

Questions and Replies

The following are actual questions and comments received by readers of *Consciousness Is All*, or from those who have listened to Peter being interviewed. The names have been changed to eliminate any personal references. In some cases there is an exchange of several emails back and forth; in these, the questions are printed in blue, and the replies from Peter are in black.

Dear____,

Isn't it wonderful that the only "perspective" there is, in fact *all* there is-- is what ALL knows Itself to be!

ALL is the only One that is existing, being. As All is *ALL*, all It can experience is Its own Self-Immediacy, yet It is a *boundless* Self-Immediacy! If there were a point at which All had a boundary, and another state could begin, All wouldn't be ALL--but It is! That means ALL is this very Awareness, presently alive here now--because, *being All*, All is the ONLY Awareness there can be.

Isn't it equally wonderful that All's Presence, Its Absoluteness, does not have to be "seen," thought about, or even "dug at" before It will fully be *ALL*. If there were another that also had to "see" ALL, again, All wouldn't be ALL! On the contrary, All's ALLNESS can't be stopped or held in abeyance! Who would there be to hold back All--All *Itself* being ALL!

ALL does not have to "deserve" Its own Already-Absolute Presence! This means All does not have to be earned; All's Omnipresence leaves no other to "work up to" It. To ALL, Its Omnipresence, thus Omnipotence, is not a big deal, but the simple fact of Its Single Omni-Being. To ALL, Absoluteness, Utter Purity, Boundless Perfection, is so "normal" it isn't even funny!

Can you imagine ALL, the entirety of Boundless Existence, stepping aside, leaving a vacancy somewhere in ITS CHANGELESS ABSOLUTENESS, where a couple of "middle men" called Peter and David came along, knowing some Truth about ALL, sort of "helping" All to be All? Now *that* would be funny--*if* such a thing could occur, but it doesn't!!

Who is there besides ALL to be concerned about anything other than All's ALLNESS? Nothing else can occur. The stunning beauty of ALL'S CHANGELESS ABSOLUTENESS is that ALL never is "suggested to." So how could ALL possibly think of having to overcome, or correct, any situation--when actually, no situation ever is suggested--for all there is, is ALL, absolutely being Its own Changeless Perfection! All--*being All*--simply cannot rid Itself of a situation, for no otherness ever occurs. All being eternally, timelessly, changelessly *ALL*, is a permanent guarantee of being absolutely free, un-suggested-to, for Eternity. And, again, whose guarantee is it? *ALL's* guarantee--for only ALL is!

How "long" does it take All to BE All? As ALL is *now being* CHANGELESS OMNIPRESENCE, Its Absoluteness of Presence is faster than "instantaneous." How long does All "remain" ALL? There is no deviation, for ALL being CHANGELESS OMNI-PRESENT-NESS leaves no time in which deviation could occur. ALL is *NOW*, just as NOW is what ALL is. It is THIS VERY AWARENESS, for THIS AWARENESS IS THE ONLY NOW THERE IS.

Peter

Hello Peter,

I have a dilemma. 5 or 6 times over the past 3 years I've had a spontaneous release of thinking, not entirely of course, but where it dissipates to the point where it is very limited. As thought arises it is immediately seen as not important and almost "pops" or "melts" so quickly that it is humorous. When negative states or emotions arise they too dissipate. These episodes are triggered by books or teachers generally. This can last for days or weeks, but eventually the mind predominates over the natural state. If I stop and "look" or "notice" the peace and joy are still there. But there is a fine line between noticing and jumping into a practice of looking for something to happen in the future. And while there are a few teachers that recommend this, there are others who say it will lead to seeking. Now I realize that every time I stop to acknowledge my true nature as Awareness, It is an end to Itself, and not really a means to an end. I can read each of your paragraphs, stop while I'm reading and all the good stuff comes in like the tide. At some point, hopefully, permanence in the natural state arises spontaneously. And I will look back and see that you never did anything. I seem to be attracted to doing this looking, believing that brief moments of Awareness, repeated often, eventually become permanent.

So my questions: What is your take on this? How does one stay "busy" being pure Consciousness? Did you have a point while you were reading that it was obvious that the "me" just dropped away?

Great questions. You said:

“Now I realize that every time I stop to acknowledge my true nature as awareness **it is an end to itself, and not really a means to an end.**”

That's the main point. And the "key" is that, always, always, always, it's all about Awareness *Itself* being Awareness. Never has there been another that also could be It, or that's now doing a better job of being more consistent--even though that may be how it "seems."

I know we all "know" that, but because it "seems" as if some of the relative still hangs around, it's easy to unwittingly "revert" and assume that "I've worked my way out of that, and now I'm doing a better job of sticking with Awareness." It's so subtle, yet that's still basically coming from the would-be relative or human side (of which there is none, really!). In Truth, it's "all about Awareness ONLY"--it's never about how good a job "I'm" doing of being that Awareness. And from HERE, the periodic "in and out" is not seen as "now I'm really getting good at sticking with Awareness." If one were to talk about such states at all, they would a gradual lessening of periods of "ignoring" Awareness--and the only I is Awareness Itself. The "ignoring one" would be just that--a would-be state of ignorance or ignore-ance--which never is I, never a conscious entity. And OF COURSE, from the standpoint of Awareness-I, or as Awareness is changelessly "starting from" or "looking out from" Its own Absoluteness, everything I've just said is impossible; ignorance simply never can happen, it's un-occur-able.

You also said, “...I seem to be attracted to doing this looking, believing that brief moments of awareness, repeated often, eventually become permanent.”

I know how you mean, but for clarity, again, as Awareness Itself is the Only One Conscious, then there's not really a separate "I" that could be looking. Turn it around...if it were to be mentioned at all, It's that Awareness' Total Absolute Presence is less and less being "hit upon" by the little waves (or periods) of ignore-ance. I know this "sounds" as if another state began, and that Awareness is "getting stronger" at being Its own Awareness, which again, is impossible. There's a line in CIA that talks about this seemingly lingering state....calling it "the last weak waves of 'not-ness,' lapping at the shore of Infallible Being." And yet that still implies something besides Being can occur, which isn't true.

This is why Chap 22 in the book is "so important"--especially the section that starts on 230 and goes to 239--clearly stating (Present Awareness "talking as" Present Awareness!) saying that NOT EVEN AWARENESS, THE PRESENT, HAS BEEN PRESENT BEFORE--so there's absolutely no prior "way" of being, and absolutely no prior history of the Present ignoring Its Present-ness, thus absolutely no accumulation of any tendencies to ignore Itself. Life's "Slate" is Absolutely Clean, Fresh, Pure.

There's another passage on 239 (same page as the one about Infallible Being) which says: "It's never that you've 'fallen' and must 'climb back.' It's staying alert that, *as the Absolute Present*, You leave no past in which You could have fallen!"

Let me know if that "answers" it. This would be great to dialogue on, because this truly is "where It's at."

(same questioner, Pt. II)

It is a subtle trap, this "I" arising to take over the experience. Is stopping to notice, from the standpoint of Awareness, and noticing the mind coming in, a problem in itself? Especially if it is done often? Is the best course to keep looking at the pointers in your book and let the resonance occur? I would like some comment on the staying "busy" as Awareness. It seems that "staying alert as Awareness" requires a conscious focus.

ALWAYS, the "premise" is Awareness being Its own Pure Awareness.

Now look at the questions asked: It is a subtle trap, this "I" arising to take over the experience. Is stopping to notice, from the standpoint of awareness noticing the mind coming in, a problem in itself? Especially if it is done often?

They still imply another self, or another state. Can Awareness Itself say or ask any such thing? No. Does Awareness have a problem being present when not saying any such thing, or not watching the mind? No. Awareness Itself never is "noticing the mind coming in" so, yes, in a sense that would be "a problem in itself" because the attention is mind-directed rather than Awareness-directed (and of course there really is no such thing as "attention"). "At this stage of the game," it does *seem* as if "attention" needs to be kept on Awareness, otherwise it seems to wander off into time and mind/dream. This is "staying busy" as Awareness. Yes, in one sense, it could be argued that this is a "conscious focus," but here's the thing...at this point *Whose* Consciousness is It, really? It's

really thanks to the Presence of Consciousness Itself...it's not a separate "I" who's doing that, for the Only One to be aware is Awareness Itself.

At this point, it isn't that Awareness is staying *aware of* Its Awareness (which implies two)...It's just Awareness alone, *being*--not aware of Itself--just Awareness aware-ing, but not as a time-process. The clarity, the awareness that It is *Awareness Itself alone* being present (and only Awareness "knows" that) is what makes the seeming ignoring or mental arising, seem to "fall back into" Awareness. If It were to be talked about in terms of how it appears to unfold in time, it "seems" as if Awareness Changelessly *being* is being experienced or "held onto" over time--but It really isn't.

Take the statement, *Awareness being alive as the Changeless Aliveness It is*...to one who *thinks about* that, it's going to sound as if Awareness is "doing" that over a period of time. And the moment one starts to think about or "know" that--one is already in time. But when it's a matter of Awareness un-thinkingly *being* with no comment whatsoever--there's nothing commenting about this being a focus of attention, or that it's ongoing in time. Only Awareness Itself can be that--for a Peter certainly doesn't make Awareness be aware.

To Awareness Itself, to NOW, there is no "practice." Can you imagine NOW having to practice Its ability to be present NOW? And there's no effort involved in this, for It's all up to Awareness Itself, which *already* is the entirety of Presence. The clarity that there is no practice, no effort involved in Awareness being present, and the alertness that It's always *Awareness Itself* being aware (which, again, is *Awareness Itself* "knowing" or *being* that) --is a far cry from running around identifying with body and senses, thinking with an intellect, and always muttering, "Well, there's no such thing as practice...Awareness is the only One aware...so I can just go do whatever I want...nothing in the human scene matters, so what difference does it make..." They're vastly different...in both cases it's the same *words*, but coming from entirely different "places."

...I forgot to say earlier about: [Is the best course to keep looking at the pointers in your book and let the resonance occur?](#)

All One can "do" is to keep "coming from" Awareness, just "letting" Awareness be Its own Ungrasp-able-ness, yet which never fails to be alive, vitally present. After all, this is what Awareness Itself is "doing" or being--and IT is the One being aware in the first place. I stay away from words like resonance, because that implies two. Awareness, being *All*, leaves nothing besides Itself to resonate with, and It, Itself,

never resonates. It would take time to have resonation, and as *Timeless Being*, Awareness is the absence, or preclusion, of resonation.

This takes away all the sacred cows so that nothing is left! Some want to hang on to their sacred cows. Left with nothing, you are swingin' in the wind and wanting to grab a hold of something quick. At the moment I'm swinging in the wind.

You swing, girl! ...no...make that, You swing, Self!

Reminds me of something I posted on the Oprah blog/thread a few days ago: "Put it this way--which is more FUN, FREE, SPONTANEOUS, ALIVE?"

To identify as one-who-is-frustrated-because-I-can't-pin-IT-down-and-I-just-can't-be-sure-if-I'll-ever-know-IT-for-certain?

Or to identify as that which *doesn't want* to be pinned down!"

Dear _____,

Thanks so very much for your kind words. And you're right—you did answer your own question. Always, always, always, Truth is entirely and only a matter of what Pure Perfect Being is to Its own un-thinking Alive Presence. That's enough, that's "plenty"—because ONLY Being exists to begin with. In Pure Being's own Being, it is impossible there could be any mental or emotional struggle or mental kicking and whining—nor a situation that would give rise to such! This is entirely BEING'S LIFE—never that of a Peter or a James. It's entirely up to BEING to be Being. All there is to "do" is to constantly stay alert to, or as, Now-Presence for that's what Now-Presence is "doing" and IT is the only One that exists. Absolute Reality is not, not, not, a "healing work." It literally cannot be, because THIS ONLY ONE THAT IS can be concerned only with Its Changeless Absolute Perfection wherein there never has been anything other than Itself, never any deviation, thus nothing that ever could be healed!

NEVER is it a struggle for Being to be Its own Perfect Unchanging Omnipresence. As this Changelessness is ALL, as ALL is this Changelessness—it is IMPOSSIBLE that anything could change or occur in Its Presence, which is ALL PRESENCE. So, if there is any seeming struggle, it is only because of an assumption that there is something besides this ABSOLUTE CHANGELESSNESS, this EFFORTLESS SIMPLE PRESENCE OF BEING.

And why is that? Because there is an assumption that something occurred, and which must now be corrected. Yet, as no time has ever passed in THE ONLY ONE PRESENT, what could have occurred? And as nothing has occurred, there can't be anything to struggle over or correct. That's the seeming trap--unwittingly assuming that something occurred, and now Truth must be "used" to correct it, or make it go away. Yet as ONLY BEING IS, It can't set traps for Itself, nor co-exist with such things. Actually, BEING'S ABSOLUTENESS certainly does not even permit any "seeming" or any assumptions.

The Truth is that Absolute Being never falls into such a trap, never "takes any bait"—again, not because Being outsmarts something else—but because BEING'S OWN OCCURRENCE-LESS-NESS IS ABSOLUTELY ALL. Being can't fall for, or correct, SOMETHING THAT NEVER HAPPENED. It's actually IMPOSSIBLE.

Just the other day a "situation" seemed to come up, and to be "clear" I (Intelligence, Self) stated the Truth. And that was that—there was no acceptance that something besides Perfect Changeless Absolute Truth could have occurred—only CONSCIOUSNESS' PRESENT PRESENCE of PERFECTION. Then, some "time" later, I noticed I had been unwittingly entertaining a very subtle thought (sometimes it's a subtle vague *feeling*) of, "I stated the Truth, now I wonder if It's going to work...I wonder if this situation will clear up..." But that was immediately followed by, "HEY, wait a minute! As ONLY BEING ABSOLUTELY IS, and nothing else ever has 'happened'—then on WHAT could Truth possibly 'work'? And as ONLY BEING, PERFECT INTELLIGENCE IS, who 'slipped up' and began to wonder? NO ONE! IT'S IMPOSSIBLE." From the standpoint of Intelligent Being, it actually would be stupid to try to work over, or hope about something--because how can CHANGELESS OMNIPRESENCE work over, or have hopes about, something that never occurred? The attempts to work over and correct, the desires and hopes, AREN'T YOU. And in Truth, no such thing occurs, not even "seemingly."

As BEING'S TIMELESS ABSOLUTENESS IS ALL, then no Peter or James ever could have had a beginning or creation as a second entity or self—so how could "they"

a) ever experience a problem, or b) be worried about whether or not they are handling it correctly? That which NEVER BEGAN can neither suffer nor screw up.

BEING'S UN-LAPSE-ABLE TIMELESS ABSOLUTENESS IS ALL! So, the "seeming problem" never is the real problem—it always would be the acceptance that there could be a secondary mind besides BEING'S ABSOLUTENESS—and there can't. The "mistake" is to chase after what

the would-be secondary mind would claim has happened—yet that very "mind" itself NEVER HAPPENED in order to do any claiming, or project any pictures, or have any feelings. But ONE does not waste time denying such a thing—for AS ONLY BEING IS, nothing else has occurred that could be denied! BEING SIMPLY CANNOT DEVIATE, and IT never is struggling to be.

Not only does Being's Absoluteness preclude there being any "situations" occurring—IT COMPLETELY, UTTERLY, TOTALLY leaves only ITSELF, and no other "mind" that can wonder, slip up, or get fooled. Another synonym for Being's Perfection is Perfect Minded-ness. It means that the only Presence there is, is that Perfect Single Intelligence that CAN'T make mistakes. There can be no such thing as doubt or wonder in Absoluteness. In UTTER ONENESS WHICH IS YOU, there is no duality, so there never is a choice of two ways it could be, never a possibility of making a wrong decision, never a deviation. There is only CHANGELESS RIGHT-NESS.

You are as "intellectually clear" on this as is possible. Let your ongoing "work" now be a matter of Being's own FASCINATION, ITS TOTAL "ABSORPTION" with Its ALIVE PRESENCE—not thoughts *about* Its Alive Presence. And yet, as BEING ITSELF IS ALREADY FULLY BEING WHAT IT IS—there can be no "ongoing work."

All of BEING FULLY, ALL-OUT IS—NOW! Being is "totally absorbed" in BEING Its ease of unstoppable Presence, Its un-go-away-able Immediacy, Its un-struggling Simplicity, Its effortless Fullness, Its Undimensional Aliveness—wherein there is ONLY Undimensional Aliveness—and nothing else to which It could be applied. Be fascinated in how impossible it is for this Presently Alive Presence to make further contact with Itself. Can It stop Itself? Can It shut Itself off? Only this is what BEING ITSELF is engaged in, and only Being exists. ONLY THIS IS TRUTH. ONLY THIS IS PRESENT.

If you can call later this week, that would be great. Let's talk about the paragraph above—because there's truly nothing else to talk about!

All the best, Peter

Dear____,

That's great to hear of your experience! Or maybe we should say an experience had by the "absence of you." It's so true—this Un-ruffled-ness simply never fails to be!

As for Fred's response/disagreement--it presents a wonderful opportunity. This is a typical case of semantics, and how a single word can be taken to mean different things. Fred *assumed* he knew what I meant by IS, but the meaning intended is far different from that...so he never even "got" what was being said. That's NOT a fault of Fred; it just shows how the conditioning we all seem to have in the human scene can get in the way sometimes.

Let's try it again. IS means now, present tense ONLY. Is means having being, or presently existing. In IS there is absolutely no provision for passing time, past or future. The past would be that which is-not-anymore, and future would be that which is-not-yet. Time would be that-which-is-not. IS cannot *be* IS and simultaneously be is-not. I think most would agree with this obvious "truth."

In "discerning" Reality, IS *has to be* the "starting point" because otherwise you're starting with not-IS or is-not. How could that which-is-not be Reality? It couldn't because it doesn't even exist. Is-not means exactly that, non-existent, and non-existence is not even a status. If you try to say it has some status, even as an illusion, you've completely contradicted yourself because you're trying to say that, in some capacity, non-existence exists! Impossible--or else you have no idea of what is meant by the words you're using. This may sound "philosophical" but it's profoundly simple and true. Is-not is NOT an opposite of IS because it's not even around as "is-not" to be an opposite--even though we have to use such words for clarity.

So...starting from the only-ness of IS, some other things quickly become evident. IS is absolutely ALL that is. IS is present alone. This means IS does not co-exist with time. IS, (or NOW, the Present) is NOT a "fleeting now-instant" in a seeming time flow from past to future. Where IS *is*, (and IS is ALL that is) then time, is-not, simply does not begin or occur. Why? Because it is-not! It's the same as saying that the Present is All Presence. So how could time, not-the-present ever begin or occur, when it's never *present* anywhere to do so? Where the Present is present (and there is "nowhere" It is not present) then time, not-the-present simply cannot get its foot in the door because only the Present can be present! How could not-the-present be operating somewhere when it's never *present* to be operating?! This is clear ONLY when starting, or "looking out from" the Pure Present Itself, Pure Now-Awareness, or IS.

It's the difference between functioning as a seeming thinking, believing mentality, or the belief-less Pure IS of Now-Awareness.

The fact that ONLY the Present can be present also means one cannot talk about, think about, mention, or try to account for "arisings" in Reality. Why? Because all arisings, all form, all manifestation require time, non-presence to occur. But where the Present is present, when does non-presence ever occur? It doesn't! And have you ever noticed a time when the Present is *not* present? It never happens! Time "pretends" to be that period when the Present is not absolutely all that is present--but, again, that simply NEVER occurs.

It sounds as if Fred is saying that (I don't want to assume!) because an appearance appears, it is *present*. Because I see a tree out in my yard, and ground, etc., all that stuff is *present*. If I have a dream, that dream is present. Sorry, it really isn't, even though we've been told and conditioned to believe so. It's not looking closely enough. ANYTHING AND EVERYTHING in the so-called material world whether "real" or "illusory" or ("real-illusion" whatever that means) can be reduced to energy, vibrating particles, always passing, moving on, in time's non-presence. ALL vibrating and form would take time, but, again, to IS, that simply doesn't occur.

Then the question becomes, "Well then how does all this appearing even *seem* to be here, if it isn't even occurring?" Who's asking that question? Is IS asking such a thing? No. In IS no time occurs in which a question could come up, or be answered! It *seems* to be asked by the same would-be mind, and it's asking because the "mind" is desperate to account for itself and its would-be activity and arising phenomena. But to entertain such questions, you have to first ignore your own Timeless IS-ness as Pure Awareness. *The mind does not know that it never really began.* Not even IS is saying "the mind never began" because ONLY IS is--so there's nothing besides Itself to negate, and no time in which to do any negating.

Fred said this appearance has to be accounted for, because if you don't, "Otherwise we have a major dualism similar to the purusha (Consciousness), prakti (matter) split of the Samkhya school." But wait a minute. As ONLY IS is to begin with, then there is ONE, and no possibility of a split. As only IS is, and no time world, no material world *ever occurs*, then where is the possibility of a split? There isn't. Nor is this a negation of such a thing, because how is it possible to negate that which never began? So there's no conflict. Sorry, that teaching, in trying to account for appearances has already ignored IS and tried to account for is-not, so it would be in ignore-ance or *ignorance* of IS,

Reality. The very notion of "teaching" should send up a red flag...Does IS need teaching in order to *be*? Who else is there besides IS to be taught? Is there another that is *being*, besides IS?

I've attached an excerpt from an article, The New, True Infinity, which discusses this same point from a somewhat different angle.

All the best,
Peter

Dear _____,

Thanks for the email--and a good question.

If your colleague clearly sees that Consciousness, Being, Self, truly is the only Identity (not "his" Identity, but Its own Identity) then to this Self, Being, yes, therapy is meaningless. Perhaps it would be better to say therapy is *not necessary*, because how could All, One, Pure Infinity, possibly need therapy when there is nothing besides Itself, and no other possible situation that could require therapy? To see this is truly the best "therapy" there is—It is eternal Wellness, permanent Self-Sufficiency, Serenity.

What it comes down to is a matter of identification. Where is "he" identifying "himself"? Is it with an intellect that merely *agrees with* what is being said in the book--or is it a matter of identifying as Pure Consciousness, Being's Stillness, which is *actually being* what is said in the book--and which is one's True Self. To merely agree intellectually is not "enough" (even though it sometimes seems that's the first "step.") There is no Peace, no Serenity, no Certainty in the churning of the intellect and senses.

Freedom and peace are not found by trying to improve the experience of the senses and mind--but by identifying only as un-thinking Pure Being, the Stillness of Pure Awareness, which is ever-available, ever-present. And to the extent one consciously stays busy "Here," the would-be problems of the "personal mind" are starved and "die," for in Reality, they actually have no Presence whatsoever--not even any history of having occurred!

My "suggestion" would be to not struggle, not try to stop the mind and all its worry and activity--but to calmly, quietly bring attention back to the Present, no matter how often it seems necessary. One doesn't have to

make "his or her" thinking mind do anything--but rather notice how effortlessly, how unstoppably Pure Consciousness, the Present, is present with no effort whatsoever. All would-be problems seem to start up only when the thinking starts thinking in terms of time. Stay in, or *as*, the Present—which is Pure Awareness simply *being*. And rather than try to make the Present be more present--simply behold how impossible it is to make the Present's calm, unthinking Stillness go away! This may seem difficult at first, only due to being seemingly conditioned to identify with the mind, not as Pure Awareness.

The Truth is, it's never about "him" or how good a job "he" is doing of "applying" the Truth, or sticking with the Present. If your colleague is sincere about wanting "relief," he shouldn't let the thinking mind make it about "him." Instead he should say something like, "Hey, It's Consciousness Itself that is being conscious here, now--not a personal 'me.' It's the Present Itself that's being present here--not a 'me.' And is the Present *Itself* experiencing anything other than Its own Presence, It's own Present-ness only? No, there is only the Present Itself. Does the Present think about past or future events? No--the Present doesn't think--It's just present, as Pure Conscious Awareness."

It may still appear that the *body* has to go through the motions of settling a divorce, improving a job situation, etc.--but the entire time it's clear that the body is not one's Identity. As Pure Consciousness, "He" isn't going through any of this experience--it's only the body that appears to be doing it--while Consciousness always is simply, freely being. It's similar to what Aiken used to say about being like an actor on a stage--the body appears to be acting out its role in human experience, but the entire time it is clear that Consciousness, Identity, always is Perfect, Free.

All the best, Peter

Dear____,

As for the "employment situation"...I loved what you said about Self-Employment. Absolutely true. All that can be "done" or "said" is the Present Fact that this is entirely All's Life, All's Existence, All's Being...so only what is true of ALL is "going on" eternally, *as* Eternity. As All is Changeless, the Absoluteness of Presence, simply nothing besides Its Perfect Wholeness occurs. All being Timeless, All simply cannot be presented with time-pictures, thus does not have to do anything about that which is not being presented. It's never a matter of "what to do

about the picture/situation seemingly being presented" but rather, from All's standpoint (and there is no other!) THERE IS *ONLY* ALL, CHANGELESSLY BEING BOUNDLESS PERFECTION-AS-ALL, which leaves nothing else to do any presenting! All never lapses in Its Total Self-Presence, Un-relenting Self-Busy-Ness; All never "opens the door" to otherness, for there is no door where All is ALL, and no otherness to do any "coming in."

All, being ALL, simply has no choice but to be 100% "un-withhold-ably, actively employed" as the Unrestrainable Being It is. All being *ALL* means Its Allness cannot be, and need not be, "applied to help a human situation" for ALL precludes the possibility of there being anything besides ITS TOTAL SELF-BUSY-NESS AS THE ENTIRETY OF PRESENCE NOW. This takes absolutely no effort, for All ALREADY is ALL, with no other in opposition. All being ALL is the "easiest thing" possible, for, being ALL, It leaves nothing besides Its Already-Total-Present-ness that could need doing! All is so absolutely at Ease, It's indescribable. And why shouldn't it be?! IT'S ALL! What a Life!

Peter

Dear _____,

Thanks for the email--I hear you--no need for further explanation.

I sometimes get emails or calls from those who seem to have "tough times appear on the scene," and I'm happy to give all the "help" I can. But what does that "help" consist of? Here's what "goes on" and I'll just put it out there for you.

Always, always, always, the Premise is that there is only One Self, One All, One Being, One Mind, One Divine-As-All, or whatever term one cares to use. As you (Self) know, there is Only ONE. At the moment, it may be helpful to use the term One *Mind*. The point is that, ALWAYS then, as there is only ONE, only what is true of the One Divine Mind, Self-Mind-as-All, Being's Absoluteness, is present to operate. Being ONE,

then ONLY Divine Mind's Presence exists, as All Presence, eternally, and It cannot change or deviate from being ALL. This Divine-Mind, being ALL, simply leaves no possibility of another lesser mind (Peter or Carla) to experience anything. Where Divine Infinite Mind is ALL, and is TIMELESS, there simply cannot also be a finite mind having some kind of time-experience. Always, it's a matter of "looking out from" All's viewpoint, for there is no other.

So...the only "issue" that ever exists, is what is true of Divine Mind-As-All? There simply is nothing else, and no other to have any other experience.

So...during the day, as the "body-Carla" appears to have to go through the motions--to make phone calls, make arrangements, talk to doctors, lawyers, gov't people, whatever--YOU always keep busy with the FACT that there is only DIVINE MIND ITSELF AS ALL PRESENCE, ALL BEING, which is changelessly perfect. It cannot alter, It has not altered, and there is no lesser mind to argue to the contrary, or present conditions to the contrary.

Where it seems one can get "tripped up" is in assuming that something besides, or in addition to, ONE DIVINE MIND-AS-ALL has occurred--and it hasn't. We get mentally "caught up in" what the "would-be little mind" seems to suggest is occurring and then worry, become afraid, and let it completely take over--when the TRUTH is that there is ONLY DIVINE MIND, and no such picture is even being suggested to MIND. We go chasing after the suggestion, trying to correct it, rather than recognizing that, to ONE DIVINE MIND AS ALL, no such thing could possibly be suggested. If that were possible, ALL wouldn't be ALL. But ALL is ALL!! ALL is changelessly, timelessly, being ABSOLUTELY ALL THAT IS BEING.

Right now, this is NOT a matter of a Peter talking with a Carla about an All (for that would be 3!). There is ONLY ALL ITSELF. From ALL'S standpoint, ALL cannot be located ANYWHERE, confined to, or experience any one finite situation, such as a series of events going on in a "Canada"; nor is there one in NY getting emails about such things. There is only ALL being UNLOCATABLY ALL.

If, during the day, it "seems you've slipped up" or thoughts come such as, "I'm not doing a good enough job of knowing this," stop and say, "Wait a minute! Has ALL, Divine Mind, lost sight of Itself? No! Is there another that has to know what ALL is? No!" ALL'S Presence is NOT something that a little Carla-mind or Peter-mind has to "see" or connect with, or be honest with--because as DIVINE MIND (PURE CONSCIOUSNESS) IS ALL, no lesser minds ever began. There is ONLY

DIVINE MIND-AS-ALL and It has not, and cannot ever lose sight of Its own OMNIPRESENCE. ALL simply cannot deviate, because, being ALL, there is nowhere besides Itself that ALL could deviate to!

This is Changeless Truth. It is already Omni-operative, and does not have to be "made so." All can no more fail to be all, than Being can fail to be--and Being simply never fails to be!!

Love,
Peter

Peter,

I just heard your Never Not Here interviews, and I'm on chapter 18 of "Consciousness Is All."

I have a question that keeps nagging me. I believe I heard you say, and have read, that Awareness is not actually "aware" of phenomenality. If that is true, these attempts during the day to "rest as awareness" don't seem to have any verifiable "target." I mean anything experienced in phenomenality, by definition, wouldn't be IT. The whole idea of pure Awareness not being aware of our every day experiences seems to give me no place to "rest in."

Hope that makes sense.

Thanks,
Gil

Hi Gil,

Good to hear from you. Thanks for getting in touch, and for getting the book!

Great question, too. Words and semantics sometimes make this tough. Hopefully more will "clarify" as you go thru the book.

Two points for now. It is Self Itself that is being, existing, or being aware. There is no other being conscious or alive--so EVERYTHING has to be from this (Its) "perspective."

The "problem" is that we still unwittingly tend to make it about "us" and how good a job "we" are doing of living up to, or "holding to" what Awareness is. But there is no such one to do any of that. Awareness

Itself is the only One that can be Awareness, and It never fails--It never flits in and out with Its attention (in fact, It has no attention), and thus actually leaves no "me" to be resting as Awareness--even though we use that term to help convey a very difficult point. The notion of "resting" can be misleading. I never used to say it, but have heard it said by so many other non-dual speakers, that I started using it too--and I think I'll stop!

Awareness Itself always, always, always is *being* Itself--and as there is no other, there is no other to do any resting. Meanwhile, Awareness NEVER fails to be perfectly present.

Awareness *Itself* being ALL, also means there is no other to whom Awareness could be a "target." Awareness, being ALL, never is seeking or trying to locate Itself in order to rest as what It simply cannot fail to be. Again, always, it's never about "me" or how good a job "I'm" doing of this--It is totally a matter of Awareness "looking out as" or *being* the Immovable All-Presence It cannot fail to be! Rather than trying to "rest" or "zero in on It," simply see if Awareness ever can be made to *not* be. Impossible!

The true "Great Freedom" is not to "rest" but the clarity that there is no other to do any resting! And whose clarity is that? Awareness' clarity--for there is no other!

Only a would-be lesser mind or finite mind would want a "target"--something to hold to, to confirm that it's "doing this correctly." Awareness is Infinity Itself--so, by definition, there is "nothing there" that could be a target, and no other to want such a thing--yet this Un-graspable-ness, this Un-pin-down-able-ness is ALIVE, and never fails to be. Admittedly, it sometimes feels like riding a bike without holding on, free-wheeling--but is Infinity Itself ever looking for something to hold onto?

It also really "helps" to get away from the *word* Awareness sometimes, (don't know how else to say it) and simply "feel" or *be* Aliveness or Alive Presence. And who, really is "doing" that? Not a Gil or a Peter--but Life's Aliveness Itself--for neither Gil nor Peter makes that function or be present. Aliveness is undimensional, un-conceivable, yet ALWAYS PRESENT as Alive Stuff.

If you want to, go back to the top of this email and read it thru again, but substitute Aliveness, Being, or Now for Awareness, and you'll get an entirely different "take" on it. From the standpoint of TIMELESS IS being ALL THAT IS, wherein time *never occurs*--there is no time in which IS

(Infinite Awareness) could experience phenomenality, thus equally no time in which IS would need to rest from such a thing. It IS this simple. To Whom? To Awareness Itself, and there is no other.

Hope that addresses the questions...if not, please let me know.

Peter

Hello Peter,

I just watched your NNH video from May 20, and I was very pleased with how you explained things, some of which I already have come to discover myself. What is most perplexing is this notion of objects that are encountered everywhere, including thoughts, emotions, physical sensations, and sensory impressions of "outer" things. This was briefly touched on in the last 15 minutes or so, but I'm still not clear on some things.

We can say that what is seen and experienced is "*apparently* there" to the "apparent" individual entity, (which won't be found if sought, in "my" experience - oh the paradox of that statement!). And so, there is just seeing going on and that everything else is sort of an overlay on top of that, including any sense of individuality or mind function which would stake a claim to seeing this, that, and the other. No "me" removes the compulsive tendency to create "other," which means there is no duality. Is that right so far?

What of these objects illuminated by consciousness; obviously they can't exist without consciousness, nothing is separate from consciousness. But what are they if they are not consciousness "expressed as form"? Even if they are only a kind of dream, an illusion, they appear to be here. What is their source, what are they made of? Apparently, if I'm understanding you correctly, they have no source because they appear to be in "now," and now has no past or future because it is outside of time, and only what is now can ever be. They come, they go, all "now." Is that right? If it is, where do they come from (they can't come from anywhere, apparently), where do they go to (who knows, they're just not "here"?), and what are made of while they are here?

I know you said "source" means there must be time because it takes time to create, and clearly there is no time, there is only this now, (and I am experiencing this clearly myself - there is only now, it can't be any other way, this is crystal clear). So then that must mean there no such thing

as "source" for anything - is that right?

Being a concept, source has no reality other than an idea which is created in the mind to somehow explain all of this (minds seem to crave explanations) - a kind of way to "put the blame somewhere" for problems or even to explain the reason for happiness, peace, silence; there is "just this" that is here now, and the only "thing" (lousy word) that is not subject to change is formless pure consciousness - is that it, no "thing" that can be pointed to and referred to as "source," whether one calls it source, God, spirit, or whatever flavor one has been conditioned to believe and accept? Pure Consciousness simply is, and "IS" always is, meaning there was no "before" from which It arose, no source out of which It came. Correct?

All of this implies that there is nowhere to go, because "going somewhere" means there is a "place" to get to, and that involves time (which obviously doesn't exist), so all there is, is "this" "here."

So this further implies there is nothing to "do" because doing also requires time, and how can you do something to get to the only reality there is, "now"? This now is full/complete just as it is. This effectively removes the "doer" from doing anything or going anywhere to get something that can't be gotten.

It seems like most of my questions are resolving themselves as I write all of this out. Am I on track with what you are saying or completely blowing it? Am I missing something vital?

Thanks for your time in reading this. I intend to get your book. In the meantime I'll watch the video again, but if you could I would appreciate a response to my email.

Best regards,

Ken

Hi Ken,

What you say is clear, and yes, it sounds as if some questions were resolved in the very writing of the email.

To save a lot of typing, I've sent a couple of attachments (excerpts from Consciousness Is All) that either address the same questions, or indicate *why* it is said that Self, the One, Being, is not a source or cause. In the first attachment, Chap. 12 is most pertinent.

We did another NNH interview one June 3, and it deals more with this point. It has to do with your question of "Well, if the appearance is not caused by Consciousness, and is not even appearing or occurring in Reality, then where does it *seem* to come from? How does it even *seem* to be there?"

When the "premise" is Pure IS, as One "looks out as" Pure Is, then *only* IS, is. Period. IS is All. Period. As this ISNESS, (You in the Divine sense), You are the Only One for the entirety of Existence. Now for the double-talk...if it *were* possible for IS to ignore Itself (it really isn't) but if it were, then when you seem to ignore or mentally stray from your own ISNESS, then it would be right then that all the time, form and is-not-ness seems to kick in. It is as if one leaves Awakeness, and begins to dream. Then one looks for a separate "cause" for this dream or illusion but never finds one. Why? Because *he* is that very cause himself. One is "enacting" the very cause of dream thanks to one's own ignoring of one's own Isness. Being asleep to your own Isness is all there is to all dream. Ignoring one's own Being is all there is to all "not-being" (time, form, objectification, etc.).

What's huge about this distinction is that now the Divine NEVER is seen as a source or cause for what appears as humanity, suffering, duality, etc. etc. Never is it seen as having been purposefully caused. Rather, it would be a complete state of ignore-ance, or ignorance. And the Divine is seen as changeless, timeless Perfection, without a creation. But this never is clear unless the premise or "starting point" is the Absoluteness of Is, Self, Being. And isn't THIS the only valid "starting point" since only IS Itself is being in the first place?

There's another chapter in *Consciousness Is All*, titled "Consciousness Cannot Ignore Its Own Presence" that actually blows even the above "explanation" out of the water. To the Absolute One, not even this seeming ignore-ance is a possibility. There is only unchanging, timeless Perfection-As-All.

Please let me know your comments on all of the above, and the attachments.

Peace,
Peter

(same questioner, part II)

Hi Peter,

Thanks for getting back to me so soon. I've got to say that today was a day unlike anything I've felt in a long time. Despite years of experiencing a deep contentment, peace, and silence almost all the time something seems to have dropped away since writing to you, as though a deeper simplicity has been realized/seen. I suppose it could be attributed to some subtle and deeply hidden beliefs being blasted away; I don't know for sure but I like it.

In light of that, at this moment for "me" I find that I only really know/realize this: Consciousness IS, and there can only ever be this now in which consciousness is - that is Self-evident and irrefutable. Everything after that gets stuck somewhere in the mind, bent this way and that in an effort to understand it all. It seems pointless to even make an attempt to understand it because the effort to do that only takes you away (seemingly) from this direct and immediate realization - of course one can't escape now, for it is utterly impossible. And yet there is an impulse to understand it anyway because this is too good not to share with others, and how else can one share it with others unless one understands it? Perhaps that is the reason for you writing the book.

You wrote in your email:

"What's huge about this distinction is that now the Divine NEVER is seen as a source or cause for what appears as humanity, suffering, duality, etc. etc. Never is it seen as having been purposefully caused. Rather, it would be a complete state of ignore-ance, or ignorance."

Yes, I've come to this realization before, and it is why I have felt such peace these last few years. Suffering and duality is a function of mind, not caused by anything else. When one misses one's real nature (through ignore-ance of it) suffering inevitably follows.

"And the Divine is seen as changeless, timeless Perfection, without a creation. But this never is clear unless the premise or "starting point" is the Absoluteness of Is, Self, Being. And isn't THIS the only valid "starting point" since only IS Itself is being in the first place?"

Without a creation! Wow. Because creation implies time, and there is no time. Correct? This has been the greatest revelation for me so far; that is if I'm understanding you correctly. If so, that idea never occurred to me before, that creation needs time and there is no time. In my thinking right now (if I correctly understand this) this explains the often heard phrase that what is experienced here is an illusion, a dream - in reality it doesn't exist.

Now I'm wondering what the "Divine" is - yes, It must be timeless and perfect, but what *is* It?

At any rate, this is what has come up for me know. I may be completely off base, so I'll read your attachments and watch the second video.

My best regards, and thanks again,
Ken

Hi Ken,

Yes, "you" are quite clear on this--but who is that? Awareness Itself, being, as "you" know.

You also said, "Now I'm wondering what the "Divine" is - yes, It must be timeless and perfect, but what is It?

It never can be "known." It's not *supposed* to be known--for if It could be something known, instantly It would become an object to Itself, and that's impossible. Yet It IS.

All the best,
Peter

Dear _____,

Don't worry too much about whether impulses seem to be coming from Spirit, or the would-be "Michelle mind"--just stay "busy" being Pure Being, Spirit Itself.

Always, always, always, this "work" is about the ALLNESS of Spirit only, and what It is to ITSELF. That's what is meant by Absolute. It's never about Spirit and how It "gives impulses to" or influences a "me" or "my daily human living," because to Spirit (the only One that is being, conscious, alive) there is ONLY Spirit, thus no human daily living that Spirit could influence! That's the difference between the Absolute and virtually all other teachings--they all are concerned with how Spirit, Self, One, can improve or influence daily human living--and that usually results in most of one's attention being on the daily living, rather than Spirit. In Truth, there is ONLY Spirit, Self, One (whose attention can't

wander from Itself) and whose Absoluteness actually precludes there even being any daily human living!

As One stays busy Here, as Pure Spirit, the daily human living *appears* to improve, but that's only because One is consciously functioning as Pure Being, Spirit, Consciousness, which is Perfection, Wholeness, Harmony. You'll find that this results in "doing" what seems to be the natural, normal, sensible thing in daily living. When "staying busy" as Pure Consciousness, Perfection, that means the very *Substance* of one's entire existence and universe is literally Perfection Itself! Why? Because Consciousness literally is the Substance or "Stuff" in which all existing appears to go on--nothing exists separate from, or outside of Consciousness. And again, it's never up to a "Michelle" or a "Peter" to be this Perfection...Consciousness Itself, Being Itself, is the only One that is conscious, that is being. Perfect Consciousness Itself is the only I, if one were to even use the word "I."

Peter

Hello _____,

You're right--at the "current time" (of which there is none in Absolute Reality) it *seems* as if there are various levels, or planes of manifestation. CIA speaks of basically three "levels" for purposes of clarity, so that a book on the Infinite can "make sense" and be practical even in what appears as finite daily living. The first realm or level discussed is the Infinite, the Timeless Absolute One, which is all that *really* is. Then, if this One were to ignore Itself (which actually is impossible in Truth, because ALL can't ignore Itself), it *seems* there are two main finite levels, the so-called physical, and the so-called mental.

As you said, on this finite basis, even the so-called physical plane isn't really physical, but can just as readily be called "mental" because it has no seeming existence apart from the finite mind. Yet, as you pointed out, this "physical-mental" is not the same as what could be called the purely "mental-mental." Example: it appears you're looking at a computer screen right now, and that screen can just as readily be called "mental" as "physical." Meanwhile, suppose you now *think* of another computer screen, with a neon-red frame around it, and flashing lights all around the border. It seems to be made of far different "stuff" than the screen now on your desk. The neon one seems to be far more ethereal than the other; it seems to be a matter of density, among other things. It's exactly the way merely "thinking" of your mortgage payment seems to

be far more ethereal than your bank, your demanding banker, your present home, etc. Yet, interestingly, later tonight when you're lying in bed, if you recall your "real" computer screen, and your neon one--and even your bank and bankers--at that point they're all made of identical "stuff"--mere dream-like thought.

I don't know which version of CIA you're reading (I recently revised it) but the key paragraphs are on p.284 (Second revised edition) or on p. 255 (first edition). The revisions didn't really affect this point:

The "Answer" is not to try to get more and better things on a physical basis—but in "letting go" of the false sense of physical limitation and separateness altogether. *Starting with the Infinity of Mind, the Only Mind Present*, where is there a state of thought that thinks in physical terms? Nowhere.

It still may appear according to the illusion of the senses that things aren't merely "mental" but are "manifest" on a physical basis—but *who* is saying that? The *things* themselves aren't saying they are physically "out there." Things have no mind with which to know anything. The things don't even know they're appearing that way! Do you realize that not one thing in the entire universe ever is *telling you* it is material or "manifest"? Only you would mistakenly assume things are "out there" as physical items that are separate from you, by identifying with *a sense illusion that is not* instead of as the Infinite Intelligence You *are*.

...One mistakenly assumes there *is* a second, separate existence, a limited physical world and life, in which mere *thoughts* are not enough—and for which a *second set* of things—a physical, material version, is required. Such ignorance would say that in order for a thing to really exist, it has to be "out there," *physically sensed as separate* instead of simply *thought*. It has to be dense, heavy, and has to have taken time to produce.

Yet the entire belief of there being such a second physical state, one of time, separateness, and weighty limitation, is *non-presence*! The whole thing would be an assumption believed by a mind that *isn't*. This would-be dream of heaviness and slowness isn't a weight humanity is bearing—it *is* humanity!

Again, instead of trying to satisfy an endless "physical" need of things—it is the superimposed false sense of physical existence itself that should be "dropped." One does that, not by dropping physicality, but by starting as the Wholly Present Mind One already is, and staying Here.

Even though such points may be crystal clear, it "seems" we are agreeing intellectually with Truth, but still are a long way from fully *living* It, *being* It. If I were fully being It, nothing finite could appear to me--not even anything "mental," let alone physical. The point is, the "more" one stays busy *being* what One truly is, Infinite Consciousness, the seeming heavier, weightier planes will appear to gradually "evaporate." It most likely will not appear to happen suddenly, but more gradually, and what now seems to be a very physical world, will become purely "mental." And eventually, as one "sticks with" what ONE truly is, even the more ethereal "purely-mental" plane will evaporate, because it, too, would be finite--and in One's Pure Infinity there is NO finity.

The "issue" is that this is a book on the Infinite, yet it appears as if it's presented within a finite framework--so it *seems* as if everything being said is double-talk. It's as if the "game" you're playing is the Absolute--yet you're being forced to play on a relative field. It ain't easy.

Bottom line: to the extent one is Infinity-conscious (staying consciously busy *being* One's Infinite Presence only, and not giving attention to finite forms), one must be less and less finite-conscious (limited by finity). And yet, even that is double talk, for the Allness of the Infinite Self actually leaves no possibility of any finity, or any of this ever occurring!

Hope that helps. Sorry for the lengthy reply, but clarity is everything as far as I'm concerned, and I often find that you just can't clarify adequately in a sentence or two.

All the best,
Peter

Dear _____,

You raised a good point about the term, "I Am" because It often is given different meanings which can be a source of confusion.

In *Consciousness Is All*, when I Am is used, It refers *only* to the Absolute, the Infinite, the Divine. Never is I Am meant in connection with a so-called personal self or body.

As there is only the Infinite Self Itself being present and alive in the first place, only *It* could be I Am, if such a term is used. I Am is exclusively the *Infinite Itself alone*. Never is I Am something that a person or lesser

self has risen to—because the Infinite One being the only Life, Self, the only I—It leaves no other to ever do any rising.

In Truth, I Am is this Present Awareness which silently, timelessly IS—before any thoughts or words *about* I Am—even the very words, “I Am.” There’s a quote in *Consciousness Is All* that goes something like, “To even voice or think the words ‘I Am’ in addition to the still, silent Presence of Awareness, is redundant.”

Ramana Maharshi spoke of “I” in two ways. There is true I Am, which refers to the Divine—as pure, unthinking Awareness or Being, Silence. In contrast, Maharshi also advocated the practice of self-enquiry regarding the “I-thought,” the false sense of a “little me” or I as a personality, separate from Self. The purpose of self-enquiry is to see the nothingness of, or “dissolve,” the I-thought. The I-thought is just that—the mere *thoughts* of an I or a “me” that seem to arise throughout the day. It acts as if it were a distinct self, ego or personality, separate from Self or pure Being, Awareness.

Nisargadatta at times spoke of the I Am Presence, but also said one has to “go beyond the I Am Presence.” I take this to mean that the I Am Presence refers to Awareness as a stillness, as changeless Being, the Timeless—yet which also supposedly *co-exists* with and “witnesses” a world of time—even though the I Am Presence Itself is outside of time. It would seem that by saying “go beyond the I Am Presence,” Nisargadatta was pointing to the Absolute, the Timeless, as ALL—which does not co-exist with time. In this light, the Absolute is not *beyond* the I Am, but *precludes* there being time in which to voice or even think such a thing as “I Am.”

True I Am is timeless, because the very word Am means just that—Am, present tense only—and has nothing to with *was* or *will be*, hence time.

In chapter 4 of *Consciousness Is All*, there is an example of “voicing I.” It is meant to show that the only One conscious in order that “I” even can be voiced is the Infinite Itself, which never is afar off in a vague “Infinite,” but is the presently conscious Self. Yes, the very voicing of I (reducing It to words), is finite and takes time—and that which is voiced never is the Infinite or Absolute Itself. Yet it is thanks to the Infinite Itself being presently conscious that it even can *seem* to be done.

Here is an excerpt:

When saying “I” in everyday use, how often do you think of yourself as Life’s Infinite I-Presence, *invisible Aliveness Itself*, instead of as a finite visible body?

Being Infinity Itself, I never, ever will see Myself as some thing that appears or is objective. *Invisibility* is all there is to I. And I Am all there is to Invisibility.

What does Infinity “behold” when all there is to “see” is Its own Infinity? In response to this question, the so-called finite, thinking “mind” draws a complete blank. Yet the answer to that question is One’s Permanent Address. It’s not a physical location; It’s *Alive Stuff*.

There never is a journey to make to Infinite Life.

The only “place” I live is *as* Infinite Aliveness. I revel in *being* It.

Now stop a moment and *don’t* say “I.” Just be alive as the *silent Presence* I Am.

Does Consciousness go away? Does It stop being Infinite, or all the Presence there is? Consciousness, I-ness, is perfectly present regardless of whether “I” is said or not.

After all this, don’t start by saying “I” am Consciousness, or “I” am the Infinite, when speaking in terms of Consciousness, the Infinite, the Self. *Turn it around*. Infinity Itself is the only I. Again, there never is a personal “I” that is being Infinite. One always starts with Consciousness, Self, Life, or some other synonym, not “I.” Why?

Infinite Consciousness never actually thinks of Itself as “I”; It never has to say “I” to identify Itself to Itself, or be reassured It is Infinite Consciousness. It *is*. The use of the word *I* is wholly a human invention. It is always focalized. The example of saying “I” is given only as another way of pointing out One’s undimensional nature, and that the Infinite never is separate, never off in a vague, imagined “Infinite” somewhere apart from *this present Being*.

All that’s important is that One which is conscious and has the capacity to voice—not *what* is voiced. Without the saying of “I,” Consciousness has no focalization, but is pure, true Infinity.

All the best,
Peter