

12

FACT: CONSCIOUSNESS IS WHAT THE PRESENT *IS*

THE OPENING STATEMENT OF THIS BOOK IS, “Right *now* you are conscious.”

Did you ever ask yourself what makes now be now?

Why is it always, always, changelessly *now* to you?

Regardless of whether the body appears to be getting out of bed in the morning, going home at night, or sitting reading a book, it is unavoidably *now*. The fact that it is always now never can be changed. It is impossible to make it be *not-now*.

No person, no body, is responsible for now always being *now*. This is how Life *is*. It takes no effort, not even the slightest, for now to be—just as it takes no effort for Consciousness to be. Try to separate the Consciousness I Am presently being from this *now*. It can't be done.

When agreeing it is always now, have you any idea of the *magnitude* of what that means?

Consciousness—this very One, aware here, now—sometimes is called *the Eternal Now*, or *the Present* because the Consciousness I Am never is other than *present*. As pure Consciousness, I cannot be taken *out* of Now and become something that *was* or *will be*. I Am. I cannot go back into a past or ahead to a future.

Try to change Consciousness from being present *Now*, and back It up to five days ago. Consciousness cannot vacate Now to be aware even five minutes ago.

On the same basis, is the Consciousness I Am ever actually aware five minutes *from* Now, in a future—in that which is not even present?

Consciousness is aware only Now, in the Present.

Consciousness is aware *as the Present*.

Consciousness, being all-inclusive of all there is, *literally is the Present Itself*.

The Present never is any *time*.

The Present is pure Consciousness, changelessly *being*.

Consciousness *never* vacates Now, the Present.

Suppose you tried to say Consciousness was conscious in the past—say five minutes ago. It really wasn't. Why? Look closely at the real nature of what you are calling "five minutes ago." Consciousness isn't back there—It's present here, now. It is *thinking* that has gone back to five minutes ago—for all there would be to that "five minutes ago" is some kind of *mental image* being projected in thought. And it is always *now* when one projects or thinks it.

Suppose you tried to say Consciousness, Awareness, can be aware in a future, and that you will be aware "then." Are you sure? Is It Awareness that's ahead in a future, or is Awareness always here, now—and *thinking* is projecting thoughts of a future? All there ever would be to any "future" is the mere projected *thought* of a future. And again, it is always *now* when it's being projected. The "future" never is an actual state; it's always just a bunch of projected mental images, nothing more than a lot of speculative imagining, being imagined *now*. Awareness can't leave Now, the Present.

This unchanging Present-ness or Presence of Pure Awareness is like the clear glass camera lens mentioned earlier, which does not think or project in terms of past or future, but stays in the present tense. If the clear glass could talk, all it could say is, "I am present. I am."

Likewise, as pure Present Awareness, You never vacate Now to think back or forward in time. Thinking *seems* to do it, but that's not You, *pure Awareness, changelessly being*. If You could vacate Now, You would leave *Being, Existence Itself*, and there would be no Being, no Existence, no Now. That's impossible.

This Changeless Now that I Am is Myself being permanent Omni-Present-ness. This Now that I Am, is not the "human now," not an endless sequence of fleeting "present moments" extending in time.

There is no sequence of Nows ongoing in time.

There is only *one* Now, which is the *One* I Am.

Now never is what I Am conscious of.

Now is the Consciousness I Am.

Only thinking, which flits constantly between past and future would seem laborious, complex. The fact that the Consciousness I Am is changelessly present *Now*, is so magnificently *simple* It is beyond description.

Which am I—thinking, which always would be moving in time, and *never is*; or Consciousness which *is*? I must be Consciousness, for I could not be conscious as that which never is. There is no choice about this. It is irrevocable Truth. It is *presently* functioning.

Why is Consciousness the Present?

If there were no Consciousness, it would be impossible to say there even *is* a Present. Take away Consciousness and it could not be said there is any Present, any existing at all. Equally, if there were no Present, nothing would be present, not even Consciousness.

Consciousness and the Present are not two separate entities functioning simultaneously. They are but two different words for the One Unchanging Conscious Presence which is all there is of All There Is.

It cannot be overemphasized that the Present being spoken of is not just “the” Present or “a” Present. It is the *conscious* Present. The Present is *this alive conscious Presence here and now alive to being all the Presence existent*. This Conscious Presence never is something You can be conscious of, as if It were something separate, because You *are* Consciousness Itself. In the same way, You never can be conscious of the Present. You *are* the Present. To read as if this refers merely to “a” Present, as something apart from *this Presently Alive Consciousness*, will make this book seem like just so many dry, boring words. *Be alive as the Present*. It’s the only place Your Life *is*.

The Present is not something separate that You experience.

The Present *is* You—All-Present Consciousness.

All that is present, is You.

When was the last time you noticed the Present was *not* present? Of course it sounds ridiculous because it simply doesn’t occur.

Where the Present is all-present (and It is absolutely all the Presence there is), there simply cannot be an absence of the Present.

That period when the Present is *not* present is what time would pretend to be. But that never happens.

The Present *always* is present.

The Present would have to be made to go away, *or be uprooted from being everywhere present, all Presence*, to have time in any way.

That is just plain impossible. In other words, the Omnipresent Present would have to be shoved aside, so time, what-never-is-present, could be present. It's crazy.

Only the Present is present, and endlessly so. That means complete, total "coverage" as *All*. This never changes.

It's worth repeating why time never is present.

Look once more at the second hand on a wristwatch or clock. See if there is any point in its continuous sweep that ever stops moving, passing on, not-being, to actually *be present*. Just as you're about to pin time down and say, "Aha, here time *is*," it's gone. It's not present.

Time pretends to be a past, that-which-is-not-anymore, or a future, that-which-is-not-yet. Time literally would be *that which is not*. Time *never is present*.

Only the Present, permanently present Awareness, is present. There simply is no point at which the Present comes to an end, and where what-isn't-present, or time, begins. What isn't present *can't* begin anywhere, because it isn't present!

Again, *only* the Present is present.

The Present Awareness I Am can't exist in time. The Present I Am is not surrounded by, or between, past and future. As the Present is *absolutely all that can be present*, It leaves only Itself, and no past or future anywhere to be between!

Present Awareness stands *alone*.

The answer to the question, "What is the Present to Its own Presence?" also is the answer to, "What is All? Who am I?"

Only the Present is present.

Only the Present *is real*, for only the Present *really is*.

Then only the Present can be *Reality*, for the Present is all that is present *to be Reality*.

Simply nothing else is present to be Reality.

One thus can see why this book does not constantly quote other sources, use references, and is not written in a "scholarly" style. It is not due to being intellectually irresponsible—but because all such material would be information gathered-in-time; such writing is intended only

for human thinking which functions wholly in never-present time, and is not the Pure Conscious Present I Am. All would-be activity of human thinking or the intellect *never really is*, thus *never is real*, or Reality. An intellect is not the proper “equipment” for discerning Reality, the un-intellectual pure Conscious Presence I Am.

The Present has to be Life Itself.

The Present is all that ever is present to be Life, to be alive.

If Life isn't *present*, where is It as It is being alive?

Life's Present Aliveness, the One I Am here and now alive to being as *Consciousness*, simply cannot be taken out of the Present and actually be alive, vital, in a past or future. A past or future isn't *alive*.

Life's Aliveness is found only in, or as, the Present. Life cannot be un-present, so none of Life is in time.

The word *life-time* is an oxymoron.

Life Itself does not extend in time. *Life is*. The entirety of Life *is now changelessly being*—as the All-Present Consciousness I Am. Because the Life I Am is not a stream of time events, not a continuity, there is no more of Life to come later. All of Life is present *now* as the Ever-Present Conscious Aliveness I Am. *All the Life there is for Eternity* already is present now.

Life *Itself* has nothing to do with passing time, change, growth or development. These appear to be effects, not Life Itself. They all appear to occur in time, what-never-has-presence. How could that which *never has presence* be Life?

To “taste” Life's unlimited Vitality, true Health, start or identify as the clean, clear purity of the Alive Present alone. Start with how boundlessly available Life's Ever-Present Aliveness is.

Be the fresh, new *Feeling* that Aliveness is, as It is just now *presently* being.

There isn't this One Present Aliveness I Am and another I. My Consciousness' endlessly present Vitality is the only I there is. I have no sludge of not-Present Life; no human thought in terms of past or future, and the emotional weight that would seem to go with it.

Who would ever try to hold back the Present, or keep It from being completely present? Wouldn't it be the most impossible thing to try? Yet that is exactly what one is attempting when clinging to mental worries about past or future. It is the pure vitality of One's *Presently Alive Being* that such worrying would try to work against and put aside. It is doomed

to futility because all that truly can be present, *forever*, is the Aliveness I Presently Am, this changeless, immovable All-Inclusive Presence. It is impossible to be more alive in a future. Why? Because a future never is *present* to be alive in. Only the Present is present, which is the entirety of Life, and changelessly so.

This also is why it is impossible to evolve to or *become* Consciousness, the One I Am, in a future. The One I Am is present *Now*, never in a future. *This Present Consciousness is the Whole of I Am*. There never will be more of what I Am beyond *this Present Consciousness*.

No amount of would-be human thinking ever can be I Am because thinking can't *be*. Thinking always moves and attempts to progress in time, all the while overlooking the I Am that *presently is*. The only way to “drop” such nonsensical delay is to identify directly as pure Present Consciousness.

The question never is, “How does one *be* pure Consciousness, the Present?” The question is, “How could One *not* be It?” Being the Present is absolutely unavoidable, inescapable.

Does it take effort before Consciousness is presently conscious?

Does any mental work have to be done to make Now *be*? The Present doesn't take years of study to attain—*It can't be escaped!*

Who is there that must try to become more aware of the Present—when there is no such separate one—but only the Present Self I Am? The beauty of My Omni-Present Awareness is that I cannot withhold any of Myself; nor do I have to make additional contact with Myself. I simply “behold” how undeviatingly *present* My Alive Presence *is*.

No attention is given to shifting thoughts, emotions, or sensations of a body; no attention to past or future, all of which would be not-the-Present. I do not resist these, try to stop, or do battle with them, for I Am “totally absorbed” in the *immediacy* and *simplicity* with which My Aware Presence is present—and that always, I Am *present only*. It is impossible for Now to *not* be, and Now is the exact same “Stuff” as the All-Inclusive Alive Presence I Am.

The irresistibility of *Now* is My Life Story. It is simple, right to the point, and never can pass away.

What if one were to mistakenly identify with what the five senses

seem to sense, instead of as Pure Consciousness, as the Present Itself? Absolutely *everything* a sensing human “mind” would claim to know about itself and its world seems to depend on the passing of time. It experiences every one of its sensations, every thought and emotion, in the passing of never-present time. It wakes up in time; it eats, works, plays, sleeps and dies in time. Never-present time is the very fabric of the mortal or human sensing “mind’s” experience.

Not a bit of mortal experience, not a single atomic particle, ever stops moving, vibrating, and passing on in time. Its only status is that of *not being present*. It is always *being-not*, and never can be *What Is*. The entire human body and all its activity, down to the tiniest part of a single cell, right down to its so-called DNA, would be in constant movement, even during sleep. The body always would be vibrating in passing time, *time that never is being*. Even DNA has been measured by scientists as vibrating—atomic particles moving back and forth with a certain frequent-ness or frequency in passing time, *is-not-ness*. The human body literally *is* movement. Nothing about a human body *is being*.

The term “human *being*” is another perfect oxymoron. For this to be clear, it’s useful to repeat an example from Chapter One concerning the five senses and the sensing of this book. Now, the sensing of the book is changed to the sensing of the so-called body:

“Don’t tell me the things I sense aren’t being or aren’t real. I can sense my body right now. I see it now, and I even could reach out and touch it now—so don’t tell me the body, and all those sensations aren’t genuinely *present*.”

Look again. Each moment some thing is sensed, even the body itself, there seems to be a visual sight or image of it, a tactile feeling, and perhaps other sensations. Those particular sensations are constantly changing and *passing on*, never to return again. It seems each sensation is instantly replaced by another new visual or tactile sensation, and another, and another, non-stop. Like the moving frames of film in a movie, the specific image and tactile feeling of the body from a few seconds ago are gone—already having been replaced by the fleeting image and touch of the body that is experienced at *this* moment in passing time, and on and on. In essence, all sensing of “body” would be a state of *vibration*, always moving on in time. All of it always is fleeting, passing away, and *not being present*—or being “not.” The entirety of all sensory experience, including the very sensing of the “body” itself, would be just so much *non-presence*.

Nothing about the human or mortal is permanently *being*. This isn’t saying there’s something wrong with body; don’t condemn or deny it; it simply isn’t being.

You can’t say *I* or say *You be*—and also say *You are a mortal body*. It’s a contradiction in terms. And *You must be*, or *You wouldn’t exist to know about this discussion*. *You are not a human being*. *You are Being, being*. The body-form may appear to be human, but that’s not *You*. It is thanks to being *Ever-Present Consciousness, pure Being*, that *You*

are not moving in step with this never-present time activity, and can see it for what it is, or rather, *isn't*.

In response, the would-be sensing “mind” may then try to say, “Yes, I understand that intellectually, but my body certainly is still being, is still present right here, solid as ever; so is this book, the room, and everything else.” But is it really?

As said before, what *appears* outwardly to the senses as a solid, stationary body and matter, in its essence would be cells, which are said to consist of molecules, which in turn are said to consist of atomic particles, energy or vibration. At this level, this “stuff” is in a *non-stop* state of motion and reaction in never-present time. This movement appears to occur on a scale so small and fast that, relative to the ability of the senses to perceive this activity, it *seems* present, solid and stationary *to the senses*. It’s because the sense organs of sight and touch themselves would be made of the exact same vibrating “stuff”—moving right in step with it.

It’s the way the earth at the moment seems very still and stationary as your body now appears to be sitting and holding this book. To the body’s senses, it doesn’t seem as if the earth were hurtling through space, orbiting the sun at an incredible rate of speed—but it is. The body, too, is actually moving with equal speed, because the body is on that fast-moving earth! Since the body and earth appear to be moving at the exact same speed, from the body’s point of view it seems as if neither were moving—but they are.

The point is, the Unmoving Present, Pure Conscious *Being*, is not a moving, mortal body-form. You are not something caused by movement of atoms, not produced or developed in time. How could All-Present Being have been produced by that which never has had being?

“If the Present is timeless and never changes, how could It be *alive* and conscious? It sounds pretty dead to me,” the thought may come.

Only to human thinking based on the senses would it seem unusual that the Present is timeless, yet *alive*. Such thinking attempts to impose *its* unreal standards, which function in time’s non-presence, upon *Conscious Presence, Life Itself*. Such thinking ignores what truly is, thus it is ignorant. It would say Life, too, should move and change in passing time, what-isn’t-present, in order to be alive.

Put the shoe on the other foot. The question isn’t: “How could Consciousness, the Changeless Present, be alive?” The question is: “How could *that which never is present* be alive?” It isn’t. Nothing about constantly passing, never-present time experience contains Life. Only *Now*, as timeless Being, is Life actually being alive. Just because something moves doesn’t mean it is Life Itself. Brown leaves move along the ground. Clouds move. Cars move. Are they Life?

To be alive yet changeless is completely “normal” to Ever-Present Consciousness. It can’t age or decay in time, for It never is other than *present*. Its Present-ness never is depleted or exhausted because where only the Present is present, no time passes in which anything *could* be exhausted. All that seems to change or decay is what *appears*, not Ever-Present Life Itself.

One who identifies as pure Conscious Being only, *is being the only Substance present*. It leaves no mistaken identification with what appears; no assumption that time or age *is*.

The fact that the only *One being* is pure Consciousness, which never is other than *All-Present*, means nowhere is there oldness or decay. And who is conscious besides Conscious Being Itself to act otherwise? The entirety of Your Existence has no choice but to be vitally, unagingly *present only*. There is no such thing as “old” Substance.

If it is exciting to read what is stated here, that’s because It is *Your Present Self* beholding that which is of sole value—Itself! You are enjoying that which is most valuable in Existence—your own Presence!

If one takes this a bit further, the next question is, “As *only* Consciousness, only the Present is, and It is absolutely *all* Presence, and never changes from being all-present, then where does time come from? How could time even *seem* to begin? *Did* it really begin?” If one mistakenly starts with never-present time, one somehow has to try to explain or account for it.

When one starts with the Present, all that is present, is the Present.

And one *has to* start with the Present and not time because *only* the Present is present to start with. What’s more, that very Conscious Present *Itself* is the only One present to do all “starting.”

That very Present must be You, for nothing else is present to be You. To identify as the Present, have only the Present, and *be* that Present Itself, as Pure Conscious Being, is to “taste” One’s own Eternity.

The next few chapters completely expose the false nature of *would-be* time and finite experience. They show in yet another way, why *the Present is all that is present*.

13

CHECK THE CREDENTIALS

TO SEE THROUGH THE NEVER-PRESENT NATURE OF TIME and the world of the senses, look at this *seeming* state in another way. It's not what it appears to be.

The first part of this chapter is a new variation of what already has been said about the senses—but don't impatiently pass it over. It helps show why the sensing "mind" and the so-called "physical world" it seems to sense would be nothing more than a purely *mental* illusion. More importantly, it then clearly shows that to the Consciousness You are, no such mental state exists at all, *not even as an illusion!*

According to the so-called human sensing "mind," it appears at the moment that a book is being held in the hands. Supposedly, by way of the sense of sight, the mind is now experiencing a mental image of hands holding a book. Simultaneously with its visual image of a book and hands, the mind seems to experience a sense of touch. There is a tactile sensation from the fingers on the book that involves feelings of texture, as well as a feeling of weight or pressure, and even temperature.

Right now, hold the book up and feel that sensation of weight or pressure. Do not, with the intellect, say, "That feels like light weight."

Rather, *feel* the weight.

Now *feel* the sensation of texture that the cover has. It is different from the texture of the pages. One feels rougher or smoother compared to the other—but don't just *say* one is smoother—close the eyes and feel them. These sensations of texture and weight seem to shift, change and pass as the book moves about in the fingers. To experience these passing sensations also takes *time*.

Clearly, identifying as pure Awareness *alone* is entirely different from identifying with all the tactile sensations.

Now—don't think of this tactile experience in terms of two separate objects—fingers *and* a book. Close the eyes again and experience it *purely as the one feeling*, which is really what it would be. As a feeling, you wouldn't think of it as two separate items, but as *one* tactile sensation, simultaneously combining weight, texture, and temperature into one overall package of feeling.

Now, where is the only place *all* feelings of weight, texture or pressure—not just those of a book—would be found? Who has the weight—the Pure Awareness You are, or is the weight found in, or as, the sensation? All weight would belong to the senses, not Awareness. *All* qualities of heaviness would be finite—what only a finite "sense-mind" supposedly experiences.

Infinite Awareness cannot be put into any such categories.

Now "start with" or identify as pure Awareness alone. Ask Your Self how much Awareness "weighs" *to Awareness*.

The answer—utter weightlessness—is what *You* are.
Just *how light* are You?

Ask only pure, Present Awareness, *as that Awareness*. This never can be known by a body or a so-called sensing, weighing, finite “mind”—for Awareness is Infinity Itself, Purity Itself. It isn’t something You have risen to. This Purity is what You *are*. You needn’t go way “off there” to a distant Divine state, apart from or above a physical world, to be this wonderfully light, free Purity. It’s what You always are being *right here*, as Pure Awareness. There never, never is an *end* to You.
This alone is “how” and “where” One lives.

Now—what is the “texture“ of Pure Consciousness *to Consciousness*?
It is not rough or coarse, but is the *smoothness* of Endless Oneness.

Conscious Awareness Itself, this Pure I-Presence You are, has no body, no sensations, to experience weight or roughness. The only place the experiencing of weight and a body would be found is *as the sensation*. There is no weight *apart* from the sensation.
Pure Awareness Itself always is simply, freely present.

Awareness, I-Presence, is entirely *undimensional*. It has no shape, no surface, with which something could come in contact, or exert pressure against. Not only does Awareness not weigh anything—nothing can weigh on It! Absolutely nothing can weigh You down! Again, what is Pure Awareness *to Itself*? Not a little weightless—*completely* weightless.
It’s not that You now have let go of weight. *You never had any*.

In Pure Awareness, in the Present, there is no heaviness, no buildup of pressure.

The Present that Awareness is, not only has no physical weight.

Equally, in the Present there is no burden of emotional or mental weight.

The Present knows only Itself and Its weightlessness—and the Present *always* is all that is present.

How often does it seem a so-called personal body-identity is weighed down by thinking and worrying? Virtually always—and all of it would be based on what is sensed. Yet none of *that* is You. And there are not two Identities, not two types of Life.

Again, how light is the Present, Awareness, *to Pure Awareness*?

This indescribable Lightness of Your Present Awareness *is absolutely all the Presence there is*. Identifying as Pure Awareness only, the Lightness

You are is *endless*. There is no point where It ends and a heavy, dense physical state begins—for sticking with Infinite Awareness *only*, It never comes to an end of Itself and Its magnificent Lightness.

To Your Lightness, *only* Lightness is present.
How much of your day do you spend *being* the Lightness You are?

It's the only way You are present—as the utter *absence* of weight or density.

Your Present Life is that of Pure Ease—forever un pressured and unput-upon. How graceful, how gentle, is this Pure Awareness You are, in Its delightful ease of *being*?

Yet, as unspeakably gentle and delicate as your indescribable Ease is, It is eternally indestructible.

This effortless Lightness that You are cannot be limited or contained. It is *unrestrainable*.

All there is, is incalculable Freedom, endlessly overflowing *Openness*, which is *alive*.

This open, alive ease is the *texture* of Life Itself. The texture of Your Life is this endless *alive smoothness* that Absolute Oneness is.

This is Real Texture. It is Self-Texture—the way pure Being “feels” to Its own Purity.

This is You as You endlessly are.

The entire weighty human world that appears each passing day by way of the senses, would be just that—a *passing sense* of existence. It is not the ease of Being or Existence Itself, as Pure Conscious Awareness. The most important point of this book is that there are not *two* kinds of Existence.

There is not the Real Existence that is, the delicate, open ease that

You are as Pure Infinite Consciousness—and a finite, weighty, three-dimensional appearing world of the senses—though it would *seem* so if one starts with the senses.

In terms of Infinite Consciousness alone, there is no weight, no finite appearance of anything.

There is only Infinity.

What does it mean that there is only Infinity? It's like saying in the movie example that not only is the movie unreal—there isn't even a movie appearing! All there is, is formless, appearance-less Pure Spirit, the endless Absolute. There is only the ease of weightless Being that Consciousness is—an entirely un-dimensional but *consciously alive* Presence.

“This is crazy,” the would-be “mind” or intellect based on the senses may try to say.

The so-called sensing, thinking “mind” that deals constantly in hard evidence—in touchable, visible, three-dimensional objects—would say, “How can this be? If there are no senses, no finite, weighty, appearing world, then why do I see it? How can I feel my body, or this book? How can I behold such a world if it doesn’t exist to Consciousness?”

All such questions are exactly what would be expected of a state of thinking that is based only on the senses. It never is Infinite I-Presence, never *You*, asking such questions. It would be a state of ignore-ant finite thinking that asks.

All that this finite state of thinking or intellect seems to do, is ignore the Infinity of the Only I-Presence, Pure Being, and deal in what is sensed and observable in passing time—which *never is being*.

In fact, such a state of thinking *isn’t a mind at all*. It’s a mistake. It would be due to mistakenly identifying with the sensations one appears to be aware of, and saying, “That’s me”—*instead of being Pure Awareness Itself, the Only I*, the only true Self, Mind, or Intelligence.

When you stop to pull it apart, this would-be “mind” is just a chain reaction of thoughts based only on what the senses sense—totally avoiding ever-present Awareness, *what truly is*, or Truth. A bunch of sensations or thoughts by themselves are not alive, not *a conscious entity*. Only *You* are. There is no Intelligence, Awareness, or Life in a bunch of mistaken thoughts. It would be only *its own ignorance* that labels what it is doing as being a “mind.”

It may seem that up to now you have unwittingly accepted this weighty state of finite sensing and thinking as being you, or belonging to you. If so, there is no shame in it. It seems to be the human norm. Without knowing Identity is Pure Conscious *Being*, one would appear to be left on the level of that constantly passing “mind.” What *it* says would be all one has to go by—one wouldn’t even know there was anything else.

Consciousness, Your Self, here, now, actually never has accepted any such thing, even unwittingly. Consciousness can *only* be Pure Awareness, Pure *Is*.

What happens when one starts by identifying or “looking out as” Pure Consciousness, Intelligent Being only, instead of identifying with ignore-ant thinking based on the senses?

What happens when you examine the credentials of this *would-be* finite, sensing time-experience? Can it pass the test of *truly being*? The so-called state of thinking based on sensing would say, “The

finite, physical world *must* be here. I can see it. I can touch it. I hear, taste and smell it. I can think about it and have emotions about it. It's *obviously* right here."

This same finite state of thinking also is the only thing attempting to refute that there is *only* the Infinite. The only place all seeming objection to the *complete, absolute Presence of the Infinite* would seem to come from, would be this sensing state of thought, the only naysayer.

The sensing "mind" would try to say: "The Infinite has no verifiable credentials. I can't see the Infinite or otherwise sense It. I can't observe or measure Pure Infinity scientifically. I can't quantify It mathematically. I only can theorize about It—but I can't *find It* anywhere. How could this Infinite Being be true, be *All*, or be a Presence or Power? It's so ethereal, so insubstantial. This Infinite stuff may sound intriguing, but *my finite physical world* is the one that's really here. Since my finite world is here, the Infinite can't be all there is, and It's certainly not being Infinite here. I see sin, disease, death. You say the Infinite or God is *all*? Have you taken leave of your senses? Maybe this Infinite is way out in space, or off in a divine state somewhere, but It's not here."

To a state of thinking based solely on the senses, any premise that is non-sense, naturally would seem to be nonsense.

Now turn the tables on it.

Question the legitimacy of this state of sensing and thinking, rather than entertaining *its* doubts about the Infinite. What exactly are the credentials of this finite "mind" that *supposedly* testifies to physicality and an entire three-dimensional world of time and space?

What happens when one closely examines *those* credentials?

And here's the real issue. How valid then could all human thinking, reasoning and conclusions be—whether philosophical, scientific or religious? How real could they be if based entirely on sense-activity that is a state of utter non-presence—thus unreal, invalid?

These questions aren't coming from another, from an author-body. It can only be *I*, the One All-Present Intelligence, the Life I Am, the only One present and conscious so this book can be read.

Pull this would-be state of sensing and thinking apart slowly, piece by piece, and hold it up to the light of Intelligence. Read the following closely, as if enjoying a good detective story, for that's what it would seem to be.

Right now, the finite "mind" supposedly looks out over a book, a body, and a room, observing a universe of objects and space. But on

what basis would the “mind” even say there is a body now holding this book and doing all that? In fact, on what basis would it be said there even is a weighty physical world of time and space at all? It is all based on the five senses.

To even *say* there is finite or human experience would depend entirely on the senses sensing it: seeing it, hearing it, touching, tasting, and smelling it. As said earlier, if one were to take away the five sensations of human experience—all the sights of it, all the touches of it, all the sounds, smells and tastes—one couldn’t even say there *was* such a thing as human experience!

Now exactly how does this sensory experience seem to work?

As an example, consider any everyday item sensed by the five senses. Say it’s a nice red apple. How does the “mind” know anything about that apple—or even claim an apple is *there* in the first place?

The sensing “mind” experiences a specific visual sensation, which also could be called an appearance, or a mental image of the apple. That particular visual sensation of red color and roundish shape is one way the mind differentiates an apple from other items, such as a book or a hand.

Simultaneously with this visual sensation, the mind experiences a particular tactile sensation of the apple; there is a feeling of weight and texture when holding it.

Also simultaneously, there may be a sense of sound associated with an apple, such as crunching when a bite is taken. There also is a sensation of taste, and a scent.

Each of the five senses contributes its particular “aspect” of the apple to the mind. As a result of all the sensations it experiences, the mind instantly says to itself, “An apple is here.”

This same process of course applies to all items in daily experience.

When the senses combine in their normal operation, it results in normal human activity; this is how the sensing mind experiences its entire world. The mind experiences all sensations at once, which in this case equals “apple.”

Now look again.

A question long pondered by philosophers concerns the nature of the *substance* of this whole apple experience. Exactly what kind of substance is one dealing with here?

The entire and only basis on which the mind would say an apple is present, is by way of the senses. Absolutely everything the mind would know about the apple is thanks to a visual sensation, a sensation of touch or feel, a sound, a taste and smell. The mind’s entire “evidence” is sensations.

Now ask yourself, what makes up the apple *itself*—that supposedly is giving off this sensory experience to the mind?

Really stop a moment. Ask yourself what the apple itself consists of, *apart* from those five sensations.

When you try to think of what an apple is, entirely apart from those five sensations—what happens?

You can't think of anything.

And why can't you think of anything besides the sensations?

Because there *isn't* anything.

There are only the sensations!

There are not the sensations of an apple *and* an apple! Sensations are the entire and only "substance." There is no apple that is a standalone physical object "out there," with its own substance, in addition to the sensations experienced by the *mind*. The "apple" would be entirely *mental*—consisting one hundred percent of sensations only.

Go ahead. First take away those five sensations. Then see if you still can come up with an "apple." Poof! The "apple" is non-existent. The "apple" as a separate, solid object didn't go anywhere. It *never was* out there as a separate object in the first place!

The mind's experiencing of sensations results in what is *called* an apple, but never is there a separate item "out there." All there would be is a series of images, feelings, tastes, sounds and smells—*experienced entirely by the mind*.

There is nothing else there.

You may be asking, "If it's just *sensations* or 'mental,' then what did I chew and swallow at lunch today?"

Well, exactly what *is* an apple anyway? Supposedly a roundish red fruit with a whitish pulp, a slightly sweet or tart taste, and a pleasant scent. Okay, but what would all *that* be? What are chewing and swallowing? Nothing but so many sensations.

The way the mind experiences it, it has an illusory *appearance* to the mind as if there were a solid object, apart from, or objective to the mind. But there never is a separate physical item. The "apple" would be a purely *mental* process, experienced entirely in or *as*, thought.

The mind's sensations of "apple" and its very *thinking* that an apple is there, is the same, one process. The mind's sensations of "apple" would be exactly the same as the mind's *thought* in terms of an apple. This is important to recognize. Call it sensation or thought; either way, mere "mental-stuff" would be all there is to it. There's no physical object.

The only “hard evidence” of an apple isn’t hard, solid matter at all.

It would be just a mental experience of a flow of a lot of un-solid sensations, always passing on in time. It is just so much *mental fluid*. While earlier one might have thought of an apple as a solid object, one can’t say an image in thought, a passing feeling, a taste, or the hearing of a sound is a solid object. Those would be entirely mental phenomena and *they* do not constitute a solid object. It is in this way that the flow of all sensations, thus all would-be “objects,” are referred to as “mental fluid.”

What does all this *mean*?

It’s a topic that has been debated almost for as long as there appear to have been philosophy and metaphysical teachings. The question always had been whether this apple experience (and thus by extension, *all* sensory human experience!) would be going on *outside* the mind, or *inside* the mind. In one regard it might be said either view is correct. Actually, neither is correct. It all seems to depend on the viewpoint.

Outside or inside the mind is not the real issue.

What *never* changes is that the apple experience is *inseparable* from the mind. The “apple” is neither outside nor inside the mind, but *is* the mind itself in its so-called operation!

To see why this is so, first see why neither of the other two is true. The traditional, physical or materialist viewpoint *assumes* the world and universe are physical and that the mind is located inside the body. If the mind is said to be inside the body, then any thing or experience outside of the body (such as the apple) would be considered outside the mind.

But if one takes a meta-physical, or “mental” viewpoint, everything is seen in reverse. On this basis, the mind is not in the body—the body and all else is said to be in mind, or in thought. So not only the apple, but one’s entire experience, is seen as within the mind, or “mental.”

However, neither of these two viewpoints could be true, or be changeless Truth. Why? The validity of either view changes depending on the premise, depending on whether one arbitrarily starts on a “physical” or “mental” basis. One is no more or less valid than the other. Both viewpoints also mistakenly imply that the apple is somehow separate from the mind itself; or at least that the mind and apple are two different things. They’re not.

The third alternative which has been largely overlooked, is, again, that the “apple” is neither outside nor inside the mind, but *is* the mind itself in its so-called operation.

For example, when the mind experiences the sensations associated with “apple,” it can’t be said those sensations are produced by an apple that is separate from the mind, because no separate apple is there to have produced them. Yet if it were not for *that* particular seeming item or “apple,” that particular package of sensations wouldn’t exist either.

One wouldn't experience those specific sensations with an "orange."
The "apple" and those specific sensations need each other. Why?
The act of sensing and the "thing" sensed are *one*. No *thing* exists separate from the sensations of it—and no sensations exist separate from *what* is sensed. In other words, there aren't sensations *of* a thing—only sensations *as* that thing.

This appears to be true for all items in finite human experience, not just apples!

What it means is, there isn't the finite sensing mind *and* any item, or any form of experience apart from the mind. *It all is the mind*; it is one. It means the finite "sense-mind" doesn't ever think *about* a condition—the mind *is* the condition. The mind doesn't visit or think in terms of places; the mind literally *is* the places. It doesn't sense all the planets and things in the stellar universe. The mind is all the things; it is the universe. Even the feeling of a body moving through empty space would be entirely sensation or mental—space just feels less dense than an apple.

On this basis, one sees that there never are separate "physical objects" that have different degrees of hardness or density—say, a ball of cotton as compared to a stone. The different "densities" really would be degrees of "mental" density, degrees of density of *thought*. The traditional misconception always has been that sense data is "taken in" from a thing "out there" that is separate. There never is a separate object or thing out there from which to take sense data. Rather, it always would be the finite "sense-mind" experiencing *itself*—which it *calls* a body and universe of separate things.

What is important is that all of so-called finite human experience and its universe would be the "mind" in operation.

It doesn't matter if it appears to be the beautiful call of a songbird piercing the silence at dawn, the dawn itself, or a plate full of pancakes. There is not the finite "sense-mind" *and* any form of experience in the entire stellar universe that exists as a separate entity "out there" apart from thought. It all *is* the mind, experiencing itself. It is one. When buying a car, a new dress, groceries—anything—it really is a matter of *buying a package of sensations*; a state of thought buying into a mental pattern it resonates with. Even the store itself and the money exchanged would be more of the same mere *sensory mind-fluid*.

This has staggering implications for science. What the mind supposedly senses as "cosmic background radiation"—supposedly resulting from the big bang and the beginning of the universe, supposedly "proof" of the beginning of a material universe and physical time and space—all of that would be entirely "mental" too. There simply is no other evidence of background radiation, or even an entire stellar universe, apart from what the mind supposedly senses of it!

There is another extremely important point to realize about this. As a result of sensing "things," never does anything solid, separate or physical *remain* after the sensations of it are experienced! Never is a stand-alone solid object "left behind." The mind's activity, with the countless passing

sensations it seems to have experienced over time, *never* has left so much as a single, solid separate object in its wake!

Equally, there never is a separate, solid apple anywhere *before* the sensations of it are experienced! It makes clear that there never is a physical, objective world “out there.”

That which is called “apple” or any other item, always would be the exact same *un-solid* flow of sensations. It doesn’t matter how solid or separate it may seem—and it will seem so. At no time is there a separate apple out there on its own, in addition to the fleeting sensations of it. Everything finite always is just a *flow* of sensations; mere “mind-fluid.” This holds true for *all* would-be “objects.”

In so-called human experience it never is mind *and* matter. Nor is it mind over matter. The “mind” *would be* “matter.” Yet in Reality, to the Present Consciousness You are, *none of this really matters at all.*

Why? None of this mental-sensing activity stops passing on in time, not-being, to *really be*, or to *be Real*. As said repeatedly, the mind’s activity always is busy *not being*—busy being “not.” None of it is You. All there is to You is Infinite Consciousness, Being Itself. You can’t *be* what never is being!

Do you realize that all *would-be* physical laws, all limitations, and all problems of the world would be *one with* this “mind-that-never-is-being”? It isn’t that this “mind” knows about all the problems of human mortal experience. It *would be* the problems! It doesn’t observe birth and death, disease and sin; it doesn’t think about poverty and war; it *would be* birth and death, disease, sin, poverty and war. This is *not* saying the mind is bad or evil—don’t condemn or judge any of it. That which *isn’t being* can be neither bad nor good.

The point is, never are there any such *physical* conditions. There is no world “out there” that is separate from you, leaving you helpless to do something about it. All there would be to it is mere mental wisps of ignore-ant thought, or belief. It’s all supposedly believed by a state of passing thought that is not You. In fact, it’s *never even present!*

Two distinct points have been made here that are so enormous in significance, they’re worth summarizing. The first is that what appears to be an entire material world and universe separated by physical distance isn’t that at all—but just a “mental” state which has an *illusory appearance* of being separate. Secondly, this entire would-be mental state always is moving or passing in time and never is *being*—and never, ever genuinely has been *present*.

If one mistakenly identifies or starts with that “time-mind,” one has to account for and deal with its would-be conditions. *Starting with Truth* shows that Consciousness, the Present, is changelessly Omnipresent. In Truth, *Pure Conscious Being is absolutely all that is being*—which means a “mind-that-never-is-being” and its would-be limitations never could begin or operate in Your Being—not even as an illusion. As there

really is no “mind” to experience or be such conditions, *there are no such conditions!*

Pure Conscious Being is all that is *present*.

14

CEASE YE FROM MAN

“*CEASE YE FROM MAN whose breath is in his nostrils, for wherein is he to be accounted of?*” (Isaiah 2: 22)

Now fully expose the nature of this *would-be* sensing mind and its world, which only *appears* to be one of separateness, but really isn't. Whether referring to an apple or a planet—all so-called “material objects,” all would-be “physical places,” and even the space that appears to contain them—have no existence apart from the “mind,” as just discussed. It means *everything* in what is called an entire stellar universe, would not be physical or separate, but one hundred percent “mental” only, or “made out of” *thought*. Again, the universe would not be outside or even inside of thought, but is inseparable from thought or the so-called “mind.” It is one.

The question then becomes, *where* would all this mental universe appear to be going on, since the entirety of it would be *only* “mental”? As there are no physical places, where would all of daily experience be going on? Is everything about the “human scene” just one big dreamlike mental image? If so, where do you *put* this mental image or all this thought?

Of course, the traditional human belief is that the “mind” and its thought is located inside a physical body's brain. But what if a body is like an apple? If a body is not a solid physical object either, *there wouldn't be any object there to put a mind inside of*.

Now see why all the mental activity one seems to experience in daily living is *not* occurring inside a physical body's brain. Rather, the viewpoint now would be meta-physical—meaning that the body, all bodies, and all of the universe, appear to be in one big mental image, or what is sometimes called the “universal mind,” or dream.

First, it is helpful to see why the old notion of there being a solid physical body with a mind inside it, never has been true, no matter how long it seems to have been believed.

Recall how the senses seem to create the illusion that there is a solid apple “out there” separate from the mind. In the same way, the senses make it seem as if *body* were a solid object, too. It isn't.

The mistaken notion that there is a “body” is an illusion because the entire experience occurs only in the seeming mind. The “body” would be purely a “mental” phenomenon—not a solid physical object. As shown in the previous chapter, it is impossible to find evidence of any physical object separate from the mind.

Closely examine all evidence of “having a body” and see what you actually come up with as its “substance.” Typical human thinking would say, “Of course the body is a solid object—I can poke it with my own finger and *feel* its solidity.” So the mind experiences a “finger” touching a “leg.” There is a tactile feeling or sensation, yes, but the mistake is that it’s assumed to be a solid physical body touching itself. If you’re alert you notice that all that’s actually *there* are some passing feelings. Just as when feeling an “apple,” there aren’t *both* the feelings *and* a solid apple—all that’s there are the *passing feelings*. In the same way, there aren’t *both* the feelings of a touched leg *and* a solid leg—the only “substance” is the passing feelings. There’s nothing else there.

It’s the same with the visual sense. The mind experiences *images*, which are mistakenly *assumed* to be the various parts of a physical body—legs, arms, a torso, etc. It is assumed these images are being given off by a solid object—but that’s a mistake—because there aren’t both the images of a body *and* a body—only the images.

The mind also experiences other sensations—which supposedly are “body-sounds,” called talking and breathing. And the mind experiences sensations of taste and smell. They’re no proof of a solid body either, because the only “substance” that’s there are just *sounds, tastes, and smells*—and, again, they do not constitute a solid object.

More importantly, those sensations always are changing, flowing, from one to the next like frames in a movie film—always fleeting, passing on in time, or *not-being*. Never do they stop not-being to *be present*. That mere flow of passing, never-present sensations would be all the “substance” there ever is to the illusion of “having a body.”

When you take those five sensations away, “body” is non-existent.

What is a body anyway? Supposedly flesh and bones. Okay, but what would all *that* be? Sensations. The entire evidence that ever could be presented for flesh, bones, or any other aspect of “body” consists, again, of nothing more than a stream of fleeting images, sounds, feelings, smells and tastes—with nothing besides to be a physical object.

There never has been such an object.

Traditional reasoning which says that mind is mental, and body is physical, and that the one can be inside the other, has a fatal flaw. It mistakenly first *assumes* something that’s not true—that body is a physical object in which a mind could be put. It’s not.

Because the belief in a solid body seems to be so strong, take one more thorough look *behind* those sensations that supposedly give all evidence of the “body” itself. Look behind all the mental images of “body,”

all of the supposed touches and feelings, all hearing of body-sounds, and so on. What is there to “body” itself, that could be giving off those sensations? Now try to come up with a separate, stand-alone object or substance that is present *in addition to* those sensations.

That’s just it. There isn’t anything besides the sensations.

There is no stand-alone solid item, no physical anchor. All you’ve ever got is a bunch of free-floating sensations. So you can’t say there is a mind in a body—when a body *isn’t* a body—and all it would be is a bunch of sensations going on in the mind.

Since the only way “body” ever would be experienced is purely as a mental phenomenon—*in the mind*—that leaves no such thing as a physical body in which to put the mind *itself!* The only reason this isn’t readily seen is due to being fooled by sense-appearances and mistakenly *assuming* “body” is a solid object in which a mind could be put. It’s just an assumption based on illusory sensations.

One cannot think in terms of inside a “body” when it comes to locating the “mind.” It’s like a con artist’s shell game—only instead of playing find the little ball, you’re playing find the mind. You never get a satisfactory answer. It’s because the mind is neither inside, nor is it even outside a body. The mind literally *is* the “body.”

It’s exactly like the earlier example in which the mind *is* the “apple.” When the mind experiences the sensations of what it calls “body,” there aren’t *both* the sensations and a body. So sensations can’t be coming from a body that is separate from the mind—for there is no such object. On the other hand, without that sense of a “body” there would be no experience of a mind at all—no touches, no sights, no sounds, tastes or smells. The sensing mind and the sense of “body” seem to need each other. One can’t exist without the other, for they would be opposite sides of the same coin.

After all this, the old way of thinking may try to rationalize, “There *still* is a physical body, and the mind is inside, in the brain.” The old argument would try to say, “The brain is where the five senses send all their information. Sensations are sent *to* the mind by way of the nerves that feel, in the fingers or legs—those nerves all *lead to* the mind in the brain, sending sensory information there. So all body-sensations are experienced in the mind—and it’s still inside the brain, inside the body.” Back up a minute. That way of thinking, again, *mistakenly assumes* that in addition to mere sensations, there *also* is a separate body-object with solid fingers and legs. There isn’t.

All there ever would be to “fingers” and “legs” is a purely *mental* experience—some images and passing feelings of touch. There aren’t the images of fingers and legs *and* fingers and legs. Such a mere mental experience does not add up to a static physical object. Since there never is a physical body-object that exists separate from the mind—there never is a physical body to contain a physical neurological system—

though it certainly *appears* as if there were.

Shocking as it may seem, this of course means there is no physical brain either. If one judges by illusory appearances and first mistakenly *assumes* body is a physical object, it appears a brain is inside a head, yes. But as the so-called “body” itself would be entirely “mental” and never is a physical object, there certainly couldn’t be a brain as a physical object either. There simply is *no physical place* in which to put such a thing.

One might ask, “What if I were a brain surgeon? I would have operated on hundreds of brains, and *seen* they were inside a head, and connected by nerves to arms and legs.”

Okay, but of what, exactly, would all that experience of doing surgery consist? The only “substance” involved in the entire surgery would be nothing more than *just so many sensations*—passing mental images and tactile feelings of operating on a “patient.” But those sensations would not be coming from a physical “patient-body,” for *there would be only those sensations*. Nor would the sensations be experienced by a physical “surgeon-body,” for there is no such object either.

At no time is there a solid physical body being operated on—or doing the operating! It all would be *one mental phenomenon* that appears to include both the “patient” and the “surgeon.” This actually would make sense from a meta-physical viewpoint, which says that the body, all bodies, and the entire universe, appear to be in mind, or in the one “universal mind”—the “universal mind” is not in any body.

What is a brain anyway? Make no mistake—the *only* evidence or “substance” there ever could be of a brain would be the mental images and tactile feelings of it, observed or experienced by the mind supposedly doing the surgery. A so-called “brain,” too, would have no state other than those mere sensations. On this basis, it could be said that a “brain” would be entirely a product of the mind, not vice-versa. No longer are the mind and mental activity seen as originating from a physical organ called a “brain”—for there is no such physical object. The mind isn’t *in* the brain—the mind *is* the brain.

Get completely away from the notion that body is a physical object or place. If one were to speak on a finite basis, all there would be to “body” is a relatively dense “mental” state, or state of *thought*. Rather than there being a body that is giving off sensations, it would be sensations giving off what appears as the mind’s thoughts of a body. It never goes beyond this bodiless flow of thoughts, or “mental fluid” to being a physical stand-alone object.

A question that may arise based on all of the preceding might go like the following:

“If the mind is *not* inside a body or brain, then why does the mind’s activity stop when the body is anesthetized? How could anesthesia affect the mind if the mind is not there? And if the mind isn’t in the brain, then

why don't the mind and body function just as well when the brain is damaged or removed?"

On a finite basis, the "sense-mind," again, isn't inside a body, but *is* the "body." They would be one and the same. So if it appears the state of a "body" is altered via chemical anesthesia or surgery, naturally the state of the "mind" will appear altered, too, for it all would be the same, one "stuff." It is not because a mind is *inside* a body.

This also appears to work in reverse, as shown by the increasingly popular holistic approach to medicine. Treating the mind appears to affect the body because they would be the same *one*.

This book is not denying that such things appear to occur. If one starts on a would-be physical basis, yes, there appears to be a control center or brain that governs the body's reactions; but that's all there would be to its activity—reaction. At no time would this reaction be a genuine mind. Better said, it is not Infinite Consciousness Itself. You couldn't *be* the Intelligent Being you are, if you were only a state of reaction passing in time, which *never is being*.

Don't mourn the fact that "body" never has been a solid physical object separate from the mind. How much mourning was there over the flat earth, once it was shown to be round?

The only reason this seems unusual is due to having already accepted what seems to be a *general belief* that unquestioningly assumes "body" is a solid object and has a mind or consciousness inside it. That is all there would be to it—just a belief or mistaken state of thought based on sense-illusion—again, no more actual than that good old flat earth. It is not Truth.

At one time it was believed that the entire universe was centered around the earth, or was geo-centric. Just as that old false belief faded away—so the false belief that Consciousness is body-centric will fade. All such belief or assumption seems to occur only on the level of human thought, which is fallible. It is not Pure Awareness, which is infallible. Awareness never assumes anything. Awareness stays Pure Awareness, unchanged eternally.

Pure Awareness is the only Identity or Presence that is *conscious*, *alive*, and remains forever perfectly present, *as the Present*, regardless of the *seeming* status of a finite body or "mind."

Do not be alarmed at this discussion of an un-solid "body" and "matter." It just is saying what appears to be taught in high school chemistry class regarding un-solid atoms and energy—now seen from a new angle. The point is, Consciousness, Life, *couldn't* be inside a body that's *not there* as an object to have Life inside of it.

This does not mean one will mis-use body because it is not physical. The body just is not the way it *appears* by way of the senses—not separate, solid or made of matter. As Pure Timeless Consciousness is the only Presence and Substance, body will seem less and less material and take on more of the appearance of being an ageless thought or idea, like

the figure four, or the letter A.

Just because what appears to be a solid body isn't really that way, nothing has changed with *You*. As All-Present Consciousness, You haven't gone away, and are not going anywhere. You most definitely are present, are real—eternally calm and serene, as immovable, All-Embracing Conscious Presence—*All Itself*.

Body hasn't gone anywhere either. It still appears to be here, available to be used freely. All that's "gone" is a false belief of being a mortal body-object. No such state ever was true or present anyway.

Most emphatically, what is pointed out here is not an attempt to minimize what appear as current medical practices for treating a "physical" body. It is not negating the marvelous advances in neurological sciences—or in *any* field of endeavor. At the current "time," these seem essential, and may continue for an indefinite period. However, this in no way alters the Truth that *Consciousness*, not physicality, is all Presence and Substance; and what *seems* to be a physical body and universe at most would be only "mental" or *thought*.

The use of the word *thought* here does not mean thinking or intellectual activity. It is used simply to convey that all things that appear to the finite "sense-mind" never are physical, but "mental" only, or inseparable from the would-be "mind." However, the finite appearance things have, even when seen as "mental," is *not* Divine. The shape and outline that apples, bodies and other mental-forms appear to have is not the way things "look" in the Infinite, in the Divine, *wherein there is no finite form*. Not even mental forms are Infinite Reality, which is discussed in later chapters.

However, it is thanks entirely to Infinite Consciousness now being present that such finite forms even can be identified. If there were no Consciousness, Awareness, *nothing* would be—things couldn't even be identified as the finite mental forms they appear to be. This is why it frequently is said that Awareness *appears* to be aware of these mental forms. Using "appears" is not saying that Awareness *is* aware of things in that way—it's just saying that it appears so.

Again, it also has been said that it *appears* as if Awareness, the Infinite, "includes" or is aware of a stellar universe of stars and planets, of space and time, all of which also are finite. Yes, it appears so, but if that were really true, it would mean pure Consciousness, *Timeless Being*, includes or co-exists with time. Infinite Consciousness, Timeless Being, does not co-exist with passing time, because any amount of time would be *non-being*—and *where Consciousness' Being is*, there simply is no non-being. As *Being is absolutely all that is being*, It *precludes* any so-called non-being, or time.

While this is not yet telling the "whole story" because it still is not speaking *only* of the Infinite, the Absolute, it's not inaccurate either. This is one of the most difficult points to make clear—it *appears* as if Infinite Consciousness were aware of a finite realm of time and space, but the Infinite is not *really* aware of things in that way.

The fact that Consciousness Itself is pure Infinity, pure Being—and not contained inside a body that’s not there to contain It—means Consciousness is *neither* objective nor subjective.

The difference between that which is called objective experience, and that which is called subjective, has been a subject for lively debate in science and philosophy. Basically, science and philosophy have offered only this either/or proposition when it comes to the nature of “consciousness” or one’s “experience”—that all experience falls into one of two categories, and is either objective or subjective. The standpoint of the Infinite, pure Being, provides a completely new “viewpoint” (the only Real “viewpoint”) and shows why neither of the other two is true in Reality.

Generally speaking, that which is objective is said to be that which has qualities and characteristics *independent* of the personal viewpoint. The subjective is generally said to be *influenced by* a personal viewpoint. In Reality, Infinite Consciousness completely *precludes* there being a personal mind—leaving no personal viewpoint to be independent of, or to do any influencing.

To show why Infinite Consciousness is neither objective or subjective, first here is a partial definition of each, according to Webster.

Objective: 1)...existing independent of mind: an object as it is in itself, or as distinguished from (personal) consciousness or the subject; 2) belonging to nature or the sensible world: publicly verifiable, especially by scientific methods; 3) treating events or phenomena as external rather than as affected by personal reflection or feeling; involving the use of facts without distortion by personal feelings or prejudices.

Subjective: 1)...determined by the mind, ego, or (human, personal) consciousness; reality as it is (personally) perceived as opposed to reality as it is in itself, or independent of mind; 2) peculiar to a particular individual; personal; 3)...affected by personal views, mental and emotional background and other special characteristics.

A simple example of the difference between objective and subjective, would be as follows. Suppose there is a red and white checked tablecloth on a table in a restaurant. Objectively speaking, the tablecloth is out in plain sight, or of “the sensible world.” It can be seen by anyone, and it can readily be verified that its colors are, in fact, red and white. Should there be some disagreement about the colors, samples of the fabric’s threads could be taken and chemically analyzed to determine the exact color of the fabric dye. In other words, it is “publicly verifiable” that the tablecloth is red and white.

Subjectively speaking, suppose that red and white tablecloth

reminded Jane Doe of another restaurant where she once had a romantic dinner and first met her spouse. She might have warm, loving memories, and her subjective or personal viewpoint would be that it was a very *nice* tablecloth. On the other hand, that tablecloth might remind Joe Jones of the dinner at which Joe's boss announced that Joe was being fired. Joe's subjective or personal viewpoint of red and white tablecloths might be entirely different.

What relevance does this discussion of objective and subjective have to this book?

Some may attempt to say that everything discussed thus far concerning the nature of Consciousness and Being is *subjective* because it does not apply to the "external" world. Because everything that has been said about Consciousness, Being, applies not to the external, but only *to the One being conscious*, some may attempt to argue that this material deals strictly with the "internal" and therefore is personal or "subjective." They may try to say there is no objective, external, or "publicly verifiable" evidence for what is said here—nothing that "all can agree on."

It certainly is true that Being, Consciousness, is *not* objective—having no external form or shape, and not being perceptible by the five physical senses, or "of the sensible world" as defined by Webster. However, it would be a mistake to say Being, Infinite Consciousness, therefore must be subjective. Why is Being not subjective? Because virtually always, subjective is taken to mean *personal*, or of the personal, thinking mind; of the intellect and human emotions. Being is not personal; It has nothing to do with so-called personal thinking, emotions, or a sensing "mind."

As said earlier, Being's capacity to *be*, to be alive and conscious, never is a personal ability. No person personally activates Being, or knows how to make Being be, or knows how to make Consciousness be conscious. Being never is something that any body or person is personally responsible for. Always, It is Consciousness Itself, Life Itself, that is being, being conscious. It is completely *impersonal*.

That which is subjective also is said to involve personal judgment, opinion or experience—and all personal judgment involves a personal *thinking mind, emotions*, and prior experience or conditioning—none of which is true of pure Timeless Being. Pure Being is not any kind of thought, or thought process; Being is not a feeling or an emotion, nor a reaction to emotions. Being is not a condition, nor the result of a condition, but is present *unconditionally*.

Being is *pure*. Being is *pure Awareness alone*—not Awareness *and* any kind of superimposed thinking or emotional experience that one seems to be *aware of*. Thus Being does not involve personal judgment, analysis, or reaction to stimuli, whether internal or external. Being Itself is not any kind of stimulus; nor is Being any kind of reaction to a stimulus—both of which also would be what one seems to be *aware of*. Being just is *aware*, period.

Most importantly, all so-called subjective experience, and all judgment,

occurs in passing time—it would be a time-process. Being is Timeless. Being is changeless Presence—not any kind of experience had in a time-process. Nor is Being any type of conditioning acquired over time—for Being is *present only*—the *absence* of time. *In Timeless Being, there is no time passing in which to judge, form a subjective opinion, or experience subjective feelings.*

When it comes to categorizing experience and discerning Reality, it would appear that science and philosophy have left us with only this either/or proposition—all experience is either objective or subjective.

Again, *all* such experience, whether deemed objective or subjective, would be a process that seems to occur in passing time. However, all time-experience would be *non-presence*. Non-presence, or *what really isn't*, can't be a solid basis for discerning *what really is* or Reality. What is most important, is that Timeless Being is *all that really is*. In Timeless Being, What Really Is, or Reality, wherein no time occurs, there is no time experience to be had, period. It can only mean there is nothing objective or subjective in Reality.

Interestingly, if one were to speak on a would-be finite basis, even the so-called objective world is not really objective! Take an even closer look at that which is called objective—that which supposedly is “publicly verifiable.” That which is mistakenly *assumed* to be external and “belonging to the natural or sensible world”—really isn't that at all.

Consider again what already has been shown about the nature of the “sense-mind.” In the earlier examples of the “apple” and “body,” it was shown that no object, no thing, not any form of human experience, exists separate from, or external to the “sense-mind.” All would-be “objects,” all seeming “places” and forms of experience would be entirely “mental.” They literally *are* the mind itself in its so-called operation.

Then is there really a so-called separate, external world that could be called objective? No—even though it has the illusory *appearance* of being separate and objective.

As there is nothing external to the mind, then are there really “others” out there who also have separate minds and an objective world? No. There really are no such “others,” no separate lives or selves.

There may appear to be many separate *bodies*, but not one of those bodies is conscious. Only Consciousness Itself is conscious. There is only the One Impersonal Self, or the One All-Present Consciousness. Shocking as it sounds, because there aren't “many” separate selves, but just One Self, there really isn't any public to whom anything can be “publicly verifiable”—even though it appears as if there were.

As said before, the only place all so-called “others,” and the entire so-called objective world, ever can appear to exist—is in what claims to be the one, so-called “sense-mind.” It would be this same one “sense-mind” that is the very “stuff” of what appears as all “things,” all

“places”—and even all “others.”

Look very closely again. Exactly what is the only “mind” to whom all those “others” supposedly exist? Only to what seem to be the five senses of *this* “sense-mind” here.

The thinking may try to disagree and say, “There most definitely are others, who have their own minds, because I talk with other people every day.”

The only thing claiming there are “others” out there to talk to, would be this so-called sensing mind. It all appears to be coming from *these* five senses right here, nowhere else. Take *this* sensing mind away, and all those “others,” too, just like the entire objective world, wouldn’t appear to be there.

As said earlier, when you awaken from a dream, all those seeming “others” in the dream do not awaken with you—you are the only one there is to be awake.

Some may still disagree and try to say, “But even if this ‘sense-mind’ were not sensing anything, the objective world and universe still would exist. It still would be there as objective and would exist to all the others who are sensing it too. There is far more to the objective world than just *my* sensing of it. And even if there weren’t *any body* to sense it, the objective world and universe still would exist.”

You *never* can prove that. Look even more closely. Again, what would be the only thing claiming that the entire objective world and all “others” supposedly exist? Only what seem to be *these* same five senses. The only thing claiming there are “others” out there who also are sensing an objective world would be *this* so-called “sense-mind” right here—*these* five senses, not those of others. Again, the whole thing appears to be inseparable from *this* sensing mind.

The so-called objective world isn’t really objective or external at all. Meanwhile, pure Conscious Being, the Real You, is none of this sensing mental activity. The Truth is, it’s not “your” sensing mind, though everything you’ve ever been taught would say it is. Why is it not “your” sensing mind? Because all there is to You is Pure Being, Pure Infinity, and Infinity does not possess anything finite, not even a finite sensing mind. As Consciousness, You do not have a mind. All You “have” or *are*, is Pure Consciousness. The Being You are is changeless *Presence*, and any so-called sensing mind that functions in time would be *non-presence*, non-existence. How could You possess non-existence?

Infinite Being is un-observable, un-objective, un-sense-able, and un-thinkable—yet remains changelessly present as *all that is*. Pure Conscious Being is not objective to Itself. Nor is Being subjective, because being *all that is*, Being knows no object to which It could compare Itself as the subject. Being is not subjective in the sense of being personal, because Being is not a person. Being is not in the sensed universe that seems to be experienced in passing time. Pure Conscious Being is timelessly *being*.

16

HOW MUCH DISTANCE OR DEPTH IS THERE TO A DREAM?

WHILE THE APPEARANCE OF FINITE EXPERIENCE is not how things really are, that doesn't mean *Life* is not real. One most definitely is real, is changelessly present, as Infinite Consciousness.

Again, *the way things appear to the human senses*—as consisting of three-dimensional space full of separation and solid objects—is not the way Life is to the Only Self, Infinite Consciousness. Infinite I-Presence does not have eyes or finite senses to “see” in that limited way at all. As the Infinite Itself is all the Presence there is, all the Consciousness operating—then only what is true of *It* is Reality.

Any evaluation of a stellar universe based on five senses and time would be just that, a *sense* of a universe, a *seeming* universe. One never acts as if there were something wrong with it, because there isn't; one just isn't fooled by “appearances.”

The human way of “seeing” would identify as one physical body on an earth, judge by way of the senses, and assume there is a vast physical universe “out there” that is separate, and *so much greater than little me*. If that is one's premise, then one assumes he is a relatively powerless *thing*. One also assumes that real Power, the real Infinite, is afar off, vaguely distant. For all of the Infinite to be immediately present as One's very Being sounds too good to be true.

First of all, there is no vast universe “out there.” It would be just so much sensation or dream-like “mental stuff”—*so there can't be any physical vastness*. That which appears as a stellar universe never is enormous physical objects separated by even more enormous amounts of physical space. To expose the falsity of this belief, look at it in the light of the Intelligence You are.

The so-called dream or “sense-mind” would make it appear as if things—apples, bodies, and even the earth—were solid objects “out there,” separate from thought and occupying physical space.

As an example of this, it *seems* the “body” has walked countless times on solid ground called “earth.” Supposedly, eyes see an “earth,” while, supposedly, there are feet which touch or feel a massive solid base of ground.

But would this experience really be one of “walking on solid ground”? Looking closely, you see that the only “substance” to the entire experience would be two kinds of sensations. It would be “made out of” nothing but images and passing feelings. There aren’t those sensations *and* an earth that’s being walked on—because besides those mere sensations, *there’s nothing else*.

Go over it again to be certain. What, exactly, have you got? Do you have an earth—or just some *sensations* of an “earth”? All you have are sensations. You cannot *also* come up with a solid object called earth that those sensations come from, because all that’s ever there are sensations. Earth *isn’t* earth—it never has been! It would be nothing but a bunch of dream-like, fleeting sensations. Suddenly, terra firma isn’t so firma!

Sensations, having no separate solid objects “backing them up,” are like the fake propped-up store fronts used in old western movie sets. There’s no actual solid building in back—just a propped-up face of one.

Likewise, the “face” of what is mistakenly assumed to be a physical, earthbound experience is fake. It is not backed up by a physical world. It, again, would be just so many dream-like images and other sensations. Nothing is occurring on an enormous separate physical planet called “earth,” for there is no such object. There never has been a physical sphere occupying billions of acres. There is no physical planet having a circumference of 25,000 miles. A random bunch of fleeting sensations in a “mind” do not have physical longitude and latitude. Never is there a solid planet or solid body occupying physical space, for mere passing sensations in a dream don’t *take up* physical space. The whole thing, at most, would be an illusory “mental” phenomenon.

The fact that there are *only* sensations, only “mind stuff”—and no separate physical objects from which sensations come—proves there is no physical space. Why? To take up space, things would *need* to be separate objects—for only objects would occupy three-dimensional space, not passing sensations experienced in a dream. As there are no physical objects, thus no physical space, *anywhere*, but just dream-like thought, then there is no physical distance or depth *anywhere*.

Again, how much *physical distance* separated all the places in a dream you had last night? If, in that dream, the body dove into a deep swimming pool—what volume of water did the body displace? Did the body even dive through physical space? Likewise, the dream known as sensed human experience and its entire stellar universe has the same depth or separateness to it as that—none at all!

As the so-called vast universe *isn’t* “out there,” but would be “right here” as dream-thought, it means there never is any depth or physical space involved in your universe—not an inch. Regardless of how spatial the “sense-mind” may make it *appear*, all there would be to it is dreamlike thought—and no physical space separates one kind of thought from another. It’s the way there is no physical space between the letters A and Z as you now see them in thought. At most, it would be a kaleidoscope of mental liquid, wisps of distanceless dream, *appearing as* a stellar

universe.

It never is that a universe, country, home, job, or other things are separate. The only would-be “separation” is the degree to which one seems to ignore Pure Consciousness. Then you mistakenly assume *you are a material body-object and that other things are material objects—and that there is physical space* in which things could be separate from each other. There really isn’t.

What else does this mean? It completely blows away the lame excuse of selfishly ignoring what appears to be the world at large and global or international issues because, “the rest of the world is so physically *distant*, so far removed, it doesn’t really concern me.”

The *entirety* of your “world” and universe never is distant. Even the “farthest reaches” are no farther away than what appears as this book, for *all of it* would be “mental” or inseparable from thought—and again, no physical distance separates one thought from another. So one can’t selfishly ignore world affairs in favor of personal affairs, pretending they’re too far away to do anything about.

The fact that Consciousness Itself is the *only One* being conscious, actually leaves no second identity to mistakenly assume there are physical objects, and three-dimensional space keeping them separate. Pure Consciousness Itself never makes mistaken assumptions.

How physically big is a thought? How physically big are the things experienced in a dream?

Suppose you had a dream, and in that dream you are working as a sign painter. You’ve just finished painting a big new sign that says, “A to Z Hardware.” In the dream, you pull out your tape measure to check the spacing of your nice, neat letters, and see that A and Z are spaced exactly three feet apart, just as they should be. Within the framework of the dream, on that level, it certainly seems as if there is space or distance. But when you awaken, when looking into the dream from your awake state—was there really a *physical* distance of three feet separating those letters? They are not separated by so much as a millionth of an inch of *physical space*, are they?

Right now, think of a thimble. Now think of an image of countless galaxies of stars in deepest space. Which is deeper or bigger? Neither. Both have the exact same amount of physical size or depth—none at all—because *thought* would be all there is to both, and thought has no physical characteristics.

As thought has no physical size, then *your current thought* has no size. To say your current thought of body (and it is only thought) as it now appears to be holding this book and is seated in a room—to say it has a certain size, and is bigger than a quantum particle, or smaller

than a galaxy—is totally arbitrary, imaginary. Thought can be as “big” as the entire universe (for it *is* the universe), or as tiny as a single quantum particle, for in both cases, only *depthless dream-thought*, not physical size, is involved. The macro world is exactly the same “size” as the micro world, because both would be only size-less thought.

The same holds true when speaking of what the “sense-mind,” or dream, would call quantity, or amount. What appears within the framework of a dream, as two (or three or more) is not more than one. Two swimming pools in a dream is not “more” water than one swimming pool, for it’s all really *nothing*. It’s all a dream—a depthless, substanceless, never-present picture. Two handfuls of nothing is not more than one handful of nothing—it’s nothing. Regardless of what appears within a time-dream, the fact that it *never has presence* means the notion of quantity doesn’t apply.

One cannot have an *amount* of non-presence, non-existence.

Imagine watching a science fiction outer space movie. On the screen is an image of a starship, traveling at incredible speed. It suddenly zooms away, far into deep space, into what appear to be huge galaxies. Now what if *you’re* the screen? The “deep space” appearing on you isn’t deep at all. That movie image of vastness has zero depth to it. Those stars aren’t distant. Everything is *right here* within your screen-ness.

In the same way, *never* has any physical distance been traversed by what appears as the “body” now holding this “book.” What appears or seems to be movement by a “body” across distance would be all purely “mental”—just the constant change of dream-like sensations which have neither physical size, nor extension into physical space. They always would be “right here” as depthless dream-images—the way everything stays “right here” on that movie screen. Even though it *appears* as if there were movement between distant places, the image projected on the screen never has any depth or extension through physical space.

Likewise, not a bit of the depthless, spaceless dream-universe involves movement through physical space. It means all so-called “space travel,” all “galaxies,” and all other aspects of the “universe,” such as black holes and gravity, would be *mental phenomena, mental movement*—not physical.

Meanwhile, *You are All-Present Conscious Being which never moves*. There is nowhere besides Consciousness’ Omnipresence that It could move to! The mistaken identification with “body” and constantly shifting sensations creates a hypnotic *sense* or illusion of movement across distance. But it’s never a body or a lot of physical places—only one set of distance-less, dream-like sensations.

So how much space could there be to all “space,” when all there

would appear to be is a depthless, distanceless dream? Again, the term *outer space* is a complete misnomer.

How much false power is given to things in a world or universe which isn't vast, and isn't even out there? How big, how real, could the worries of one little "body" be, when the *entire universe* would have no more physical depth to it than a *depthless dream*?

To mistaken thinking based on sense-appearances, it is staggering to behold that all so-called "physical reality" would be one distanceless, depthless mental illusion, and *the entirety of what truly exists* involves zero physical space, zero distance. That's the *immediacy of Being*. That's *What Is*. That is *this* Undimensional Consciousness.

There simply is no physical distance extending in any direction from Your Present Conscious Being! Right this instant, as Consciousness, there is nothing separating You from *All That Is*! There is nothing separating the One Self from *all of Itself* right here and now.

The whole of *All* is so *present*, so *available* as this very Being, It is indescribable! How much Presence *and thus Power* does that "put" here, now?

All of the Infinite, all Presence, all Intelligence, all of the Self's Love, Peace and Harmony existent is right smack *Here*, as this very Conscious Being! If not, then where is It? There is nowhere else!

This is It! The Infinite, Omnipresence (call It God if you wish), never has been afar off—*there is no distant place* afar off that God could have been. Only a mistaken state of dream-thought was *dreaming* that a God was afar off. Consciousness Itself, which is Omnipresence, never dreams. Consciousness never assumes It is afar off from Its own Absolute Presence, *this* Presence.

You can't get away from the fact that Consciousness, aware here, now, literally is *all* that is being! This hasn't wiped out an illusion of distance. To Pure Consciousness, distance never has existed! This One Being, Infinite Presence, or All-Power has no opposition, nothing to fear or overcome, for there simply isn't anything besides Its Distanceless Presence. There simply is no *space* in which to put anything else!

As the only Presence is Pure Consciousness *Itself*, Its Presence is Absolute. Being All, One alone, It is endlessly single, non-dual, leaving no conditions contrary to Its Presence that must be offset. Omnipotence lies in the *effortlessness*, the ease and lightness of Consciousness' single unopposed Being. Only to sense-ignorance would any of this seem unusual—but Consciousness' Absoluteness leaves no other to even be guilty of sense-ignorance. To Your Present Consciousness, nothing is more "normal" than Absoluteness.

This also shows why Omnipresence, Existence, or All, rightly known, doesn't fill physical space—there is none to fill. Contrary to mistaken belief, Existence, or All, is distance-less. Omnipresence or All means the Formless, the Immeasurable, the Un dimensional—*yet which is consciously alive*. It is an exact description of Your Present Conscious Aliveness. *Undimensional* doesn't mean bigger than, or beyond a three-dimensional world—Undimensional *precludes* all forms of dimension.

If Omnipresence, Infinite Being, *did* fill physical space, or had length or width, it would be possible to go from point A *here*, to point B over *there*. To go from here to there requires movement; it takes the passage of *time*. But the instant one is moving in the passage of time, one has left *Being*. Anything moving in time would be *what-is-not-being*, which literally means non-presence, or *non-existence*. And one really never would be moving through physical space at all, but only experiencing an illusory *dream* of moving through space.

Some scientific theories today have gotten away from the notion of there being solid objects located in space, to non-localization. But they're still accounting for space. Omnipresence, Absolute Being, or All, does not mean “everywhere present” or extending endlessly in *physical space*—for there is none. Rather, All means all of Infinity's Own Alive Presence, which is not spatial or dimensional, but spaceless and undimensional.

In Truth, the I-Presence being You now, which is *consciously alive*—yet is formless and undimensional—is the only true “Location.” So that Infinite Consciousness' undimensional, spaceless nature is clear, there is another essential distinction to be made—concerning the meaning of the word *endless*. The true, Infinite meaning of endless is vastly different from the finite sense of endless.

The finite sense of endless means a long extension, a quantity or distance that goes on forever, without coming to an end of measuring the extension. It's basically a big, endless finity. In contrast, Infinity, or In-finity, means *no finity whatsoever*. Where there is no finity, there is *nothing to measure or extend*. So the Infinite meaning of endless isn't a long extension, but *the complete absence of extension*. *Infinity is the absence of all measurement*. Being absolutely measureless, Infinity has no point at which It could be said to begin. Infinity, then, can't have an ending anywhere either—because It never had a beginning.

Having no measurable beginning or ending, is vastly different from that which has a beginning and can be measured forever.

The fact that Infinity, Consciousness, has no measurement or size—means It equally has no size that could be endlessly *divided*. Infinity, having absolutely no size, no amount, is by definition, *indivisible*, or what scientists call *irreducible*.

That which has no size or quantity to begin with, simply cannot be divided or reduced—and this is the true meaning of irreducible.

Only *Infinity* is truly indivisible or irreducible. The true irreducibility of Consciousness' Infinity puts new light on science's long-sought "last irreducible particle." Irreducible really does not mean achieving reduction up to a certain point, beyond which one can go no further. Why? Because that still involves *some* reduction—which is entirely different from *having nothing to reduce in the first place*. Only Infinity—which is the Present Consciousness You are—is truly irreducible.

Infinite Being, All That Is, or Existence, as the term is used in Reality, has absolutely no physical, spatial measurement. This is Your Presently Conscious Self being spoken of. Consciousness, Existence, or *All*, is exactly as "wide" or "deep" as Your Aliveness is alive. How deep is that?

No matter how far, how "deep" into Your Alive Presence You go—and there's no end to It—there never is any movement in physical terms, and You always remains *right here* being Alive Presence, don't You? In Reality, the term *All* means the immediacy of Infinite Conscious Aliveness to Its own Presence. There isn't *an* All that is separate and which Aliveness "fills." This Infinite Presence of Aliveness here, now, is specifically *what* All, Reality, is.

The fact that *All*, all the Presence there is, is formless and spaceless—that Undimensional Being is absolutely all that exists as Reality Itself—is such a departure from the would-be human way of thinking, it isn't even funny. Yet it's undeniable, for nothing in the dream world of sensed, three-dimensional forms that constantly passes in time, ever genuinely *is*.

As mentioned earlier, in the same way that Omnipresence does not mean everywhere present in physical space, the term *all-inclusive* really does not mean Consciousness "includes" a stellar universe of space. Consciousness can't be all-inclusive of space, because there is no space to include. This also means pure Consciousness, which is All Presence *changelessly being*, does not include time. As Consciousness' Presence *is all that is present*—It leaves no possibility of any non-presence, or time. There is no non-presence. *Not even as non-presence*. There is only Presence.

In Truth, the term all-inclusive means Consciousness is being all of Its synonyms "simultaneously." Consciousness is Being. Consciousness is Infinity. Consciousness is the Present or Omnipresence. Consciousness is Purity. Consciousness is Life, Existence, Love. All are the same all-present, omni-operative *One*.

A big question in science today is whether there is something faster than the speed of light. Of course there is—It is Omnipresence. Omnipresence is Infinite Consciousness as It is changelessly *being* the One Total Presence. But It is *undimensional* Presence, and does not span across space. So the answer doesn't lie in finding out what crosses

physical distance faster—it lies in dropping the illusion that there is distance to cross!

It doesn't take the movie screen *any* time to be “all-present” throughout itself. And the screen never is altered by any illusion of vast distance or depth that may appear in the superimposed movie. Likewise, it doesn't take time for Omnipresent Consciousness to be Its own Undimensional Presence, which is absolutely all the Presence existent. When Existence, All, is seen to be Undimensional Consciousness Itself, it is clear that Existence involves no distance or depth, despite the illusory appearance of depth that the universe *seems* to have.

In the science fiction movie example, if one ignores the screen (which is what's really present) and starts with the superimposed moving pictures, they create an illusion that there is distance. They make it appear as if there is light that can quickly cross long distances on the screen, and starships that take a longer time to cross it. Consciousness' Total Presence is “faster” than light because It *doesn't* move. It doesn't involve space. It is permanently all Presence, *being*.

In a race, the “speed” of Omnipresent Being beats the speed of light every time. As Its own Undimensional Presence is *All*, It doesn't traverse space. Omnipresence is already where It would be “going” before It even “leaves.” That's faster than the fastest speed possible, which is why Omnipresence always wins.

If the complete absence of space doesn't bring everything close to home, consider what this means in terms of *time*. *Once again, the so-called “vast stellar universe,” and all of the time it appears to have been around, would be what? It never has gone beyond being mere sensations, or depthless dream.*

So what becomes of all the supposedly separate and distant “solid” heavenly bodies, whose movements appear to produce time? What then is the “physical object” earth, revolving with other “material planets” around a sun? All of this activity supposedly produces seasons, days, hours, and minutes which control and age “physical humans.”

These so-called heavenly bodies aren't out there as separate bodies or locations—they would be nothing but passing sensations, or dreamlike thought. There are no physical *objects* there to cause days, years and age.

What *is* a day anyway? Looking closely shows its only “substance” to be nothing but five kinds of sensations, and a bunch of emotions and thoughts. There aren't both the sensations one has of a day *and* a day—as if the day were separate. The sensations *are* the day; they *are* the entire “universe” and all of what passes as time—for none of it has any existence apart from, or without, this dream-like sensory flow.

There is no such thing as a day which *causes* one to have sensations.

It's the other way around—the dream-mind's sensations appear to produce what is mistakenly assumed to be “a day” that is separate from the mind—but it isn't. That's all there would be to what are mistakenly *called* days, years, eons, and all of the universe's history and time—merely this *would-be* illusory depthless dream. It's that same propped up mental façade—a *purely spaceless experience*.

Only this fleeting, flowing mental stuff of the “sense mind” is what appears to move through time. In fact—and this is a huge point—the “*sense-mind*” would be *all there is to time itself*.

There are no separate physical stars and planets to cause time—passing sensations of the “sense-mind” appear to cause time, for there is absolutely no evidence of time (or stars and planets) apart from that “mind.” All time would be one hundred percent *mental*—never a phenomenon of a separate physical universe, for there isn't one.

That's the point: time is not something *separate* that the finite “sense-mind” *experiences*. The dreaming of the depthless “sense-mind” literally would be all there is to time itself! Again, there is absolutely no time *apart* from its would-be activity. The “sense-mind” doesn't know *about* time—it *is* time itself!

Rightly seen, the finite “sense-mind” isn't something that was caused or evolved in time. It's the reverse—all time comes about in, or as, this would-be “secondary mind.” (More on this is in upcoming chapters.)

Just as important, notice how the “sense-mind” and its time *has to* keep moving and never be present. Time has to continue not being, *being-not*; otherwise, it no longer would have its status; it would lose its very nature. Not a bit of the supposed millions of years of time and sensation that appears as human experience ever has had actual being or presence. To continually function as a body or “sensing mind” in time, is to never actually taste *being* or truly *exist* at all!

This also makes clear why *Consciousness, Being*, has no connection to the seeming finite senses, or so-called “human sense-mind,” which constantly moves in time's non-being. How could that which never is being, genuinely *be* anything? A “human mind” certainly can't be Consciousness—or be conscious or intelligent—because its only seeming status is that of permanently *being-not*!

A human “body” never could be conscious or know anything, because it's *not* a body—just a constant flow of dream-sensations passing in time that *never is*. To begin with finite sensing as one's point of identification is to begin with what is-not.

To what extent do you allow *what-is-not* to tell You what You are? What does all this mean? Time isn't all-powerful, unavoidably pulling Your Being along in its flow. It's just a mistaken state of thought, an assumption—that *what never is present* can be present somewhere to do something. It isn't! The Consciousness being You, now, is all that is present. In fact *Consciousness is the Present Itself*. It can't not-be. It can't age, for It only can *be present*. It is *all* that is present.

If one were to speak of the human scene, science has long said the underlying or driving force of the entire so-called “universe” appears to be energy. But this energy also appears to be in a constant state of *random* reaction. It implies that all events in the universe occur randomly, or by sheer chance.

Scientists have puzzled that, if there is an Omniscience, an All-Knowing One—how could It have a hand in something based on randomness or chance—instead of certainty, intelligence, permanence? Even Einstein wasn’t able to explain it, but said he couldn’t accept the notion of a God that “plays dice” with the universe. Why was that right?

Because *that* universe, that seeming existence, the one of the senses, time, and chance, *is not real Existence*. There is only one true Existence—but sense-illusion would distort that one and make It appear separate, objective, random, and based on time—which is not the way Existence *really is*.

The only Existence there can genuinely *be* is the one that is *being*. That means true Existence is not the same as what appears as a stellar universe. True Existence is not based on time; It is not physical, material, or even “mental”; It is not an Existence full of matter and energy that randomly changes and decays—but is an Existence that *never changes*. That means It is a timeless, perfect, changeless Existence known to Pure *Being* or what is sometimes called Divine Mind or the Absolute. The Existence of Pure Infinite Being, *Your real, only Existence*, isn’t a random reaction occurring in passing time. Here, things never are “dicey,” never subject to chance or change—for in *Your Timeless Being* there is no time in which anything *could* change. Timeless Being *is*—once—and is perfect eternally.

Don’t be captivated by what may seem to be a “new look” at finite experience or time. Don’t waste effort denying time or space, or delving into the nature of “sense-dream.” It never is *present* anywhere to delve into. Don’t start with a finite appearance and say, “This really is infinite, undimensional, so I’ll ‘un-see’ or ‘undo’ the appearance.” Your Present Infinite Being does no such thing. It never sees a finite appearance to undo. One need not de-materialize a world when there *never is* such a thing. Don’t even call it energy or dream or illusion. That all would be *starting* with so-called finite sense, stuck on its level.

To know Intelligence, one *starts* with Intelligence; one does not study the workings of ignorance. Instead of “un-seeing” what isn’t present, be what *is* present! Infinite Present Consciousness, which is All, knows only Its Oneness, or Love—as *this very Aliveness*. Consciousness can be known only via pure Consciousness. One identifies *directly as* It—which is un-sensing, un-intellectualizing pure *Awareness, Aliveness*.

Identifying as *Consciousness*—which One has to identify as, for nothing else is—*Its Infinity is absolutely all Presence*. Therefore one cannot even refer to a so-called “physical universe” as a mental illusion. Strictly speaking, it is not even right to say the universe is depth-less wisps of dream or sensation. Why? In Absolute Infinity, Reality, anything not-Infinity is altogether precluded—even as illusion! *To the One Infinite there is only Infinity being all the Existence there is*. One Endless Infinity leaves nothing besides Itself—no superimposed pictures, and nothing to do any superimposing. That Endless Infinity must be *this* Infinite Being, for there is only One, and *no space* for another.

In light of this Truth—that *Undimensional Being is All*—then can it honestly be said there are physical places *out there* that can be a source of terrorism and wars—or can suffer from them? Can it honestly be said there is any physical body *out there* acting as a space or location for disease? Are *others* experiencing such problems? How could there be? There is absolutely no space, and it would take space in which to put problems or “others.” Or would *all of that* be a never-present sense illusion; a mistaken dream-assumption that there could be physical distance, separate places, and a secondary finite mind? Where do you start? Do you ignore what appear to be such problems, hoping they’ll go away? Or do you start with the immediacy of Truth—that *only* Pure Infinite Being is present?

Where does the Infinite Itself start? Is there another being conscious? The fact that only Pure Conscious Being *is*, puts everything in true Light. The fact that *this very Consciousness aware here, now*, is Infinite means It is One Endless Perfect Whole. There is only Its own Presence, and never space between Itself, thus no space in which problems could or *ever have* been present. There is only Its Utter Awakeness, thus nothing to do any dreaming in terms of time.

There is no vacuity between *this* Conscious Presence and *all Being*. In the Absolute Being You are, there is no such thing as “between”; no cracks for problems to fall into; no place for ignorance or mistaken sense-assumptions to spring from or operate. There is no distance Consciousness has to travel to have Its Perfection *be* all Presence, all Substance—thus Harmony, Peace, Heaven Itself.

How much distance is there between Consciousness aware here, now, and Its *Present Being*? The answer to that question is also the answer to, “What is All?” and “How far away is Omnipotence?”