

Unedited First Draft Transcription - What Consciousness Knows and Doesn't Know - 2015 May 23 (PM)
Carlsbad, California
#18 through #27

Questions & Answers:

#18 / 1:22

Q: I would like to hear, or discuss I guess..... I have a new housemate and I've made some requests, and this morning there was awareness that one of the requests, after the third or fourth time, was still not respected. I watched myself get irritated and then it chose to no longer be irritated.

Jac: Well done.

Q: Yes, I felt that way too. So maybe by contrast, or how does this all fit together is really my question, so far as really just the allowing that everything is okay, and then there's the question of like, "okay, who or what did that choosing, and why didn't I just stay angry and write him a nasty note?"

Jac: 2:49 Yes, it's a little bit like what we were talking about this morning, at different perspectives different things are valid. And from the point of view of, you see an option to be annoyed or you see an option to just not annoyed, you there have that choice. At that moment you have that choice, but from a bigger perspective you don't even have that choice. From the bigger perspective it was already determined what direction you would go in, from the other perspective. But functioning in the world we're very often in that subject/object perception. We can be there identified, and then there's suffering, or not identified, but you're using dualistic perception just function. Like right now there's dialogue because there's dualistic perception which enables us to communicate something.

Q: 3:49 So that's what you're calling the functioning mind?

Jac: Yes exactly, so the functioning capacity uses what might look like duality. There has to be that freedom I suppose because language is dualistic, and you know, you only know yourself if when you say, "I" you mean an identified "I" or the Brian character, the Jac character. Only you know, you know? So in that moment when you have, "do I have an option here," like, "Oh God I see that's a thought I'm not going there," at that moment when it looks like you have an option choose wisely, choose wisely. When you choose wisely the phenomenal knock on effect is better for you. It's going to give you a better quality of life, so why not choose that? We can choose that for sure.

Q: That helps.

Jac: 4:55 Do you see? So it's like, wherever the rules are valid use them. Why not? At another point they're not valid at all and it's a different game, but where we have choice use it, use it well. It's interesting because the more we begin to expand to the totality the wider view, which is what I'm beginning to call, "non-denialism." You know, it's like it's more non-denial, you know that inclusivity of all of it. From there none of the different perspectives is sticking, not the absolute, not the non-dual, no perspective is sticky. There is like a free flow of whatever is needed in any moment and you just pick up the kind of code or language or the tools that you need to operate at that level. We have the capacity to dip in and out of all of them as required, and not stick to any. That's the trick.

Q: That's really making a lot of sense, because any time that I've ever tried to stay in one when it didn't apply, it's frustrating!

Jac: 6:15 It's frustrating, and the controller tries to do it. We imagine there's an advantage in staying in one perspective. The only thing that becomes solid is the backdrop, that absolute stillness, the knowing or whatever we want to call that beyond something phenomenal, we have to put names on it, but that's the only thing that's constant, and from there everything else is fluid. It's all fluid! It's all fluid, there is no non-dual is better than the dual. It's not actually there's just two perspectives, they're actually the same thing; two sides of the same coin. It frees it all up. It's much freer, you know? Then whatever is playing must be okay. I mean, it's okay for consciousness because it's happening, so it's okay. By virtue of the fact that it's happening of course it's already part of the game so it's fine, you see? So that helps to retrain mind I suppose, to function well where it's supposed to function and to back off when it's not needed. It imagines that it can upgrade everything and it can't, it just rejects what is and imagines that it can choose something better, but what is actually is, well that's enough in any moment, you know? It really is enough. So not sticking to any perspective, then the natural state is where the body rest because it's in that still place. The nervous system is calm because it's not in fright or flight, it's not defending itself, it's not doing any of the dualistic stuff, it's not invested in anything so it's relaxed. It's just being. So the natural state happens in the body and the mind comes in and out as it's needed. Life gets very simple! It gets really simple from there, you know?

Q: 8:25 Yes, I feel I do. Thank you for that clarification.

#19 / 8:51

Q: What you're describing is Unity, because there's really no distinguishing between one or the other. Does that make sense?

Jac: Is that Unity? Is there one?

Q: Or is there less than one?

Jac: Or is there less than one?

Q: 9:16 Yes, but what I was just sensing was the absence of division, the absence of separation.

Jac: Yes.

Q: But I saw my mind trying to go with, like this..... it was a real physical feeling. It was reverberating, and then the mind wanting to pick that up and make something out of it; let that go.

Jac: Yes well done. Good to see it. So from the perspective of manifestation, that's the unit isn't it? Manifestation is the unit.

Q: Yes.

Jac: And so consciousness is part of that or underpins that. Consciousness does the manifestation or awareness does the manifestation, whatever you want to call it.

Q: 10:02 This organism is all part of that there is no separation.

Jac: Yes.

Q: 10:06 At lunch we were sitting on the balcony of our room and watching the palms move back and forth, and I had the feeling of, "this is a palm tree I saw in South America 50 years ago," but it was that there was something eternal about the moment. But my thought was,

"how do I behave in duality?" This just answered the question, just behave. Just forget all the, "how to's."

Jac: 10:44 That's right, the how to is the controller trying to gain something. Its much simpler. It's actually simpler.

Q: Yes, I had a thought earlier that I will just be the best human being I know how to be, and that's good enough.

Jac: That's fair enough, and even that can be dropped, because you actually will only be able to be what you can be anyway. You really will, you know? But yes sure, it's no problem at all to give mind a motivation that's clean and not sticky, and say, "hey go with what brings more light here, go with love, you know, and sometimes you can give mind that motivation. It's useful, but you know you're not attached to it it's just a direction for mind.

Q: 11:35 Well that's what I'm sensing now, that letting go the attachment is just sort of.... But you know, letting go is too crude of a word. How do you let go of something that never was really there?

Jac: Yes, that's exactly it!

Q: 11:51 But that's the sense because it just.... This morning you said to [indiscernible word] all your experiences and I.... "do we have to talk really?" I didn't want to the words just marred the silence.

Jac: Yes.

Q: I told you last night about when I first really dropped into consciousness, and I said it reverberated for the last several years, and what it is, and again this is a memory, but it was that every time a thought would arise it was marring the experience of consciousness, and so now any time when I'm really sort of quiet and that thought comes in, "this is just a thought this is not it," and it just vanishes now.

Jac: 12:48 Yes.

Q: And this morning it was that whole re-experience of it you know, but on a quieter level, and all I wanted to be was there, which is here. Yes I realize you know in making a place, but even that's not it, and I recognize that too. Is this making sense?

Jac: It is making sense yes, and yet talking happens.

Q: 13:21 Then that's what you just said, you know what, good. Yes you said earlier about being tribal, yes okay. That's okay too then.

Jac: Yes that's okay too. You see how it comes in, it's like an understanding of how it fits together in one bigger picture. There must be space for our humanness and for our need to connect and understand and be understood, and all those things that come in you know, they don't have importance but they play a role.

Q: 13:56 What comes back to that is that quote by Ramana, something about.... the bottom line is, "we might as well just be silent because we can talk about it." So that comes to my head, but now I see that he talked a lot, and he got angry at people, you know? He liked to walk around the mountain just like I would.

Jac: Yes, just like you would.

Q: Or anybody else. That's a lot of freedom.

Jac: 14:24 Yes, being human is..... You know this work makes you be fully human. It gives you an understanding of what it really means to be human, because being human is not being a slave to the mind, that's being in prison that's not humanity. An understanding of what it

means to be human blossoms, it just flowers and it becomes very simple, and one of the tools that the human being has is the mind. It's one of the tools, you know?

Q: 15:02 You just touched on something. I told you this last night, I had a really rough few past months, and the bottom line is that I was on the edge of losing my job, which would've been losing.... well we would've lost our home, and it had to do with some mistakes I made and people in charge said, "hey you're an old guy now, you're losing your mind dah, dah, dah, dah," and I thought, "well that might not be a bad thing if I lose my mind," but not that portion of the mind that works. And I had to do some testing and all that, and I have some metabolic disease, Hyperhomocysteinemia. Okay big deal, but it's fortunately treated with vitamins.

Jac: My goodness!

Q: 15:56 That's one good thing, and this metabolic disease is associated with stroke, cardiac disease, and Alzheimer's, but my homocysteine levels are back to normal, my tests are improved and better, so the bottom line is.... But what happened is it shook everything about my persona. It totally took it from any sort of self-image, self-importance, blew it out of the water.

Jac: Fantastic!

Q: 16:27 Yeahhhh and I saw that, so the whole thing was a blessing in disguise as painful as it was. It was horrible! It was just horrible, but I do remember that I would just sit and meditate and it was like darkness rising, a dark rising, a dark energy, and I could step back from it and think, "c'mon is this all we've got?" And then, "whew," yeah there was more coming, but it's gradually.... I would say it's about 95% of the time now that I'm free of that. I can see the energy rise, that little pinch come up, and then I see it (sound effect-not interested 17:13), and it goes away again.

Jac: A stripping like that is a blessing! It really is, isn't it? To just really see what was there an attachment to, what was there an assumption about?

Q: 17:27 You know I'm sure there's some still there, but like I said, it arises and I see it and then it goes away again. You know, and I wanted to keep our house that's the bottom line. So I really struggled and worked to make it so I still have work and a job, and I do. So in some ways I felt, "well let's just go ahead and lose it completely," but I couldn't accept that.

Jac: Ahh!

Q: I couldn't accept it that Barb and I would lose everything, and we will go through my savings in a year or so and that's going to be it. I couldn't accept that. So did I sale this grace short or was this what all I needed to have done? These are questions that... maybe they're just stupid things to ask or worry about.

Jac: 18:28 No, no there's something in this for sure. So why couldn't you accept it? What was the big, "we draw the line here and no further?" What's the threat if you went to the level of bankruptcy or....

Q: 18:44 You know, I was sitting in our little TV room and I remember thinking, "I love this room." No big deal, but it was the attachment to some of the comforts and maybe the privileges that I have with those comforts. I didn't want to lose them or at least I thought that's what I didn't want to lose. So I'm in the position of right now being able to keep them. How's that? I stopped there, but I see people who give up everything and I couldn't do that, and it was sort of like..... I even felt that awareness or nature or consciousness says, "okay this is good enough, you're okay here but give me the best you've got now."

Jac: Right.

Q: This is all story though. This is all a lie.

Jac: 19:52 It is all a lie.

Q: I know that, but it's a nice interpretation.

Jac: 19:57 Yes, okay so at one level it's a lie and at another level, okay maybe there's something there. Traditionally the attachment ties to the sense of I because that's the thing that sticks, it's me, myself, I, that's attached. Sometimes it's an aspect, okay this is going to require you to be seriously self honest with yourself to figure it out, but sometimes there is an aspect of our character which has a strong dependency on, for example, beautiful things or like, "I'm actually better if I live beside the sea than if I don't live beside sea," so something is well, more balanced. Is there an attachment to living beside the sea? Well, "no I've left it, of course I've left it, but I'm just not as well. I can do it but I'm not as well." Do you see? Now, when we do this work we find the word "attachment" very useful, but actually sometimes it's like a veneer, that placates over something that is naturally there attracted to our persona, because it gives us a sense of well-being, and we call it attachment. Now what I'm after is like, what would be threatened if you took it? Is it just things we are attached to like self-image and stuff like that, or is it actually, "you know these comforts like this TV room, there is nothing else going on except the feeling of well-being here. It's just a feeling of well-being and this body/mind needs it." Now, it's a thin line but sometimes the body/mind just knows what it needs and it calls in what it needs just to be healthy and well. It's like, for example somebody giving up all exercise, "oh no I'm attached to exercise." If you don't exercise at all you're going to get sick actually. It's a bit like that. It's like we imagine that it's always attachment and sometimes it's not. Sometimes it's more fundamental to our well-being, and we interpret it as an attachment. That would be worth investigating.

Q: 22:22 It already did. Yeah that's it. And I'll back up, years ago I lived in South America, I lived with peasants and we were a two day walk from the nearest road in the middle of the jungle, Amazon basin. I slept in bamboo huts, I slept on concrete floors with my T-shirt as a pillow, and you know go to the bathroom in the woods. I've done that and you know what, it was okay for a young man but there is no more thrill in that. We don't live extravagantly, please don't misunderstand me it's a modest home, a duplex on a street corner, but it's comfortable and I feel alive in that place. It's home and I don't want to give it up. But what this really does is it answers another question, it it can go to rest.

Jac: 23:27 Yes, it can go to rest.

Q: Yes, take away that doubt. You know I'm giving this my best you know, the personality is okay I have accepted this, and I was like, to give an example, this was at the end of the day at work and I wanted to take care of this patient, and I had to ask permission to do it, and a guy 20 years younger said, "no that patient is too sick for you, don't do it." "Ooh burn!" But let's look at this, 24:01 let's see who got the [indiscernible word], who burned with that? It went away. If I can recollect the experience now there's no charge there. That was the gift of grace.

Jac: 24:19 Indeed. It gets very subtle doesn't it, as we go on. You know stuff that we assume is something we have to burn through, actually it's, "poof," it doesn't have roots, it doesn't have a tap root into something, you know? Sometimes it's just habit out of a reacting in a specific way. It's like impact, but actually it's gone. It's gone, there was just a moment.

Q: 24:52 It would go so quickly that I would be, "wait that went too quickly." When I saw that was happening repeatedly, you know different things pop up, "oh that's what's going on." There are no roots to that or the roots are there but they're like little (sound affect 25:14).

Jac: Yes little fibers there's nothing there. Yes it gets like this it's much looser, and sometimes it's just the body/mind having a response, you know your nervous system just has a reaction, but it's just literally a habit. It's just an old program to like, "whoa what's going on here," and it falls down. Sometimes it's just a memory in the nervous system. The nervous systems version of a miniature fight or flight, and it just reads it like that, but there's nothing there, there's no story there it's just how we.....

Q: 25:51 One of the experiences was how the mind, which is created..... I would be quiet and all of a sudden here comes a story out of the blue, and it would be 2AM in the morning, "why is this happening, look at this this is crazy!" And yet the more I saw that, that energy burned away. So again, it came to the..... just a little pop of little bubbles. I suspect that's what that is.

Jac: Yes, and they might always be there those little tiny bubbles, because they've nothing.... If they don't have substance or charge, nothing, it's just a cloud coming by. They might always be there, that might be the minds way of being active now, you know? Yes, you see if it doesn't have charge it's okay.

Q: It happened some this morning, I'd see that, "okay," but I did question it, "why is that still going on," thinking it should go away, but it may not.

Jac: It may not.

Q: All right, so that still continues, wow.

Q: 27:17 Just one more thing, somebody, and I think it was Mahesh, mentioned about space, and we were talking about space this morning. Space vanished because as soon as you said look at space I was like, "there is no space all there is is awareness." It was that fine line between, where is pure awareness and where does personal I start, arise? And it appeared to be that sometimes there was a personal I looking at this and at other times there wasn't. It was just sort of a back and forth.

Jac: 28:02 So when the personal I is looking at something there might be a commentary like, "oh look at that," or you know, "it's mind doing that."

Q: But not even that gross it was just like a little energy, and it would be more energetic than anything else.

Jac: Okay that energetic thing, does it create a sense of I or does it create something a little more potent than the sense of the I? Is there a reality feel to that personally felt energy?

Q: 28:41 I don't think so. It's very vague that's there's..... and I know what it is, it's when I start..... if I can raise a question, "is this I," then that's an "I," yes? That's kind of what I saw, and is personal "I" involved here. If someone's asking the question consciousness wouldn't ask that question.

Jac: That's right, consciousness wouldn't ask that question.

Q: No, see it would know.

Jac: 29:08 it wouldn't even see the personal "I" you know, it wouldn't. It's just known that it doesn't have a reality in and of itself, so it can't isolate it like that. So it's funny because you know, when it's a spiritual practice for a long time, is there a personal I here, that sentence can be continuing simply because of the habit of the spiritual practice. It's like checking for attachment but actually it's just something that's needed for your well-being you know, or is

there actually attachment. So at a certain point the spiritual practices have to get a bit more refined, you know the sense of staying clear or processing whatever else might come up down river. It stops creating the personal I because the line that would cross there is that you know that no matter how believable the personal I is it's never you. It's never you! The identity isn't there with the sense of a personal I. Even with the personal I story there isn't an identity locked in, it's not you. You are no longer the body/mind. That's the important line. Do you see?

Q: 30:36 Yes, I'm working on that right now.

Jac: Yes, because if we know that that I never creates an autonomous me, well then there isn't a me who can be attached.

Q: 30:47 You just answered something, because I see what I'm doing with that. I'm making something of it. I'm making a sub story, a little sidebar, "oh this personal I, you're not there." So there is a little diversionary energy saying, "you're not it."

Jac: Yes, and doubt will always come up you know, all doubt will rise up.

Q: If it comes up big deal.

Jac: Yes, big deal. It's just out.

Q: It's just consciousness doing its thing conceivably.

Jac: 31:21 Yes, unless there is like, "actually no this is me I'm the body/mind again." You'll know that, that's a whole other ballgame. It's a very different feel and look and everything. Internally your experience is different if you believe that you are yourself. Everything is self referenced, your double checking yourself, you know mind has gone into it and it's all about me.

Q: 31:48 Ask me about work and it would be all about me. No, I won't actually.

Jac: No I don't think so, but you put on that hat to play the role, you know?

Q: So if I put on the hat I do my human being Doctor thing, and I will do that to the best of my ability with the most knowledge I can, and I'll use the functional mind also as well as I can, and I'm okay with that, that's what works.

Jac: Yes, that's it.

Q: 32:24 You are my grace.

Jac: Self looks at self.

Q: 32:31 Every time I get around you something energetic happens, and like right now it feels like there's profound energy just flowing. It happened the last time you were here and I remember I couldn't sit still for a day. I don't know what it is but it's there now. It's just an observation. That energy too is a lie, isn't it?

Jac: 33:04 Yes, that energy too is a lie. Thank you for that, it is. You stripped it away from yourself, yes! It's interesting that at a certain point to see how the spiritual path actually becomes a problem. The seeking keeps the seeker alive. That's the classic sentence, but there was a few great examples there of like, we can come in and like be totally prepared to dig out what it is, but actually the digging out was actually bringing us more into the story than what's actually happening. And it's a level of maturity that you kind of have to arrive on, because if you grab this..... Yeah you have to arrive at it, and then hopefully if it hasn't happened to you already you might remember this and say, "oh my God I remember hearing that somewhere." Because if you grab it as a concept then mind will use it to avoid seeing attachment or desire or whatever else is going on. An immature mind will grab it as a concept to avoid stuff, whereas; it will show itself as you mature. As you mature it will show itself and it's like, "gosh you know,

doing the work in the old way is more solid than the sense of the I that I had that directed me to do the work, you see?

34:56 So when we are like on the spiritual path and you are clearing stuff, identification runs and you'll know, it's like the clouds coming in, your vision is smaller and your world is about you, and you vis-à-vis people around you, your job. Okay you're in your micro view, and that's identification. Then as we do this work and you get clearer and clearer, the sense of an I can arise. The sense of an I, but it doesn't have the closed in micro perspective. It's just.... it's kind of like.... It smells a bit like an I. It's like, "oh yeah there's the sense of an I there defending herself or the sense of an I there being nervous about how to tell somebody, "I don't want you to do this." There can be the sense of an I that plays like that. Now, if it's the sense of an I recognize it, because it needs a little bit of a different toolkit to the full on identity micro view, where we have to dig out what's making me believe I'm real now, is it a desire, is it a threat, is it attachment, what is it? Different toolkit, that's a more gross toolkit. When it's the sense of an I sometimes you're better off leaving it alone. Because with the sense of an I it's like, "ah yes, there's the sense of an I, but it doesn't really have a reality feel to it." If you go digging it will create an I most often. It will create someone who is trying to get rid of the sense and you've created a deeper reality feel to the I, because the sense of the I wasn't left to be fluid. So the sense of the I is there for an awful lot of spiritual teachers, the sense of an I. It most often comes up when there is another little revelation coming or another blind spot being seen, and you know it's not you, you know, "oh there's some challenge coming up that I have to deal with," and there is the sense of the I, the sense of.... It's like a little memory, it's not even that, it's some capacity of the mind to think in an individual way without identifying with it, without losing your whole identity into it. But we retain the capacity to think individually. We have to. So the sense of the I can come in there, and the sense of the I isn't that there's a big issue for me to dig out, it's that there is something, "oh yeah this is happening," so it's softer, "what's not being seen here or is there some new way for me to grow," and none of that is personal. None of it is personal it can just.... You know what happens impersonally, because you're no longer dealing with my identification has gone into being this person, this individual, and when that is broken down the sense of the I will be there. For most it's there, and it comes in and out drawing attention to something, but you know it's pure consciousness that's running the sense of an I. You know it, and that's totally fine. So it's a subtle one, and if this makes no sense then you're probably still dealing with the identification, and that's fine if you're dealing with identification, but if you're not the sense of the I is probably cruising around.

Audience: It has less baggage.

Jac: Yes it has less baggage. It's impersonal, it's and impersonal sense of I.

Audience: Does it have a function?

Jac: Does it have a function.....

Audience: 39:04 [indiscernible several words].

Jac: Yes, I think it's the lens that comes up just prior to a new realization or a new growth spurt.

Audience: 39:20 [indiscernible sentence]

Jac: It's part of a lens until I say, "ooh blind spot."

Audience: 39:25 [indiscernible sentence].

Jac: Yes, but it belongs to consciousness you know, because you know that you're all of it so you deal with it in the same way, and of course you can say, "yes there's a bit of something there that's being challenged by this." You can say that.

Audience: 39:53 [indiscernible sentence].

Jac: 39:56 And if you do something about it it's kind of softer. It's softer, it's more refined. It's not dismissed, because sure it's coming for a reason it's showing you a blind spot, you know? From the perspective of the spiritual path, yes we can say there is something there, there's something remaining. We can say that, but when it's happening you know that consciousness is doing it, and that it is the lens that comes up in order to show that there's something going to be revealed; something is trying to burst through, because your viewing point is the totality. Your viewing point is no longer from within the personal, and that's the difference because when your viewing point is in the personal and it's only the sense of the I, you're actually digging yourself deeper into the personal. You're trading, you're going into the identity, into the controller of somebody who wants to dig out something. Am I making sense? It's kind of a subtle later. So, so?

41:10 Working with the I and working with the sense of the I. So working with the I it's you, and your dealing with your crap and you've got to handle it. Working with the sense of the I, your perspective is the wider view but you know that the persona has to do a bit of developmental work, evolutionary work, blind spot work; there's some residue around, but the backdrop is where you're doing it from not from the I, so it's impersonal. The sense of the I comes up but it's impersonal.

Audience: 41:43 Even that's not it.

Jac: Even that's not it?

Audience: 41:47 Yes, [indiscernible 1-2 words]. The impersonal sense of I is still not the bottom line.

Jac: What do you mean by the bottom line in that case?

Audience: Prior.

Jac: Sure this is just an unfolding of consciousness, and I'm highlighting it so that we don't get ourselves deeper into the I because of the habit of doing spiritual practice, and of doing the work. All of these things happen in manifestation, so it's just a subtle way that it works after awakening. Prior to all of it, sure that's the only thing that's real. You know that this too is a lie. It's all a lie. If we can talk about it it's a lie. So within the zone of the lie, within manifestation, this is a happening, and something we need to have a wisdom about phenomenally.

Jac: Want to come up?

Q: 42:49 You just dragged me to it I am enjoying this. So you keep on teasing, and you go back as far as possible, but there is still at the end of the day something knows.

Jac: Or there is knowing.

Q: Okay there is knowing, but that's kind of tricky. When you say there is knowing some one knows that or something knows that. What I'm saying is, how far? Because again it keeps on becoming a game.

Jac: 43:40 It can. Why must there be something or someone who knows that?

Q: Someone is not the right word.

Jac: Okay, why must there be something that knows?

Q: 43:51 Because whenever we keep on teasing there has to be awareness of what is being teased, otherwise you wouldn't be able to recognize that there is teasing. So, where does the buck stop? See that's what I am....

Jac: 44:15 Yes, capital R reality; that which can't be named really, prior to all of it. All we're doing here really is moving around the furniture, refining the furniture, getting rid of the sharp edges using finer sandpaper, and really honing that down. It's a movement, an evolutionary movement, a natural pull to improve, but it's within the lie. It's all within the movie, but that's where life is. So beyond all of it there isn't this, there isn't this. So the best it can get is the knowing beyond all of it, and allowing functioning to happen, allowing life to be lived, but yet your attention is at home; prior to all of it.

Q: 45:14 And the knowing of all that is obviously not a lie then?

Jac: The knowing of all of that?

Q: What you just said, because you said there is a capital R reality. So that has to be.... I know it's talking semantics, but that has to be if you will, something which is not a lie.

Jac: In theory yes.

Q: Wow, now you threw another....

Jac: 45:42 It's that if we're saying.... It's semantics, but I need to qualify it because language is dualistic and this is the blip, okay? So if it's not a lie then we've pulled it back into the realm of where there is a lie and not a lie. So now we've pulled it into this. It is not here. It doesn't know about here because there isn't a here, this is the lie, but that can't be not a lie because then mind has pulled it in to be the flip side of the lie, and we've made it a dualistic thing, but it's prior to what can be a lie or not a lie, truth. So that's why the concept of truth has to fall down too, you see? And even truth, it's not that the truth can be true or false truth is outside of those. Do you see? So when we're using language, if we're going to pull that in here, no, it won't work. So from that totality, that non-denial broader view, the beyond all of it, there's nothing. You know, there isn't even the concept of truth, there isn't even nothing. And that is known. That is known, and out of that rolls consciousness and the lies.

Q: 47:20 Yes, now if I say, and I want I say that I know what you're saying, I understand what you are saying, what does that mean?

Jac: Yes, that's beautiful isn't it? So if we explore what that means we'll bring it in here because the language will pull it into something phenomenal, and mind ultimately wants to make it phenomenal so it can get something, so it can have the certainty. That might be what's happening, that the certainty feeling that mind has is completely different to the part of you that says, I understand. Mind wants to get it but it can't. That's why every time we bring it in I'm going to just destroy it again and again and again, because it's like it's too close to the realm of where mind can get something. But to cultivate that knowing; there we go, cultivate the knowing, and it's cultivated by not believing the lie. As we pull back from the lies something gets cultivated because there is space for it to show itself. Make sense?

Q: Yes

#20 / 49:32

Q: So you just said that that knowing should not be labeled certainty. Did I hear you correctly when you said the knowing? The minute any label is put on that, for example certainty, then you're back into the dream?

Jac: 50:10 The minute any label is put on knowing, yes. There's a place where that doesn't happen, but generally yes. The intimate is engaged in gleaning an understanding, in recognizing, remembering, whatever we want to say, but then you have to drop it. It's like we bring in the intellect and then drop it. Whereas, if we keep the intellect involved then we've brought it back into duality because mind has something to grasp. It's like we just engage the intellect and we drop the intellect, and leave the knowing beyond all of it. Whereas, if we put a label on it, what are we going to try and do, we're going to try and grasp it, we're going to try and name it, we're going to try and say, "I've got it."

Q: 51:16 [indiscernible words] even this word that comes up, "certainty," [indiscernible many words] even if that is not anything yonic or intellectual [indiscernible words] a feeling, more a feeling or a sense of certainty.

Jac: Yes.

Q: 51:53 Even that is a point back into the dream, because the word which appears is maintained. That word is not dropped, whereas somehow knowing seems cleaner.

Jac: 52:10 Yes, it does seem cleaner doesn't it? Other words tend to make it dense or maybe it's the more than one word which gives it facets, and it gains form the more words we use, so it becomes more cumbersome, has more form.

Q: 52:30 And then of course knowing is [indiscernible word].

Jac: So the sense of knowing, it might be useful to think of it in terms of like there's an echo in the body/mind. It's like an echo from the part of you that knows, really knows. It's like an echo and the body/mind responds to that.

Q: A constant continuous echo.

Jac: 53:00 Yes, because what is beyond can't come here, but yet we have a capacity to know, capital K, to know. What is that, and is it that actually we have a capacity to go prior to consciousness? We do but it's rare, but we do.

Q: That's it.

#21 / 53:46

Q: 53:46 [Indiscernible words] terminology. In the answer to the last two questions, in the first one you mentioned consciousness comes out of ultimate reality. So in my terminology I equate consciousness with ultimate reality.

Jac: Sure.

Q: So what is your definition or use of the word consciousness?

Jac: 54:20 You can say that, that consciousness is the ultimate reality, you can. It's just that there's a piece of work called, "prior to consciousness" also, and I was pushing Dean there, but yes consciousness is ultimate reality absolutely. Take that, that's a definition. I was maneuvering something.

Q: Okay, because in the Indian tradition of sat chit ananda, I mean if sat is the ultimate reality, and chit is consciousness, they're one and the same ultimately, so I didn't quite understand your reference 54:59 of consciousness coming from ultimate reality.

Jac: 55:04 Yes, it's totally fine. I suppose this is the contemporary version of what would've been in old.... in the Hindu tradition that Advaita Vedanta would only be given, that the tools of non-duality, of seeing non-dualistically, we would be given to somebody after they had served their guru for 20 years, you know it was a preserved text, and there still are. I know in Buddhism there are some sacred text that you really have to work hard to get or it would be quite involved to receive, and the same in Sufism. 55:43 I'm going there with this group today [indiscernible words] but I am I'm going there. So prior to consciousness, yes there is a window there that I'd be inclined to push somebody through, but you're not going to find this written anywhere. Well maybe you are, but you'll have to join the Army in whatever tradition does it.

Q: Well then, what do you mean when you say, "pre-consciousness?"

Jac: 56:12 Well it kind of has to happen. It's prior to consciousness rather than pre-conscious, because "pre" is in time. It's prior to consciousness, yes. Okay, what you get to see just before it, which is probably the closest I can get because that's a seeing and there's words on it, is that this entire cosmos is based in cosmos consciousness. Are cosmos is actually..... we've got the wrong cosmology. It will be revised, but there will be an understanding that consciousness underpins everything. Science isn't there yet, and they hold the Holy Grail on what are cosmos is about. But consciousness underpins all that manifests, and that must be our cosmos also, I mean logically. But we're coming in from the other side, we're seeing that pure consciousness is the ultimate reality and it underpins everything. And ultimately that's the true nature, everything is pure consciousness, okay? But we're advocating that for a long time. In prior to consciousness you get to see it's about cosmology. You get to see the cosmology and all that ever was and ever could be rolls out from pure consciousness. When you get to see the very start of consciousness, well, there's some capacity to perceive that's actually not conscious. And it sounds ridiculous, because of course I'm using all the tools of consciousness now to talk about it, so it sounds like complete and total BS, 57:55 and that's why this teaching is [indiscernible word] available, because it's absolutely gobbledygook until it shows itself.

Q: 58:08 Well if there's something known prior to consciousness or can be experienced in some way, how would that.... We are at a loss for words, but how is anything known without consciousness?

Jac: 58:24 Of course that's the paradoxical thing. That's the great paradox there, just like this is real and this is not real, this is happening and it's not happening. And those paradoxes, the first time you hear those paradoxes that this isn't actually really happening at all, you're going, "that's garbage!" And then as you do the spiritual work you're saying, "wow, it is and it's not. I kind of get it." Okay, so that's the paradox there that edge.

Q: 58:50 Well, in using another tradition would you then equate pre-consciousness in the Hindu trilogy as Brahman?

Jac: No, I'm talking about prior to all of that.

Audience: Is it Atman?

Jac: Atman, yes that Hindu stuff, no I'm talking prior to all of that. But in throwing it out there something gets shaken you know, something gets shaken, so that's as good as it gets. It has to show itself and it does.

#22 / 1:00:01

Q: When you talk about the ultimate reality, I want to get a little bit of understanding around this. I've heard it said, I don't know I followed a lot of different teachers so I don't know where I'm getting this from, but when consciousness for the very first time saw itself and recognized itself as other, that's when all this began.

Jac: Recognized itself as an other. So when it saw itself, it might be just a language thing, but to recognize is to see what's really there, but when it started believing that it was separate that wasn't recognition; it started believing that it was separate. So it's like.....

Q: It started splitting.

Jac: Yes you can say it started splitting.....

Q: And deliberating or.....

Jac: 1:00:58 The concept that it could split was born, and the concept is what made it appear as real. That's why if we pull back we discover, "heck, concepts are the source of an awful lot of what we imagine to be real." Not everything, some things are preconceptual, but a lot of it, like we were talking about last night, a lot of it is based on concepts. The reality feel of things being separate, things being divided, is birthed from a concept. So as consciousness was, you know the first movements were happening, and it turned around and saw itself, okay so it recognizes itself and as it was evolving concepts were born; the capacity for concepts, and the first one that came in was space. It's even before it turned around actually because for the movement to have..... It needed space in order for that movement to happen. So as concepts started to happen, the first one being space, as concepts started to mature; the idea that something is separate, that there is other, but it came from a concept.

Q: 1:02:15 But then that created that reality.

Jac: Correct.

Q: So would you say that by us, very few that are sitting here together, are we trying to remember where we came from? Is this like a remembrance rather than a.....

Jac: 1:02:31 It feels like that sometimes yes, "consciousness remembers itself." It feels like that because from the point of view of that the knowing it's like, "I know it," so it's useful to say, "we're remembering."

Q: Like when things resonate as true, I don't know how you can call it remembering, like you remember a childhood memory, but sometimes you hear things from being exposed to a teacher like yourself, and you know that those things that you guys say are true, they resonate as true even though you've never really heard them before.

Jac: That's right.

Q: 1:03:12 But there is some vibration in it that feels like, "oh my God that's true, that's true." That's why I say in that sense remembering, because it's something you've never heard before yet you know it to be true in every fiber of your being. So you sit in satsang like this and you remember.

Jac: Yes you can say this and it's true to say this, but from another perspective the mind is playing catch-up. The mind never knew it actually. The mind really never knew it, but something inside is being reawakened you know, and the mind lines up with it. The mind ultimately is going to serve pure consciousness. That's what it's doing so it lines up, and it sounds like we're remembering and it feels like we're remembering, but the mind never really knew.

Q: 1:04:02 Okay, and then my mind question. Why? Why do we have to go through all this forgetting, remembering, and coming back? What is this game all about?

Jac: But really you're not doing it pure consciousness is.

Q: Well let's say you call it God, why is God playing this game with us?

Jac: There isn't God and us. There really isn't! That question comes from one who believes in separation. When your perspective is wider like when you're in the ground of being, like in meditation, that question won't be there.

Q: There is no questions there.

Jac: There is no questions there. So that's a dualistic question. It's only valid from a dualistic realm, so only a dualistic answer is going to satisfy the mind, and we're not in the game of just satisfying the mind, you know? Mind isn't King here in this room at all. So the mind wants to know, and you can find plenty of reasons you know, for the mind to accept there, but it's better to see that, "yes that's a mind question and it's looking for a dualistic answer." The truth is, "I'm not here at all, I'm not here at all." Just to open it that much would be really good when the dualistic questions come up. "I'm not here, I'm not getting caught, I'm not lost in remembering myself, it's not me."

Q: 1:05:29 That one was hard for me because I feel like I am here, and I feel very much identified with the personal and not the wider perspective. When you say, "I'm not here at all," it feels threatening. It's like, "yes I'm here there's 250 pounds of me right here."

Jac: The body is there, the personality is there, your consciousness is there, but none of it is you. There is a mistaken identity going on there. It's just an old piece of software that I'm trying to shake.

Q: 1:06:20 Why do I attach to it so much?

Jac: A bad habit.

Q: Kick it in the butt.

Jac: Yes, kick it in the butt. I tend to say this a gazillion times in every satsang, so at the risk of throwing it out yet again, it tends to be much less of a habit if we really love ourselves. If there is phenomenal love for the character the habit is much, much less. Somehow that works. If you really love yourself and you're tender to yourself, and you love every part of yourself; the body, mind, spirit, all of it, it's not as persistent a thought then. Somehow it dissolves it. That's worth doing.

Q: 1:07:22 When I perceive myself as loving every ounce of myself, every part of myself, but obviously there's a place, a raw place, that that's not true because yesterday when you told me to say, "I love myself," I couldn't say that. I've been telling this lie to myself all of my life, that I really love myself.

Jac: So you perceive that you love yourself, and then you set up in telling yourself, and yet you're a feeling person. Do you feel that you love yourself? Love is a feeling!

Q: 1:07:55 Yes I feel like I love myself, but when yesterday you told me to say, "I love my body," I said, "I can't do it, it doesn't feel honest."

Jac: So there's something to investigate there, there's something hiding there. If there is self-love it's like we don't have to run so many stories because there is no deficit. It's like we've balanced out something, so then it's easier to explore the shifts in perception.

Q: There's not so much to defend.

Jac: There's nothing to defend, yes. We can let the person go because they're at peace and they're okay. They're not needy.

Q: There's something to investigate.

Jac: There something to investigate; unconditional self-love, unconditional.

#23 / 1:09:11

Q: I just wanted to take this opportunity to see where you might take me with this [indiscernible word] with the exercise this morning where we just let space go, and it was just gone, and what I saw was this thing that was like in the shape of sitting on a chair, there wasn't the chair necessarily but.... I don't know, I'm putting words on it after so that I can explain it.

Jac: Yes, that's all we can do.

Q: 1:09:49 So that was there, and then there was this thing around it but I was more back here, and it was very.... It felt wonderful and quiet, and when you talked about vastness I couldn't really find vastness in order to get the space out, so that's what I wanted to check out. After that I don't know, this is what I want to.....

Jac: 1:10:19 Some people hang out in the vastness and some don't, and if you don't hang out in the vastness don't bother creating it it's just something to blow up if it's there. So the body was there sitting on a chair and you were behind it?

Q: Yes, it was like there was something that was in the outline of somebody sitting on a chair, but the chair wasn't really there.

Jac: So an awareness of the body.

Q: Yes, it actually felt like something dark, that's not meant to be plus or minus but just like nothing, and there was maybe a film around it or an outline, I don't know, but that's just looking at it from aback to be able to describe it.

Jac: 1:11:30 Okay, looking at it from the back, do you mean time wise or [cross talking several words]?

Q: No, there something that's looking at that.

Jac: So what's looking at the form in that way?

Q: I don't know what it would be, but it keeps getting softer as I look at that and it goes more back, and more back, and something would be looking at each thing.

Jac: Yes, yes, and where are you in this diagram?

Q: 1:12:02 I'm in the back.

Jac: You as Lynn or you as what?

Q: 1:12:07 It's just this larger wider..... it's not so much a person. This is maybe my question, it feels much better, there's not that much agitation going on. It's not even really concerned so much if there's a person or not a person, something like that. But I just thought that I would check this out to see what this is. It feels like a better space to hang out.

Jac: But what is hanging out there?

Q: Yes exactly.

Jac: 1:12:55 You know in hindsight we can say there is no agitation, but I would put money on it that when there was an awareness of perceiving coming from there that there wasn't an, "oh this is much better than the usual anxiety." Were you able to pull in the memory of anxiety?

Q: No, well let's see.... I wasn't thinking about anxiety it was that I was feeling much.....

Jac: 1:13:23 You see it's not there. It's not there, because the anxiety is when the person is doing her thing.

Q: Yes, it felt more like "me," the me that.... It's hard to talk with all these me's and I's,

Jac: You're doing great!

Q: So when I say it felt more like me, I'm not even worried if I'm calling it a me.

Jac: Yes beautiful. Okay, so could we call it like a point of perception?

Q: Yes.

Jac: All right, can you see that when the Lynn story is running that that's a point of perception as well?

Q: Yes I can see that right now. From now I can see that, but when I'm in it I don't know that I can see that. But anyway, I'm not in it now I'm here, and I just went out.

Jac: It's perfect, it's perfect, it's perfect. So if we are kind of establishing how it works for you, and that there are points of perception, you know that are accessible to you, and there is no access point between the densest perception, the all about me perception. It doesn't have any access at all to the one who.... point of perception that saw the silhouette of a form maybe or maybe not on a chair. So if you can see the implication of that, and you just said that the perception that was farther back was more you, it's more what you really are, that's what happens. There's no we see and then we're pure consciousness, and then that identity drops too. So when the dense Lynn is running her story, if there's some way where you can say, "hold on now this is just perception, this is a story that's running out from this Lynn's perception," that would be really useful.

Q: Okay, so can you say that one more time?

Jac: 1:15:42 Yes, when the Lynn story is running or there is anxiety being felt or there's some chaos going on, you know just stuff, to access that would be really useful. So to recognize that, "I'm off, this story is running, my mind is going crazy, okay this is the result of a point of perception." This is a point of perception, you see? Then it's like, "okay let's pull back and see this point of perception," and if you pull back you'll find that it will be, "this is more who I really am," what you said to me, "that there's more of me there really." So pull back to that point of perception that's more authentically what you really are.

Q: 1:16:32 So when I'm in this story just realize that it's a point of perception, and in doing that it will probably just [cross talking word].

Jac: Yes, because the Lynn story is the product of a point of perception. So just that there's a form maybe sitting on a chair is the product of another point of perception, and just one more step back from that there is just perceiving where nothing is seen. That's pure consciousness perceiving itself, and it's not seeing anything but perceiving is happening.

Q: 1:17:13 So this form that was on the chair that was a point of perception as well?

Jac: Yes, that's my product of a point of perception, yes. That might help you because you found it yourself. When you find something yourself it's yours, you know? It's how it works for you.

Q: Okay, points of perception, points of perception, and then just perception.

Jac: Yes pure perception. It's like pure perceiving it's just the verb, you know? It is not seeing anything it's just pure perceiving. It's not seeing anything at all, and that's pure consciousness.

#24 / 1:18:43

Q: I've never sat up here like this before. So I actually have two things, and I'm not sure how they might be related. Last night and the previous time I saw you I thought you had terrific gifts of insight into sort of everyday pragmatic problems.

Jac: Thank you.

Q: I'm a neonatologist; a Doctor for babies in intensive care, and this incredibly sincere lovely woman back here with the heart problem, and like, "why, why, why," that's what parents get, and to redirect that energy.... Anyway, you have a lot of beautiful gifts. So I kind of struggle with this question to access these gifts that you have, and this morning I'm not following anything. You know, everything is emptiness, spaciousness, and I'm like, "what the heck are we talking about?" "There is no space, space collapses into a grain of sand," and you know I've read William Blake too, but I've never actually had a whole crowd around me like that. So this is where my two questions are coming from. You can address either one, because maybe one is irrelevant for this audience and maybe one is or maybe they're both equally valid. So that's my apologetic serving up here, okay? We'll start with that. So when you were talking about this, "things that can be helpful directors for the mind," I guess that's where I am on the first question. You know you hear this, "things happening for a reason," and anybody with an ounce of sense knows that that's not true.

Jac: Yes.

Q: But people like to believe that. It's a helpful mystics perspective.

Jac: That's right.

Q: 1:20:23 So you go through these things, like the woman last night with a heart condition, you go through these things and you ask yourself, "how did I become a context for this experience?" You know, I've gone through something, like we probably all have, that was just horrendously odd, and you kind of go, whatever you said before, like, "same habit different story, is that what this is?" How do I do this pursuit of it to look at how I became the context for this or is it just it was going to happen with consciousness back here, whatever I did, and it's not worth doing that kind of human homework on that. So I guess my question is, is there something from that perspective that informs this conundrum that is helpful, and that's why you have this gift of wisdom, or am I making any sense at all?

Jac: 1:21:18 I think you're making sense assuming that I understand what you're talking about. I'm not sure I do. Incredible wisdom comes from the perspective that's prior to the all about me story. Incredible wisdom comes from there, and everybody has access to that. The thing is we tend to take what's happening in the world more seriously than the wisdom that rises up in the silence. You know, like when you're not thinking about something and the answer pops in. Like there's something bothering you and you go, "oh that's what I should do!" Just out of the blue. It's a little bit like that. It's like that there's space and something.... That's kind of how creativity happens, but it's actually a little bit like that also, it's like the wisdom of the bigger picture is accessible to you. Sometimes you have to wait quite a while for it to talk to us and sometimes, actually usually, it's just there, okay?

Q: 1:22:30 So the bigger picture that a lot of spiritual teachers will teach you is that things happen for a reason, or is to investigate this, "how did I become a context for this?" But that's more of this me story.

Jac: Yes it's me story. Both of those are me stories, yes.

Q: 1:22:46 So how do you go from that to getting this wisdom that you're showing up with? I thought I had created that sort of spaciousness; I don't judge it right away I embrace it, I try to accept it, or what you said maybe I'm not accepting it, pushing it away, but it feels like you're accepting it and you go, "okay what are the lessons in here for me?" But that feels a lot like me.

Jac: Yes.

Q: The reason I mention this, probably like everyone in this crowd we are all the guru's for our crowd, right? Like they come to us like we come to you. So if you go through something, like some horrendous thing that puts you so much into the me that you never thought you'd be there again, and then all your friends see you get into this collapsed me, even if you're only there for two days, then you come out and they're all still there. They're all still in that story, and every dinner, every meeting is about this, and you are onto the..... or you want to grow right, but I guess the best handrail for growth through a horrible experience for me was looking at how I became the context for this, looking at why this might have happened.

Jac: 1:24:01 And when you say the context for it, you mean you got personally involved?

Q: It happened in my life. It wasn't me it was, for example, my boyfriend, but it happened in my life and you're almost like, "how did I miss the clues of this, how did this happen?" Instead of blaming the other person you almost want to embrace it and say, "gosh if I can get the lessons from this," but if I'm not supposed to get the lessons from this but it's supposed to teach me another focal point from which to view this, I'd like to be pulled to that focal point. And if that focal point is no space, and that's why it made no sense to me, then please explain to me what you were explaining this morning, and if not just stay with this.

Jac: 1:24:44 Okay, there is about six things going on.

Q: Yes, I tend to be that way.

Jac: Wow that's fun, that's new for me, what am I going to do with this? Okay, if you have a mind that likes to learn from being the context of something, then your mind will find something for you to learn. It's a bit of a set up. It's really a mental pattern. It's like whatever happens, if something big happens, "well that's set for me to learn, and it's a blessing and it happens for a reason, and blah-di-blah and off we go we've opened that box. Mind will find evidence for something that you didn't know before. Mind will find evidence and it will support that, and you can bring that same framework for the next catastrophe that happens.

Q: And it actually sounds pretty brilliant until I sit here and listen to you, and then it sounds like such a superficial way of dealing with some things.

Jac: 1:25:47 Exactly, it's one way to look at something, but really it's quite self absorbed, and you know that's fine that works. 1:26:00 It happens to me in **odd time**. I'm just kind of thinking if that still happen here. It happens in **odd time**. I don't know if the lessons have slowed down or if I've actually become really slow at learning them. Genuinely I don't know which. Do you know? It's fairly rare. There were two things that I learned about two years ago, and that's the last time I learned something from getting caught in the crossfire. Life just happens, and I suppose there's a trusting that wisdom comes along as I grow older. I don't look at scenarios anymore unless they make me sick or something, and then I'm lying in bed and I'm thinking, "what the.....?" You know, I'm lying in bed and thinking, "all right, c'mon you're going to have to look at something here. What happened here you missed something?" It has to be completely

in my face for me to pick the lessons out of something, really in my face. 10 and 20 years ago I used to do it all the time, everything!

Q: 1:27:14 You're picking these lessons from this me level or you're picking these lessons that you mentioned now from this other level?

Jac: 1:27:20 From the phenomenal, it's like, "how did I end up getting so sick?"

Q: Right, like I do then.

Jac: So it's really when there's high impact and life has a consequential huge thing that I can't ignore or doesn't go unnoticed. Some big flip happens, a huge thing, and I'm like, "okay, all right, what can I learn here," and it's just one or two sentences that will come out and that's it. There's no pulling apart stuff. All I can do is tell you how it works for me. There's no really thorough investigation. There isn't one, it's like, "what do I know now that I didn't know then?" It's more like that. There's never regrets, there's never, "in hindsight I should have." I mean that's nuts, that's nuts! Okay, so that particular scenario where there were two blind spots, and then I got sick and during the sickness I had time, and it was like, "gosh, how come I went to this level that I got so sick, how come?" Two insights came.

Q: 1:28:34 Could you share what those are? Maybe it will help me on the human level to know [cross talking several words]

Jac: That's what I was wondering how can I explain this better without..... but I'll just say it. An ashram was built in Costa Rica, and I went to the ashram and worked there. I assumed that the person who was building the ashram was following through on everything that she promised, and I've always had a naivety until I saw it. Some people say something with the best of intention, but it is totally at odds with what they are actually going to do. I just tend to assume that people are telling the truth, I just do.

Q: 1:29:26 Wait, I thought the mind was always a liar.

Jac: Yes, it is indeed, but phenomenally if somebody says, "such and such a thing," I just believe them. There isn't anything that asks, "do they really mean that" or "what's really going on?" I just took it. So that was the main thing really there was confusion, "oh this was agreed and this is happening," and I never added it together at all until I got really sick and left, and then it was like never once did I notice that what she says and what she does are two completely different things. Somehow I just didn't see it. I just didn't see it because I was happy with my conclusion, "she said this therefore....." Never saw this, whereas other friends of mine were like, "why are you doing this, why are you continuing like this?" I'm, "what's going on, continue like what, what are you talking about?" I couldn't see at all what was going on but everybody saw different signs. So that's an example of how it happened to me. Really, really, really late I get sick for a long time and my whole system crashes, and then lying in bed it's like, "how did this happen Jac something somewhere," and it just comes, and it's like, "oh my God!" and the naivety showed itself. So yes, in a similar situation to yourself, some friends of mine I called and I said, "listen I've got no help here. I've just landed here and people are coming, could you just fly here? I can't pay you, but can you just fly here and help me?" And I did that, I brought a friend of mine, actually two friends of mine, one was from Ireland and she just left her job for three months, came and just worked. So I was kind of compensating, but I didn't even see that I shouldn't be compensating here this is a management problem. I just never saw it at all. Even with all of that happening, as you can imagine, a few years later that friend of old from Ireland talks about it, you know? And I'm like, "but it's gone, it's gone, and she goes, "that thing nearly

killed you, how can it just be gone?" "But that was years ago," it was like three years ago, and I'm like.... can't understand how.... 1:31:55 and she wants to go back there and dissect [cross talking] and hold on for me.

Q: She wants to hold onto it for you.

Jac: And it's like, "we can talk about it if you like but there's no charge at all. I got sick, I got well, I learned a couple of things, end of story, this is what's happening now." And I've said that to her about 10 times, and I'll probably say that another 10 times to her. It's still one of her huge life stories. And that's fine if it's one of her life stories, that's fine that's what she needs it to be, you know? People have stories for different reasons. I don't do many stories really. They come up in these kind of contexts but there isn't a lot of stories usually. So socially if she talks about that story I chit chat, but I don't add fuel to it because I can't add fuel to it, so it invariably dies down. I can't because I've disconnected from it. So when you come out of something and you're meeting people who are still in it, it will die down if you've no charge around it at all, and you've no charge around them needing to have that story. Let them have that story but it's their story then.

Q: 1:33:24 Well that's what you said last night, if you resist it persist. I thought it was interesting that my father said that I'm a fairly kind person that doesn't have a lot of stories or a lot of problems in general, and I'm sure all humans do, and he said for your friends that you've helped so much to see that you need help. That's the only time that they have that kind of thing, and maybe for you, like she can't let go of it because it's the time she felt so validated or whatever, but you're like, "look I'm onto the next book," or whatever you're writing or doing. So you're pretty much in that phenomenal world assessing it so that that habit or that story doesn't repeat again. That's kind of what I'm talking about. 1:34:07 So that's the phenomenal world, that's not something here, that no space thing, informing something there that's just the pragmatic subway.

Jac: 1:34:15 It's pragmatics of life, and I suppose how it works for me now, now that I'm not like, "that happened for a reason, what happened, and what was I to learn," none of that happens, none of that happens. But when there's space a little bubble of naivety popped up, a learning popped up, and it's like, "oh gosh Jac, hello." Do you know? "Mature a little bit here people don't always mean what they say," they just don't, and they're not even aware of it and that's fine, but I didn't have that wisdom. So that popped up, not because I was looking for it, it popped up and it popped up from that place for sure, from the spaciousness.

1:35:04 So practically, yes the space informs life, of course it does. If we're in there imagining that we are the controller and we're on top of something making the decisions, we haven't allowed space for that inner wisdom to direct. The direction that comes from that inner wisdom is more efficient, more on the ball, and more insightful than our mind can even comprehend. And the way it is now, as far as I know, it informs my mind. My mind plays catch-up, and very often my husband will say, "why did you do that?" "I don't know why I did it. Hold on while I see, until I find a reason for it." That happens a lot and he's like, "it's just happening is it?" "Yeah." And really so many things are, "I don't know babe it's just happening," and I'm like, "okay Jac find a reason, bring it into the cause-and-effect realm."

Q: 1:36:03 But he can't be ignorant of the gifts that that shares with people. I mean, I don't care where it comes from.....

Jac: Sure, but try living with it 24/7.

Q: Yeah I guess so.

Jac: Living with it 24/7 he's like, "no it's got to make sense to my mind. 1:36:14 I can't switch off my mind and trust yours I've got to be able to see [cross talking].

Q: 1:36:18 Yes I know you want [indiscernible word] on the wall but not in bed with you.

Jac: Exactly, yes. So there's pros and cons of functioning this way when you're living with somebody who works in the phenomenal realm, but it's really interesting how to make that work. It takes a lot of work. So while it would be much easier to live an ashram life actually, and to be disconnected from those intimacies that require a lot of phenomenal communication, it's bloody tough! There's a lot of engaging of the mind in order to communicate what you're only half privy to anyway, because it's coming from a deeper part of you that doesn't have the language. It doesn't have anything, but just action flows and mind plays catch-up. But your nearest and dearest isn't going to want you to play catch-up, they want your mind to be there before the action. Sorry, but the action comes before my mind knows what the heck I'm doing, you see? So that's really tricky.

Q: 1:37:30 Well it's very interesting, because one thing you said last night that really I thought was interesting, was like you look at religious beliefs or Isis right, something comes up and it attaches their belief and they believe it so strongly that they do crazy things, and what you were saying last night is that we all do the same thing with our values. The value comes up, like a belief, it attaches, and what you're saying is instead of those two things happening, you're having something come up from somewhere else that isn't even attached to that stuff. So that's very interesting!

Jac: 1:37:58 Yes, it comes from a completely other place. It's not created from the dense place it arises from what we really are, and prior to that identity. So it's cleaner, it's wiser, it's got more of the totality in view. It always takes account of the full picture, so even though it might seem a weird thing phenomenally or not okay phenomenally, there is always a knowing that the wider thing is taken care of, and invariably that shows itself. I don't look for it, it is just an understanding comes. There's total trust I suppose. It's not that I'm trusting something but phenomenally I have to use that language.

Q: 1:38:49 That's been so helpful, because some of the things that actually have happened with me, and I'm not saying that I'm enlightened or anything, but some of the things that actually were my response after the initial contraction into a story that was sort of horrific, but then all of a sudden it was like trying to explain to others why love and compassion would be there anyway. I don't know where it came from but it certainly wasn't you know.... Yes, to try to explain that, I think I get what you're saying on some level, and that's a different way to look at it. I almost felt like I was trying to justify a "me," where you're saying really the language is justifying either a sense of me or a sense of something, 1:39:50 a sense of memory [indiscernible word] or whatever, a memory of something past, or like someone said a recollection or something coming through you. That's a very interesting perspective.

Jac: 1:39:59 Yes, because the body/mind is a puppet that is in service to what I really am. It's always in service, so that's why the mind plays catch-up. It's in service to what I really am, and I spent years saying, "not my will but thine." You know, "I'm surrendering personal will, I'm surrendering personal will," and I worked on that for a long time and I don't know if that.... I don't know if there's cause-and-effect, but it's on the same trajectory, that personal will it's

somewhere.... it just dropped completely, and so the body/mind is now the thing that's secondary to this other movement, which I guess is life itself, I could call it, or pure consciousness or whatever it is. If I have blank spots, of course it redirects, it bends the light a little bit, you know? So the blank spot of being naïve, it bent the light a little bit there and I got very sick. Okay fair enough. So something naturally wants to honor the light and stay as clear as I can. Phenomenally of course that work continues, just watching, just watching, you know to make sure I stay as clear and open and honest and full of integrity as I humanly can, so that I can honor what flows through me, because that's the only thing that is in any way authentic. To come from the dualistic side, I have no interest in it at all, none. It's bullshit! It's just a mind created concoction of separation that is so far from anything authentic (sound effect).

Q: 1:41:48 Well thank you for honoring that gift that comes through you. It's coming through you in such a beautiful way, and I really do appreciate it.

Jac: Thank you.

Q: Maybe I'll come back up here in the next couple of days and ask you about this space disappearing thing, because it's a different thing.

Jac: Yes, it's a different thing. It's completely different, yes.

#25 / 1:42:39

Q: I keep coming back to this issue about prior to. How come Ramana never talked about this?

Jac: His gift to the world was about non-duality. It was to make Advaita Vedanta; the theory of non-duality, accessible. He went a little bit further than non-duality by saying that it goes from the head into the heart, and that happens after the non-dual perspective. It doesn't get expanded much but it would be great if it did. It's possible that he did see much more but that he didn't have the vocabulary for it. When he went into those samadhis and zoned out that that's what was going on, and that's quite possible, but it didn't come through in words. But looking at how we evolve, seeing people that deal with the masses and bring in mass consciousness, like Eckhart Tolle, you know people who deal with large, large, groups and pull mass consciousness further away from duality, I think Ramana was one of those. You know, a very sacred being who made non-duality accessible. He just had that potency to bring so many to the stage of seeing the truth. Maybe that was his gig. So I'm not sure, it's one or the other I think.

Q: 1:44:40 What you're talking about, is this similar to what Lao Tzu says, "the truth that I speak about is not the truth," or something.

Jac: Oh that's beautiful!

Q: 1:44:55 Is that what you're saying, [indiscernible word] that language.

Jac: Yes, the truth that I speak about is not the truth.

Q: Or it ceases to be not true when you talk about?

Jac: 1:45:05 That's beautiful, yes, yes, both of those sentences. I don't know Lao Tzu's [indiscernible word], but yes that's what we are talking about.

Q: Maybe I'm paraphrasing too much.

Jac: That's what we're talking about, and look at it, like we've 20 people, that's the thing you know, it's like who wants to hear this, who is going to get pulled to this?

Q: 1:45:33 I must say when I first heard you talk about this a couple of years ago or so, there was a lot of resistance. I just couldn't accept what you were saying, and I guess mainly because

we have put teachers like Ramana on such a high pedestal, and to say, "okay, well if Bhagwan never talked about this then it doesn't exist." As I sit here I still have to say that I don't know still whether what you're saying is a place there, but there is still an openness to say, "yes it is possible to get there." That's all I can say.

Jac: Yes, and to qualify the language that it's not a place, yes of course. Nisargadatta Maharaj did say, "prior to consciousness."

Q: 1:46:29 He did but I think is usage also, from my understanding or reading, of consciousness was sometimes different from.... You know everyone has a different terminology.

Jac: Maybe so, I better read some stuff on that.

Q: He would talk about Brahman and Parabrahman in that context, but sometimes when I read I say, "I understand," and then when I read another line which kind of contradicts what is in the regular, if you will, lingo of this subject, but anyway, thank you so much.

Jac: Sure, but it's interesting because something is bringing you back Dean, what is that? If you had the absolute inner knowing that what Jac keeps talking about is BS you wouldn't be here, or would you?

Q: No, no.

Jac: You know, can you be fooled?

Q: No. Yes, maybe there is some recognition, which we all have, that there is something and that words cannot completely convey what is being discussed. There is some beauty in that. It's good to be in a place where we cannot place words to something which is this sacred.

Jac: Yes, oh it absolutely has a sacredness, yes.

Q: But in all fairness, initially when I used to ask this question, this specific question, it was really trying to understand from an intellectual level where you're coming from. But the more I sit with it I have to say, "well you know, why is she always talking about this? Is there something to it, can I look at this," that kind of stuff.

Jac: Good that's going deeper than the intellect.

#26 /1:48:54

Q: Just a little while ago what happened this morning started happening again, when you were talking to the gentleman before Dean. I remembered, "okay is there a personal preference for that perception rather than ordinary perception?" I was trying not to..... say, "okay do you as an individual have a preference for that wider perception?" So the question came to me then and I tried not to have the personal preference for that. So the question came to me, "does consciousness have a preference for the limited perception or the wider perception?" And that was kind of a joke because how could it, it allows both obviously.

Jac: 1:50:02 Yes. [cross talking]

Q: 1:50:05 So I saying to myself, "okay consciousness couldn't have a preference because both exist within consciousness."

Jac: Yes absolutely.

Q: But that wasn't really a resolution because then I thought, "Jac says..... you know, and I kind of understand and I don't disagree with it, that consciousness really doesn't know that it has forgotten itself and has a limited perception.

Jac: Yes.

Q: So this is a conundrum. The question that came to me is really not even a real question, because consciousness doesn't know, if I understand you correctly, consciousness doesn't know limited, doesn't know forgetting.

Jac: That's right, and it doesn't do preferences, it doesn't do value systems, none of that operates in pure consciousness.

Q: Yet consciousness does appear as limited, so I guess there should be no confusion because these are different levels of reality that....

Jac: Yes, so pure consciousness never changes you know, its true nature is always there.

Q: 1:51:21 It's just always be with consciousness.

Jac: Yes.

Q: But we're talking pure consciousness.

Jac: Yes.

Q: But sometimes we just say consciousness, so when I asked the question, "I said this is ridiculous consciousness doesn't prefer a limit of wide over limited."

Jac: And in a way it's always pure consciousness you know, that true nature never changes it's just how it manifests, and it's the manifestation itself that offers a new perspective with a value system, with a preference. It's the manifestation that does it. It's not integral to pure consciousness's true nature, it's manifestation.

Q: 1:52:05 It's consciousness manifesting as a value system, as limited and not limited, and I have a preference.

Jac: Yes.

Q: I guess it is a subtle practice... I mean it came up as as a subtle practice. I mean, like this is ridiculous because there really isn't any preference.

Jac: There really isn't any preference.

Q: So it's an aid in seeing the ridiculousness of having a preference.

Jac: Yes exactly, and it lines up with what Barbara was saying earlier, it doesn't matter, none of it matters. In that place nothing matters, but we can't choose nothing matters or there is no preference in order to deny.

Q: Exactly, we have to just recognize that there was an individual preference at this moment.

Jac: Yes, and the individual preference is fine, but is it sticky or is it just impersonally showing up?

Q: 1:53:09 No, but I think at the time it was....

Jac: Okay.

Q: You know, it's happening again so what do you do with it, you know? Are you going to try and hold onto it, and after the thought came, it's ridiculous pure consciousness doesn't care. Pure consciousness has manifested as this.

Jac: But it's just manifesting it like this, manifesting the story about something, yes that's right.

Q: So there. They're tiny ah ha's but they help.

Jac: 1:53:56 Yes they sure help. For sure they help, and it's like holding the two perspectives, and they don't clash with each other. That's the beauty of it, you know?

Q: Then I thought.... as you said earlier this morning, "consciousness is not aware that it's doing this."

Jac: That's right, the awareness is only in the part that is manifested that's actually doing it and perceiving it, that's the only thing that's perceiving it so that's the only thing that's aware of it.

Q: Pure consciousness is not.

Jac: No.

Q: We're not even getting prior.

Jac: No, but that's fine it is where it is. We work from what's presenting as real.

#27 / 1:55:00

Q: There is an old quote from **Maharishi** that said, "when existence becomes existent consciousness becomes conscious." As I was thinking about that it sort of suggested, intert isn't the right word, but is consciousness pre.... part of consciousness? Where the conscious part is the active part is really what he was trying to say with existence, and he said consciousness and existence are the same but maybe a little playfulness indifference, but still unmanifest.

Jac: 1:55:37 Still unmanifest, so it's before subject/object.

Q: Yes. but as it takes form becoming existent, and then that awareness part has the ability to be aware of.

Jac: Yes.

Q: 1:55:50 And that's what we were talking about over there, and the playfulness of that. So it's like consciousness wakes up.

Jac: Yes, that's what we say isn't it, consciousness wakes up.

Q: That's paradoxical too.

Jac: Yes.

Q: Patrick hit on that earlier too, and I was going, "oh it's far beyond understanding," but it's really cool. That whole peace that passeth all understanding; from Jesus' statement. That's so clear now, the death of passing the understanding.

Jac: That's right, that's right.

Q: 1:56:44 That's what is sort of resonating with me. That is so far beyond.

Jac: That's right, and then you get to see not just the mind but actually the intellectual capacity where understanding registers, and you leave that and you go deeper still, you know?

Q: 1:56:59 Just last week I had this experience of trying to get it, and realizing that I got that I was trying to get it. So get rid of getting it.

Jac: Yes.

Q: So I've got to get that.

Jac: Yes that's right that's something else to get.

Q: This is cool.

Jac: That's right, mind does all of that stuff doesn't it, it just keeps on creating the loops.

The End