

A LETTER TO A SADHAKA

Franklin Merrell-Wolff

Reprinted from the *Bulletin of the Assembly of Man* 6 (April 1961)

Dear . . . :

First of all I am particularly impressed that you should have had on some six occasions what you call a state of "Euphoria," a strictly medical term and which for that reason is pejorative when used in connection with the higher states of consciousness, when you could have used non-disparaging words such as Joy, Bliss, Ecstasy, Ananda or positive Hedonic-tone? I find your selection of the term to be psychologically significant as revealing something in your attitude that may be largely unconscious. And to this something I must take exception.

I realize that it is characteristic of Western man since the time of Heraclitus to disparage Delight in connection with the higher values since he tends to associate this Hedonic quale with mere secular pleasure. But in this he is very wrong. There is no other mark of God-consciousness or, if you prefer, superconscious consciousness than the experience of a spontaneous, exalting, and purifying Delight, that is of more importance. Delight or Ecstasy is not only an affective value but it is also a Noetic state, as Plotinus has shown. What you call "Euphoric asides" may well be more of the nature of "main-line" stuff than your theoretical dissertation. I am sorry that you did not report them, as they would be of a sovereign interest to me. Time and again I have had to face the choice between a systematic theoretical development and permitting this other power which comes with Delight to take over the guidance. So I am familiar with the problem. It is just plain intellectual ego that tends to reject the so-called "asides."

The foregoing leads directly to the second point I wish to discuss at this time. It is the question of the place the intellectual mind or Buddhi (I use the dictionary sense of the word rather than that of H. P. Blavatsky, which was "Spiritual Soul") has with respect to the attainment of the Higher Consciousness and its expression. This question becomes important because you speak of a postulational process with respect to the Supernal Consciousness when proceeding toward manifestation. Now the Supernal Consciousness does not act directly through mind but through another and higher activating principle which has been variously called "Gnosis," "Supermind," and "Vijnana." Postulation is an exclusively intellectual process and is not a function of the Vijnana. Let us consider this more fully.

Postulation is the prime process of Western theoretical science. It means "assuming without proof," not in the sense of an immediate knowledge known directly, but in the sense of a groping or guessing in the twilight of no certainty. The pragmatic epistemology is the only basis whereby a postulate receives relative justification. It leads only to "probable knowledge" (Bertrand Russell) or "warranted assertibility" (John Dewey). This means that it receives justification by consequences, primarily in the sense of "practical consequence" and not immediately as an already known truth. It is, I believe, the greatest power of the Ignorance and, of late, it has proved dangerously effective in that it has unleashed overwhelming power without balancing spiritual control. It is a prime power of the intellectual mind which does not POSSESS Knowledge, but SEEKS Knowledge.

But the Vijnana does not seek Knowledge for It already possesses all Knowledge. For It, therefore, there can be no such function as postulation. Our psychological term 'projection' comes closer to suggesting Its mode of operation, save that we would have to

conceive of the process as a conscious projection rather than as the unconscious process the psychologist postulates.

Another point to bear in mind is that Knowledge in the sense of Vijnana is not knowledge in terms of concepts. It is a massive and integral continuum, not discrete and separative. It is dynamic and projective, in fact, the proximate source of the Universe. It is at once the equivalent of Idea and the Execution of the Idea.

It is really quite impossible for the mental man to imagine the Vijnana-Consciousness: Realization is an irrefragable necessity for understanding on this level. Without this, mental speculation concerning this Consciousness is bound to miss the mark and could lead to a cul-de-sac in some intermediate zone which would still be part of Maya. This is one of the reasons why I stress the importance of Realization first. The Above can and does comprehend the Below, but the Below cannot comprehend the Above.

Nonetheless the intellective mind can play an invaluable part in the preliminary stages of the Sadhana. It is one of the two leading aids in this part of the Sadhana. It can do necessary work for the purification of the mind and it has a substantial power of discrimination. But it must have the humility to abdicate its sovereignty when the Sadhaka has reached the Lid between the Below and the Above. No doubt, this is a difficult step for the intellectual to take since he expects to test all things with his mind before he gives acceptance or trust. This, indeed, is an excellent practice in the mazes of Maya, but it can no longer apply after reaching the limits of the unilluminated mind. Here Faith is ineluctable, and to the intellectual man that is a hard saying.

After Realization the intellect has an invaluable part to play in the office of transcription and, hereby is, I think, the most effective means for communication. Here it serves a Knowledge which is not its own in its own right and, in this service, acquires a greater power than it ever had before. In so doing it participates in the Illumination and there may be a vast enhancement of skill. The mind that thus serves transcends the mind that clings to its supposed sovereignty, however sophisticated the latter may be. The thinking of the Illuminati is transcriptional rather than postulational, though the power of postulational thinking is not lost or necessarily lost. To use a Western Gnostic mode of representation, transcriptional thinking is the Christ, since it intermediates between the Above and the Below, while postulational thinking is Mephistophelian, i.e., tending to disparage all sacred values. (The Freudian interpretations when too generally extended afford excellent illustrations of this kind of thinking.)

Your theory as to the derivation of the Self, as well as the ego, has the ring of the anatmic doctrine as developed in some of the Sutras with which I am familiar. This may indeed be a successful approach to Realization, but it is not the way I found to be helpful. My orientation was to the Atmavidya in which the Self served as the irreducible base, by means of which the Door opened. In the end there was a transcendence of SELF as well as of GOD and all other dualities or polarities. But all this developed spontaneously. However, the SELF is not a postulation. To be sure, at its ultimate stage the High Indifference is both Anatmic and Nastikata, but that is the character in its totality. Within it are all possibilities and, therefore, they do not lose their being. All may be evoked and brought forth into existence. Further, it is very important to note that the last polarity to vanish was that of SELF-GOD. Thus this polarity is the primary basis of manifestation, while the HIGH INDIFFERENCE is the Basis of both the manifest and unmanifest. Postulation is a power way down in the Ignorance.

So long as you are only who and what you think you are, you are moving in terms of the Ignorance, and have not found the stable fulcrum. The truth is that I (all I's) cannot be any object standing before consciousness. While the ego can be a predicate, the true SELF never can be, but is always the hidden subject.

You spoke about my tendency to be silent. That is something that grows upon one. In my time, I also was very fond of dialectic. And while this certainly has its place, yet one does reach a place where this has fulfilled its office. Today I rather gravitate to the hole in the hub of the wheel of the Chinese figure. Discourse is less valuable than example and example is less valuable than Influence. I say to you: develop according to your svabhava, and function in conformity with your svadharma. (There is a logical connection here if you can find it.)