

THE PLACE OF RESTFUL AWARENESS IS WHERE THE RELATIVE MEETS THE ABSOLUTE

Satsang with Clara Llum – September 21, 2009

Hosted by Doris Weyer. Transcribed by Helen Harnish.
Total time: 1 hour, 57 minutes | Mp3 file size: 108 megs

Audio file available at: <http://www.archive.org/details/Satsang2009-09-21>
Clara's website: <http://clarallum.org/satsang.html>

In your heart there is already completion, perfection, purity, and peace.

While the mind seeks, the heart is.

The whole of the path then is about mind listening, and surrendering to the heart.

Thus becoming its inspired, bliss-filled vehicle.

Hear, hear, the invitation within.

(from Clara Llum's emailed Satsang announcement)

There should not be a difference between the silence when you are meditating, while nobody's talking, and now, listening to someone talking. They should be the same, because this talk does not carry more truth than the silence that you are listening to, maybe less. But apparently we need to listen to words – with the only purpose of removing words, words that are stored in our minds, our memories and that have the habit of getting in-between reality – or this moment – and our pure awareness.

We are using words to kill the habit of depending on words to see. So these words are destructive, they are not constructive. They want to get zero, to get silence, not to give you something you have to remember. They want you to forget, not to remember. If we are able to forget after we know so much, then there is a space of freedom.

And this freedom is different in depth from the space and freedom of the child who has not yet become invaded by a mountain of concepts. Because children have minds that have not been developed yet, so it is not the same situation that we are in.

The tool to destroy the attachment to thoughts, models, schemes, structures, ideas – the tool is inquiry, investigation, questioning, realizing that we don't know. We go to each thing that supposedly we know, we see it carefully and we find nothing solid. We don't know. But in order to inquire we have to be able to make room, to be spacious. Because if while we listen we are already crowded by thoughts, the inquiry fails, we cannot penetrate, we are too busy thinking.

So inquiry implies already a measure of pure awareness or abidance in no-mind, in no-thought, which is the only thing that is left when the inquiry has gone through to its conclusion. We are not left with another formulation of truth or reality. We are left with what we use to inquire – our attention, our consciousness, the light of our intelligence – that is what is left.

It's not a construct, it's not a theory, it's not a truth that you can write down. It is the essence of inquiry, a not-knowingness that is aware; the spaciousness of clarity which is always us, always present and always the ground of all experiences, be they thoughts or sensations, sensory perceptions, anything. All of them are embraced by this pure awareness that we are, the light of our being, which is the inquirer, the inquiring, and the conclusion of the inquiry, ourselves.

So if we are listening right now, that's all there is to it. If we are just listening, this is the true state, the natural state. If we are thinking, that is another layer on top of the listening, and we need to make room. If you are listening you have already arrived. There is no other message.

10:02

The problem is not thoughts, it's what we do with thoughts, or what thoughts do to us. That's the problem, because thoughts in good use are the result of this listening, of the silence, of this being, our own being, abiding in pure awareness. From that, naturally, flow out thoughts of enlightenment, thoughts of guidance, thoughts of illumination. That is opposite to the direction we are habituated to and which is not working: using thoughts to get to some enlightenment, some illumination or some wisdom.

Thoughts by their own, cannot. Silence produces wise thoughts but there is no thought that can produce wisdom, because thought left to its own is a machine that is blind. Thought is memory; thought doesn't know anything. Thought knows what was, but not what is. What is can only be known directly, without thinking: seeing, being aware. We have to put thoughts to rest, to be in the moment, to perceive reality. Thoughts left alone are like a mad machine that is trying to create something meaningful from scattered pieces, like a Meccano,¹ making something from many little things that have no natural connection.

The intellect left alone juggles with concepts, in hopes that it will arrive at some enlightenment, some realization. It doesn't work like that: thought has to be a servant, not the master. Only in being a servant does thought find its place.

It's the printer, the output device for something that knows, intelligence, which is without thought in itself, which is pure presence, consciousness. Then thought is only there to translate, communicate, in the level or field of the relative, the conventional, the conceptual. So concepts come after understanding, not before. They are the form that understanding takes; but first, understanding need to be there.

¹ Erector set.

The main obstacle to transcending the mechanism of the mind – that is in its own delirious activity of finding truth, juggling concepts – is the pride or arrogance associated with that intellect: wanting to be someone who knows, the investment in being someone who knows, a sage or an expert, someone knowledgeable.

If we carefully look into this mechanism of the mind, the autonomous mind, searching like mad, we would see that it is absurd, hopeless, helpless, powerless. It cannot get anywhere. If we are honest, looking into that mechanism, we will see that we cannot go anywhere like that. So if we see, looking with honesty, accepting, “I don’t know, I cannot know that way” – the mind will drop. The mind will relax, the thinking mind, this mechanical mind. Then it will accept its place, which is just resting, listening. And that will show what is left, which is our own natural state of being and of awareness.

20:24

We will start to enjoy our not-knowingness. And from that, paradoxically, we will also start to notice that clear seeing and clear understanding manifest when we have dropped the mind. After we are not invested in knowing, and we accept that we do not know – from that base, clear seeing and clear understanding will arise naturally. Because for the first time we are giving an opportunity to our natural intelligence, which was occluded by the activity.

Our attention was totally focused on the mad activity of juggling concepts, with no seeing, no paying attention, no inquiring. Now our attention is released from that madness. Now this intelligence that was always there, always here, starts to shine, starts to see, starts to provide insight, either for us or for others.

But most of all, most importantly, we will find the peace and completeness of that fundamental state without concepts. So we will not even need the insights that come, and appear, and manifest, and are shared, and then go. We will not need them. Because the natural state, which is nonconceptual, is complete in itself, and needs to resolve no question, needs to analyze nothing. So even wisdom or understanding is after the natural state. It’s a by-product, the consequence, an accessory. Understanding is an accessory.

Sandy: How do you get to that place, of understanding?

Clara: The place of understanding is where you already are, minus the questions. Minus the questions and the mind-activity or agitation. This place of understanding is your consciousness of being, right now, your consciousness of being conscious, right now.

You notice that you are. Are you? Yes?

Sandy: Yes.

Clara: Are you aware?

Sandy: No.

Clara: How can you say no?

Sandy: I intuitively know that I'm not "there".

Clara: Wait, wait, I am using the word "aware" in the most plain sense. I'm not asking you if you are enlightened. I am asking whether you are aware. Are you aware of sitting on the couch?

Sandy: Yes.

Clara: Ok, so you are aware. That's the awareness I'm talking about. So you are aware that you are. Right? And you are aware that you are aware.

Sandy: Yes.

Clara: Yes, because if you were not aware, you would not be aware of things. You are aware of the table, the room, the couch, the people in the room, you are aware of those things, so you are aware. That's the awareness.

Now, you are aware of being and you are aware of being aware. We have established that. I'm just recapitulating.

Sandy: Yes.

Clara: Now are these two assertions different or are they the same? Awareness of awareness and awareness of being are two different things, or the same?

Sandy: I'm not sure.

Clara: Ok. Let's inquire. In order to be aware of being aware, or simply in order to be aware, do you have to be?

Sandy: Yes.

Clara: So you have to be, to exist, in order to be aware. You cannot be aware without being, just being. If you were not, if you did not exist, you could not be aware.

Sandy: Right.

Clara: So you have to be, in order to be aware. And can you be without being aware? Can you know that you are, without being aware?

Sandy: No.

Clara: So to say, "I am," or, "I exist," you have to be aware. Otherwise you could not say it.

Sandy: Ok.

Clara: So they are the same thing. There is no awareness of being, and there is no awareness of awareness, one without the other. Both are mutually necessary. Beingness needs

awareness, awareness needs beingness. In order to find them, in order to experience them – you cannot experience beingness without being aware, and you cannot experience awareness without being.

30:30

Sandy: To me it seems like they are two different states.

Clara: We are exploring whether they are two or one. Again, you cannot experience beingness, that you are, without awareness. You cannot experience awareness without being. So they are inseparable. If they are inseparable, it's that they are features of the same state. You cannot be aware without beingness and you cannot be, without awareness. You cannot experience one without the other, the awareness and the being. So in your experience they are one. They are simultaneously present, in other words; simultaneously present in your consciousness and your experience – awareness and being.

So think of that. I'm not saying believe me. We are exploring. We are inquiring a lá Krishnamurti, or a lá Socrates. It's not something to believe, it's something to see, directly. You cannot experience beingness and awareness as two different things. They are always together in experience. Every time you are aware, you are; every time you are, you are aware.

The important thing, once we are at this point: these are two angles to enter the same state (they are like two aspects, two features).

They are separated only in our thought process. That's why you have to think. You are habituated to analyze and think, and since they are two different words you tend to preconceive that they are two different things. But they are not two different things if you look at them. That is the purpose and value of inquiry. We look into things and the concepts get dissolved, they get deconstructed. We are not attached to the concepts; they do not blind us anymore.

As I was saying earlier, once we are at this point, either we enter into the natural state through the pointer of being, or through the pointer of awareness. It's the same. If I say, "Be aware of being," I'm pointing to the same state. I'm inviting you to recognize one state that is with you all the time; it's the state of being, but with consciousness. So you don't overlook that you are, you stop to see that you are.

You notice your beingness. When I say, "Be aware of being," I am inviting you to take consciousness of the fact that you are. This is more fundamental than anything you are on top of being: that you are an American, a man, and whatever else – these are qualities or attributes on top of being. But: you are.

These things may change or not change, these other things on top of being. But being remains. This being that remains as just being – you can notice this beingness, that is equal to itself, moment by moment. Because it's not the things that are, but the beingness itself. This beingness can be recognized, and it is free from qualities. It is free from all these items that are associated with it.

This can be used as an introduction to this natural state. Or I can invite you to the natural state through the other door, of awareness. And I might say, "Aware of being aware." Can you be aware of being aware? Yes, try, just try. You notice that you are aware right now. You can be aware of many things. You can be aware of the room, you can be aware of the couch, you can be aware of the people, but while you are aware of all these things, you notice that you are aware.

Sandy: Something notices that I'm aware.

Clara: Yes.

Sandy: I don't know what that something is.

Clara: Wait, wait. Awareness itself notices. What else? We will get back to that later, but the point now is that you can recognize awareness in itself. How? First you are aware of being aware of things; you notice that you are aware of things. Obviously you are aware, in order to be aware of things; because if you were not aware, you could not be aware of things.

So things are second, awareness is first. In other words, awareness of things is second, awareness in itself is first, it is the basis. Now, in practice, while you are aware of the table you can be aware that you are aware of the table. You can be aware of this awareness that is aware of the table.

It is like three steps. First, I am aware of the table but I didn't pay attention to that fact. Second, I am aware that I am aware of the table. I'm consciously attending to the table. Third, I am aware of this awareness that is all the time in the background, that is the one that is aware of the table.

Sandy: It never stops, it keeps going back.

Clara: No, that's the end point – noticing the fundamental fact of awareness, regardless of the objects. That's the point. That's the natural state. It's the same state as we mentioned before, when you are aware of being, just being. Just being is without qualities, unqualified, without attributes. It is naked, it is bare, it is nothing at all, nothing in particular, just being.

When you are experiencing the nakedness, the formlessness of just being – which you can right now, but you have to stop and pay attention – you will not be able to touch it or to put a face or shape on it. But you will just experience the spaciousness or peace of what is just being. And you can see it, you can access this fundamental ever-present condition through the window or door of awareness. And realize that this awareness is self-luminous, present in itself, or can be recognized in itself just by noticing. Then it rests in itself, and at that point it is exactly the same thing as being.

When consciousness rests in itself, recognizes itself, without any movement, any attempt to go anywhere or to do anything, that seeing-ness is identical to the beingness, of just being. It's the same thing. This beingness and this seeing-ness are the same thing.

So we find that in the base of all the experiences, at any given moment, there is spaciousness that is clear, or that is luminous, or is perceiving – perceiving spaciousness, perceiving beingness.

40:14

That's what is constantly at the base, but we don't pay attention to it, because we are habituated to just pay attention to the contents, to the things that are changing, that are going on, on top of this beingness, or within the space of awareness, or whatever we want to call it. We pay attention to the changing elements but we overlook the ground, the base, which is pure space, spaciousness, which is aware. Awareness that is spacious, that is being.

You can access this natural state with either of these clues, these pointers: being or awareness. And it is not limited to either one of them, because they are the same, and it transcends the language and it transcends these access points. It is at the same time luminous and spacious.

So that's the place of understanding that you asked about.

But that place of understanding is empty. It is empty in itself. It is always populated with things that are being experienced. But in itself it is empty, like a mirror is empty. A mirror is empty but constantly there are images on top of the mirror, reflections. It's normal; the reflections are constantly changing but the mirror remains empty, essentially.

Which means the image never sticks, it never adheres, so it never contaminates or pollutes the mirror. In the same way our pure natural state of empty awareness is never contaminated, never tainted. It never gets dirty; it is always pure, always empty, always clear.

That's the place of understanding – even if there is no particular understanding. It's just watching TV. The place of understanding is watching TV, the place of understanding is listening to Satsang, the place of understanding is playing ping-pong, cooking, coming up with some idea, maybe a poem, a song, any by-product of creativity.

This place of understanding, this emptiness that you are, this conscious or this knowing emptiness that you are, is creative. This is another of its qualities. It is empty, it is knowing, which means clear or luminous, they are the same, and thirdly it is creative. It's all the time watching things. But it's never, never, never touched by things. It's only touched by things when it believes it's touched by things – because it can; it can create the illusion.

This beingness can become identified with anything, and can say, "I am this, I am that." At the moment, when the beingness says, "I am Republican," at that moment that beingness has limited itself; it becomes identified with its own magical creation, its own product of imagination. And then it suffers because of that limitation that it has imposed on itself.

But this imposition and that limitation is illusory. It remains empty, but now has created the feeling that because I say I'm such and such, I am carried away by the dynamics of that. I suffer the vicissitudes or changes of that experience. If the Republicans are winning I am happy but if they are losing I am unhappy, because I have tied my sense of beingness to that.

But it is something illusory, something artificial or imaginary that we have done. It's like what we do in dreams, same thing. In dreams we become a character. This character may have an accident in a truck, the truck goes on top of him or her, so the character goes to the hospital. Something bad happens to our character in the dream, but all the suffering and all the vicissitudes or experiences of that bad situation are all imaginary, all illusory. When you wake up it's gone, but you suffered while you believed that you were that, and you were in that body suffering those conditions. It was imagination, but that's how it works.

We are always free, we are always this pure consciousness that is empty of content in itself. But since this consciousness is creative – it's like a mad artist, always inventing things, and we have not recognized ourselves, this pure consciousness, the creator. We have not recognized the creator. We are constantly carried away or are taken under the destiny of our creations, because we have associated our sense of being with that.

We have created this character here in this appearance, which is the dream again. "I am Barbara", "I am Clara", "I am Sandy". It's illusion, it's false, we are imagining that. We are the pure consciousness, which is without a body, without shape and which has created the idea "Oh, I could be Barbara", or "I could be Clara".

Then, not satisfied enough with the idea "Barbara" or "Clara", it has jumped to the inside of it, like in a dream. You incarnate, you put your life, your consciousness, within the creation. It's like the author of a movie script – he writes the movie, he writes the script and then he even jumps in and identifies with one of the characters, and forgets that he wrote the script; and then he suffers all the destiny of that character.

Sandy: Again, how do you jump back out?

Clara: You are already out, but you have to recognize it, that's all. So what is the "out" part, that you are already enjoying? The abstract, formless, shapeless, nameless feeling or sense of being that is unqualified, that we found minutes before, when I asked you, "Are you?", "Yes I am." This "yes, I am" comes from this spaciousness, formlessness. Because I didn't ask you, "Are you American?" – I asked you, "Are you?" – which is the base. Are you hungry? No. But maybe in an hour you will be hungry. The "hungry" changes, from not hungry to hungry, but the "I am" didn't change.

50:20

So the "I am" that is below, you can recognize it right now. The only sadhana or practice is to identify yourself with that – because now you are identified with Sandy and all Sandy's things, and me Clara, with all Clara's things. So it's only to identify, to first find, what we are talking about: What is this beingness? This beingness is the sense of being, the feeling of being in its formless, essential expression. And then, once you are able to identify it – then get identified with it.

Re-associate your "you" with you, to your core you, to your base you. Liberate your you-ness from everything, and return your sense of you to your true you. Maybe this is confusing in

words. Anyway, now you are saying, "I am this, I am that, I am the other," but you never stop to abide in your pure self, your pure beingness.

Start returning your consciousness to your basic sense of being, and start withdrawing your sense of being from everything else. Start disbelieving that you are everything else, because it's a belief only, it's a projection. Everything is a projection. "I am a man", "I am a woman." To be a man or a woman you first have to believe that you are a body. Well, that's false. So if that's false, the other is false, because it's another layer on being a body.

This does not mean that some things are not more comfortable to you than other things, of course. As long as the identifications keep presenting their own inertia, you are more comfortable one way than the other, but this is the play of the identifications, the play of the acquired conditionings, the play of the identities with which you have identified, or created.

But we have to disbelieve all that, even while still we play, or while they are being played. We have to disbelieve. We have to know that it's false, we have to know that it's a dream. That's all. Correspondingly we have to start getting more used to resting in our naturalness which is just being, just awareness, without qualifications, without shape.

So that's the place of understanding. But maybe "place of understanding" is not the best expression – because in your naturalness, in your beingness and your pure awareness, understanding is something that appears and disappears. It's another phenomenon; it's another item that arises and dissolves. If we were understanding, we would be understanding all the time.

So you don't have to worry, "Oh, I don't understand, I am confused." Because being is not understanding, like being is not like being blonde or redhead. Being is being. So understanding comes and understanding goes. Confusion comes, confusion goes. Don't worry about it.

Now, what happens is that the tendency to confusion fades. When you have dropped this mechanical mind, because you are resting in your naturalness, you are resting in your place of being – you have dropped the mechanical mind so your intelligence is at rest, but it is present: it is awakening.

And then this intelligence that is without any compulsion, and without any need or neediness to know has the space to see things, and sees things. And understanding becomes the general experience, the norm. But this is a by-product. But at other moments there is no understanding in particular, there's just being. What is constant is the spaciousness, the freedom, the peace. This is always here. It's like if the noise is very loud you don't hear the silence, but the silence is there. The peace is there. If you are agitated and worried you don't see the peace below, but the peace is there.

So sat-chit-ananda,² these are the constants of the natural state. Sat is being; chit is consciousness; ananda is spaciousness, freedom, bliss. It's enjoyment, the enjoyment of just

² <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Satchitananda>

being, of just being aware. But it is enjoyment in a very broad sense. It's the enjoyment of not having compulsions, not having boundaries, not having thoughts that take you in any particular direction. It's freedom, freedom from knowledge. It's enjoyment, yes.

G: I had a talk yesterday with some monks, and their concept of bliss is – not there.

Clara: Depending on the tradition it is more or less explicit, but in the Tibetan tradition ...

G: This was Theravada.³

Clara: Yes, Theravada is more austere. The Tibetans talk about the union of bliss and emptiness, for example. For the Tibetans, the state of enlightenment is bliss. It's sat-chit-ananda, same thing, bliss in emptiness. But for the Theravadans maybe it is the absence of suffering. It's nirvana, what they call the extinction of suffering. It is the equivalent to enlightenment or realization, but it is not something that is emphasized, the joy that is in there. What is emphasized more in the Theravada tradition maybe is the absence of suffering, or the peacefulness of it.

1:00:38

G: Well he was talking about the voidness.

Clara: Yes. The problem is when you find some Buddhist who is talking from concepts, from readings, from ideas.

G: This was a monk.

Clara: Yes. You can be a monk and still be talking from concepts, I'm telling you. It happens. That's the problem with concepts, you get stuck. You get attached to some label and you don't see anything. There's no voidness – that's a wrong simplification of the Buddhist term sunyata.⁴ It is not void or voidness, sunyata means other things.

It means empty of intrinsic existence. It is a term that applies to the dream, to the relative reality. It is an understanding about the nature of things that do not exist independently, on their own. They are composed and changing, composed of everything else, interconnected. You cannot separate something from everything else; and that's what the term sunyata means, that there are no objects that exist on their own, that there is nothing that has intrinsic nature or existence.

So that's emptiness, or empty of intrinsic existence. That is the sense of the word . And also, the word sunyata, that I just said applies to relative reality, as the ultimate truth of things, that things are not things – it also applies to absolute reality. When sunyata is applied to absolute reality it does not mean void or emptiness, it means formlessness. That the absolute or totality has no

³ Oldest surviving Buddhist school. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Theravada>

⁴ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sunyata>

particular shape but contains all the shapes, all the phenomenon. So it is not empty, literally speaking. It's not empty of everything, but is beyond all forms in itself.

And because there is nothing outside of it, it cannot become or be made an object. It is not an object that relates to something else, or to us. The "we" – this body, this phenomenon – is within it. So emptiness also points to that nonduality, to the fact that the totality or the absolute cannot be made an object; it cannot be objectified.

And that's what emptiness means. That you cannot touch it, you cannot perceive it, you cannot grasp it, or describe it. It's as if it were nothing, but it is not nothing. It is that, since there is nothing outside, it cannot be made an object that you can touch, perceive, describe, etc.

Steve. That's our problem, that we're trying to do that. We're trying to find truth by somehow conceiving it. We need to stop doing that.

Clara: Yes. We cannot objectify or grasp the absolute, but we can be it, because we already are it. So that's all we can do. We can be the absolute – since the absolute is all there is, it follows that we are it already. In other words, it is and we are not. If we are something, giving us license to be something, then we are it. But in any case, it is, but us: we are not.

The absolute is and we are not, so we cannot grasp it. We are in it, and we are it, if at all. It is, already, and we can be it because it is the only that-is, the only truth that there is, the only reality that there is. We cannot grasp it, embrace it or touch it or meet it. But since the absolute and the totality is all there is, we can at least, or at maximum, as Steve said, somehow renounce all our attempts to grasp it, and relax in what already is. And that's it, there's nothing more. So when you relax all this dualistic thinking mind, this grasping mind, conceptualizing, etc., this is the same as resting in your natural condition. This is already all the absolute that can be.

You are not touching anything, but at the same time you are not jumping outside of it. You are not disturbing the already-truth of reality. When you are wondering, when you are seeking, searching, you are creating a false movement outside of the already-completed-ness or wholeness of reality, this infinity, this totality.

If this totality is all there is, it is already complete and perfect; when we do something to achieve it, we are jumping outside at that moment. We are disturbing it – if it could be disturbed, let's say. But in terms of what regards us, we are disturbing the already attained peace of the totality, the attained-already perfection, completeness, of the totality. So if we simply don't step outside of ourselves, in looking for whatever is the holy grail of the Supreme or God or the totality – if we stay where we are, then that is already realized, already accomplished.

It is the movement in search of it which disturbs its very, very, very already-ness, its immediacy. That's all. We cannot grasp it, but we can happen to be it, if we don't pretend that we are not. That's the categorical point. We can be it if we don't pretend that we are not, if we stop pretending that we are not and that we have to search. Don't pretend anything, and you are already it.

1:10:49

That's it, because it is it. It doesn't need you, to be it. The absolute does not need you, or me, or us, to be it. It is, in spite of us. So just join with it, fuse with it. How? In not pretending you are not fused with it, in not believing you are out of order already. If you believe you are out of order, that is what you are projecting.

It's very difficult to communicate this. But in other words, there is no subject or witness of the absolute; there is no subject or witness before, that can experience the absolute. But when we disappear in our natural state, we are the absolute. That's all.

Barbara: But when we are seeking, isn't that just consciousness, the absolute, seeking itself?

Clara: Yes. But that's the play of the absolute, in the projection of the manifested, in its unfolded version, which is the manifest reality. Yes, of course, everything is the play of the absolute, the seeking also. But that is the game, the detour. What we are talking about is the returning or dissolving all the manifested. That here in the manifested we can find the end of all that. The manifest gets to its end, arrives to its end.

Now you say, "But who has made the manifest? And who has made that process that arrives to that end?" Well, it is inside the absolute. The manifest is its own game, it's own play, to see itself. The infinity of possibilities is the absolute itself, and within these possibilities are all these things that happen. And we are illuminating this one course of possibilities, for example, and this is one of the universes.

In other words, we are taking one of these possibilities and thinking of it, dreaming it, and animating it as if it were real. It's not real; it's a virtual reality. Maya⁵ or Shakti⁶ or the manifested is the apparent unfoldment of what is a possibility, but has never happened. It has happened only as a dream.

G: But a dream is real.

Clara: Dream means that when it is over, you see that it never was real. It never happened. It never left the mind. It never left the imagination, consciousness. It never materialized.

G: But this dream is realized, it is Maya.

Clara: No. When you dream at night, everything is material too, and when you wake up it has never been material. The same way, the material experience is part of the illusion, part of the dream. When you wake up everything is gone and you say, "Oh, I imagined that." What is imagining? It is taking one possibility and animating it, giving it your attention, recreating it in your consciousness.

⁵ Power which governs illusion, the dream of duality. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maya_\(illusion\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maya_(illusion))

⁶ Creative power. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shakti>

You recreate it in your consciousness, you give it tones of reality in your consciousness, and when you stop paying attention, then, "Oh I was daydreaming, I was imagining." Where is that? Nowhere. But you gave to that possibility, to that concept, you gave it reality in your feeling, in your mind, in your consciousness, by paying attention. You animated it, but it never happened.

This is how the manifestation relates to the absolute. It is an apparent unfolding. This consciousness, this pure consciousness that is infinite, that has all the possibilities within it – has imagining power. Of course, because it contains all of the possibilities.

When this imagining power is given space or free reign; then it can endow with life or animate those possibilities. It's like a writer who has conceived many characters for a novel. Many, many characters, thousands of characters that he has drawn in his infinite mind. (It's a metaphor that I'm saying.) He takes a little nap after having thought of all these characters, and then his imagination goes wild and starts imagining a play with all these characters.

And for awhile what he has just schematized becomes a tale, in his nap, of all these characters, very alive. It has never happened, but it's a virtualization of what is possible with the elements that were possibilities. And in the nap, he is inside of the novel. That's the case exactly. That's why it can animate, because here, now, we, who are this pure absolute infinite consciousness, find ourselves within the body.

So imagine the degree of identification. It's crazy. It's inconceivable.

Steve: This identification weakens us.

1:20:07

Clara: We have fallen in our own illusion.

G: But if it's just a game and we realize it, we have done nothing wrong.

Clara: Nothing wrong.

Sandy: How can we awaken?

Clara: Again, it's just as I responded before. I know it's the same answer; you will say I'm very repetitive, but it is the same. It's by returning to your sense of being, which is naked, from being this or that or the other. By disbelieving that you are this or that or the other, and staying content with just being.

Sandy: Apparently my belief is very strong.

Clara: Yes, because you have not stopped enough, in just being. You have not given yourself the opportunity to experience that.

Paul: We have given up the desire to awaken.

Ann: The wakefulness doesn't believe in Ann or Clara. The wakefulness knows that they are just a dream. So when you are just being the pure awakeness, there is no Ann, there is no Clara.

Clara: Yes, it's true. But you have to give yourself the opportunity to experience that.

Ann: The only thing in the way is the attachment to being Ann.

Clara: Yes. And that attachment is normal, because it's what we come from; it's the habit. It's normal to have these strong attachments to all the forms, all of the manifestations, all the phenomena, especially because we have not been introduced to what liberates us. We have not been introduced to the means of liberation. We have never been presented to the reality of our pure beingness, pure consciousness.

Now you have heard from someone, from a teacher, not only from me, from Krishnamurti or from Nisargadatta or Richard Rose, that you are being and consciousness, or being-consciousness, sat-chit. Now you have to enjoy: sat-chit-ananda, enjoy your self-consciousness. That's what all the teachers of non-duality are teaching.

You have to enjoy being-consciousness. But you have to stop your activity that is identification with things; you have to stop and rest. Give yourself the opportunity to enjoy being-consciousness. Or, to be conscious of being, however you want to say it. You have to give yourself that opportunity. You have to give yourself that practice, that sadhana.⁷ Until you do that you have not tasted the freedom and the peace that is with you all the time.

You overlook it all the time, and you are taken or carried away by the world, by the circumstances of the world, the circumstances of your character, the identifications. So this is very strong, such that you have not experienced your true self. The more you experience your true self, the less strength, the less power the illusory world has to grasp you, enrapture you.

It's just that sometimes we have been exposed to teachings, but for whatever reason they have not broken the barrier of theory. They have not become something that you understand livingly, directly. So it's theory, theory, theory. And then we have not made any progress, because it's all words. It is not because the teaching was not right, sometimes it's because we have not found the key to our door, we have not found the right words, the right teacher, that speaks a language that touches us.

For example, my father never understood, reading Krishnamurti. He spent forty years with Krishnamurti and he got nowhere. And I was feeling his pain that he didn't advance, when I was that age, 12 or 13. And then later, at 14 or 16, I was very conscious of that. I saw that he was stuck. And then I started to offer him other teachings, other authors: Yogananda, Muktananda, Sai Baba, Osho, everyone; "Read this, read this, read this." And he was open to read.

⁷ Spiritual practice. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sadhana>

And one day I told him, “Read this.” And a few weeks later he says, “I have found my teacher.” It was a book that I gave him by Nisargadatta, *Seeds of Consciousness*, a Spanish translation of a little book of talks, *Semillas de Conciencia*. He liked that book very much, and then he went and ordered *I Am That*. He read *I Am That*, and then he came to me and said, “I found my teacher.” And then he ordered two more, so he had three copies, one in the painting studio, another at the apartment at the beach, and another at home. So everywhere he was, he could read *I Am That*.

And that teacher helped him a lot. And there was nothing wrong with Krishnamurti, but there was no penetration. Sometimes we have 40 or 50 years listening to teachings and we get nowhere because we were moving in the theoretical all the time. We have to reach a point where things start talking from inside. When what the teacher says you understand from inside. Then we are touching something and we are going somewhere.

And most importantly, at least in what I am saying here – which is the same thing that Nisargadatta and other teachers say, Ramana Maharshi and Krishnamurti – that when we can rest in our pure sense of being, or in pure awareness, then we may still go and share with the teacher, but we don’t need the teacher anymore. I’m telling you. Because now we are in the vehicle already, of the awakening. We are already in the boat, in the ferry that crosses samsara.⁸

When you are able to rest in your awareness, when you know what these words mean, you have got the essence of the teaching; you don’t need the teacher anymore. Now you will fully awaken, fully awaken. But we have to break this barrier, and understand what we are talking about.

1:30:07

Barbara: It appears that your father was stuck, and yet that interconnectedness, of how everything worked out and worked through you, and where it led him – isn’t that just consciousness manifesting itself?

Clara: Yes, of course. It’s the play of the divine, it’s the drama of the divine. Nobody can figure it out. The manifestation is the expression of the absolute, of the infinite. The infinite contains everything, and the manifestation is how the infinite sees itself. And since everything in the manifestation is the expression, the manifestation, of the absolute, there’s no way to escape from the absolute. Because there is no outside.

It’s what I was trying to say before, when I said, “This manifestation has never happened.” It means that we have never stepped outside of the absolute. It has always been just the absolute, having this dream and becoming identified with the dream; but it’s something that happens within him, within it.

⁸ Cycle of birth and death, suffering. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Samsara>

It's not that something has taken a separate existence, that would be the material, the external reality – the absolute and the relative, the manifest outside, something apart. "Oh, where is the absolute? How do we get to there from here?" You can't, because there would be different things: there would be the snake and there would be the rope. But there is no snake that is not just a perception, projected on the surface of the rope. There is only the rope; there is only the absolute.

Do you see that analogy? You were walking in the jungle and you jump because you see a snake. But then you pay attention and you look carefully, "Oh, it was a rope." It's a rope so it always was a rope. When you saw the snake it was really a rope, but your imagination made you project a snake on the surface of the rope. Has the snake ever existed? No, only the rope, but we saw for a moment a snake. It's the imagination.

How can the snake appear in the rope? Because infinite things can be projected on top of the rope. Not only one kind of snake, but hundreds of types of snakes exist as possibilities to be perceived on top of the rope.

So the infinite, the totality, the absolute allows infinite perceptions, infinite interpretations, infinite projections. These are all the manifestation. They are all definitions of the absolute that are false, but that appear thanks to the absolute, that is allowing something to be imagined on top of it, superimposed on it. Without the absolute there would be no manifestation; without the rope you cannot imagine, you cannot see the snake.

Barbara: And yet sometimes it seems so absolutely precise. It seems like when things come, they're not really random, in our experience.

G: It is precise, it's complex, it's the world.

Clara: It's precise but it's an imagination. You go to see Star Wars or Avatar, the movie, and you are amazed at the exuberance of alien beings and machines and spacecraft and all that. Is anything real? No. It's just made by man, by imagination. It's the same thing. There is no limit to imagination. This world could not be what it is, so profuse, so rich ...

Steve: So difficult ...

Clara: All that - without the infinite power of imagination. Imagination is an unlimited power, so much that, out of the absolute it makes all this. It takes the absolute and makes all this of it, to the point that even the absolute is confused. So what a power? Who is more powerful, Shiva⁹ or Maya? I would bet on Maya.

G: Because this is not the only creation.

Clara: Well, it doesn't matter. One or one thousand, it's endless, endless, endless.

⁹ Unmanifested consciousness. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shiva>

Endless, but every single moment, every single situation is out of the creation, out of the manifestation. Which means, it is a revelation of the absolute, because it happens in the absolute, it happens thanks to the absolute, on the body of the absolute, on the non-body of the absolute. On the spaciousness, the infinitude of the absolute.

Every single spark or speck of the dream is the absolute, touches the absolute, reveals the absolute. Because it is not actually happening. So you can see the snake, but you're seeing the rope, actually. You can be very much convinced and even be afraid, and jump and everything. But exactly where the snake is, the rope is. Exactly there, simultaneously. Everything is the absolute and nothing is hiding it.

What I'm saying is that the relative or the manifested never has separate or autonomous existence, from this formless infinite of possibilities that imagination chooses to see this way or another way. Chooses to see we are here, Barbara and Clara, in this room – or we could imagine that we are on a planet of hell or a planet of gods. Well, we are lucky we are on this so-so planet – that we are choosing to imagine this, let's say.

So it is never separated, the relative, the illusion. It's never separated: every single moment is the formless, the absolute, hidden in plain sight. Because if you drop the names, the identifications, the projection of the mind, you drop the thinking – what is left is the pure beingness that is formless, abstract, which is the absolute itself.

1:40:04

So you are left with the rope. You still see the snake, you still see the form, but at the same time you know, you experience – if we can say these words – you are established, if you prefer, in the formlessness, that is simultaneous with the form. Because you have understood that the form is projection, the form is name, the form is label, the form is thought-concept. You have understood that, you have dropped Maya at the moment. However the snake is at any moment, you see that the snake is a projection; then you see simultaneously the rope. You see the formlessness, simultaneously.

So that's the only thing. Returning to our beingness, our spaciousness, our pure awareness, then we are resting in the infinitude, nothingness, where the dream appears. And the dream we know it's the product of thought, the product of conceiving, naming.

Every moment, every corner of the dream, in its timeline, in its course, is the entrance to the absolute. Every one. So there is no way we can get lost in the dream, in the relative, orphans from the absolute. There is no way because the Truth is the absolute and the relative is its play.

Barbara: If that understanding is there, the realization of the dream, does the dream state change? Does it affect how we live?

Clara: Yes. Why not?

Barbara: It creates a different dream?

Clara: Yes, it happens. The consciousness of the dream alters the dream, modifies the dream. Sometimes a little, sometimes a lot. But the more you are conscious that this is a dream, the more freely the absolute that you are plays within the dream, assumes more of its own power. It's logical.

The consciousness that first was identified with the character now knows that she, this consciousness, is the infinite potential. It is released from the script, to some degree, to the degree that it has been liberated from its beliefs. The beliefs are what retain the infinite power of consciousness in this or that condition, until consciousness says, "No, I don't believe I am this or that, I am free from this or that" – and knows itself, then releases the belief. And power returns to power.

Power becomes self-conscious. It is not invested, it is not identified with the particulars of the dream. Then it can create. But this is a process – of this consciousness, being released back to itself, claimed back to itself from all the traps of thought, of belief, where it was identified. So that's the emergence of the samskaras,¹⁰ the thought forms, the thought patterns. So it has to disbelieve all that.

It can happen gradually or more quickly, depending. But this is when in the manifestation, which is the dream, the character becomes apparently powerful. That's what the term siddha,¹¹ in Sanskrit means. Siddha means the one who is perfect, the one who is powerful, the one who has power. Siddhameshwar Maharaj, for example. The term siddha is to denominate not only the one who has realized who they are, but has released all consciousness out from the dream. Who has disbelieved the whole dream, and now, dreaming consciously, this consciousness is fully liberated.

So there is no limitation to its expression within the dream, when the consciousness has recovered itself from all the beliefs, formulations, patterns in which it was invested. It's all that. It's a degree of realization. Ultimately, in the Indian tradition they would call it avatar,¹² or full incarnation of the divine. In Buddhism they would call it a Buddha,¹³ when this consciousness is totally liberated. Within the dream there are no limits. It is an agent that can transform any aspect of the dream.

G: It's the matrix. [reference to the movie]

Clara: Exactly. Agent Neo, he's the One. It's a metaphor. It is true, you can experience it at night, if you dream consciously. You start to acquire powers within the dream. That's a training. You first start to realize that you dream. Second, you start to realize that you are aware while

¹⁰ Mental dispositions <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sankhara>

¹¹ Perfected master. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Siddha>

¹² <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Avatar>

¹³ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Buddhahood>

you dream, so you become aware of dreaming during the dream. Third, you realize that you can change aspects of the dream. Fourth, you master the dream.

At that point you can wake up or keep dreaming, but you master the dream. You can explore the infinitude of your imagination in the dream. You can go out to planets of your imagination, to tour, to learn, whatever. But it is all false, this whole creation, so what is the meaning of that?

It is a training for here, to wake up here, to develop – not to develop but to recover the full power, which is then in use for the release of all consciousness everywhere.

1:50:49

Wherever consciousness has identified with a body, with a character in the dream, like Neo was identified with Mr. Anderson – so you go, you enter the dream of all the Mr. Andersons, to tell them, “You are dreaming, and you are in another place dreaming this.” That’s your mission, then.

Steve: Sometimes the consciousness wants to keep dreaming.

Clara: Yes. That’s the truth, that’s a fact. In order to wake up we have to have had enough of the dream. We have to be at the end. So that’s another instance where we can say it’s perfect, because no one can wake up before it is time. No one can wake up, “Oh, you have wakened me. I wanted to dream a little bit more. Now you spoiled my dream. Now I’m awake – what a bore.”

It never happens, because you place your own barriers, it’s a self-regulated device. You don’t wake up because you don’t want to wake up, so no problem. Everyone who is complaining, “Oh, what can I do to wake up?” - they are just trying to convince others or themselves that they want to wake up. No, it’s not true.

G: That’s our condition?

Clara: Yes. You have to exhaust the experience of this manifestation. You have to exhaust it. You have to come to a point and say, “Well, that’s it.” Or, “That’s not it.” You, who else?

Ultimately, no matter where we go, or don’t go, no matter where we attend teachings or don’t attend, everything is exactly the course of perfection. Everything is exactly what we want, what we need. Everything fits and fulfills our path. So there is no way to make mistakes.

Everything is us. It’s us, and Us beyond the us. The other Us, the big one.

Everything is Us as the self, as the absolute, giving us what we need. Everything is Us, the absolute, God, the self, the divine, that is guiding our life, perfectly, step by step. There is no way that it is not that way.

And everything is our little me, or little us, or ego, or whatever. It means that everything is also in correspondence with our mind process, understanding, etc. Nothing is in disharmony with what

this person, this character needs to experience at every moment. Everything is the right experience for this illusory character with which we are identified at the moment. We are in the right place at all times. Do what you have to do. Everything is exactly as it corresponds.

Barbara: We cannot be disharmony.

Clara: No, because again, when has anything ever stepped out from the totality, the infinite, the absolute? Never. Everything is contained in the absolute, in the infinite, in the totality. So everything is its very being, its very creation, its very form, its very manifestation. There is no way to fall outside of the divine.

Namaste.

Thank you.

Recording ends at 1:57:38