

*The fact that there is just awareness - in the way that I hear it, that's totally neutral. It's just this blank, it's awareness - so what? But then at the same time - and my own experience seems to validate this - when that nothingness is kind of just let be, this amazing love does come through. So there is something that's called love, that's not just awareness . . .*

*And what is love? Is it some kind of energy? Is it an obligation? Obligation is the wrong word, but is it a force that wants to happen; that isn't happening because it's twisted or misconstrued or something? You know what I'm trying to say?*

'Absolute wisdom sees that I am nothing; absolute love sees that I am everything'. (Those aren't my words.) Everything is generated from unconditional love - all of this is only unconditional love manifesting as a wall or a flower or a candle. This is unconditional love, candle-ing. You are unconditional love, Bill-ing or Joe-ing or whatever (that's to say, that body/mind is). All of that is generated from a totally liberated unconditional love - which is beyond our normal concept of love, which tends to be needy, which tends to want things and need things.

This love is totally radiant; it fills everything. But it also is neutral in the sense that it allows everything. It's a totally liberated love which allows any manifestation. Nothing can be except in that love, including Hitler, or whichever baddy you have in your head.

And certainly awakening is totally beyond just the idea of awareness. Certain people teach that awakening is the seeing that there is no doer; that consciousness is all there is. But there's something that *knows* that consciousness is all there is . . . is the lover . . . is the ultimate . . . is what you are. There's a stuckness in that idea of just awareness. Something still hasn't blossomed - unconditional love.



*I'll take a risk here and speak for most of us where ego's still arising, while you're on the stage speaking from an awakened perspective, as you tell us. My question is, I know there is nowhere to go, as you say, and no one to go anywhere, but how does one lift that veil, so to speak?*

You can't, you never will. You can't lift the veil because the veil is the idea of 'you'.

*How does one drop that?*

One doesn't drop it - but it's dropped by a seeing that there is no one. There is no one. There is no one there - there's just, if you like, space in which things apparently are happening (only apparently).

It's getting a sense of moving behind that guy who's always been around - you know, that apparent guy who's always been around . . . And just behind that apparent guy who's always been around is the one who knows that guy standing there looking at me. You know that; you know that there's something just behind. Everyone in this audience knows there's something just behind watching them sitting there looking at this. Incidentally, what's happening here is that you are listening to you. It's me speaking to me, and something in there knows this.

*So practice is futile? Any sort of practice?*

Who's going to practise? Who's going to practise - the guy who's going to get there? 'I'm going to go on practising until I get there . . .' And so he is constantly in a state of 'getting there'. But where is he trying to get to? There is nowhere to go. This is it, as it is. Practice only reinforces the sense of me practising. It is the spiritual ego at work.

*But it seems to me that the opposite of practising would be to just carry on like everybody else . . . You know, the great majority of the people in the world out there are just going about their ways, their ego ways.*

Absolutely, it's the purest meditation. In a way everybody is

searching. They're all out there looking for something, whether they think it's wealth or whatever you like. Actually, really what they're looking for is this. Everyone is a seeker, but once there's a recognition that what you're looking for is beyond you, then there's a readiness to die.

Then there's a tremendous relaxation and you can just stand the way you're standing and be the way you are and nothing has to change - it's absolutely divinely perfectly appropriate. The way you are is exquisite. It's a total change of perception. It's not about - oh, you know - 'I could be better' or 'I have to change' . . . It is totally around the other way, in seeing that what you are is totally exquisite - just as it is, with all the neuroses and problems that body/mind thinks it has. That is the unique way it needs to be.

*I appreciate what you're saying, I really do, but one thing I would like to say about it is that for Tony Parsons, before you realised that there's this empty space, you were on some sort of a search, you were looking . . . I mean, from what you say in your book and some other things I read . . . I don't know if you would call it a practice, but you were seeking, you were looking, right? There was kind of a quest for 'What is this life all about?' And that's different from your average Joe Schmoe who's out there doing whatever.*

It's the final step that's taken . . . I mean, most people live their lives without, let's say, seeking enlightenment. At death, of course, they find what they've always been seeking all their life, because they've never moved away from it. But in life, when there's a seeking for the final resolution, yes, it is the final seeking - but it's all the same seeking. It's only that you've refined it down to the final search (which, incidentally, is the death of 'you' - that's the final realisation, that there is no 'you'). But that seeking out there is just as sacred as this seeking in here. There's nothing more worthy about this as compared to that - it just feels more worthy, to be a seeker for enlightenment rather than wealth.



*It seems that from the body/mind reference point there are emotions, the whole range of emotions that arise, and there's an observer there or there's a witness - or rather, there's a witnessing, a watching of this occurring. But is it that there are different levels to this, a deepening or a refining of the recognition . . . ?*

OK, so as far as I'm concerned, observation is still to do with the mind. For me, the word 'self-observation' is simply the mind watching the mind, or the mind watching what seems to be happening. It has no relationship to awakening at all, because usually in self-observation there's some sort of judgement or analysis of what's happening, and the need to change that. That has nothing to do with liberation - it has to do with manipulation.

Impersonal watching is another phenomenon that takes place when somebody is opening to the discovery of their original nature. First of all, there seems to be a watcher - that's why I suggest to people that there's something behind them watching them sitting there looking at me. That in a way is certainly the first opening for many people.

*So that's like an all-inclusive type of watching?*

Yes, but that falls away also. Just as the invitation falls away in the end. Once the invitation is accepted, there's no need for an invitation. So the watching and the invitation are in a way, you could say, preliminary steps or preliminary happenings (that makes it sound like a process but it isn't) that seem to arise when there's an opening to the realisation of our original nature.

For me, Tony Parsons, when watching used to be there, it was somewhere sort of up there (*pointing behind the head*). For some people it's all over the body; for other people it's in the head. It's a simple seeing of what is arising without any need to change it. It's the first beginning of awakening. It's the initial sense of impersonality.

*OK, and in that beginning of awakening, as one deepens in that contentment, does the personality experience emotions? Is there a level of deepening where those don't even arise?*

No, they do arise. We're coming back to the fact that it has nothing to do with individualism. Emotions arise in this body/mind. I have to say that for this body/mind they don't have the drama, there's no great charge to them anymore - there is simply an emotion that arises and lives for a few seconds and then is no more. But let's be clear about this - emotions arise because I am this, I am that. It's not to do with the individual - it's to do with the whole of manifestation. And at the moment, for this body/mind, the whole of creation is this. This is the creation - there isn't anything else - nothing else exists.

*So, to be a bit more specific, is there a charge that arises as one deepens?*

When you say a charge, there is an energy in the emotions or feelings have a charge . . . It depends what you mean by charge.

*Like a hook to . . .*

No.

*A charge that would create a contraction.*

Oh, contraction can happen, yes. But that only is there - and then not there. Nothing can live for very long in this. There's no one there who's taking delivery of it. I keep on having to come back to this thing that awakening has absolutely nothing to do with this individual. I am not liberated . . . And if somebody tells you they are liberated, walk away, or just say 'Yeah sure, and I'm Shakespeare'. It's meaningless. There is only liberation, there is only light, this is the light. I don't see anybody here - I only see being in the form of apparent people. There's nobody here.

