real life, of death, disease, pain, etc. Now it is not normal for a young person to meet life pessimistically. The healthy attitude is to look at life, from the standpoint of youth, as a joyous and intriguing adventure, full of prizes to be won by courage, ingenuity, and wise labor. But the weak or sickly person is liable to take a frightened and pessimistic view of it, and to endeavor to escape the battle by some form of side-tracking. If this attitude is held, and it is very likely to be taken and held by a child who is an only child, and too much coddled and sheltered by unwise parents, as Buddha, is said to have been, it is very likely to lead to some form of neurosis. It seems that, often unconsciously, the nervous system contrives a way of escape. Thus the neuresthenic becomes helpless, the hysteric falls into temperamental chaos, the epileptic throws a fit, the paranoic deludes himself and often others by concepts of his own supreme wisdom, grandeur, power or wealth, or there may be escape thru self-hypnosis and visions. According to the story, Buddha tried to escape by extreme mortification of flesh and desire, but finally swung back to a "Middle Path" of partial ascetisism, a monastic regimen, and a technique of samadhi. And this he offers to the world as "salvation".

According to Lewis Browne, a late writer and scholar, Buddha was

Letter to F.F.Wolff # 2

preceded, and indeed over-lapped, by Mahavira, the Jain. And the two stories are curiously alike, and it is hard to escape the conviction that the story of Buddha borrows from that of Mahavira. For Mahavira is also the son of a rajah, who for thirty years lives the life of luxury and then revolts and becomes extravagantly ascetic. After twelve years he attains Nirvana, and becomes "Jina", the Conqueror of Desire, the attainer of "salvation", without help of gods or prayers, who spends the rest of his life preaching it to his fellows. He derides the Vedas, decries caste, preaches the annihilation of the self, poverty, humility, harmlessness to all living things and beings, abolition of hatred, but especially absolute avoidance of women in every way, not even to look at one, much less speak to her. And after his death, in time, he was worshipped as a god, and claimed to be the the greatest of a long line of "Conquerors", just like Buddha.

Most Buddhistic scholars of to day, I believe, claim that Buddha, like Mahavira, was truly at<sup>h</sup>istic, as regards personal gods, at least, did not believe in the soul, or its immortality, and that nothing survived death but the Karma of one's deeds. But, confusingly, others say he revolted against the Wheel of Existence, with its succession of deaths and rebirths and showed a way to eternal Nirvana thru a technique of meditation. It is all a part of the welter that hangs around these ancient teachers. I do not know what you believe or teach exactly, for I have never had any clear statement of creed from you, that I remember, tho I have a pretty clear idea that you are at<sup>h</sup>istic, but do believe in the possible attainment of some kind of personal immortality.

But you very well know that I do believe in God, both pantheistically and personally, and that there is an undying principle in man, also a belief in a Karma of cause and effect. I believe there is still a Greater Teacher due this earth, one who will not be a man of sorrows, or an ascetic of monastic separation, but who will be so great and superior and wise in spirit and soul, above and far-seeing and understanding of the cause and meaning of the Wheel of Life, that he will always have a smile on his lips, always be showing men that all so-called evils are only the tasks and the lessons of life, constantly building their intelligence, character and soul-growth, that death is only a change and a door into a rest-room, and re-birth will bring only another needed lesson. That glimpses of Cosmic Consciousness will cheer them on the way, and finally, when the course is done, they will graduate into A Nirvana of Divine Consciousness as a reward of merit, instead of a reward of a technique of effort. Nirvana will be a completion of evolution, of a fullness of growth. This is a good way from Buddhism, is it not, and perhaps somewhat its opposite? As to experiences of samadhi, of course I believe that these have occurred to many people, but have been attained in many different ways, and by many different techniques, or quite suddenly and unexpectedly, by the percipient. And I do not deny the possibility that certain great characters, very near final Attainment, may be able to be in a state of this Bliss continuously in this life. But I do not believe for a moment that this Great Teacher of whom I dream will have any fear of or antagonism to sex, love or family life, or any normal relation of human affections, but will show that any relation will be all right if sufficiently spiritualized, and actuated always by kindness and human blessing.

I cannot help questioning wherein resided the great gain that Buddha attained by his doctrine or way of life. He did not live to be older than I now am, and died of an indigestion. This would seem to indicate that there was no supernormal wisdom in him, or it would have revealed to him what food was digestible and what not, would have warn-

Letter to F.F.Wolff # 3

ed him in this particular case, or shown him how to cure himself. Do you say his gain was inner, in peace and happiness of mind. No doubt it was, but you have attained that inner peace and joy without forswearing marriage or becoming monastic in any way. Socrates attained it in another way, St. Francis in another way, Mahavira through that very asceticism that Buddha abandoned, and I, to some degree, at least, in quite another way, differing from all. It was horror of pain, pain, disease and death that drove Buddha to doctrine, but after all he did not escape, pain, disease and death. Where is the superiority of it all? The Eighth-fold Noble Resolutions are all right, but, after all, what is there really original about them? Does not every good man affirm them in some sense? Mahavira had summed them all up before him in his "Three Jewels" of Right Faith, Right Knowledge, and Right Living. Please understand, I am not trying to undervalue Buddha, or his good influence, but to truly evaluate it. His one supreme merit, it seems to me, consists in his following Mahavira in condemning caste, though neither were as successful as might have been wished.

It seems to me that the statement of Jesus that "The Kingdom of God is within You" might very well mean a change in life-motive from selfishness to beneficence.

You will think this is a very poor and unsatisfactory answer to your letter, but consider the very unmetaphysical mind you appealed to. If it does not wholly discourage you, and you still want me to read your commentary when finished, why certainly I will do so, but you must be prepared for the worst.

Very cordially your friend --

J. William Lloyd

J. William Lloyd

San Fernando, Calif.,  
Jan. 29, 1938.

Dear Brother Lloyd:

Let me first thank you for your clear and extended discussion of the psychology of Buddha. I feel that what you say is important, not alone as reflecting your own point of view, but as well for the reason that it expresses substantially the position of western psychology. The base of valuation of the western psychologist being what it is I suppose that the general line of reasoning you have outlined is, more or less, inevitable. But I challenge the general validity of that base of valuation. I realize perfectly well the difficulty the Westerner has in getting away from the perspective established by his own psychology and I am quite willing to grant the relative and partial validity of that perspective. But that does not justify opposing the man who occupies a different psychological base by the method of calling bad names. This is the typical method of the western psychologist and medical materialist, as exemplified by Leuba in his "Psychology of Mysticism." Now, just what do we do when we call the man with whom we do not agree a neurotic? We are trying to discredit him by the method of the politician, the familiar method of the argumentum ad hominem. Afterwards we may speak kindly of him but we are claiming for ourselves the superior position.

In the last few days I have been absorbing Dr. Jung's book, "Psychological Types". It opened my eyes to considerations that formerly I had only imperfectly appreciated. For one thing it shows the radical difference between the introvert and the extrovert and, as well, the difference between the different functional types such as the thinking type, the feeling type, the sensational type and the intuition-type, each having an introvert and an extrovert phase. As no man can escape the effect of his own type-complex in his view of the universe the consequence is that no one statement can be universally acceptable. The West is extremely one-sided in its extroversion while the Orient is more introvert. From the standpoint of the extrovert the introvert seems rather pathological apparently and since the extrovert style predominates here and he is the more articulate of the two, the result is that the introverts generally have to 'take it' and often accept the extrovert evaluation of themselves. As a result of not being true to themselves they often do get into the asylums unquestionably, whereas if they had been true to their own psychology they would be just as normal on their own base as the extroverts are on theirs. A certain amount of conflict between these two types is wholesome as it helps toward breadth of perspective, but when the term 'neurotic' is used as an instrument of argument it ceases to be wholesome.

In any case the psychologist's classification of normal or abnormal is irrelevant. They even say that Newton was psychologically abnormal. But what bearing would any such judgment have upon the validity of the "Principia" or the Calculus which Newton developed? It is simply entirely beside the point. The same point is true with respect to the philosophy of Buddha.

It is true we do not have, so far as I know, any authentic resemblance of the personal man Gautama. The images of Buddha

are symbolic and largely north Asian. The Chinese envisage a Mongolian Buddha just as the Germans formerly painted a German Christ. The Chinese admire a fat man, hence they picture their ideal man as fat. The superficial westerner scholar would probably say the Chinese admire fat because they generally have so little to eat, thus quite over-looking the deeper reason which grows out of the fact that the Chinese race center their consciousness in a solar-plexus occult power. It takes a fat body to stand the solar-plexus Fire. As Gautama was a Hindu he was not personally like these images. Yet I have seen images that were true symbols of the Dispassion, Compassion and Wisdom which is the Enlightenment or Buddha, an impersonal state of Consciousness.

You speak of Buddha's pessimism concerning Sangsara as abnormal for a young man. Yes, to be sure if we take the norm of the average unthinking and quite indiscriminating young man as our base of reference. But you seem to overlook reincarnation. There are some old or mature souls born in this world and their norm is not that of the average. How else would you account for a Shankara for instance who went to his Guru at eight years of age having mastered all the Fundits could teach him by that time, and who completed his life-work at the age of 32? His work was so important that it seems still to be regarded as the most authentic Bramanical contribution within historic times. No, the norm of the average young soul is not fit standard for judging the incarnations of really mature souls.

Buddha's phenomenology and his doctrine of Nirvana are two different things and not at all incompatible. Incidentally, there is much in modern science that parallels quite closely Buddha's phenomenology. (V. Ernest Mach) The concatenation of causes can never lead to Nirvanic consciousness, but leads on in an endless series of out-breathed and indrawn states, the later being the effect of the former. But man can break out of dependence upon and involvement in this series through Enlightenment (Buddha). This something not achieved by evolution but by Recognition. There is no contradiction here. The atheistic and anathic features of the doctrine are difficult to understand until a certain state of Recognition is attained, and so I will let this rest for the present.

So much that you say concerning your ideals, aspirations and intuitions accords with sayings accredited to Buddha in the Buddhist Canon that I often wonder how far you are familiar with this canon. Consider, for instance, the following quotation of Buddha's answer to the merchant Anathapindika, a man of real nobility of character and charitableness who wanted to know whether the ascetic life was necessary.

"The bliss of a religious life is attainable by every one who walks the noble eight-fold path. He that cleaves to wealth, had better cast it away than allow his heart to be poisoned by it; but he who does not cleave to wealth, and possessing riches, uses them rightly, will be a blessing unto his fellow beings.

"I say unto thee remain in thy station in life and apply thyself with diligence to thy enterprises. It is not life and wealth and power that enslave men, but the cleaving to life, wealth and power.

"The bhikkhu who retires from the world in order to lead a life of leisure will have no gain. For a life of indolence is an abomination, and a lack of energy is to be despised.

"The dharma of the Tathagata does not require a man to go into homelessness or to resign the world unless he feels called upon to do so; but the dharma of the Tathagata requires every man to free himself from the illusion of self, to cleanse his heart, and to give up his thirst for pleasure, and lead a life of righteousness.

"And whatever men do, whether they remain in the world as artisans, merchants, and officers of the king, or retire from the world and devote themselves to a life of religious meditation, let them put their whole heart into the task; let them be diligent and energetic, and; if they are like the lotus, which, although it grows in the water, yet remains untouched by the water, if they struggle in life without cherishing envy or hatred, if they live in the world not a life of self but a life of truth, then surely joy, peace, and bliss will dwell in their minds."

Does not this imply a courageous and manly attitude toward life? Not only is all action allowed, but it is specifically enjoined that it should be energetic. Only there must be a certain attitude in the action. Of course this is not the discipline for the man who is seeking Liberation in one incarnation. His course is a great deal more exacting. I have here the biography of one of these and it certainly makes our western heroism seem like baby stuff. But I know of no place where this severe course is urged upon anyone, but rather the contrary.

Now, How about Buddha's ideal for the man who has the power to attain Liberation and does attain it? After honoring such a one for his attainment then the following words are given:

"Now bend thy head and listen well, O Bodhisattva & Compassion speaks and saith: 'Can there be bliss when all that lives must suffer? Shalt thou be saved and hear the whole world cry?'

"Now thou has heard that which was said.

"Thou shalt attain the seventh step and cross the gate of final knowledge, but only to wed woe - if thou would'st be Tathagata, follow upon thy predecessor's steps, remain unselfish until the endless end.

"Thou are enlightened - choose thy way."

Not only do I know of no ideal superior to this, I know of none other anywhere nearly equal to it. This is not the lesser renunciation of the world but the great Renunciation of Nirvana for Compassion's sake. Further life is continued for and in the world both in a seen and unseen way with consciousness continuing unbroken for untold ages. Vicariously the agony of men is felt at the same time Light is brought to relieve that agony.

Now as to Buddha's empiric life. It is not the Buddhists who but the Hatha Yogis who strive for extension of gross physical existence. There is a subtle kind of embodiment wherein the Adept can play a far more effective part for the world than in the physical one. The general attitude seems to be one of letting physical life take its course, though there are traditions that some Arhats have lived for hundreds of years. Exoterically Buddha is said to have lived to 80. The esoteric tradition gives it as 100 years. His death has a symbolic meaning though it may have been literal also. The best account of the literal death is this: Buddha and some of his disciples were guests of a farmer. The latter offered pork as part of the meal. Now the rule of the Sangha was that that which was offered must be accepted. Buddha

knew that this food was injurious to his Bhiksus and asked that all of the pork should be given to him. In this way the rule was kept and at the same time he protected his disciples. It was the cause of his death according to the account. Now note the exquisite consideration. Foreseeing how the farmer would feel he sent a disciple to him while he was on his own death-bed to give comfort and tell the farmer that he had helped the Buddha to his final Nirvana and that his name would go down in history.

There are Buddhist Arhats who were married. The Tibetan Yogi Marpa is one of them. He had a wife and at least one child even while functioning as a Yogi. The reverse is the rule as it is unquestionably harder for a householder to break through than for an ascetic, but it can be done and has been done. In fact a Maharishi ~~is~~ now living in Southern India says that the Western Path must be in the midst of the action of western life. It is a matter of difference in racial character.

However, Realization does require conservation of the libido or creative life-force and the focusing of it into the Self. Even Dr. Jung realizes this necessity. Complete asceticism is not necessary for this but at least some degree of asceticism is. For my own part I did practice an instinctive and self-imposed asceticism from the beginning of adolescence including quite an exacting discipline of the emotional nature. In later years I relaxed the discipline somewhat, but the essential purpose had been accomplished, i.e., the shifting of the life-flow and interest from the object to the subject. This made possible first the opening of the door of mathematical understanding and finally the great event of a year and a half ago. There is a law in this that I have found even western mathematicians have sometimes had to apply. Even indulgence of an interest in music makes a creative mathematical activity impossible. It is all a question of going after the values which one finds of most importance. One simply cannot eat his cake and have it too. Any hardship that I ever faced was trivial when compared with the values finally realized.

Yes, I will appreciate your reading my commentary when I have it completed. Your criticisms will help me to realize a more objective view and also see their effect upon minds quite different in type from my own.

Ever most cordially yours,

Franklin F. Wolff



P.S. Since writing the foregoing it has come to my mind that a more complete discussion of the psychological interpretation of Yoga as a technique of escape is needed. From your letter I judge that you take substantially the position of the western psychologist, and as I must meet this problem in my present writings, I should be glad to avail myself of the opportunity to thrash it out with you if you are willing to carry on the discussion.

Now there are two kinds of problems that arise in the course of life. One type can be solved, even though difficult, the other can not be solved on the level where it arises. The former is the genuinely intellectual type of problem which has its perfect manifestation in mathematics but also, in general, in physical science and in situations with which the engineering mind can deal adequately. In such problems there are always given or may be found enough invariants to make possible a control of the variables that enter into them. Solution is a theoretical possibility on the level of the problem and so satisfaction can be attained in these cases without shift of level of consciousness. The other type of problem always involves too many variables and too few constants for a solution to be even a theoretical, much less a practical, possibility on the level of the problem. These are the psychological problems that grow out of psychical tensions either within one's self or out of the relations between one's self and other creatures, particularly other human beings. I find, not only through personal experience but as well through my psychological studies, that the effort to solve these problems by the intellectual methods simply leads to a transformation of the problem into different terms but never to a genuine resolution of it. Unquestionably the effort to find a solution leads to collateral results including a growth of self-consciousness, but the direct objective of genuine solution is never attained on the level of the problem, yet it must be attained if Peace and real Happiness is to be realized. I find that Dr. Jung has also recognized as a result of his extensive clinical psychological experience that this type of problem is essentially insoluble in the mathematical sense of solution. My analysis has shown me an essential similarity in these problems to situations that arise in the dream state. In the dream state one may be beset by a flux of situations carrying a certain quality of threat, but every effort to handle the situation is off-set by the changing flux so that the problem simply reappears endlessly in a new shape. It is like the croquet game in "Alice's Adventures in Wonderland". Now there is a very simple way of solving the dream-problem. It is simply to wake up, and that means 'rising to a higher level of consciousness'. The problem in waking life can be solved in the same way, by rising to a higher level of consciousness where the problem ceases to exist and therefore is solved. This is really a more or less profound phase of the Yogic Awakening of the Second Birth. I interpret the presence of these life-problems as unmistakable demonstration of the unreality of ~~my~~ sangsaraic existence. I believe that these problems serve two valuable offices: (a) to arouse and develop self-consciousness, and (b) to arouse disgust with sangsara and a yearning for Reality. Otherwise they are a cheat and a snare that lead the entangled soul on in much the way that a retreating mirage leads the thirsty desert wanderer on and on in a fruitless search for water.

I have found no other solution of these problems than that of Yogic Awakening in my own experience. Nor through my reading and conversation I have I found any evidence that any one else has



found a real solution in any other terms. To be sure, I have found many who still think that the mirage is a lake and go chasing after it throughout incarnation after incarnation, but always endlessly failing. Perhaps as significant an effort as was ever made in this direction was exemplified by Whitman. As he had a degree of Illumination his effort is more than usually significant, yet if he had succeeded he would never have had to write the tragic "Prayer of Columbus". No, I see no hope whatsoever in that direction, and so far as I know, the authorities on Yoga all agree with this.

He who tries to solve the life-problem directly is like the man who tries to catch his shadow. No matter how fast he goes the shadow always keeps ahead of him. But if he turns his back upon the shadow and walks toward the Sun the shadow will follow him as his slave. This turning about and facing the Sun is not an escape through weakness, but an act of sheer Wisdom. It is the act of the man who at last through the experience of innumerable lives has learned the uselessness of chasing his shadow and the Wisdom of turning toward the Sun or the Eternal Self, which, in its turn, becomes metamorphosed into Eternal Selflessness. Such a one has not lost power over the shadow, but through his relationship with the Light has won the only real control that there is. His consciousness is centered above the level on which the unsolvable life-problem arises.

The chasing of the shadow may give a one percent pleasure but it involves a 99% percent pain when all the accounts are reckoned up. Thus the essence of sangsarik life is, as Buddha said, simply Suffering. To be sure this Suffering is valuable for the arousing and development of self-consciousness, but beyond that barren of value.

---

You use the term 'hypnosis' in connection with Yoga. It is the same thing I find repeated in the superficial treatment of the western psychologists. When will our colossal western conceit permit us to realize that however much we excel in mathematics and physics, yet in psychology we are no more than babes as compared with the Oriental Adepts in psychology? Jung, the most competent of our psychologists, has indeed seen that in this field we are relatively amateurs, but how many others have been able to see this? To pronounce a condition hypnotic is merely uttering a word, and affords no explanation. For what is hypnotism? Crude indeed our our western explanations. What of the enormous difference between an externally imposed hypnotic state, condemned even more by the Yogis than the western psychologists, and the self-induced samadhi where the individual has conscious control of the state? The westerner sees in both cases only the external state of the organism. What does he know of the inner consciousness value? Nothing, unless he too experiments directly, and then he will know only so much as his degree of spiritual unfoldment will make possible. The western scientist in this field is so utterly unreasonable and positively childish that I find it difficult to have any patience with him. In the fields where objective method is valid he has done good work which I respect and value, but when he carries that methodology over into the subjective field he is utterly unreasonable and unscientific. The only valid scientific method here involves introvert technique and external observation is useless. There is a science of introversion as well as of extroversion. The Orient has developed the former; we the latter. We are just about as competent in the introvert science

as an uneducated Oriental mystic would be in a modern physical laboratory! Will the Westerner never learn true humility? Will he ever learn that the fact of having mastered external nature in a high degree and the further fact that he has demonstrated extreme skill in the art of destruction, it does not follow that he knows everything better than everyone else? No, my Brother, though we Westerners do have our genuine excellencies, yet in that vast subjective domain where the Oriental Adept excels we are no more than children. I believe that in future milleniums there lie before us the possibility of uniting the best of the East and the West and thus achieve something more than either alone has accomplished. But this can only be done by those who have first been pupils before the eastern and western genius and then, having mastered essentially both, combine them into superior values. But this means that such a one must master both Buddha and Newton with Kant and Shankara thrown in as bridges between these two extremes.

Pardon me, my Brother, if I have seemed severe. But whenever the terms 'neurosis' and 'hypnosis' are introduced to viciate and discredit the values of Yoga or the insight of the introvert the argument drops below the level of polite discourse and a battle without gloves is indicated. This is merely a part of the primitive brutality of the Western extrovert which he habitually employs with the introverts. I shall certainly use every resource I have to protect my own people and their philosophy from that kind of treatment. Few, if any, recognize more than I that the philosophy must meet logical necessities. But I claim that difference of vision or insight as between the introvert and the extrovert give to the latter no right to fight below the belt with 'neurosis' and 'hypnosis'. It is no more fair than judging ~~western~~ western culture by the world war.

Let me thank you again for your frank discussions. I hope they may continue. I hope they are of value to you. They certainly are of value to me for, among other things, they help to prepare me for meeting those who will be critics; not merely of me as a person ( a matter of small importance), but of the philosophy which I know is the vehicle of the saving manna for the human soul which the West so grievously needs.

F.F.W.