

**Molecules Moving in the Movie (#2)**

*Man playing flute fades to scene of a participant sitting across from Jac.*

Phillip: I even felt compassion for the ego yesterday. Like I literally felt sad for this poor ego that, like, has been running around trying to be...

Jac: Sure.

Phillip: And then I thought, the only thing that can feel compassion for the ego would be the ego?

(laughter)

Jac: (nodding) The ego. Right. That's right. And no matter what way you look at it, it's still the movie. No matter what way you look at it. Because the looking, you're already in the movie. So working it out, trying to "get it"...ah, yeah. (*makes circular motions with her hands, laughing and nodding*). So you might as well enjoy it. Do you know?

Phillip: No, you throw me...because I don't know who's enjoying it anymore! I get caught up...maybe it could be the Pope, saying; "I'm enjoying it!" (*points randomly around the room, laughing.*)

Jac: Exactly..exactly. Yeah. It's full of paradoxes. It's full of paradoxes. Yeah.

Phillip: And also I want to see that part of me that's trying to be nobody. Like, "there's no one here, not no one...". So that doesn't feel free either. Not that there would be someone free, but there's....(*waving arms, shrugging shoulders, laughing*).

(laughter)

Jac: Yes. So it can't be worked out from within the movie. We can talk about concepts; and we can drop in little cracks in the matrix. But you can't work it out from the movie. Because the working it out is the "I", who is attached to the outcome, who's doing something...who thinks there's something to get. But somehow, in the falling away, in the non-investment in the "I" story, somehow (*makes whistling sound while quickly spreading hands*) the exposure to the, gosh, the lack of authenticity to all of this creation; somehow that - the seeing of that - arises *within* the movie. It's always within the movie. Nothing happens to what you are. It's outside the movie. It doesn't know about the movie.

Phillip: Hmm. Ok. Right.

Jac: Can't know about the movie. Like awareness not being aware of something. So it *can't* know about the movie. So it doesn't know there's somebody trying to get there. Do you see? Because the trying to get there is in the movie.

(Audience member interjects question)

*Female voice: Can you elaborate on why it can't know?*

Jac: If what you are, or Awareness, or the Absolute, okay? If what you are knew about you, or knew about creation, there would be two. There would be the Absolute knowing some thing. So there has to be a distance. For some thing to be known, there must be distance between what is knowable and what is knowing something.

*Female voice: I remember that from last time. Thank you.*

Jac: Yeah. Yeah.

(Another audience member interjects question)

*Male voice: But, but, uh – you know - is there, is there, uh, is the movie just random? Or is there an impulse for benevolence or harmony? Given that there isn't, isn't two, but is the One, uh, is the impulse from the One to harmony, and then peace. and benevolence? Or is it just random?*

Jac: It's just molecules moving.

*Male voice: So...so*

Jac: The concepts of benevolence and harmony are created by mind. They're created within the dualistic framework that says benevolence is good – crime is bad, you know. So that's even a creation of mind. So if you can pull back prior to those concepts, it appears just as molecules moving. Sometimes manifesting as form, sometimes not form – just molecules moving doing their thing. And even that is an appearance. So there's nothing. There's no actual evolution. There's cyclical evolutions within it. But there's no overall getting someplace, getting anywhere. So within the mini evolutions of it we end up seeing that, that we're in a movie but we can't get out. Because by seeing it's a movie, we're in the movie. That's part of the movie. To see we're in the movie is part of the movie.

But somehow, physiologically, when attention is not placed on the "ownership layer", that thin layer that you're finding now, is actually about the personal "I". When there's no ownership there and that layer, if that doesn't have any resonance and meaning – if that's not believed – somehow something happens in some half of the brain. You could talk to Jill Bolte Taylor about this. But something happens neurologically, whereby the movie is always seen as appearance; and the capacity to believe the personal "I" simultaneously goes. So the best you can do towards that – because that's the *pull* – the pull is towards: "I know I can't get out. I know I'm causing the movie to continue because I'm trying to get out!" And that, that seems to happen. That's a phase of it all.

**Molecules Moving in the Movie (#2)**

We try to control it. We try to control being in and being out. And it's like – whoa! – that is, that is the essence of what the molecules are trying to do anyway, all the time. So that's no better or worse than anything. They try to control your cat litter or something, I don't know! The most basic domestic stuff is, is no finer than what we're talking about. It's all still the same framework of thought.

But in, somehow, something physiologically happens. And that can be done. That, the 'doer' within the movie, that can happen. You know, I can spill this water; that can be done. It appears in the movie that that can be done. If I turn this (*touching glass on table*) upside down, the glass is going to be empty and the table is going to be wet. Yeah. Sure. Within the movie, that can happen. And within the movie, the same, ummm, idea of 'doer-ship' that would apply to doing this; the same idea of 'doer-ship' can unplug from the 'reality mode' of ownership.

(Audience member interjects)

*Female voice: Say that again.*

Jac: Ohhh, uh...(*holding head*)

Phillip: ...uh, something snaps?

Jac: Yes. Something gets snapped. Yes, it does. Now it's within the movie. But it does seem to be something that happens to physiologically enable a disconnection from the personal "I".

Phillip: Friday night I think you mentioned that things physiologically literally burn up?

Jac: Yes.

Phillip: That really shocked me. I've didn't think any... I mean, I had heard this from someone. It almost scared me I think, because I think - keep all your body parts! And things burning out...you know...

(laughter)

Jac: You cut your nails, what do you do with those? Everybody does.

Phillip: I store mine! I store my hair too! (*laughing, holding imaginary jug*)

(laughter)

**Molecules Moving in the Movie (#2)**

Jac: In five years time, Phillip will be walking like this ...with hair down to here (*touching her hips*)...."got all my body parts."

(laughter)

Phillip: My body! So now I feel like a victim, I guess. That I have to surrender these. I have to really...I have to wait for these things to burn out? Is that true really?

Jac: No. Because now we're setting up a concept. And nothing is actually. If it's set up, you know, you're just reinforcing the "I" exists and "I" have to have experiences and after this experience *this* will happen." So don't set that up.

Phillip: Okay.

END  
dbc