

TRUE BEING IS UNSELFCONSCIOUS
Satsang with Clara Llum – Miami, November 17, 2008
Hosted by D. Weyer.

Clara: Consciousness is attending thoughts or sensations, but we are missing consciousness itself. Who is attending consciousness?

So, it's not important the object of our meditation, or how successful we are in following that object; that's concentration, although it's called many times 'meditation'. When we follow after an object, formal object, in the form of thought, or in the form of sensations, that's concentration.

But meditation, in a more pure sense or meaning, is not the activity of consciousness following phenomena. In a more pure sense, meditation is consciousness aware of itself; consciousness tracing itself back to the subject, the one who is attending, the *one who* is being aware of things, phenomena, thoughts, sensations, whatever is happening in what we call the world outside. So, tracing consciousness back to that source, the subject, that's meditation in a pure sense.

In the tradition of Ramana Maharshi is called self-abiding. In the tradition of Great Perfection is called contemplation, or is called rigpa. It's the same thing.

It is the practice of not being distracted, but remaining together, or collected, within oneself, within self. And self means awareness. Self is not the person, is not the formal identity, is not the body-mind. Self is completely beyond any description, any limitation, any category. Is the infinite space of awareness; it is that which can not be grasped or destroyed, and where everything happens, arises, as within.

Our practice of each moment is contemplating. Is this natural meditation of embracing all that is, all that appears, within myself. Is the practice of being aware of myself, as this limitless space of awareness. Is not missing this all-containing space, which is luminous because is cognitive, full of perceiving capability.

This practice is nothing that can be forced, or contrived, or manipulated. So we have to develop a very felt, or simple, spontaneous sense of confidence in its availability, in its omnipresence. Because this self-awareness-emptiness that is full of cognisance is always present, always here. So, we have to assume that confidence that we don't need to fight or put an effort into fabricating that

state of awareness. On the contrary: we have to trust that is just that, just this, what we already have; what already is, right now.

But, delivering satsang doesn't help. Because at the same time that may help, it creates distance, it creates the false perception that "it must be difficult, if I am here attending to someone telling me all this". "Otherwise, why would I attend, if it is something of which I cannot go away". "If it is something I cannot miss or lose. If it is my very nature, I would not need no one to tell me."

So, that's the price we pay by attending satsang; let alone attending other teachings, let alone! Teachings that deal with the complexity or the complication of going after many special effects or experiences. If we attend those teachings we will get even more the impression that it's so far and so complicated.

Here we are in a station, let's say, in a subway station that says "you are already there", that's the name of the station. "You Are Already There". Here. You know, Times Square. So, 'Already There Square'. That's an advantage, that at least the name of the station says that. So, we are forced to at least say "Well, ok, so I have to look here, not going anywhere. It's not the next station, it's not five stations away from here." But still, still we get the impression that we are *looking for*, because we came to attend.

But, that's my job now to tell you "Ok, don't be deluded by this appearance that we are here attending to someone that says 'It's Here'. Don't be deluded by this choreography." Ok? Just take all that is happening here like a pretext, like an excuse, that you have given to yourself to remember "Right now, I'm back to myself". "Right now, I am myself". I'm saying this within yourself, within each of you, like if you were saying that, ok? In order that you say it, within yourself. I'm putting my voice within you, so you say it. "I am within myself. This is my dream. I have created this choreography, this little scene of a movie. Not only to remind myself. I don't need to remind me. This is it. This is it. Right now. Right now: this is myself." So, right now: see that. See that: "this is myself. This is all myself. All that I'm seeing is myself, and I am this infinite space that is containing it." Is that close. That close.

This is the practice. The practice is here-now, containing all this. Knowing you are this awareness. Knowing this is all you.

While you look at me, know that this is all you. So you are not looking to Clara, you're looking to your own self.

So it's like this is my challenge, somehow. That we transcend the appearance. And... ok... I can see Barbara, Kirsten, Steve, Mischa, Guisele, Ann, Doris. I can see 'these people', but still: this is all me. So, I'm not saying you stop seeing 'things'. Form is form. But form is emptiness. The two are two, the many are many; but the two are not-two. Because consciousness is what contains these two, these seeming two. But the seeming remains. The seeming two remain.

Doris: What's the difference between awareness and consciousness?

Clara: Ask the inventors of English language. [laughs]. Because in Spanish there's no difference. But somehow it's a matter of taste. Sometimes you say awareness, sometimes you say consciousness. There's little... Of course you are better prepared than me to answer that, because... Maybe not you, because you're German, but these American people here.

Ann: Awareness seems more active.

Clara: Well, my impression is that although there's no essential difference, consciousness relates more to something structural. Is more close to other concepts like 'thought', 'thought-process', 'memory', or 'mind', somehow. Consciousness is more close to that. For example, there's expressions that say "if it's in your consciousness to do" this or that, related to judgement, for instance. Christians have a use of 'consciousness' in those terms, that consciousness is (the base of) the guiding principles that you store in your soul.

Ann: That's 'conscience'.

Clara: But it's related. You see?

Ann: Conscience is related to consciousness?

Clara: Yes. It's from the same root. That's how the term consciousness may get you, subconsciously, to... And you see, another sense: 'conscious', 'subconscious', 'superconscious', all these expressions that have to do with memory, that have to do with perceptions.

And 'awareness', from my point of view, is not that structural. It doesn't have so much connotations, or connections, or senses. It's more related to immediate perception of events –of the mind, or of the world, of the body, of the senses. It's more immediate.

Kirsten: Almost feels more naked.

Clara: Yes. But essentially there's not much difference, for me.

Mischa: Many teachers that I have experience, don't make a distinction. And some, such as Nisargadatta, do, as I've read him. Awareness is closer to the absolute. If I'm not mistaken he says Awareness (with a capital 'a') cannot know itself, whereas consciousness can. This one is somehow more embodied, more personal. Awareness is more further back to source. However, other teachers that I love, make no distinction.

Clara: I think, even Nisargadatta, which I have read to some extent, and that I consider of my family, somehow, I think he contradicts himself many times.

Mischa: Absolutely.

Clara: Like Ranjit Maharaj, and even Siddharameshwar Maharaj. They contradict themselves. Not counting also the fact that they didn't speak English, to begin with. They have been translated from Marathi. Well, not Ranjit, who spoke English a little bit. So, I think if we try to dissect what's consciousness, what's awareness, even what I said before is not of much use; we'll get confused. I suggest that you just take it as it comes in the moment when you listen to a satsang person; whatever it means for you at that moment it's okay. That's the closer you can get.

Ann: They even use them together. 'Conscious awareness'.

Clara: Yes. I use that many times. 'Conscious awareness'. Yes, just to avoid cacophony or redundancy, that would be the expression 'conscious consciousness', or 'aware awareness'. [laughs] So, in order to avoid that cacophony, or repetition, you say conscious awareness. It's another way of saying 'awareness being aware of itself'. 'Consciousness being aware of itself', that's the meaning of conscious awareness, or conscious consciousness, or aware awareness. That's consciousness, or awareness, aware, or conscious, of itself. That's the meaning, and that's what I was pointing few minutes ago, when I explained 'this is what meditation is about', or contemplation, or rigpa.

It is just naturally falling back to this implicit, intrinsic, capability of cognition that we have right now, in a way that we are present in it. We are present in this awareness or cognition that we are enjoying right now, because this is us. So,

we are present in that. But, in being present in that, we don't have to make particular effort or struggle. That was my point, and again, I'm saying it back.

Sometimes we read some teachings about that; maybe Great Perfection, Dzogchen teachings, and it may start to sound really complex, really complicated, like if you had to walk on a razor blade, "oh, you can fall from the right side, or from the left side", "is that complicated, keeping the track is so difficult". It sounds like that when you read some places. And it's not that. It's not that. A certain dose of confidence, helps.

Steve: [comments about how the only obstacle is doubt]

Clara: It's true. That's something on which Ramana Maharshi was insisting very much, in many of his teachings or talks. 'Just remove the doubt, and that's it'.

Steve: Even if there's a little, how to remove doubt? And I think this applies to any area of my life. How would one go to end the suffering?

Clara: Yes. It's completely right to say that doubt is how our conditioning manifests, because is how intellect, which is the platform of this conditioning, solidifies or presents itself. That's how intellect presents itself, in form of questions or doubts.

Sometimes you can not help but question, but ask. To go through doubt and solve it, sometimes you have to just follow the course of this intellect that wants answers in its own terms, intellectually, and you just ask the question. Like now for example, without going further. That's an example. So you ask. You have a doubt, a question: you ask. Then you get an answer that may, somehow, give some relief, or some pacification, to this intellect, that somehow fills the hole in form of knowledge, or instruction, or wisdom. And you get satisfied, for the moment, until the next time doubt appears from this doubt-making machine that is the mind, intellect. So, sometimes we have to ask. We ask and some answer may come. And through the answer you get into a stage or moment of silence, and you flow more in the present, you are ready again to listen, to be open and go through the present, because mind has been pacified for that while. It's like giving a candy to the mind, so the mind gets entertained, pacified, and consciousness gets back to the immediate.

Steve: But when is wisdom arising, not so much the head knowledge, not so much the intellect getting the candy, where there is no more doubt, that doubt

does not come into the picture, that doubt is history in every area of our life, that it doesn't arise anymore?

Clara: I was getting there, but step by step. [laughs] I was trying to describe what happens in actual circumstances. Mind is fabricating these doubts and we provide answers. Not me, just a book, or you ask someone. Because you were saying you would have doubts or questions that pertain to relationships, or finances, or other mundane subjects too. So you go to your lawyer, you go to your marriage counselor, you go to different people that can help you to resolve the questions that you have in so many departments. This helps momentarily and you get to the next moment with your freed awareness. But yes, this is not the solution, this is not a permanent solution, because mind tends to repeat this cycle. Before getting to the ultimate point, which you [Steve] wanted me to go, when I was answering the question I was seeing another step.

The other step is that which we could characterize as prayer, or devotion. That's another step. Not for the mundane things; (but) even for the mundane things, for the worldly concerns also. But for the spiritual, the metaphysical; even to address the ultimate question: peace, happiness, joy, liberation. The very simple way to face all these challenges, or needs, or wants, or concerns, is just surrender these needs, or this questioning mind-feeling, to the Totality –if you want, to God, to the Supreme, to the Source, call it Universe, I don't know, however you may call it. If that way or that approach is within your nature, within reach for you. Because, of course, many people cannot do that. But other people can do that. If you have a sense of having a relationship with the Supreme, with reality as Intelligence and Power, you may, naturally, turn to that Principle. And you may give yourself in body-mind to that all containing Intelligence-Power. That's a very direct way to address any question, all questions. And this is not yet the nondual approach. But who cares. It works.

It works, because the truth is that this body-mind, that may be illusory, which we are surrendering, but that we perceive as real, the truth is that this body-mind which we surrender, even if it's *not-two* in regards to this Totality, or this Intelligence-Power, anyway it happens and it arises within That, within that Supreme Principle, Power-Intelligence, or God, if we want to call. So, there's nothing, absolutely nothing wrong or mistaken in that act, or attitude, or approach of surrender, if that is one's nature, the nature of this body-mind, to take that road.

This is an approach that is multipurpose, all fulfilling. Because in the relative manifestation, every problem has particular, specific solutions, or specific solvers; specific resources you have to go to solve. If your car doesn't start, you call your car shop, you call triple A, or whatever, to tow it. Specific problem, specific solution. But even in this relative manifestation, this universal consciousness rules and takes care of everything, even the relative concerns.

When I sent the weekly message, yesterday, I think I wrote, "There is a simple way of living, where there is no thought of misery or division."¹ That's trust. Trust is that way of living.

So, you pray. You give yourself, -your little self, your apparent self, your person; the self you believe you are. The self that you believe you are in your conditioning, in your conditioned mind. Because this little self, this person, belongs to That, anyway. It belongs.

Who is doing this? All this. Who is doing all this? That Totality. So, why worry! Why worry. Is not my –when I say "my" is this person, is not my responsibility, is not my burden. Ramana Maharshi used to say: 'it's like, you are in a train, and you are carrying your luggage on your lap, or on top of your head' [laughs]. 'Why are you doing that? Put it on the floor! The train is carrying it anyway.' [laughs] But we have this attitude, this belief in this little self, that "we have to take care". So, we are duplicating the effort. Creating an unnecessary effort. That's the prayerful approach, the devotional approach.

Kirsten: This conversation reminded me a lot some things I'm becoming more aware of, so I'm gonna try to expose, kind of in response to what you were saying, some ways that help me. Have been almost like that doubter. Is to understand that that doubter is here, like in my living room, so I just let the doubter sit there and be, then I can go back. That doubter has permission to be there, then I go back into myself, and find that quiet space and sink into that. And trust and know that the answer to what I need actually comes from the silence and not from knowledge. There was something that I read last week in one of these printouts of one of the talks, that you said something like... I realize now, me as Kirsten realize now, that the answers are not gonna come

¹ I use to send a reminder by email to my satsang friends one or two days before each meeting, and I compose a quote for each message. That was the first sentence of the quote inviting to this meeting (November 17, 2008). The full quote was: "**There is a simple way of living, where there is no thought of misery or division. Intimate spontaneous trust in the all-one. Thus, the waters of devotion meet the mount of wisdom**". [Note by Clara Llum]

from my mind, and I have more trust in that silence. And the way that I can kind of touch that silence, is like I almost sense it, like when you were saying right now “I’m not Clara”, I almost sensed into how would feel that I am you. And for an instant I felt something, and then a contraction. And it was all not verbal, it was sensing. And I think that for me that’s how I get more in touch with silence, it’s through a sensing. I kind of let my mind do what it needs, like a little dog that’s just barking, but I sense him.

Clara: Thank you, Kirsten. I will condense, for the recording, that you spoke about that what works for you is being more in touch with your silence, and contemplating, or addressing this talking mind, or doubting mind, as a content of this awareness, from the silence. So, somehow including, letting be, this thinking mind, or protesting mind, or doubting mind, or voice inside, as part of the content of the present, and your being in touch with the silence. Then you can somehow transcend, rewording what you said. You were saying also that even during these sessions of satsang, you have had some moments of sensing what is like being the other, or the other being one. The sense of nonduality, or non separation. Including the seeming other in oneself from that silence, from that non verbal, non intellectual, presence.

Kirsten: It comes almost like a curiosity, like a kind of moving towards.

Clara: Yes. I’m glad that these moments of insight, or let’s say realization, happen. I’m glad that they happen. For you. And also Mischa last week was also sharing another moment of that kind, of sensing, or experiencing, oneness, or unity, non verbally, non intellectually. Even if these moments are ephemeral, they are very valuable because they give us a glimpse on the nature of reality, on the absolute aspect of reality. And this absolute aspect cannot be grasped, or fixated, or objectualized, or converted into a permanent experience. You see? Because the nature of experience is to change. So, these moments of little samadhi, or satori, or kensho, or understanding, or insight; or experiences of love, or unity, or oneness, come and go naturally, because that’s the nature of experience itself. But what remains is the insight, is the understanding that they provide us. And this understanding is the intuition, the knowing, the knowledge that this is what it is, actually: that there is no separation. That separation is the projection of thought; the projection of thinking, mind; the projection of words, that create the division, that create fragmentation, that create the objects through which our perception works. But what is attained, through this coming and going of the experiences, from the ordinary divisive perception to some non ordinary more non divisive perception, what remains or what is attained is an amount of intuition or insight, of understanding.

Barbara: [tells us of also having gone through those moments of merging mentioned above and about how for her the experience is usually accompanied by “the fear of losing myself, the loss of my boundaries, my identity”, and then she experiences contracting from that, back to the body-mind sense, back to her known persona]

Clara: It’s funny that these mini samadhis are happening here. It’s a good signal, it’s an indicator that shakti is present here and we are being *touched* by Reality, we are being shaken from inside, and the structure of our thinking mind and persona is being questioned, so intensely, so closely, from inside, that the ego fades, it blinks for a moment, it disappears for a moment.

Ann: I had it happened something like the reverse of that. I have been absorbed into the emptiness, for several days, and then I woke up with this feeling, it came even before the thought, and the feeling was “what about me?”, and so the thoughts were “go after this person who wronged me”. I had to force myself to question the I. And I used the method of Byron Katie to go back: “well, is that true?”, “what do I get when I believe that thought?”, and that was useful, then I was able to go back to sleep, and then I woke up feeling better.

Clara: So, did you use Byron Katie’s method to go back to the person?

Ann: When I was getting all agitated with this “what about me?”, that was giving rise to all these angry thoughts about how was I gonna go to correct things, and be angry at that person who wronged me. That subsided after I actually had to go back to sleep and wake up again. But in order to work with it, because it was really very negative and strong.

Clara: Then that was at the end of some days of resting...

Ann: In the emptiness.

Clara: Ann is describing a recent event of experiencing a state of being without much thought process or concerns, “in the emptiness”, and how she moved out from that to the activity of ego, as a voice claiming for herself, for this person. And how she had to take care of that crying ego by practicing ‘The Work’ of Byron Katie, as a way to stabilize again between the ego and the practice.

It’s very interesting.

Going back to what we were talking before in reply to Steve's question, we have these different steps, or layers, or stages. In the ordinary approach, when we have questions, we ask for solutions in the relative world. Next step, if we have a sense of the One that rules everything, we resort to that One in prayer and devotion; and that is an approach that resolves everything. Even if it solves everything through specific resources, still our mind-heart is pacified through this trust, or giving our body-mind to that source, to that Intelligence-Power. So, that's a deeper approach, bhakti.

And going further, another step: we are that all-containing Power, Consciousness, Intelligence, that can embrace, include, console this crying mind, by just being, by just staying here-now, by just being present; which is what you, Kirsten, suggested. This going back to my all-including, all-inclusive awareness, where this crying mind-heart arises. This is the nondual approach.

You are this all-powerful God that takes care of it by just staying with what is, with the lament, with the voice of need, of wanting. You are this Silence that listens to that, while listens to itself. And that's the ultimate trust, the ultimate refuge, and the ultimate relief. Being this consciousness that remains, is present in itself, while the mind chats. And this chatting subsides naturally, spontaneously, because this awareness is the source of all peace. So, when this awareness attends to itself, the chatting that happens within subsides, because the Master, the Lord is revealing itself more present, and naturally pacifying, satisfying. This is the nondual bhakti. Nondual devotion, nondual trust.

But both approaches, the nondual bhakti and the dual bhakti, are not contradictory. There's nothing wrong with the dual -or dualistic- bhakti. 'Clara', if I can say that, this body-mind, practices both. Sometimes I see myself, -and when I say 'myself' now I'm referring to my person, my body-mind, I see myself practicing conventional devotion, like 'dualistic' devotion. Like praying, like mantra, like prostrations. And other times is just the awareness that contains everything; with no projection, or externalization, even in thought, or in attitude, of this Source. But even when I'm practicing conventional devotion, the nondual contemplation is there anyway. In other words: the knowledge that this principle of Divinity to which I'm praying is *this* consciousness itself, myself. That [knowledge] is there, simultaneously present. But this doesn't prevent me to actually feel, and execute or practice, these formal devotions. Doesn't prevent me, because is just another act of nature of this body-mind. Not only that, is an act which is an expression of the Holy, or of the Sacred. Is an acknowledgement of the Sacredness. So, why not? Every morning, I make my prostrations to Siddharameshwar Maharaj; and every morning, before

leaving home, I bow to Ganesh, to Kuan-yin, to Shirdi Sai Baba and, again, to Siddharameshwar Maharaj², with some mantras to each of them. And that bowing is an acknowledgement of the body-mind, of this person, to that Principle, in ‘dualistic’ terms; but, at the same time, while this is happening, this consciousness is aware that all that, all this devotion, is contained within itself, as myself.

But, no matter how much this consciousness could or would remain in the knowledge that ‘I am all’, or that ‘I am He’, still is –for me, very important to not miss, or keep practicing, conventional devotion. Because the body-mind can easily go into the self-aggrandizement trip³. It’s very easy. So, the body-mind is always surrendered. I keep myself, in terms of body-mind, always surrendered to the Divine. Because the line between ‘I am all’, as Self, as consciousness; and ‘Clara is all’; is very thin. So, “I am the Supreme Guru, I bow to no one”. No! Clara bows to everyone. I bow to you. I do namaste to you. Because you also are manifestations of the supreme principle. You are the supreme principle, actually, disguised as Steve, Ann, and so on. So, I bow and I salute to the Divine that you are. While I also salute to you as people, to your persons.

You see, all these levels of practice are not contradictory among themselves. All of them can happen simultaneously. If I have something like a health issue, I take a pill, or I go to the doctor, or I go under the knife. Whatever is necessary. And I did it before, I went under the knife several times. But at the same time, there’s the other layer. That’s knowing that God takes care of everything; I don’t have to keep the burden on top of my head. The burden is on the side and God shows me the way, the next step. Not only that. He is my body walking to the next step. There’s no doer: He does everything. ‘He’, ‘She’, whatever, I don’t mind. God/Goddess does everything. He/She is walking us. I have put my burden on the side, through surrender, through prayer; and at the same time I watch how this body-mind goes to the doctor, or goes to the pharmacy, or takes the car to the shop. And I know, while all these things

² Ganesh represents my connection to the Hindu tradition, specially the Vedantic and Tantric teachings. Kuan-yin comprehends the whole of my Buddhadharma background and is the source of my nirmanakaya. Shirdi Sai Baba personifies the archetypal avatara-guru in its pure non sectarian way and the inner guru. And Sri Siddharameshwar appears as my original parampara nondual sadguru on the Nav Nath satsanga.

³ Actually the preceding warning is mentioned only to illustrate the need of surrender from the side of the seeker. Not that when understanding is present there’s need anymore to neutralize egotistic thoughts through dualistic practices, since awareness takes care of any thoughts naturally through its intrinsic light, without intervention of will, and without personal attempt. In the spontaneous state, satchitananda, elements like pride, if arisen, dissolve by themselves, with no need for purification, as waves on the ocean of Reality.

happen, that is God doing that. And on the other layers, superior to that, I contemplate all that as my dream, my consciousness. This is all this Consciousness that is manifesting all this appearance. This limitless infinite Self. This is all Me.

But I don't get fixated in concepts, here or there. This mind has no structure. In other words, what we were saying sessions ago, is like the spontaneous improviser performer of the instrument. This mind keeps no mold, holds to no formula. This mind is always in the flow, empty. So, I will not create fixations about "oh, I am devotional", or "I practice devotion", or "I am the Self contemplating Myself", or... Garbage! I just said all these things to you one minute ago, for the sake of, somehow, clarifying; but I don't hold these concepts myself; I don't keep track of how I work, what I do, because "me" doesn't exist to begin with. If I don't keep idea of myself, how I can keep track of how I practice, how I work. I did that just now to explain you. But it's just a picture, a painting that I made of Clara. But Clara keeps no record of "I am devotional" or "I am practicing Dzogchen, or rigpa". Nothing. Bullshit. There's no structure. Is all that that I said, but in a completely free flow. Free flow. I don't follow a plan, I don't follow a program, nothing subjects me to a particular process or sadhana. The Totality is happening!! If it rains, rains. If Clara postrates, Clara postrates. It's just an event that's happening. I have no plan. You see? But in retrospective, it's happening like that, as I explained. But I don't keep structure in my mind. There's no mind, actually. No mind.

The mind is just a collection of words that is summoned for when we meet. When we stop meeting, mind goes fff...!: nothing. When the meeting is over, fff...!: no mind. Just driving, driving the car home. The car is being driven by this body-mind. Everything *happens*. No mind. Maybe music, maybe radio, maybe nothing. Whatever! There's nothing, no mind. You see? Talking with my husband, totally conventional, totally normal, like any other couple seen from outside. Absolutely! Do I have an idea that I am this or that? No. No! Do I keep a belief "I am the wife", "I am Clara Ibanez", or "Clara Llum", whatever? No! Have any idea of myself? No. Am I playing a role? Neither! I'm not playing a role. Is not that I know "oh, I know I am the Consciousness, I'm playing the role of the wife, I do it very well". No! Neither! Is totally spontaneous. But I don't dwell in anything. Everything is what happens. But there's no trace. There's no trace. Is free.

Attender: No problems.

Clara: No problems. Free. If there's problems, problems may be part of the landscape. There may be problems. Sometimes my computer misbehaves, and I kind of get frustrated, or worried, or concerned. But it's part of the flow: consciousness is watching that. Even sometimes I say a mantra, to the computer, to God. All is part of the same thing. But there's no separation, there's no fixation, there's no structure. Everything is the same flow. All is the same flow. The flow of the Totality. Who says "this is where Clara starts and finishes". I don't keep any concept. No concept of a person or a personality. This is just appearance, all. But I don't play a role, I don't fake. I don't interpret a role. I don't pretend. I'm totally where I am, I'm totally the character. But at the same time of being totally the character, totally involved in whatever is the action of the moment or the attitude of the moment, at the same time I'm totally free.

It's difficult to express because it's like it cannot be at the same time, but it can be. You understand. You are totally there, but at the same time there's freedom. You see? But you are not playing a role, you are not pretending. You are not faking it. But at the same time there's the space that contemplates that. You are that space. And I'm not missing that space; which is what I was pointing to you before, saying "naturally, you are already that space, acknowledge it". So, that acknowledgment is there, and that gives infinite room, infinite freedom, that goes with whatever is happening, with your apparent feeling, attitude, role, whatever. It gives infinite space, infinite freedom. It's funny that you sometimes may be frustrated, or angry, or whatever, but you are not buying it. You are not buying it, and this is not buying you. That is not kidnapping you, or getting you. You see? Cannot take you, cannot catch you, cannot capture you. It's like being a fish that plays with the net. It plays with the net and it's never captured.

I guess I'm saying all this because through this you can see. I guess through all this you can see. But I reiterate, as "me/myself", I am not fixated in concepts about myself. I ask you don't be fixated with concepts about myself, or yourself by the way. I say this like a point of view, like a reference, like an example. But this naturalness is yours too. Anytime, at this moment. But you don't need to capture it, or pin it down like a butterfly, in order to be able to absorb it or to incorporate it. No, don't do that. Don't pin it down, no need. Don't make anything artificial, you are okay like you are. Just be yourself. Know that you are free. You are free.

Kirsten: [gives us an example of how someone used to honk when someone else crossed on the road, and one day that person decided to observe his

impulse and not acting it out – she asks: isn't this a way of manipulating the situation?]

Clara: You are the Self, you are the awareness, or the consciousness that is behind 'manipulating it' or just going with the habitual reaction. You are the awareness or the consciousness that would witness any of these two behaviours.

Kirsten: One feels more contracted and the other feels more spacious, and so I have a judgement that "the spacious is better".

Clara: Okay, fine. But you still are the consciousness that embraces both. I do many honkings, [laughs] and I enjoy it! I play it, I somehow let myself go like if I was angry, but at the same time I'm not angry. You see? And my husband, when he is at my side seat, he takes it seriously –what I do. I don't take it seriously. I want to let them know. For example, some situation that I honk very much is: your driving down the street and at one of the intersections, someone driving ahead on the same lane gets crossed in the middle, where it is even forbidden to make a turn from that lane. So you have to stop, wait and drive around them when no one comes from behind. When they do that and I get there, I honk with passion, letting them know "this is not what you have to do", "this is wrong, you are interrupting the course of the cars, you should go further into the middle". So, I let them know, very wrathfully. You see? Who cares.

Kirsten: [points that sometimes it feels as if she is reacting from her ego]

Clara: Of course, but still you make distinction between ego and non-ego.

Kirsten: Yes, like "the non-ego is good". I make that judgement.

Clara: But the ego doesn't exist! There's no ego. [pause] There's no ego.

Of course, again, we get back to a subject that we talked before. It's always confusing. Because "ego" has two meanings. Ego, in one sense, is "I am someone separate". This is what I say that doesn't exist. This ego doesn't exist. What exists is the *notion* "I am someone separate", the *assumption* "I am an ego", or "the ego exists"; all these are equivalent. The notion that an ego exists, this is a misunderstanding, this is a belief that is wrong, a false belief. This is one meaning. But we believe that, or you believe that. "I am someone separate" or "the ego exists". No.

And the other sense or meaning of the word “ego” is what the belief in ego has created, in terms of behaviours. Of course has created self-defensive behaviours: fear, desires, needs, and so and so. It has created a personality, an egoic⁴ personality, a personality revolving around, or spinning around the false belief in ego. So the *egoic* personality, yes, it exists. The egoic personality that we call also “ego”. But when I say “the ego doesn’t exist” I mean that, in the pure sense of the word, the separate self doesn’t exist.

In that sense is what I say, when you say “I do that from the ego”, I say “forget that!”. There’s no ego. You didn’t do that. Because there’s no *you* that did that. It’s just a pattern that it’s owned and belongs to the Totality. But this pattern, of course, has been created through the assumption of a separate entity. But start by releasing the concept, or the idea, or the belief in that separate entity. Start from there, and then just watch the pattern as something that happens within this consciousness, which it is not “mine” or “me”, in a sense of separate entity. It’s just a wave in the ocean. So, somehow, you have to destroy the “ego” that owns that. Because that ego doesn’t exist, so you have to disown that, and being able to watch it as an event in your awareness. And then if it still happens, it’s okay, because you are not holding it, or reinforcing it from this “ego” belief, or “ego” sense. You are watching it from awareness and the tendency may play itself, and awareness may allow it, or this awareness may cause this pattern to be released or to be dissolved. But, anyway, you are free from it. Whether it dissolves or it keeps playing itself, once is reframed from awareness, you are free from it, because there’s no ego that owns it. It’s just a behaviour-pattern, created originally by the belief in a self, a separate self. That created the need to “defend myself”, or “vindicate myself”, or protest, or whatever. Pride. Of course in the honking, originally pride may be involved, or whatever expression of this sense of ego. Anger, or pride, or self-entitlement, or “I’m a better driver than you”, whatever. [laughs] I can see all that, when I’m honking, but I don’t care, because I’m not *believing* it, essentially. Essentially I don’t believe this ego; I don’t believe this pride; I don’t believe this “better driver”, or whatever, but I see it, and I may allow it to play. Me as consciousness, I may allow it to play because “okay”, I find it fine that the other gets a message for the best of all people who are driving –maybe next time he drives a little bit better, out of the way. If I can help! [laughs] ‘Honk honk’, “move out”, “that’s not the way driving”. But I don’t take it seriously. So, I don’t take myself seriously –this behaviour or that “ego”, that my husband says: “oh that’s very uncivilized, you can not do that here in Miami”,

⁴ Egoic meaning selfish, self-centered, egotistic.

[laughs] “some people can get out of the car and beat you” [laughs], he says to me.

Barbara: [inaudible question]

Clara: Barbara is asking if that approach of just embracing the behaviour from presence or awareness, is a more direct or natural way of transcending or releasing, than trying to change or to manipulate that behaviour. I would say, in a way, yes. But even, as I replied to Kirsten before, if you manipulate your behaviour as an experiment, that's fine too. In any way, in any of the cases, what's important is that you somehow fall back to your all embracing awareness, which contains either response: the automatic response, or the more sophisticated response that intervenes in your mechanical behaviour. Okay, that's fine; you have been able to identify your impulse, your habit, your mechanical behaviour, and you are able to intervene; but you are judging it from another corner of your conditioning. A conditioning that says, “oh, I should not be that aggressive driver, that uncivilized driver, I should be more polite, more feminine [laughs], women don't go honking like that”, you know. Whatever conditioning is saying to you that you should behave in a different way. So, you can do that, but in any case, if you go back to your awareness, you will transcend all behaviours, and your awareness will take care of whatever you find better for the moment. But you will not need to process it intellectually. You will just be spontaneously doing this or that. And it will not be a problem for you, because this awareness takes care. So you will just honk, or not honk, but that will be it, that will be the end of the question: you are already the next moment. After a honk, I'm done, I'm just: keep driving. I don't think, myself, “I did the right thing”, or “I should be more polite”, or whatever. That was my answer from awareness. You are in peace. You are at peace with it, whatever it is.

Steve: I'm having this sense of celebration. This liberation is a sense of peace, a sense of freedom that's emerging. It just sounds so simple. But what you're talking about, the ego, the sense of separation, this is a new awareness for me. And I want to celebrate it, because I feel like this new awareness is going to open up freedom and liberation.

Clara: [singing] “It's the age of Aquarius, age of Aquarius...” [laughs]
“Aquariuuuus”.

Steve: I'm not gonna try to figure it out, I'm not gonna try to intellectualize it.

Clara: No, no. I'm just playing. [Ann keeps singing Aquarius on the background]. I'm just joining the party with you, the celebration.

We are in such celebrating times. "Obama: Change" and all that, you know.

Ann: Obama is the Monkey God.

Clara: Monkey God. Hanuman.

Yes, Mischa.

Mischa: [inaudible question]

Clara: The question is "you are watching a movie, and there appear Woody Allen and Diane Keaton; do you make a distinction between the two characters?" My answer is: you make a distinction if you stop to make a distinction. If you stop to think about. Then you may make a distinction. You see? But to make a distinction you have to ask yourself about that, first.

If you are, somehow, just *flowing with the moment*, to use very hippy terms, [laughs] [Ann keeps singing Aquarius] (now that we are in the Aquarius, you know) so, if you are just flowing with the moment, there's no much room for 'distinctions' or 'not distinctions'. That's my feeling.

Mischa: To enjoy the movie, to experience the plot of the movie, don't you need to invoke distinction between characters? If they are all one...

Clara: Of course there's distinction, but there's no specific consciousness of the distinction; then there's no distinction. You see? If there's no specific, explicit consciousness of the distinction, we can say 'there's no distinction'. But implicitly, of course there's distinction, because I can say "oh, Woody said that to Diane", and if you explain the movie to another, you go into those descriptions, like if there were different individuals or subjects, and so on. So, obviously you make distinctions, implicitly. Right? So, of course. Of course, there's always distinction.

Plurality is not overridden. Is not deleted, is not erased. But it is transcended, without being eliminated. Because you are not emphasizing the distinction. You are not denying it, you are not emphasizing it. Is just part of the functioning of phenomena. Distinction is part of the functioning of phenomena. Part of the functioning of the mind, that works through words; and that processes this

oneness as plurality, through the structure of those words, that are implicit in mind.

Mind is nothing else but words. Mind is mantra. “Mind” and “mantra” have the same root of the word. Mantra means ‘protection of the mind’, and is also words, sound. Specific sound. Mind is made of specific sounds. Is the computer, the combining, the permutating device, the gambler of sounds; and through sounds creates, produces, or projects this plurality, from an undifferentiated whole, undifferentiated mass, or *one, magma*. So, phenomena – or manifestation, and mind, are the same thing. Are just this expression of sounds, of forms, of concepts, of words. And all this is implicit. So, when awareness is not fixated anymore in that functioning, that’s Liberation. But the functioning continues, by itself. The functioning of this phenomena manifesting itself as plural. Phenomena continues, but no one is being fixated, or fixating it. So, it flows spontaneously, without owner, or without specific trap into these distinctions. Mind is not getting trapped by itself in the concepts that are there anyway. Concepts are there anyway, but the mind is not stuck in itself, in these concepts. Mind is just without *folding*. It does not fold over itself; it’s just flat, it’s just flowing.

Ann: It doesn’t take ownership.

Clara: It doesn’t take ownership. Is just blind to itself. It’s just flowing in itself. It’s just the ocean creating waves that don’t analyze themselves. That just flow. And another wave gives pass to the next wave, to the next wave. So, the distinctions that are there, but implicitly; nothing is attracting attention to them, to perpetuate them. The distinctions are not interested in themselves, in being perpetuated; they are just flowing. Because awareness is freed from this process. Awareness is not hypnotized, caught by mind anymore. Consciousness is free from mind, and mind just flows within consciousness as spontaneous phenomena. So, phenomena, and plurality, concepts, flow, flow, flow, keep flowing, keep flowing, keep happening, keep arising and subsiding, moment by moment, by themselves; and there’s no ownership, consciousness is not owning them, is not trapped on them, is not creating this mind to perpetuate or to analyze itself, or fold back to itself; is not creating conflict.

That’s the difference. That distinction is not emphasized, is not overemphasized, is not fixated; it does not create a ripple on itself. And this applies to everything I said before. What I just said in regards to concepts, and mind, and words, and all that; it applies to behaviours, to patterns of action, whatever the personality does. It’s the same thing. You see? What I said before

is the same thing. That the personality does whatever it does, but there's no feedback. This personality is not feeding back to itself through this analyzing mind; because awareness is just not caught, is not shackled by what happens. Awareness is not shackled by anything that happens. Awareness is free from everything that happens. So, what happens, flows. And personality flows within that awareness, spontaneously.

Even if personality happens to analyze itself, or mind happens to analyze itself, or distinctions are emphasized, or folded back to themselves, still this can be also released into this awareness that is free from it. You see? So it's what I said other times, in other satsangs: there's always room for this awareness falling back to itself, no matter how much complicated we have made the thing, or the thing appears to be. (Not *us*, because there's no one.) So, no matter how complicated, how many layers we have put, still awareness can look into all that without grasping, without clinging, free. No matter if we have made distinctions over the distinctions, and have been made all explicit, we still are free, awareness is still free.

Mischa: What motivated the question is, I experienced 'I am source, the ocean', there arises these appearances, the appearance of this body, the appearance of thoughts, mind, even the appearance of the I thought. They are all equivalent, theirs is nothing special in any of them, there's the thought of that there is an apparent separation between the subject and this object. I'm not either of them, or in a sense I'm all of them. But there's the discrimination, like a movie screen.

Clara: I understand. It's a good example: a movie. Because in the movie, like you said, there are seeming characters, but at the same time you know, as the watcher of the movie, that this is the same ray of light, which is projected on the screen, that creates the seeming different characters and objects. But you know as the watcher of the movie, that they are all the same compound of particles of light with no particular separation among them. Just particles of light being projected; light and shadow being projected. So, it's the same thing.

That's a good example. And it works: there is this oneness, that you can experience somehow in your feeling, or in your intuition. Some sense of this oneness among all that is present here, and you can in your intellect know that you can make distinctions between these appearances, like persons, like different people. And at the same time you can watch these different approaches of the mind that I've just described, that you described, the two approaches: the making of distinctions, or knowing that "this seems to be like people"; but at the same time "this seems to be like one thing".

Mischa: It's one thing. I'm certain, I'm clear that there's no separation. That I'm not this apparent body.

Clara: Yes, yes. But what I'm saying is that you can embrace both approaches. You see? The intuitive approach that says to you that "this feels like it's really only one", "this feels like it is actually one single thing, even if it seems several or many". This approach, that you feel that "oh, seems like there's only one here", this approach and the other approach can be simultaneous, and both can be observed, and embraced or watched, as understandings or angles, from the mind, of experience. Angles of experience.

The awareness that you are, even transcends that, as the pure space, non categorized, non defined, of cognizance. This space where this is happening, where this intuition or insight is happening, or where the interpretation of everything as separate also may happen, this space that you are, that cannot be grasped or pinned down, transcends. So, you can allow the thought or the experience of separation, or the thought or the experience of oneness, to happen, equally.

And as I said before, the samadhi or the sense of oneness is also an experience that comes and goes; because belongs to our *buddhi*, the intuitive intellectual mind. Very refined, very subtle; your most refined intelligent aspect of the intellect. And your intelligence, raw, naked, is this awareness that can see that. That can see this refined understanding: that "this is one". That's a samadhi, or an experience (no difference of meaning intended here).

This refined insight happens in this buddhi. "Buddhi" is the root of "buddha". The spiritual intellect, in terms of Yogic psychology. This buddhi is the seat of intuition. It's above *manas*. Manas is the mind that stores all the conditioning, memory. And *chitta* is the awareness as perception of this moment, or of the senses. Is the perception that relates to the objects of the senses. Chitta, manas, buddhi. Buddhi is the refined aspect of the intellect, which is intuitive. So, in that organ is where you experience this sense of oneness, because your mind has been refined. But still, your awareness, your *chit*, -not chitta, chit- this awareness, this chit -of *sat chit ananda*-, this awareness is undefined, uncategorized, unlimited, transcending, contemplating, embracing all these experiences of duality and nonduality. So, the experience of nonduality also goes sometimes.

Mischa: It seems like a choice to whether to even try to understand, or not. Or just rest...

Clara: But, somehow, in the process of getting in the habit, or getting used to go back to your chit awareness, to your rigpa, contemplating of Self, which embraces everything, getting back to that, again and again and again, what happens is that you end up dwelling by default in that layer or level of the intellect. It means: whenever the intellect is present, is on the buddhi level, not on the ordinary level anymore. In other words, manas becomes a servant of buddhi. And chitta becomes a servant of buddhi also. Both. So, whenever mind manifests, it manifests as a conduit, as a channel of this chit awareness, and it manifests as buddhi, as the refined insight that happens in the moment. This happens too. It means that the approach, or the understanding, or the perspective of oneness, or of nonduality, shows up and manifests, more and more, through the intellect, whenever the intellect is called, is summoned by the circumstances. You see?

So, your mind, whenever this happens, dwells in this consciousness of oneness. But when this mind, or this intellect, even the buddhi, is not summoned, you dwell in nonduality with no consciousness of nonduality, and with no consciousness of duality either. You dwell in the uncategorized, you dwell in no where, in no thing. You dwell in freedom, without dwelling anywhere. The chit of sat-chit-ananda is not aware (like you said before quoting Nisargadatta) is not aware of dwelling in sat-chit-ananda. That's why is bliss, ananda, because there's no sense of belonging to any state. Is not a state. Is the "stateless state", this chit. Sat-chit-ananda: ultimate, supreme state of bliss; supreme awareness in bliss. This *bliss* is a not-knowing, is a not-dwelling, is a not-fixation, in any state, either is dualistic or nondualistic. There's no fixation, no solidification, no consciousness –as long as the intellect is not summoned and convoked. Even when it's convoked, it manifests as the consciousness of understanding, that may show up as the feeling of oneness, or not: just more diluted in this undefined reality where, as I said before, there's no emphasis in distinction, and no emphasis in non-distinction, there's no emphasis, just free. So even if the intellect shows up when it's summoned, when it's convoked, still may remain free from any fixation, from any conceptualization.

I'm saying this to illustrate that these are phases, stages, that happen, in which the intellect gets purified and it provides more these experiences of oneness or whatever else. But you transcend. You are, right now, what already transcends all that. You are, right now, that which is free from all those states of oneness, or of conscious bliss, manifested bliss, or what ever. You are the bliss of non categorization. That kind of bliss, which is *ananta* (not ananda). Ananta, limitless. Limitlessness. And you are that chit, that awareness that rests in itself without even effort or knowing that is resting in itself; because that's the true

resting. That's the true resting in your Self: not even *knowing* that you rest in your Self; because you are not concerned. Not concerned with nothing. World does not concern you; and spiritual practice, self consciousness, does not concern you either; because that would be a fixation too. You're just resting. Without knowing. That's Sat Chit Ananda. Being in your being without *knowledge* of being, even. That's the true being. With no knowledge. If I have knowledge, I'm still wandering, you see?

Attender: [inaudible question]

Clara: (You ask whether there's wisdom in that understanding; the understanding that may show up as samadhi, insight, whatever.) Yes, but the thing is that you let it go. You observe it, like you observe your honking; no difference. You observe that moment of bliss, or that moment of oneness, or that moment of understanding, or that moment of wisdom, or that moment of insight, like you observe that moment of anger, or that moment of pride, or that moment of honking. Same thing. You observe because, again, that space that you are, transcends. So, you don't hold it, you don't cling to it. You don't put it in a frame on the wall [laughs], that you got that insight. It's wisdom for the moment, and that's all. It's honking for the moment. I honk that guy that was crossing the street; but that honking was for that moment: I forgot already. So, that samadhi, or ecstasy, or bliss, was for the moment, and that's it. You made love to your partner, you enjoyed a lot, that's it! Next thing, you know, smoking a cigar [laughs]. Whatever!

Mischa: It's not an attachment to any fruit or state. However I'm motivated to continue to deepen that experience to rest in it, because it's the instruction of the guru to self enquiry.

Clara: Yes, I understand. Of course, everything you do is fine.

Anything you do, or not do, that's fine. Just embrace it in your awareness. That's all.

Namaste.

Group: Namaste!

Clara: Happiness and celebration. [laughs]