

J: Good morning, everybody. Welcome. [long pause]

Let's do something a little bit different and have an open discussion for a few minutes about what happened in the last half an hour: if your mind didn't stop at all, if there was a sense of something revealing itself, if there was kind of something that you learned in the silence. Or what happened for you in the last half-hour? Or was it like, "Oh my God, I wish we'd start!" Was there an impatient story going on? What was happening?



Q: My mind would stop. One of the things I find curious is that sometimes when I... It didn't necessarily happen this morning, but other times when I do that, the mind will come in and say, "This is boring." And I'm like even without that thought I do kind of feel like it's boring.

J: That's the thing yes, without the thought, is it boring?

Q: Sometimes it is. Well like maybe the thought arises, "This is boring," there's recognition, and even without the thought it's boring; but other times it's not. So I was just curious. Sometimes it's like, "Ha, thank God, the thoughts have stopped!" [laughing]

J: Yes, some thoughts are believed before we even see that they are thoughts, because yes this is boring, even in spite of the thought, "It's boring." If it's boring, it's like actually the thought was in there before you had the thought that it's a thought. You see? So it really is a thought that makes it boring because the mind is already there wanting distractions. It's like saying, "I love distraction. I want to play, I want to play, I want to play," you know? So it's telling you it's boring, and then you see the thought, "It's boring," but you are really only seeing part of the thought. You're seeing the thought that it's a thought; that's what you're seeing. You are not seeing the original thought that's making it boring, that's giving you the experience of it being boring. Does that make sense? Yeah. Mind loves distraction, so it's already in there trying to shake things up a little bit. It's already doing something to give you a bit of a distraction, looking for a bit of food, meat. Good though that it stops. It's nice that you get some break.



Q: As we got quiet it was like I felt... For lack of a better term, my energy field in the room felt very peaceful and quiet. It took me away from thoughts, the thoughts receded, and it was almost like I could feel... It felt almost physically in my head as if there were waves of peace taking the thoughts away or obscuring them. They never totally stopped, or maybe they stopped part of the time, but they got smaller. I could hear them in the background a little bit saying like, "This is really nice; I wish I could do this when I'm alone," you know, commentary, or, "I think I'll go up and ask her about what's

Drop the Concept of Space

happening.” Just a little bit of comments, but really about the peace and the quiet; and then I just sank more and more deeply into the peace and silence and the absolute stillness that seemed to be here. So it was just really lovely. And then as this has happened to me before in other meditation settings, at times I could feel like we were going to come out of it, almost as if you were doing something like, “Oh she's withdrawing the energy that she's putting out.” And I don't know what is doing it, but then I would go back in and it was just very wonderful. I guess I do want to know, and I've asked this before of another teacher, but it doesn't work for me, how to do this when I'm alone? I don't seem to be able to go so deeply still, and especially not so fast. It was almost immediate stillness.

J: I don't think you can make it happen, because when we try to make it happen, or if our desire or intention is there, that's the very thing that's going to push away that inner true nature. Because the intention makes sure that your attention is on your intention, there's no space for the complete letting go. So it has got to be like when you sit, “Hey if it goes deep it goes deep, and if it doesn't it doesn't.” If you have no agenda at all, there's actually a better chance of your true nature shining through. So it's a bit of a Catch 22 because the mind will say, “Will I get something if I don't want to get something? So I don't want to get something, but really I do. I don't want to get something because then maybe I can get something,” you see? So mind can do this. So it has to be an authentic, authentic non-attachment, an authentic letting go, you see. So you can't make it happen, but the thing is it happens as you go along this path. It just happens. It's just one of those things that just starts to come in, that the depth is more accessible, because we're not so caught up in story. So it's like a sign of, I don't know, kind of a maturation really. It's just things ripening on their own. It's an organic thing.

Q: Yes, often I notice the mind wants to get something, or more like let go of things that aren't important. I do notice... (voice fades)

J: I think the battery (in the microphone) is probably gone. So while we're waiting, I just want to pick up on something that you said a little bit earlier. On my own part, there is no clue at all what's going to happen at any moment. So there was no withdrawing or doing anything, none, nothing. It's just like sitting here, and well no talking happened, no invitation happened. It's like those things didn't happen. So when things don't happen, there's space, you know? For myself, the Jac-character woman, it's like my mind plays catch-up. Do you know? So I would notice that I had been looking around, and then I might zone in on somebody. There's nothing going on. It's just a zoning in on somebody, and I'm just watching it. And I'll go, “Ahh okay,” and I might see something in their thought system coming up or not coming up or coming up and going down, or there might be a pushing through something. But me, the Jac character is watching, just watching it. It's softer than the observer because it's not the observer watching the personal. It's just my functioning mind just noticing what's going on in order to be able to remember what's going on or talk about what's going on or have some take on it. Do you know? It's like a perspective is watching. It's like that. So there's no putting out an energy or taking in an energy. It's just what's there when there's nothing else going on.

Drop the Concept of Space

I remember at one point taking some tea, and then like, "Oh okay," you know, it's back into the stillness again. It's silence again. I suppose in the early days it would be like, "Gosh, is this going to be boring for people?" For sure in the beginning it would be like, "How do I do this?" because on the human level people pay for something and they want something. And that used to be there in the very first couple of months of like, "There must be an exchange here, so how do I make that work?" But of course that's garbage, and when that was seen, of course that's garbage, and it's never followed. But I think I do remember that there at the very first few satsangs, just that natural part of like, "Okay how do we marry this with the world of exchange where people are paying for something? How do we marry this? Do I have to put a value on it for people to recognize this?" I remember that dialogue being there maybe the first three or four satsangs, and that was it. And all the rest of it is just what happens; it's just what happens.

Yes, the body-mind is really responding to something else. It's like it's a puppet for something else that's moving through. This something else is always first, always first; and then sometimes the body-mind, the Jac character, has to kind of fit in too to the world in some way. In some way this has to fit in. But no, nothing is done to make it stop or start. I suppose there is no controller, no sense of controlling it or directing it, within the direction of like okay I've got to be here at half past ten, that kind of normal functioning. What happens in here, no it rolls by itself. So I suppose then, marrying that to what you were saying, there isn't any greater value placed on the silence rather than the dialogue. There isn't. They're both just manifestations. There isn't even a preference for one over the other, anymore. There was a preference for the silence, of course, but the silence is there all the time. So once that was clear that it was there all the time and that functioning is never very loud—it's never loud enough to take attention away from the stillness behind all of it—so then the issue drops. The issue drops. The stillness that is there all the time isn't touched by no matter what the world can throw up. So then there is no preference for anything, because it's kind of always the same. And I suppose even if there is a distraction like, "Oh yes, it would be nice to go out now for a walk," you know, that kind of pull for a distraction, but it's not so much that the mind is looking for a distraction; it feels like it comes from a place where the body is taking care of itself, or the mind just needs stimulation in order to stay healthy, to stay alert, or that the body needs to move, or it's like there's other things at play. It comes from a more organic movement which is not motivated by the mind looking for contrast or entertainment. That layer goes. The mind is fickle, you know. It wants entertainment and then, "That's enough now. Give me something else now; give me something else now. What will I do after this?" And that becomes very boring once you see the game that it's playing. That becomes boring! The distraction becomes boring! It wanting distraction becomes boring, you know?

Q: I'm almost incoherent.

J: Wonderful! It's beautiful.

Q: Yes, I feel like I haven't come back really fully into the room, but that's great. It's such a safe place to...

J: Great, yes, that's great.



Q: As well, I felt a very deep feeling of peace and happiness that permeated the entire time, and it was so completely fulfilling in itself that it didn't matter what occurred. So if thoughts arose, that's great. If a distraction arose, "Oh, isn't that an interesting distraction." The best I can describe it is, it was like any mentation that arose out of the peace and happiness was like folding a batter or stirring a batter. You know, it was just like a little wave and then the batter would just collapse into itself again. And it was just that when that happened, it was just like an aha feeling, somehow nice, just another wave of the batter just folding into itself. So it was a wonderful description that you gave. It was such a deep feeling of peacefulness, no desire for anything. Whatever happens is just a little fold within the peace and happiness.

J: Yes, that's it. Another way of explaining what that is, is that when your perceiving capacity, your own personal way of perceiving, it's very different when you perceive the mind's comment to be a disturbance or when the perceiving has pulled back to a point of view of exactly what you're saying, that whatever happens really, it's just blended in. It's beautifully blended in because your perception of what arose, the perception of a thought or the idea of a distraction, your perception of it is what's different. Your perceiving of it was from stillness, from way back there, not a position of observer or position of the personal, you see? The perceiving is integral to the Absolute.

Q: It's like there's no break or interruption between that which arises and that from which it arose. It's kind of just like a continuous fold or motion.

J: Yes, that's exactly it.



Q: So there was a sense initially that there was nothing, gone, and not a strong energetic deep nothing, but shallow, because a judgment came in, or a sense that it was shallow. It was a judgment about judgment. I mean it wasn't... It was an observation, perhaps, a little bit more than a judgment. If that makes any sense to you?

J: Sure.

Q: And there was a sense to follow that a little bit to see what that was, and that petered off. It's kind of like there was a wondering, "This isn't so deep. It was deeper last night. It was deeper when I sat this morning," you know, but not a whole lot else going on with mind. Mind really didn't... Mind only bought that a few times, but behind that, the head was nodding as if... It was almost like there was some little string back there, that happens back there for this character. It was part of the depth.

J: The depth indeed. The depth coming in.

Q: So it was a funny kind of... Since we started talking, it's that kind of shallowness, sensation or whatever, seems to be tied into more of what's been going on that I'm wondering about.

J: What has been going on as it's related to something else in your life?

Q: Yes, it seems there is a general sense of that. But it's not a bad thing or a good thing. It's what is. There is... Sometimes there arises a comparison with before, you know, "Am I going backwards?" But there's so much else still there. I can't... So it's interesting, and I'm not worried about it, you know, it's just observing the thoughts. That's what's happening, and I don't know if I did lose some ground, or it's more balanced.

J: I'm just going to throw this out for you to stew with it. This even happens to some spiritual teachers that some kind of doubt arises and it presents an experience of, a superficial take, a perceiving mechanism that seems very superficial. And what's really going on is that there is a self-doubt mechanism that's playing. I spoke to a few different spiritual teachers about this, who are on the circuit like myself doing this madness. And what's happening is that self-doubt arises and there is a sense of, "Oh did I imagine all this? Is this identification back? Is this supposed to be there? Is this where I talk from when I'm in satsang?" So there's a whole... Actually, it's doubt. All it is is an energy called doubt, and it can look in some versions... It can present the idea that you're going backwards. It can present that idea, but actually all it is is a piece of doubt that's up and it shows like that. It shows like that. Just for you to sit with it and see. That happens all the time, like for a lot of people.

Q: I don't know if you recall but when we last spoke... I don't even know when that was, but I think it was in Florida, but I don't even know what month that was, but I have no clue. That was January, but I have no clue. Things completely shifted. That knot that was there, and what I had to deal with in my day-to-day job, I was just coming from a completely different place in dealing with it. So that's gone; that's kind of... Even though lots of emotions from out there that I've had to deal with on my own. So I guess maybe it is doubt. I don't know, that's part of like...

J: It's part of what's telling you that you're not going backwards. You see the thing is you can't go backwards actually. You can't go backwards. It's just that we have this idea that there are goals or that there are markers of success, and actually there aren't.

Q: I guess there is a judgment that sometimes it's deep and sometimes it's not...

J: That's totally fine.

Q: Yes, it is whatever it is. And I know that but still...

J: And you see, *deep* and *shallow* actually would be fine unless we judge it. It's when we judge it, that's the thought that we feel uncomfortable about then. Whereas if you can just know that deep and shallow are totally just part of the manifestation, then we don't go into the, "Oh, me!" with reference to the deep and shallow. You see?

Q: It's also when push comes to shove, the behind, the behind, the behind is there, so it's not really an issue.

J: Yes, that's right.

Q: ... For anyone but the mind.

J: Anyone but the mind.



Q: There are just so many thoughts, so, so many thoughts, like a choo-choo train. And I try to maybe watch one and the next one and the next subject, and that's not it. And then what we were talking about last night and explaining that to myself, and just knowing that it wasn't sinking in except it must be because this is going to get loud, okay but not exactly and that's it. I don't know.

J: And is that okay?

Q: Well no, I guess not. No, no, and it seems like this is getting, recently, all this stuff is getting louder and louder and louder, and it's like I don't recognize myself, except I kind of do because it's kind of what went on. That's not the me I want to recognize.

J: Your mind isn't going to work it out.

Q: Yes, and I know this but it still does it.

J: Yes.

Q: And that's very frustrating.

J: It's frustrating if you believe that the mind can help you in some way. I mean, there's some investment in the mind there; otherwise, it wouldn't be so frustrating. If you know that the mind is a liar, and it's just that whatever it's going to say is not going to help you in these situations.

Q: I say I know that, but I don't obviously.

J: Yes, because you're fighting with the mind a little bit.

Q: A lot. How do I stop that?

J: Could you accept it, accept that the mind might always be busy?

Q: Can I accept? I have trouble accepting that.

J: Do you?

Q: Yes, it feels like I am.

J: All right, then that's where we go. At a certain point on this path, we end up feeling that, no, *recognizing* that we can't do anything, that we actually can't do anything, that it's just that it won, that the mind won, and you were broken by it, you know? Despite all of your

efforts, that the mind won. It's okay to go there. It's okay to go there. Fighting the mind will never bring any resolution; it just creates more conflict.

Q: Okay, so I understand that. I say that I understand that, but it seems like there's two things going on—two people, one that understands that and then this one.

J: But the other part of you still has a desire for it to be different.

Q: Yes.

J: That's what I'm after. Drop the desire for it to be different. Drop the desire for your mind to behave in any particular way.

Q: Okay.

J: Let's see how it goes when there is no desire.



Q: The experience here was, well it's sort of like space, lots of space, and thought went through. This was at the beginning. I remember there was a sound I heard. I hear the sound, a weird sound, not aware of my body, and I'm not the sound, I'm not the body. So that was sort of going around. Then a thought came, right then a song came, and it was, "Love to love being over to your right to your left, inside outside." Not those exact words. And then there were like tears coming, and then just a sense of, I guess the word is love. Where normally I have space, space is spaciousness, so there was a sense of love and the tears started coming; and the thoughts were always there though. It wasn't like I was out or anything.

J: Yes.

Q: And then when you mentioned distraction to someone before, I went, "That's a distraction."

J: What's the distraction?

Q: The tears.

J: Did you have a different value on them when they happened?

Q: No, just there's...

J: Just noticed.

Q: I mean they weren't happy, they weren't sad, just tears. In the very beginning, something like (another Questioner's name) said, "I wonder what Jac is doing?" Then I would sort of fade away. And that's all I have.

J: We'll talk about space in a little bit because there is... Yeah I want to talk about space in a minute, but after this part. Can I get back to you on that? Super.



- Q: So I have two things to share about my experience, but also I want to ask you, because one is more urgent it feels. When you say drop the desire, drop the expectation of things being different, how the heck do you do that from a human perspective? How do you drop your desires or your expectations? It doesn't seem possible.
- J: Doesn't it? It's more human to not have desires or expectations. These are learned habits that come from dualistic thinking. It's actually more human not to have them, but the world is commercially based, so it keeps stimulating more and more desires. So there's an influence coming from the outside—new conditioning to promote desires. The thing is to see that for what it is. Desires usually come one by one. When we talk about them like this, “Oh my God, there are loads of them,” but actually there is only one by one. So when there's one up it's like, “Ahh there's a desire.” When you see it you can drop it, but if you don't see you can't drop it. But they've come one by one. That's very doable, to not be the slave of a desire when it arises.
- Q: Well, I'm not talking about a desire for a new iPad. I can drop that no problem. But when you have desires for a better life or a better future, a better outcome, how do you drop that?
- J: Same, it's the same. It's just the desire for a fantasy versus the desire for an object. It's still desire. It's the same thing. It's just that there's more potency in the desires that you have for an idea. You've invested more in it. That's why it feels more sticky; it's that you've invested more.
- Q: But saying with your mind, “I don't want these anymore,” doesn't really work.
- J: But it's not, “I don't want this,” because that's a desire as well. You're desiring to not have something. That's not the opposite. It's like, “Okay, drop it. What's here right now is okay. Some part of me is okay with this.” So let's find that part of you that's actually okay with what's happening right now. That's one way to do it. But “I want” and “I don't want” are both desires. So it's not, “I don't want that.” It's not the negative of it. It's like *whoops*, that's fantasy land. What's here and now, that's what's happening. Let this be good enough. This is as good as it gets, and then acceptance arise. And from there, of course, life will change, and it will move in a direction and you'll have choices to choose things. But it won't be a fantasy land idea of how a better life should be. It's how life really is, and from there you can maneuver. It's torture to have an idea of what's better because it totally rejects what is. You're missing the life that's here because it's being rejected. That's kind of suffering, don't you think?
- Q: I agree. I have a PhD in that.
- J: This is as good as it gets, and somewhere within you will actually be really content with that. But for as long as you're still believing that the fantasy idea of how you can upscale life, as long as you're invested in that, you're going to miss that this is actually perfect.

This is actually totally fine, but it's being rejected when we are investing in a fantasy. And you're missing life itself. You're missing what's really showing itself.

Q: There is that desire to always go to a better past or a better future, like you don't stay in what is.

J: Yes, you're missing what is, and what is has the magic. That's the only place you can learn something; it's what is now. That you can work with the rest of it is just daydreaming. You're gone. Your attention isn't here, so you're missing what's here.

Q: Let be what pretty much wants to show itself.

J: Yep.

Q: So it is much easier to say it than to do.

J: It is breaking a habit. It brings great freedom to break that habit. The whole relief of being able to be present and to not live in a place of rejecting. Oh man, it's so much easier! It's easier on everything from your nervous system to the quality of your mind even when you sleep, the quality of what's going on, you know? All of it will get lighter, step-by-step.

Q: And you would say meditation is a tool for that?

J: Sure, you'll find what's working for you over these days, you know, little bit by little bit, something will make sense. Meditation is one tool for sure. It's very useful. It pulls your mind in. It shows it how not to be in fantasy land so much. That's very useful. But any moment when you recognize that you're up there in dreaming about an alternative, say, "Whoops, this is as good as it gets, this is life. This is it. This is what's trying to show itself. Be present, be here with this." And the next thing will be mind will reject what's here and now, and it is like, "I'm not rejecting it, I'm accepting it, and I'm being with this."

Q: So with the meditation I had a lot of quiet sort of peace, and then there was a little shake of our staircase, and I was like, I mean in such deep meditation that I'm going to miss the earthquake. And then there was something else like popping, and I just let it come right soft, not that I let it, it happened it feels by itself, and you just let it drop. Things like this would come up and go. And then I saw you and you were meditating with your eyes open; and that got me into that loop of, "Oh, she's in that state of consciousness with her eyes open. I'm going to see if I can do it too." And I was able to do it with my eyes open. Usually when I sink deeply, I sink with my eyes closed all the time. So I did that a little bit with my eyes open, and I saw that the quiet was there for me also with the eyes open, it's not just with the eyes closed. It is possible to sink in with the eyes open.

J: Yes.

Q: But then once I saw that and I examined it for myself, I was like, "I wonder if this is how Jac lives? How did she start being a teacher of this?" Is this how life pulsates for you all the time even when your eyes are open, you're still feeling that quietude inside? How does one get there permanently? And then I started with the thoughts, obsessive

thoughts, "How does one get there permanently?" and then I was like, "Close your eyes, shut...", like...

[laughing]

At a certain moment, it all became about you, how you do it, and I'm going to ask her for the recipe, how it's done, how did she get there, you know. And then I closed my eyes and I was able to sink back in. So for a little bit of time I was able to do it with the eyes open, but then I just needed to just... Why is that?

J: You're just interested in the chatter, you know? Because if you learn how to do something, "That tool will help me," you know, and that's just chatter. That's part of, "I've got something to get, something will make things better." It's just a rejection of what is, really. Same habit, different story. Right now, just acceptance of yourself on every level is right up. Acceptance of yourself on every level of your life, of your health, all of it, accepting it all. Be okay with all of it. Things will look differently then. Not exactly better, but different.

Q: Maybe better.

J: Maybe so, but if we say it will be better, then we've put it into a fantasy place. Yes, good, you're breaking it down. You're breaking down the resistance to what is, that's great.



Q: It was very powerful this morning. I'm just wondering if I could explain or describe what happened, which is what you asked for. But also there are several questions I could ask. So I don't know what's best. Or I could be quiet.

J: Go within and see what the natural movement is. See if something moves from there in one of those directions.

Q: One pull is to be quiet, but there's also a fear of not asking the question, because it would give me pride in not asking. Do you know what I mean?

J: Yes. So if it's a regular satsang question, can we do it after this? Or is there a connection to the meditation?

Q: It's a connection to the meditation.

J: Perfect, go for it then.

Q: You mentioned, describing a zoning in, and you mentioned that the Jac character's mind kind of catches up. There was a zoning in and something happened here and there was zoning in and then... So in the zoning in to this energy field, what you said was that you would see something or you wouldn't see something, you would see something arise or something fall away. So within that powerful stillness, there were things happening with the perception—which have happened off and on for years and years and years and years—but this stayed longer than usual. And there are some things when the mind

comes in, I think I can make... You know, it's like it's going to fade away, the power is going to fade away, and I can do something to kind of make it come back. At least I feel like I can do something.

J: That's the game you play, yes.

Q: And it's interesting because one of the things that Paula mentioned and you mentioned is space. So while it was happening, one of the things that comes to mind is some kind of an old Vedanta trick of perceiving the background rather than the content of the background.

J: Yes.

Q: Very in the back is seeing the ether, seeing the space where there's nothing. I think it's the same thing as seeing the background but anyway. So that was happening, which made it even stronger. So I was wondering, because you zoned in several times, whether any of those, I hate to say it, but they're techniques, but can you look to see whether they're getting in the way or you saw it or didn't see it or...

J: So they're all just experiences, aren't they, for the phenomenal character?

Q: Yes they are. They come with the stillness; they're part of the stillness.

J: Yes.

Q: It's almost like... I mean, at times everything goes away except your face.

J: Yes.

Q: And it makes the stillness stronger and stronger, and you know, it's blissful.

J: Yes.

Q: It seems to be truer than a limited perception.

J: Yes, the personal story.

Q: Because it seems almost to dissolve. It's consciousness.

J: Yes, it's just another aspect of consciousness that hasn't so much separation in it. Yes. So is it okay that it's another experience but it doesn't have the value of being better? It's just experienced as qualitatively different perhaps, but even that qualitative difference could go.

Q: Could go? It comes and goes.

J: Yes, but the judgment of it or the noticing that it's a qualitative difference. Any attachment to the qualitative difference can...

Q: Yes, I understand the question. Well it's like, again, I don't make it happen. It often happens. And I had this other little thought, it often happens at the beginning of a satsang. And I add this little humorous, "Okay Jac, can I go home now?"

J: Yeah, yeah.

Q: You know it's like, "It doesn't get any better than this."

J: Phenomenally, no it doesn't get any better than that. Yes.

Q: So I mean, there is a mind question, you know there's always been a mind, that's why I always do the same thing, because questions, the mind questions why is this happening? It's just a qualitative different experience.

J: Yes.

Q: But in my value system it's nicer than... I can't deny that value system.

J: That's right that's just the value system.

Q: And sometimes as I sit and I'm wondering, "Well, is it all going to go away?" You know, is false identification going to drop because of this, you know, is this it? I don't know of any other way that the false identification is going to drop, other than staying with this different consciousness.

J: Yes.

Q: You know, is this pure perception? If that's what it is... It's certainly me going towards pure perception.

J: Yes, and is there any...

Q: You asked me that question. I think it's qualitatively better because if it's closer to pure perception, it's better.

J: Okay, but there's two things there, because it can be qualitatively different to be comfortable and not cold. But would there be an absolute preference, and is one good and one is bad? It can get deeper and deeper, and be brought into the dualistic perception. Can it be seen: yes, that it is a qualitative difference but one isn't good or one isn't bad? Can you leave it qualitative, without good and bad, because good and bad is very much personal. That's a different category.

Q: Right, that's a good question. I think good and bad is too strong.

J: Okay, good, not bad. Yes, you see that potency, that's where the dualistic identified character is. Yes, it's too strong. It's kind of forceful; it's too far away from what you are, the softness of what is real, and yet the power is in what is real. There is no power actually in what we're calling "too strong," in the identified place. There's no power there, no.

Q: That's evident that the power is in the stillness.

J: Yes, (whispering) *the power is in the stillness.*

Q: It shows us the power is in the stillness.

J: That's right.

Q: And not even personal. So there certainly is a preference for that.

J: Yes, but the only one who can have a preference is the personal.

Q: Yes, yes, yes, because it's not absolute.

J: Something is sliding in there, into the strong potent personal, to have a preference.

Q: Yes, only the person can have a preference.

J: Yes, so can there be... Okay qualitatively you know there's a phenomenal experience that seems to have a different qualitative set of characteristics, and they all come and go, and no stickiness to any of them. The personality can like one more than the next, but *nothing stronger* than that—no good, bad, no stickiness, no investment. Can you stop it going to that part, that perception where it's personal, where it gets tight and there's a somebody who wants something?

Q: Well I can hope. Even while it was happening this morning and I could watch the personal person, the individual wanting or desiring or trying to keep, hold onto, grabbing, but let it go, if it comes back, let it go. You know, just like surrender to...

J: Yes. How much of you goes into the personal in order to let it go?

Q: How much goes into the personal?

J: Like in the place of letting it go, does that arise from the personal agenda?

Q: (inaudible)

J: So when you let it go?

Q: Well, it's like ahh...

J: Okay, all right, it's tricky isn't it? It's very tricky to notice that, yes there is a qualitative difference, so of course, there's a preference for something nice over something sticky. Of course, that's natural. Now, then there is the contracted position of a preference, of good or bad, of what can I do to make this happen more often. There's the personal that gets contracted. So it's about kind of weeding it out. To have the impersonal agenda is fine, that's natural. That's human functioning to want something that's more pleasant. But all the attachment, and maybe the one who has to let it go, all of that comes from cranking up the personal in order to let go of something but we're still tied on to the personal. It's like, if we are igniting the personal in order to let something go, then...

Q: I hear you.

J: So it's like the impersonal zone of where there are preferences, where it comes and goes, where it's all kind of loose, and there's no contraction for the personal—the impersonal zone. From there, I wonder is there a surrender and a letting go, because the surrender and the letting go tends to be from the personal, not the impersonal.

Q: The surrender and letting go has to be from the personal?

J: Yes, I'm wondering if it's from the personal? It usually is.

Q: And it doesn't have to be from the impersonal, that's what you're saying, because the impersonal doesn't have to let go of anything?

J: Generally not. There can be an idea that flows through the impersonal, and it's like, "Ahh, we'll let that go." It's almost like a functioning; it's not sticky. That can happen. But I'm

wondering if the personal in your situation, is the personal being ignited when you're talking about letting it go or surrendering? It's a subtle line here, isn't it?

Q: My intuition is telling me that you're answering my question about zoning in, because that's what you may have seen. I'm tricking you now.

J: Yes, yes. There is a very thin line there between when the personal identity comes in and when the impersonal free movement of preferences is at play.

Q: Is there any last bit of advice?

J: Just getting more familiar with if something comes up and it's like, "Whoa, there is a personal agenda here, I'm annoyed about something. There is personal agenda. What does this look like from the impersonal?" Just step back, and from the impersonal, is there some residue of it there? Is it there, so that you can really feel the difference between preference and desire, between the perspective of the personal and the perspectives that are impersonal and prior. It's the dividing line between the personal and the impersonal; that's the line I'm bringing your attention to. Because everything happens impersonally.

Q: And sometimes during that powerful stillness, there is like a slight aha, or whatever, that that's what this is, it's happening impersonally. It doesn't stay. So again it's a mind question that I have to ask. Again, is there any connection between this phenomenal whatever is happening and the final dropping.

J: And the final dropping?

Q: I mean if that question could be answered for this person...

J: You see, yes and no. From the point of view of the individual, yes there is a connection; but when the dropping happens, you get to recognize that it was never about that.

Q: Right. Then we talk about time. Years ago there was a glimpse and whatever you want to call it, a samadhi experience, so so so long ago, that this individual or whatever was on the other side of that realized no cause and effect.

J: That's right.

Q: This individual's not there... It's like somebody said in Sebastian, it was not an abiding awakening. I loved that group.

J: Yes.

Q: So anyway, that can be remembered.

J: Yes.

Q: What you just said can be remembered.

J: Yes.

Q: So it's a two-part answer.

J: Yes, it's a two-part answer, and both are valid within their own reality spheres.

Q: So from the relative standpoint, there's a connection.

J: Sure, if you leave the space, something can show itself. Is it guaranteed for the showing to happen? No. But leaving the space, of course. But if you have an attachment to something happening because you made yourself available, well the space is kind of crowded with the attachment.

Q: There really isn't space.

J: No, there really isn't space. No, it's the desire for something to happen that has taken over the space.

Q: So again, when this power happens, I would have to say it's a surprise now when that happens. Before it was, it's going to happen, it's going to happen.

J: Okay, so the expectation isn't there and it opens.

Q: I believe I'm most surprised.

J: Good, good. Good, expectation is going or gone.

Q: Except that something does come in. A wonderful thing happened last summer, last January, something went, and it's all censored because it is not even in the tapes I bought. I bought the tapes to go over it and...

J: Yes.

Q: I feel like James Joyce and Ulysses, whatever I say gets banned, censored. But you know you said something to me afterward that took on you know now, like it fully opened or whatever, you know what I mean, things have changed, you know? So that kind of gave me a little expectation.

J: Sure, mind is going to grab anything. And every now and then we need to kind of phenomenally feel, "Yes, I'm getting somewhere." Every now and then we do, you know? Sometimes we need to kind of feel a sense of progress, but are you getting somewhere in terms of really seeing the truth? No, it's not incremental in that way, but phenomenally we need to kind of every now and then feel, "Okay, I'm in a new phase of my life." That's okay. Then if we load it up with expectations and desires it's like, well actually, maybe it's not so new after all. You're putting the old furniture into the new house.

Q: No, I know this. It was almost like now there is more responsibility. You know what I mean?

J: Gosh. But why?

Q: I'm just telling you what came up.

J: Yes, gosh, because responsibility is the personal. The personal comes in quickly to feel the space.

Q: Now there is an opportunity, to drop all of that.

J: Drop all of that. Yes, looser, freer, more open, with no agenda. I hear your Mrs. chuckling in the corner.

Q: I do, too.

J: Sure, sure.



Q: When I first closed my eyes, at first I thought... I felt stillness, but I have been feeling that almost since I got up anyway; or at least it's been real quiet. Then I felt like I was going deeper, but, "No, I'm not going deeper." And then the whole idea of space came in. I just heard what you just said. But overall, it was like nothing mattered, nothing. I mean, even when people were talking over here, I was hearing... Sometimes I was hearing it and sometimes it was just voices, and that it doesn't matter. Nothing matters.

J: Yes, nothing matters.

Q: There was a question and I thought, "Well that doesn't matter either." They're just nothing.

J: Yes.

Q: You know they're talking and if I don't share, it doesn't make any difference. And then maybe a little bit of I have no control over this anymore, so it doesn't matter.

J: Yes, and then phenomenally, everything matters, but it requires a particular lens of perception. You can say that?

Q: I guess, to get up and drink water or something.

J: Yes, that's it. For functioning to happen, a lens of perception comes in which allows for things to matter, but in the wider view absolutely nothing matters.

Q: Yes, that struck me the minute I woke up this morning—if I get up right now or if I don't get up right now.

J: Yes.

Q: Yes, I can see how the lens can come in.

J: You can see?

Q: The lens, how the lens works. I guess that's what you were calling it.

J: Yes.

Q: Last night there was just all this joy and happiness, and that felt good. That doesn't seem to be there this morning, and then I thought, "Oh that doesn't matter any more." It's just different.

J: It's just different; that's it.

Q: (inaudible)

J: Yes, that's all there is. Yes. Beautiful.



J: Everybody who would like to speak has spoken for now? Okay, let's do something. See if you can find inside—see if it shows itself to you—a sense of spaciousness. Just going back to Paula's point. When you drop in, does something expand; is there a vastness? If it doesn't happen to you, that's fine; this will be interesting anyway, I think. But see if you can recognize spaciousness inside. Just hang out there for a minute. [pause]

That's spaciousness, if you have access to it. It isn't any place. It has no location. It is the mind that puts vastness or an unlimited sense in place. The concept of space is something that must be seen through. So the vastness is actually not vast; the concept of space on emptiness makes it vast. So in that place of vastness, take away the concept of space. See what happens.

Emptiness has no space either; it's empty of space. Vastness isn't vast—no space, no place. And if it's possible for that concept of space to be whipped away, then the next step is to see that right here, right now, in Carlsbad, this isn't any place either. This isn't any location either. The concept of space gives it a context for us to manage within, but actually there is no concept of space.

Next step. Things are not beside each other within a context of space. If space collapses everything is actually inside each other. Everything is within the next thing.



Q: What is it that you're referring to when you use the word space?

J: The concept of space is a very subtle one, and it's actually the first concept because it gives us a context for phenomena. So when we go within and there is a sense of that vastness or spaciousness, you can be sure the concept of space has not been seen through. The concept of space is in there underpinning it. So it's one way to go after the concept of space, because it's usually the only concept that's in place. Now, the concept of space bleeds right through from when it first arises. It's *there* as one of the foundational structures for the phenomenal world to appear as real. So I'm going for the very first concept, which is like a cornerstone of the phenomenal world. So it's the thing that's inside the room—space—right through to being the first concept that kind of gives the vastness its vast quality. Same thing. So I'm just kind of hacking it wherever it pops up.



Q: You said, "Take space away from the vastness."

J: Yes.

Q: My physical body shrank. I mean, I don't know what really happened, but like you pulled a plug, like pulling a plug.

J: Pulling a plug. Yes.

Q: And you said Carlsbad, we're here and it's also not here. Then the plug. Something got even smaller, something else. I can't say body, but something got even smaller and smaller. And there was still this sense of something rather than nothing.

J: Okay, and that something can exist without space?

Q: Yes.

J: Can it?

Q: Well, yeah.

J: So does it get reduced to a point, a dot? Is it that kind of...

Q: Very tiny. I'm kind of thinking of a grain of sand. My mind works with that, a grain of sand. Yet there's still... I mean, it has to have a reference point. So is it just transferring the idea of space? I guess it's still a concept. But when you say spaciousness and vastness, I mean when we go there, it's like, *yeah*, there is nowhere else to go. And to drop space in vastness, the vastness goes.

J: Yes.

Q: That's the sense, but then there's still this grain of sand or whatever. Now it's not okay. That's where this character is at the moment.

J: Okay. So it's down to a dot, down to a grain of sand, and that can exist without space?

Q: I don't know, now I'm in this, because space for me was everything. Spaciousness was like *wow*, bliss, and I'm out there.

J: You're out in space. How lovely!

Q: Without thought.

J: Yes, except you have the thought of space.

Q: Exactly.

J: Do you know? That's what's keeping you going. Okay, so then space, you take away the concept of space and everything shrinks into a dot, okay. And now?

Q: It's unfamiliar.

J: Are you using the dot as a reference point?

Q: I guess so. I mean, I don't know what it is.

J: Would the dot kind of dissolve into nothingness if you didn't need a reference point? If you didn't *think* you needed a reference point?

Q: What's coming out is that I'm the dot. The dot is *it*.

J: The dot is *it*. And is everything in the dot, or is it just a Paula dot?

Q: I never thought of it like that. All of the space is in the dot. What was huge is now tiny. So when you say Carlsbad doesn't exist (inaudible). My mind can't go anywhere with this. My mind, I don't know what to do. My mind doesn't know what to do.

J: Your mind doesn't know what to do, yes.

Q: My experience was without space in vastness, a sensation of total collapse into a dot, the grain of sand, that's how small.

J: Yes.

Q: That was the experience. Now what do I do?

J: Yes, let's see.



Q: Body sensations. The skin boundary goes and body sensations are floating in vastness. But if there is no vastness, there can't be these sensations floating. I don't know whether this is pure, just logic, or whether it's being.

J: This is the question.

Q: Yes. They can't even float. That's it!

J: Uh-ha.



J: Okay, anyone else like to say what's happening?

Q: There is this experience of boundarylessness. Like I can't feel... I don't feel inside layers of skin, or there's just no inside and outside. Like even right now, like what would be considered physical objects feel like I can't see the borders sometimes, like it's just all... I can see your face but it might as well just be like everything, melting into the wall almost. There's a borderlessness that...

J: And is that similar to what we call unity consciousness? Everything kind of melts into each other.

Q: I suppose. And hearing you talk about this space and the concept of space, it's almost like I can't even grasp that. I don't even know what to do with that. I hear you talk about it, and I hear you talk about the concept as a leg and a pillar, but I don't know what to do with that.

J: Yes, but some part of you does. Your mind is like, "What the—!" And it's going to try and use logic. Your mind can only use the tools that it has, but some part of you is able to recognize prior to all concepts. Some part of you. That's the part, I'm saying, "*Hello*, let's see if that can talk."

Q: I heard you speak last year, and you were pointing to something about *back, back, back, back, back*. And I'm wondering what exactly you were pointing to that's beyond the beyond, and how that relates to anything I'm experiencing?

J: Yes. Different techniques, same destination that's not a destination. Just another technique. It's just pulling it from concepts. When we go back, we are directionally taking a path in order to shift your perception to a different part of your brain, and that helps with some neurological rewiring. That's just part of what happens with awakening. So with this I'm just going at it from another angle, just pulling away the basic concepts that have been taken for granted that might not have been challenged before. Because you see, the non-dual, well unity, if we look at unity consciousness, there's two ways of looking at it. It's like okay, God is in everything. It's like in India there is a story—it's a very useful metaphor—that everything is made of gold. So if it's a gold necklace or a gold ring, they're two different forms. It might be you and Mahesh. One is a necklace and one is a ring, but actually it's just gold that is just appearing differently and having different functions because they appear differently. But everything is gold. That's one way to view unity consciousness.

Now, you can see unity consciousness without space, and that's what you were describing. It's like unity consciousness when everything *is* actually the one thing. It's not this one substance manifesting as forms. Take away space. There is no manifesting as different forms because we don't have the differentiation that comes with space. Right? So unity actually is everything must be inside each other. Everything is in that grain of sand, everything is inside each other. The wave isn't on top of the ocean, you know. The ocean is inside of the wave and the wave is inside of the ocean without space. Everything is inside in everything else. This is making a bit of sense to some people, I think; some nods coming. So you are seeing unity consciousness without space, when like no borders and everything is melting into each other. It's the deeper understanding of unity consciousness. The mind will logically get the thing about gold being in different forms, that we are all God manifesting as different things. That's easier; that's logical. Take away space; yeah, it's like your perception alters. So it's great to have a capacity to allow the perceiving to come through and not to be edited, not for mind to grasp it and rewrite it. So right now it's unity consciousness without space. That's what you were talking about there. Perfect, that's fine. And then for most people, when they do drop in and there's that vastness, if the vastness still has the concept of space in it, [sound effect] something collapses. Now we are talking about emptiness. Now we're talking about emptiness. Now we're really talking about emptiness, of where you even see... The next step from there is that the concept of truth goes also.

Q: I would say for the past eight or nine years truth is what it was like. I was a beeline for truth; all I cared about was truth. And in the last six months or so, it's like I don't even

think about truth. It's bizarre because for the last almost decade, it's like that was all I was literally after. Nothing else mattered, and it doesn't even like... The concept or the thought or the idea of it, it just doesn't even come up. I don't look for it. For a moment, there was a fear that would arise with that, that I've deviated off to some path of... I don't know.

J: But it naturally subsided itself, the pull to truth, six months ago?

Q: Yes.

J: And has your life changed an awful lot? Or is it just that concept of truth isn't so active anymore, isn't so potent?

Q: Things have changed, things have definitely changed. It's just a settling.

J: Yes, has seeking stopped?

Q: Almost completely. There are pieces that come up that snag, and I can see and feel and explore. But it doesn't show up as truth as much, you know; even the snags, the snags aren't for truth.

J: Yes, yes. The concept of truth breaks down. It's a useful goal. It's very potent. There isn't even truth, actually.

Q: And that's the shift that feels funny. I don't feel like oh now I've found the truth, you know, that I was seeking for the past decade. The seeking for that is just not there anymore.

J: That's exactly it. Yes. Because if *you* found the truth, then what? Truth would be a phenomenal thing and the personal I would be able to get it; so it's like of course, it has to go the way you're talking about. *One* can't find truth. *One* falls away, end of story. It's that things stop taking your attention away from what is, and then *what is* is like what is phenomenally, and actually there are layers that are the building blocks of that. It all boils down to nothing, and nothing gets empty, and empty isn't even empty. You're actually outside of all of it. That's when we talk about prior to consciousness.

Q: I've heard some people talk about that they have these experiences where they look at something and say, "Oh I'm that chair, I'm that flower, I'm that tree." And I don't feel that. What is that all about?

J: That's the unity consciousness, where you get to see that the gold is the necklace, the gold is manifesting as the ring, as the bracelet, whatever. That's what that is. The perception of unity consciousness has space. Space is still intact, so what it's doing is showing you the oneness. There is like *vwoop* and alignment with the oneness. What's in place is space. And what's in place is a level of identity, a non-dual identity, where you are all of it. And that's the thing about non-duality—there is still identity in place because you are the Absolute, you are the divine. There's still an identity there. It's not personal, but there's still identity there. So if you've got identity and space, you will see that you're the chair and that you're the tree. That's set up. Whereas, if one of those has taken a rocking, then you won't have that perception. If one of those is already broken down, it won't line up. So it's fine not to get that one. Unity without space—you

described that this morning. That's how unity consciousness is showing itself to you, that there are just no borders. Everything can kind of melt into each other. Now the thing is, is there an identification that's watching that? Like is there an identifi... Is the perceiving happening from within the borderless?

Q: I don't necessarily feel myself here seeing borderlessness. It's just a sense of borderlessness.

J: Yes, perfect, because if there was you looking at it, there would be subject-object. All the objects are borderless. They've all merged, but I'm the subject. No, we've still got two. So then, how does that perception happen?

Q: Do you mean, how or when does that show up?

J: Yes, how come there is seeing, there isn't you seeing the borderless view, but somehow—and tell me how that somehow is—that perceiving from within it? Or how come it's perceiving that? If there isn't a you that's perceiving it, how come the perceiving is happening?

Q: That's a great question. I think that's the edge I'm at right now that you're probably picking up on. I don't know.

J: Is it *knowable*?

Q: I don't know. It just feels *known*; it just feels...

J: But it feels known?

Q: It feels known, but I don't know how or why or there's no location from where known is coming from.

J: Yes, yes. So is it known without anything knowing?

Q: That's how it feels.

J: Okay. We call that pure knowing or wisdom. It's like it's the essence of wisdom itself; it's not like something being wise. It's wisdom. It is wisdom, because we like to put words on things. So is that knowing or pure knowledge, wisdom. or whatever we want to call it, is that an intrinsic part of the unified field that has no space?

Q: I don't feel separation between the two.

J: Then is it self-knowing?

Q: Yes.

J: Is it self-knowing without knowing itself as unified field without space, or is it self-knowing? Gosh, I'm sorry. Is it self-knowing and it has the capacity to know itself as *dot, dot, dot*—it can fill in the blanks? Or is it self-knowing without there being a knowing of what it knows, a labeling, a capacity to recognize what it knows?

Q: I don't feel much filling in the blanks.

J: Yes, okay. I'm going to jump this out a little bit wider, because this is exactly the point of where pure consciousness is doing all of it, *even* when you think you've forgotten who

you really are. When consciousness forgets who it is, it actually only knows itself to be exactly what it is. It does not lose itself ever, even when you forget, when it forgets, and you imagine there's a you. Because consciousness is forgetting itself, even when there's suffering and we're trying to make sense of suffering in the world, because consciousness has forgotten itself and is believing its experience, and hell can happen, phenomenal hell can happen. Consciousness itself knows itself but not *as* the sufferer. It knows itself but not *as* the individual. It knows itself. It doesn't have the breakdown capacity to say good or bad, lost or found, forgetting not forgetting. That's why when your perception comes from pure consciousness, everything is okay. Nothing matters at all! Nothing matters because that division is not in place. It actually doesn't exist at all; it's gobbledygook. It's a perception. It's a mechanism that allows separation to happen, allows subject-object; and after subject-object, suffering happens. But consciousness knows itself not as anything; it just knows itself. So it actually can't forget itself because if it knew itself as something then it would have something to forget. So it's truly not touched by any of it. And you've found that frequency, that zone, of where knowing itself, *point*. That's the sentence—self-knowing. That is integral to that point of manifestation. And yet it's within a physical form that the rest of us can say, "Yes, there is a woman who is separate from me." Yet that capacity can be here also, to divide it all up. But look, there it is, that point of perception of consciousness, self-knowing, and it's in unity consciousness. It's in unity consciousness when you take away the division, the division that comes from identifying with unity consciousness and space. So that's where non-duality falls short, because non-duality can have space or it can be without space, but if there is *identifying* with any of it, if there's identifying with the Absolute, if there's identifying with anything with the non-dual perspective...

Q: (inaudible)

J: Yes.



Q: When we started the meditation, a feeling of peace and the thoughts rolled in and out, there was no identification with that. But when you were talking about that that there is nothing out there; it's subtle like it was just expansion, just light. There was nobody watching. There was just light surrounding and there were no limits to it, no boundaries to it.

J: Yes.

Q: And then I just came out of it.

J: Was there space there?

Q: No.

J: Ahh!

- Q: No boundaries, no space, and the only thing I can say was I was there, there was something there. It just was space; it was just light.
- J: It was space, it was light, but there was no space?
- Q: Yes, I mean when I say space there was just light. There was nothing to identify or nobody to identify it but light. I would say that drawing back, coming back out of it, saying that there was light. I can say there was light, but at the moment there was no identification, nothing.
- J: So the perception that there was light, when it was happening—talk to me about that perception.
- Q: There was no perception of that at that time it was just there. Coming back out, this body-mind knows that light is what the description is at this time, but at the moment there was just nothing. I can say there was light because there was no darkness, just because you know there is darkness and light. But in the moment there was nothing.
- J: Okay, so mind is putting the story of light on it afterwards?
- Q: Afterwards. But at the time, nothing.
- J: Truth?
- Q: You can say that, because if I go back and think about it, I could say it was just an acceptance of whatever it was. There was no questioning in terms of, what is it or what is it showing now or whatever. It just is, and I stayed with it for a while, and after that I came out of it.
- J: So what happens when you come out of it? Is it a state of mind is what I'm asking.
- Q: No, I mean it took me a while to come out of that feeling, but I still feel very relaxed and very comfortable. If I were to put the words or adjectives, I would say it was an enjoyable event.
- J: Yes, but you just picked that up afterwards.
- Q: Yes.
- J: So then there was no comment at all while you were there?
- Q: There was nothing. It was total silence, and total stillness, if you will.
- J: Yes. Is there access to it all the time?
- Q: When I sit quietly yes, but not until I sit quietly, because the mind has a tendency to go in all different directions, like clouds floating in the sky.
- J: And something is looking at them, huh? [laughing] "Ooh, it looks like this; hmm, that one is darker."
- Q: What are the clouds (inaudible) [laughing]
- J: Yes any story will do. Okay, so that zone, that blank... Because no matter what word we use, it's not there. So there's access or there's an availability, when you sit, to that which

is beyond. I'm just wondering for you what would allow that to be there all the time. Is it accessible every time you sit?

Q: No, not every time, but enough times.

J: Can you access it if you do self-inquiry, if there's something in your waking day that you can...

Q: I don't try to access it. When I sit and close my eyes then if it comes it comes and I stay with it. And then if it goes it goes, and then I come out of it. But there's no burning desire to seek that experience if you will. If it just happens, it happens.

J: Sure, it just happens. Yes, yes, yes. The thing is it's there all the time, but perception leaves it.

Q: Well, as you were describing it you said that knowing, the self-knowing, already knowing is there; so it's a matter of, as you say, tapping into it?

J: Yes, tapping into it.

Q: Tap into it at times or don't tap into it. But it's not that when I don't tap into it I'm saying why didn't I tap into it.

J: Yes.

Q: There is acceptance that I didn't tap into it.

J: Yes, and that's the paradox, isn't it? You know, there is a paradox there because the more you tap into it... Like if you've got access to that level of prior, the more you are there, the less bandwidth. So you won't have the bandwidth to go from that level. You won't have the bandwidth to get completely caught in your stories, because you can't do both, you know. You're pulling your bandwidth forward and you've lost that outside-of-all-of-it viewpoint where the stories are running. So the thing is that the depth of the stories is a little bit too deep for you. So one way is to, of course, recognize the stories, recognize that mind is a liar, and pull back so that you have the bandwidth that "outside of all of it" is there all the time. And that's where consciousness will move you to anyway. It is going to do it on its own, you know? There is that, to unplug those, or to more frequently go back. And that's what Ramana used to say, that the more you go back it will burn out the stuff. It will burn out the hooks by itself, but *only* when somebody has access to prior. That's the only time it burns that out.

Q: But it is happening increasingly. Denise and I talk about it, so it is just a story. We don't find ourselves attached to any event or anything that's happening or any description, other than to simply say, "Oh yes, that's just a story." And then we simply try and let go of it or we do let go of it, and that works. Continually that's happening.

J: That's fantastic.

Q: And there is a peace and quiet associated with that when we say, "Oh, it's just a story."

J: Yes, of course, once you see it's a story it's like poof, perception is going back to a more natural place. Good, the more frequent that can happen the better.



Q: I just want to clarify something that you just said. So when you say consciousness decides to forget itself or consciousness is playing a game... I think when a teacher says that, it is just to kind of appease the mind. So I want to try to find if this true, because you were saying that prior to that none of this thing exists. Is this true what you said?

J: Yes.

Q: Because it always used to bother me, this sentence, which is all consciousness is playing games, consciousness is deciding to forget itself. But what you are saying is that all of this is still in the domain of duality still.

J: Yes it is. Just a little point there, consciousness kind of doesn't *decide* to forget itself or lose itself. It's a way of putting another explanation on our own hypnosis that we are separate, putting an explanation on it to give you a breather, so that it is like actually consciousness is the one who's forgetting. And yes, from the point of view that forgetting is possible, it has to be that consciousness is forgetting itself. From that point of view, it's valid. But prior to that, no, that's not valid at all. So it's from a point of view, that's valid, consciousness forgets itself, but it doesn't ever *decide* to do it. It doesn't have that capability. Is that ultimately untrue? Only in the same way that everything is untrue, or nothing matters, or there is nothing, or there is no truth. It's like, gosh, everything is valid some of the time. From the point of view of pure consciousness, it doesn't forget or remember. From the dualistic point of view, yes, it does forget and remember. So it depends where you're looking from. It's a bridge from the dualistic point of view. It's useful. But as you pull back and subject-object stops, it makes no sense at all. It's gobbledygook.

Q: That's very useful. The other thing I wanted to clarify with you is, as you are going around the room asking people what happened during their meditation and to share our experiences, I wonder when this is said, first of all because the mind is so tricky, I wonder if at times it invents all these things because it may want to experience something. Would you like to comment?

J: That the mind invents?

Q: Yes, like if you're asking people for their experience, mind being so clever, it will invent even these so-called experiences, and say well, "Okay I was feeling this, I was feeling that." And I sometimes wonder if there's any truth to this.

J: Well, there's no truth to any of it, but still there must be space for the phenomenal experience. Mind interprets things, usually erroneously; but that's what we talk about, whatever mind has deduced to be a valid perspective. We accept it and we talk from there. But there are so many variables, and then mind just makes a deduction, you know?

Q: Yes, so then I'm saying, why talk about this?

J: Yes, because we just talk, don't we? We communicate, we look for ways to meet with each other, because were tribal and our species likes to come together.

Q: But that's the extent of it. I mean, that's it.

J: It is really. It really is about that it's a species thing. Yes.

Q: And that's why this teaching, you know, "Be still and know that you are God," in which there is in a way no communication or no talking.

J: That's right, but there's still identification with, "You are God." That's not the end of the line.

Q: Yes, I mean I get that, limited by talking obviously.

J: We are, but it's also the way of freeing up the mind. It got us into this mess, and it helps a little bit to get us out of this mess—the mess that we think we are in. But a lot of it is just part and parcel of our species really. Really, it's just how we function. It is what we occupy ourselves with, you know, because we don't have to do subsistence farming. We've evolved a bit from that, so now what are we going to be obsessed about? And if we knew how to manage our minds? We wouldn't have to do this at all. I'd find another way to make a living, I'm sure.

Q: And the reason I guess I'm saying this now, if I may, is because you made such a powerful statement yesterday that the mind is a liar. And this keeps resonating, you know? So then there is always this self-doubt that whatever thoughts come, all thoughts are lies.

J: Yes, they're all lies.

Q: Why can't this one also be a lie?

J: Yes, it is. Every word I'm saying is actually BS. It really is! It really is.

Q: Tease out that thought.

J: If you tease it out that far, thank you for the words, yes it's all BS. If you meet the Buddha, shoot the Buddha. It's true!



Q: When you made the suggestion, experience vastness and then remove the concept of space, well something happened. I suppose you could describe it as a collapsing or disappearing. And then, the first thing I remember after that was my mind and it said "immediacy, intimacy." So that was my integration of that experience. When you mentioned that the mind is a liar, at least those two words... I mean words, we could just say in the absolute, words are always representations of something else, so in that sense they lie. But to the extent that mind is a messenger, sometimes it gives pretty accurate messages and sometimes it give a false message. And I would say in that case the mind wasn't a liar, because at least those words sprang from the truth, or whatever you want

call it, sprang from reality. So they were kind of infused with that, and so they seemed true when spoken.

J: Okay. When mind gives a true representation or an inaccurate representation, even the true representation is a lie. It's still a subjective perception. Somewhere it is a lie. It might be useful. It might be true in terms of it has an accurate conceptual contextual validity, and it can be used in some way. Okay, it allows you to take the next step. And it's true within that context, but is that ultimately true? No, somewhere you'll find it's a lie even if it's true within the normal phenomenal life. Could you go with that?

Q: Yes, sure.

J: Okay, so immediacy, intimacy, these are the words that came. So if there's no space, you know there's vastness and then we remove space from vastness, where would the words come from? Can words arise from there?

Q: Sure, why not?

J: Because space is the first concept, and immediacy, intimacy, these are concepts also. So now we're back into concepts some place. And concepts that are received are within a context, so there must be somebody who is receiving them or listening to them or something. So for that to happen, we've left the absence of space. Another perception is active. Something slid in there.

Q: Well certainly before those two words, all I can say is that I don't remember because no one was there; and then something perceived words.

J: Yes. And grabbed the words.

Q: I don't know if I grabbed them or perceived them.

J: Okay, so something is perceiving something else.

Q: Well, there's perceiving.

J: So there's perceiving and an object of that perception, which is two words.

Q: Yes, or you don't even have to go that far, there was just perception.

J: Okay, but with just perception, nothing is perceived. If it's just perception, really there is nothing perceived. No words would arise with just perception. So I'm trying to encourage you to find what came in, what lens of perception came in. Because when those words came in, already another perception was already activated, which was deeper in the illusion than the absence of space. So if we could identify *just* before the arising of those two words. And maybe it was perceiving, pure perceiving. But with pure perceiving, nothing is perceived; it's just pure perceiving.

Q: Well, if you asked me if there was pure perceiving from the time things collapsed until the words arose, in the abstract, I would say yes. But it wasn't my experience because there was no one there to perceive. Do you know what I mean?

J: Yes. It might have slid in just before. In pure perceiving, there is nobody there to perceive. There is nobody; so it's a really, really subtle one. And it might have slid in just

before those two words. You know, it might be, "Pure perceiving, ah, now we've got something to perceive." We've got a sounding board so that something else can arise. So it would be interesting for you to play with that like at home or in the next few days, just to kind of identify what is it that re-creates the world?

- Q: In a way, using the semantics we're using of pure perceiving, there's nothing to be perceived, it's almost like the moment a drum is struck, there is no sound. So it's almost the potentiality of sound, but then the striking creates a vibration and the vibration creates the sound. So if you were asking me to try to describe what was there before the words arose, it was just kind of like an urge to express.
- J: Yes, some urge was there, some movement on some level. Yes, that's it. And the more we are able to attune us as pure consciousness—okay I'm pulling in identity now, us as pure consciousness—the more we're able to recognize the subtleties of it, the more you spot. You spot it straight out, "I'm not buying it, I'm not buying it." You see the lie before it even manifests as a lie. You see the movement towards a lie, and that gives great freedom.
- Q: Well, when you say, "You see the lie," why is every expression a lie? So when you say it gives you freedom because of that urge to express and you see the lie, why is it a lie?
- J: Everything is ultimately a lie. From the perception of pure consciousness, there isn't anything other. So from the phenomenal, of course, it's all valid. I'm not denying any of it. I'm introducing you... Because there's no problem at all in seeing where something is valid and real, because that's how life presents. That's what mind does, it says it's valid and real. There isn't a denial of it, but if you can see the unreality of it, that's another way to shift back to how pure consciousness operates, recognizing its nature.
- Q: So when you say it's a lie, are you saying it's only a lie if you're identified with it? If you're not identified with it as something that's real, then it is not a lie.
- J: Say that again, if you wouldn't mind.
- Q: When you say that what manifests is a lie, and ultimately you could say that in another way, that the world is unreal.
- J: Yes.
- Q: It's only a lie if you believe it to be real. If you don't believe it to be a lie and you recognize it as unreal, then...
- J: But it's not you who believes it to be a lie or not a lie. I'm after that one. For the position of somebody believing it to be a lie or not believing it to be a lie, the perception that I'm pointing to, there's no beliefs there at all. It's recognition. So you're mixing two things that don't see each other at all.
- Q: So if there's recognition that it's unreal, then it's not a lie.
- J: You're seeing the true nature of something. So if you're seeing the true nature of something to be unreal, you said earlier that unreal is another word for a lie, so...

Q: I guess maybe I'm getting caught up with semantics on the word "lie." You have to have an objective party to believe something is true.

J: But you see the belief system is not valid where I'm talking from. The belief system is only within duality. You're mixing apples and oranges, okay? So it's not about believing it's a lie. It's about recognizing the unsubstantial basis of what is presented by mind. Do you see? A belief system comes way deeper into the story than that. It's not a belief; it's about something revealing itself to you. It's about recognizing the true nature of things.

Q: But I guess, in using my analogy, if you recognize manifestation as just presence's urge to create...

J: That's one way to see it, but that's in separation then. Now we're in separation.

Q: I can't describe it in words other than the way of separation. But in other words, if the recognition is at that level, there is no lie and there is no truth, there just is.

J: But that's not recognition; that's being in the present moment. That's not recognition; that's a perspective. It's not recognition. It's like we are creating a space where something else can show itself. It's not about being in a particular place of where something is and is a lie or is truth or is believed to be this or not believed to be that. That's a different zone altogether.

Q: I get that.

J: Okay. So what are you saying?

Q: What I was saying is that... I guess I was fixating in a way on your comment that manifestation is a lie. And if you are, and when I say if you are or you, if there's presence, if there's full presence at the time of manifestation, then it's not a lie.

J: That's right, because when perception is coming from the place of presence, it's already within the lie, so it has to see it as true. It has to take it as true because it's already within the context. So we're pulling back from the context of manifestation, and it shows itself to be unreal. It shows itself. It's not believed because there's nobody there to believe it. But from the place of presence, you're present to what is, and what is is already in manifestation. So at that level of perception, of course, of course it's real. Of course, it's real because it's from within the context of what looks to be real. It's already taken that to be real, because being truly present and being with what is requires things to be taken to be real. There is something that has clicked in, in our ability to perceive, the ability of pure consciousness to perceive, in order to allow presence to happen. Do you see? Tricky enough, isn't it?

Q: Said another way, if from experience or knowing or freedom, the wave is always the ocean, and the wave is never a lie if it's always the ocean.

J: The wave is the ocean at one point and the ocean is the wave, and at another time the wave is within the ocean. That's when you take away space, and the ocean is within the wave. And then prior to all of it, there is no wave or ocean at all. All gone. Never was. Never was! What do we do then? And the capacity to recognize that is there also.

Q: Well, thank you for the help in leading me to the preconceptual.

J: That's exactly it. That's a good phrase, yes, preconceptual.



Q: So when you told us to sink deep and see what happens, for me there wasn't any concept of space. For me when I sink in deep, I go to feeling. I would call it feeling, but you tell me if it's not a feeling. A feeling of connectedness. A very basic ground of being, also. There wasn't space there as a concept for me when you were saying, "Try to drop the space, drop into the space," the amplitude of the space. For me it was like something in my mind was going like, this is not about space, this is about something else.

J: Okay, great. So there's a feeling there. What is there?

Q: The feeling of connection. It's a very basic, very primal, very... I don't even know how to put words on it, but there is an oscillation that happens when I'm in meditation and it feels like peacefulness, connection. It's more feelings than space. When you then said like, "Imagine there's no space," so in order to imagine there's no space, first you need the space in order to take it out.

J: Yes, that's fine. If space doesn't arise, space doesn't arise. But it's for those that have that vastness you know, because they came up to ask.

Q: But then when you started saying like, you know, "Drop the space, collapse the space," it was almost as if by putting in the space, the boundless became bound. Do you get what I'm saying?

J: Yes.

Q: Like all of a sudden I had something that was without boundaries, boundless, and I added space to it even though I didn't see that I could stop the sensation of everything looking the same way. It's more a sensational, feeling kind of a thing than an appearance, visual kind of a thing. I operate from here; so for me, it's not a visual crystallization or phases or nothing like that. It's more like this feeling that everything is merged yet boundless at the same time. It's paradoxical. Then by putting the space into it, it almost became more limited.

J: Yes. It's not about adding the concept. It's for those who find that there is a vastness inside, or if you can drop into the vastness, then we can take it away. But there is no point in adding a concept when it's not there. I wouldn't worry about it. But what I would be after is, okay your way of connecting to it or when you drop in, it's your feeling capacity is what gives you the sense. So that sense of connectedness. Can you recognize that your body-mind interprets that, that that's what happens in your nervous system, and then the body-mind interprets that feeling? But that the feeling isn't actually arising from where you are, that that's your body-mind's reaction when your perception is there?

Q: I can't identify it like because my mind, I guess my ego, I don't know what part of me, wants to think that this love, this connection, this is all there really is. For my desire to be awakened or connected, I want to feel like that's the most primary feeling where it came from. So I don't recognize it as the mind.

J: Okay, so when there's that feeling of connection, there's something connected to something else, and then those two become one? Is that what happens?

Q: Not those two, those many become one.

J: Many become one, and does that one ever disappear?

Q: No, I don't think so. I don't always access it, but I know that it's always there. It takes sitting down and sinking in. And almost always when I'm in the meditation, sometimes it will be very profound and sometimes it will be more subtle. I can always access it. Always.

J: Okay, it's a version of unity, no? Where everything merges into one, everything is recognized as one.

Q: It's everything is nothing.

J: And everything is nothing.

Q: Like, there's not a *thing*; there's just that ground of being.

J: Okay, that's okay. A ground of being without space.

Q: Yes, I mean I don't interpret it as space.

J: Yes, that's fine because your feeling capacity is very strong, so that's fine. I'm reluctant to push you further. I'm just reluctant to push you further. If that works for you...

Q: No, push me further.

J: No, something is just saying, no just... Something is saying... There's no something, all right, Jac.

Q: What I want to know, is that my ego identity, spiritual identity, or is that something real?

J: It's a nice zone you've got in, and it's really useful for now. And it will be the reference point of where the body-mind kind of hangs out, but your perception can go prior. Perception, your capacity to perceive, can go much prior, but that ground of being will be where the body-mind... Well that's where the body-mind resonates, and that can be there. It loses its importance. It loses its value. Like we were talking to Veda earlier, it will lose its value and it becomes just another experience. It's the same as actually getting caught in story. When it loses its value, then it's like, "All right, come on, the body's doing that; it's not important, so let's shift perception back." It's almost like your body needs to have that place of rest, that place of home of that connection, you know?

Q: Yes.

J: It needs to be there for you to have that. I'm reluctant to pull away that refuge because it hasn't been maximized yet by you. But knowing that there's more, this ground of being is

there all the time. You'll be saying this in six months, "This ground of being is there all the time. Is that it, is that it?"

Q: Yes, that's what I want to know, is that it or is being created by the ego?

J: No, it's that you're able to perceive what happens in the body-mind when your perception pulls out of the personal and the impersonal, and when it's back in that being, the place of being, isness, what is.

Q: How do I take me there?

J: No, me isn't there. When you're talking from there, me isn't there. Me is enjoying it but me isn't there. Me is enjoying the roll-out, the consequences of it, but the me isn't there.

Q: So there's nothing I can do to get there?

J: See if you can bleed that meditation state into your day. When you drop everything else, it's there. It's there. But you need to really, really maximize it, to be there. And your perception will leave from there, but that's as good as it gets for the body-mind. That's the natural state for the body-mind. It's natural. But your ability to perceive can go much prior to that.

Q: This is that place where I told you yesterday that I can access that place that gives me peace, but I need to be sinking into that place. Otherwise it's not... I know it's there, but it's not accessible unless I... It takes effort; it's not effortless for me.

J: Yes, that's it. And that's where the work needs to happen now, is that it becomes effortless. When it's more accessible, it will become effortless, you see? So go in there more frequently and get your system more used to like dropping in, dropping in. If you're driving the car, drop in and be able to drive the car. That would be a great one to practice, dropping in and letting functioning happen. Eventually you'll be able to talk and have a conversation while you're completely in that place of being, that ground of being. I would definitely do that. It's the more practical common sense way to do it, you know, steady, steady.