

# SELECTED LETTERS, GEMS AND TRANSCRIPTS

by Wayne Liquorman & Ramesh Balsekar

## topics

2	<i>Seeking</i>
8	<i>Progress, improvement &amp; getting better</i>
13	<i>Meditation &amp; practices</i>
21	<i>Ego &amp; self</i>
35	<i>Suffering &amp; pain</i>
44	<i>Enlightenment, or final understanding</i>
61	<i>Guru &amp; disciple</i>
80	<i>Acceptance &amp; fatalism</i>
91	<i>Truth</i>

# SEEKING

August 2009

## *A Living Gem from Ramesh*

(previously unpublished)

The individual is always seeking something and is satisfied when he gets what he is seeking. But then another search starts for some other object. The ultimate successful search is that which shows that the seeker already had what he was seeking, that he had never lost it, that the seeker himself is what he was seeking for.

1989

April 2006

## *A Message from Wayne*

Hello my loves,

Jnana (the path of knowledge) and Bhakti (the path of love and gratitude) and Karma (the path of action) are not separate. They never have been. The distinctions are purely notional, not actual. The mind, the heart and the body are bound together as a seamless whole.

I can't tell you how many times I have heard the so-called Knowledge people put down the Heart People for their "slavish devotion to the guru" while the Heart People complain that the Knowledge people are "cold and in their heads." Meanwhile the Action people (when they take a break from being busy) look at the others, shake their heads and wonder why "those people don't get off their butts and DO something!"

It is all just too ridiculous and all too human. People are born with different natures and one of the qualities of having a nature is to feel that it is natural, normal and right. Unfortunately, that often makes people with different natures, unnatural, abnormal and wrong.

The way out of this critical quagmire is through first understanding one's own relative nature, and ultimately Understanding one's True nature. As you begin to see the genetic and environmental forces that continue to combine to shape this body-mind organism that bears your name, you may glimpse the Essence which is the source and the substance of everything.

This Advaita teaching insistently points to that Essence and is available to everyone regardless of who they think they are.

With much love,  
Wayne

January 2006

## *A Message from Wayne*

Hello my loves,

The process that's happening in this Advaita is one of inquiry and examination; whereby you gain insight by looking at your own experiences. In the course of life, experiences happen. The question is, what was your part in bringing those experiences into being?

If you look back over your life you will see that people you never knew existed suddenly entered your life and brought with them enormous life changes. They might have been lovers, teachers, enemies or gurus. How could you have brought them into your life, if you didn't even know that they were alive?

Perhaps by looking at your history you will see that events happened in your life that were part of a much larger happening than what you could possibly create with your own physical being. If you can look at your own experience and your own background, you may begin to see that your present state is a product of huge forces outside of your egoic control. This teaching simply directs your attention to look. Insight follows or it does not.

Clearly, if you were in charge - if any of us were in charge and capable of creating our own realities - we'd all be saints! We'd be loving and kind and generous all the time, because when we're loving and kind and generous, we feel better, everybody around us feels better, and this translates into a better life. The fact that despite our best intentions, and our most earnest observations and efforts, we're still filled with positive and negative qualities, seems to suggest a certain lack of control on the part of the organism.

If you look, and you are blessed to be able see the vast universal forces that were operative in creating who you are today, then guilt eases naturally, on its own. You don't have to make any efforts to reduce it; it simply dissipates in the seeing, as you understand that who you are and what you are is a function of the Universe. Both your finer qualities and

those qualities that you and others might not like are part of this mixed bag that constitutes every human being.

May this vision grow within you in the coming year.

With love,  
Wayne

September 2005

## ***A Message from Wayne***

Hello my loves,

Ramesh's latest book landed on my desk a few days ago and I was delighted to see that he is still in top form. Ramesh's Teaching is a living one and thus is constantly in flux. After many years of esoterically emphasizing the illusory nature of the individual his approach has become increasingly down-to-earth and practical. He meets the spiritual seekers at their point of identification and then deftly leads them to deeper understanding. One of the tools Ramesh uses is to challenge the seeker into examining what it is he imagines Enlightenment to be...what are the imagined benefits? So the question ultimately boils down to the new book's title: Seeking Enlightenment -- Why? I hope this newsletter finds you well and at peace, abiding in the deepest possible conviction that with all of the joys and agonies of the day, the Universe is in perfect order.

With much love,  
Wayne

6 January 2005

## ***A Webcast Transcript Excerpt***

Wayne: Have you always been a seeker?

*As far back as I can remember yes, but then I don't think of myself as a seeker anymore.*

Wayne: I see. And was that a choice that you made?

*No. It was a happening, it was unexpected. Afterwards I thought I was still a seeker when I tried to identify myself again but I've come to realize I'm not a seeker anymore.*

Wayne: When you say you're not a seeker anymore, to be more specific what do you mean by that?

*In the experience there was an awareness of something that I could not describe or could never have predicted. Trying to explain it afterwards to my friends - was impossible. So it wasn't something I could grasp with my logical mind. As a seeker, I was always trying to use my logic to explain god. Or my relationship to what god is. In the experience, the gap disappeared and I didn't know that until later, I only experienced it. So now it's just a sense of wanting to deepen. Deepening not defining. So it really seems like an attempt to define it and so reading the works of Maharshi and these books. Advaita seems very comfortable with that experience. I don't know why. I'm not positively trying to acquire something but it comes to me. It's not like a traditional learning process. That's why I don't think of myself as a seeker, a seeker would be students sitting in the class gathering information. I don't feel that anyway.*

Wayne: Right. I understand.

*So I'm wondering if all seekers are perhaps in some non-choice situation.*

Wayne: For me it's a matter of definitions. The way you're using the term seeker and the way I would use the term seeker are slightly different. The seeking that you've described, as having fallen away, is a single pointed seeking. And I experienced something very similar in my process as well. And what it was, was a movement, you see. This movement of seeking began with seeking something. Seeking god seeking knowledge seeking truth as a one-pointed effort and it was very directed at "it-. Then there was this moment where that changed. What I called the seeking then changed from a seeking for something to a seeking that was then expanding to include everything. What you're describing as a deepening of that shift where going from to get it, to the understanding expanding to include all of it. So there is this sense of opening, this sense of bringing more and more in without, you see since it's not focused on anything there isn't any object that one is trying to get, you see.

Now this is a very profound shift in the nature of the seeking. And it's easy to make a distinction saying well this is seeking and this is something else. And we can call it something else. But in my lexicon, the way I talk about things I say they're both seeking. One is a seeking for something, and the other is an expansion of the seeking to include everything. But when you say there is a sense of wanting a deepening, of looking to, however subtly, to expand that into something greater, that desire is a seeking energy. It is seeking expansion, it is seeking more presence or openness. So, It is a profound shift in the structure in the nature of the seeking you're describing. And it is one that is very consistent with the nature of this teaching, you see. And the single pointed seeking has no meaning really here.

It is only when that shift has occurred and the seeking is now expanding in this way [Wayne gestures to indicate expansion] that we have some means for being here. Some rationale, if you will, for this kind of teaching. Because as soon as it points to something, you see, the whole essence of the teaching is to spring it back out again. To question that as soon as the mind focuses and says ah, this is it, what it is, is going in like that. And the nature of this teaching is to reopen to re-expand whenever that energy to close down comes. So when you say that this feels right, it is because the nature of the seeking has shifted to what is appropriate. These are the tools for this kind of seeking energy. Now the organism that we call the sage is one in which there is neither. There is neither the seeking for something nor the expanded kind of seeking. The whole paradigm is gone. Completely. It has no meaning anymore.

September 2003

## *A Message from Wayne*

Hello my loves..

Sometimes I am amazed at the effects of this Teaching. Last month I was visited by a radiologist from Santa Fe, NM who specializes in breast cancer diagnosis. Many times each week he must tell women that they are going to lose their breast or perhaps to die. He described how the Teaching had transformed his approach to his work. Whereas before, he was looking only to get enough money to retire, after the Teaching had "infected" him he found that he approached his work with openness and joy. He described how grateful he was to be able to witness the incredible strength and dignity some of these women exhibited and to participate in their lives.

His story and his display of quiet gratitude moved me deeply. My wish for you all is that you be so blessed.

With much love,  
Wayne

PS: I leave for Europe in a few days and look forward to seeing some of you there. The retreat at the beautiful and serene Gut Schermau in Germany is always one of the high points of my year.

## *A Living Gem from Ramesh*

(previously unpublished)

There never has been a seeker, only seeking, whatever the seeking - seeking money, or seeking fame, or seeking God - and only that seeking happens for which the body-mind organism has been programmed to seek. The ego - the identification with a name and form, with the sense of personal doership - thinks he or she is the seeker. Self-realization is only the realization that, in the words of the Buddha, "events happen, deeds are done, but there is no individual doer thereof."

# PROGRESS, IMPROVEMENT & GETTING BETTER

19 March 2005

## *A Webcast Transcript Excerpt*

*But prior to that, through understanding, there seems to be a kind of progression - like things can fall off - not the sense of doership like some ultimate thing, but some prior progress.*

Wayne: Yes there can be, and I mean it's not quite as widely publicized in spiritual circles, but they can also reattach sometimes. I mean when you really look at your spiritual journey objectively, you'll see that yes, there were insights profound, maybe life-changing, and then as time went by, and other things crept in and altered that conviction; that perception, we could say that you back-slid back into more involvement through various other things. So the spiritual process tends to be much more of an ebb-and-flow, like a kind of pendulum swing into separation and unity...

28 October 2004

## *A Webcast Transcript Excerpt*

*What do you make of this 'seeking to make sense', then?*

Wayne: What do I make of it? It happens. It's part of what is manifest.

*Is it essential, or is it just because that's what is?*

Wayne: Whether it's essential is only from the standpoint of a result. What I'm saying is that it's part of 'what is'. Now, it's becoming fashionable - it always comes in and out of fashion - to consider seeking to be an obstacle. "Oh if you're a seeker, then you're an idiot, because when you have an advanced understanding, you see that the seeking limits you from knowing what you truly are." So if you're seeking something, then the very seeking is the obstacle. If you continue to consider yourself a seeker, you're an idiot. So you have a group of people who are seeking but who say they aren't seeking anymore. It's just redefined!

I don't consider seeking to be either clean or dirty. I don't think it's this elevated state or that it's the most divine thing that you can do - where if you're seeking God then you're clearly a superior being - as opposed to someone who is watching the World Series and other such mundane, pointless acts. I have no evaluation on either the positive or the negative side. Seeking happens. Some organisms are created to be interested in

this; others you could not drag here. Most people, in fact, you couldn't drag here.

*I can't help it.*

Wayne: And others can't stay away. With the understanding that it is happening - it's happening; it's part of 'what is'.

*Unfolding the way it's supposed to be.*

Wayne: Unfolding the way it IS.

*Okay.*

Wayne: Unfolding the way it is.

*In the unfolding, is there any direction possible? Is there a personal capacity to make a choice here or there, or it's just unfolding the way it is?*

Wayne: Well, personal choices are part of the unfolding; they're part of 'what is'. People make personal choices, continuously: I'll have vanilla; no, I'll have the chocolate; I'll have the escargot; I'll have the lobster. As long as they don't mention McDonalds! So, choices are being made continuously.

*Is it part of our intellect to sort of try to figure out what that means?*

Wayne: Certainly. Certain intellects are interested in such questions. We generally call those organisms seekers after knowledge, seekers after truth. They want to know; they want to understand. This path of knowledge is one of the traditional Yogic paths. Certain types of human organisms are drawn to that kind of seeking. There are other kinds of seeking as well: devotional, more art-centered kind of seeking; more active, doing kinds of seeking. Different people are temperamentally suited for these different paths.

*Is there such a thing as evolution in this, or is that just an illusion?*

Wayne: We could say that it's as real as you are. So, if you're real then evolution's real.

*Does that mean if evolution is real, that progress is real too? In other words, five thousand years ago, we were one sort of culture, society, creatures, and now there's another society? Or is that just bullshit?*

Wayne: I don't know if there's going to be anything tomorrow, much less five thousand years from now. It's pretty much a crapshoot as far as I am concerned.

*I guess what I'm trying to get to is does it matter to one to yearn to evolve? To be - I don't want to say better - but somehow...*

Wayne: If you yearn to evolve, it matters. For the people who don't yearn to evolve, it doesn't matter. You can say to them, "It's very important for you to yearn to evolve," and they're going to look at you like you're crazy. "What do I have to evolve for? The game's on!"

*So, either path is okay.*

Wayne: It is. Okay or not okay is something that we put on top of it.

*Free to be what we are.*

Wayne: We are what we are. It is what it is. What's happening is what's happening. You can call it freedom to be what we are or you can say we're enslaved.

*Do you feel you're gaining knowledge or is that not even how you approach it?*

Wayne: On a good day, I figure I'm making progress. It's not always readily apparent.

*Is that important to you?*

Wayne: Not really, no. My life unfolds before me, and each moment is rich and very full. Sometimes it's full of shit; sometimes it's full of incredible beauty. But there is fullness; there is absolute presence in what is.

*And each moment to experience, that fullness is what it's about?*

Wayne: It's what is. And this organism is an effect.

29 April 2005

## ***A Webcast Transcript Excerpt***

*It seems to be a built-in mechanism, at least in humans, to know who they are, to desire to know their own nature. Otherwise, why would we be sitting here?*

Wayne: I don't think that it's a broad human desire at all. I think the number of people in this room indicates that it's a very narrow band of people who are interested in knowing their true nature - very narrow indeed!

*There seems to be something that calls.*

Wayne: For seekers, absolutely! There is no question. If you are bitten with this bug, if you have this particular addiction, if you will, then there's no question that you are drawn to know; you are drawn to read these books, to be in the environments like this, to talk to people who might be able to give you insight. But you couldn't pay 99.9 percent of the people out there to spend an hour and a half in this room. It would be sheer hell! They would have to be desperate for the money.

*Why are we junkies then?*

Wayne: Why is anybody a junkie?

*I have no clue.*

Wayne: That is part of 'what is'. It is the nature of this organism to be interested in this subject. It is the nature of another organism to be interested in how much money they can get. Another organism is interested in how many salt and pepper shakers they can collect. It doesn't matter what the interest is on the part of the organism. Each organism is designed and created with different interests, different values.

*But this goes far back to the ancients, the Tao, to seekers and teachers.*

Wayne: That's right. It goes back to the question of: what is Consciousness trying to prove by all of this, what's the objective, what's the reason or rationale? There are thousands of explanations. Every religion has an explanation. Most spiritual enterprises have their explanation; generally self-serving, but explanations nonetheless: we are riding the crest of the wave of human evolution, whatever we are; we are advancing the cause of Consciousness; we are the front line in the movement toward a better tomorrow. In all of those reasons and rationales is the idea that Consciousness is getting better and we're part of that process.

*I guess I was thinking about having read the Buddha's vow, where he talks about directing his entire life to bringing about enlightenment for every sentient being, or something like that, as if that were the purpose. I guess that stuck in my head. I don't know what...*

Wayne: I don't know either. As far as I'm concerned not every sentient being needs enlightenment. Enlightenment is only necessary where there's a sense of separation, which is a peculiar human trait. Animals, insects, bacteria, viruses do not need to be enlightened because they do not have the sense of separation.

*I guess what stuck in my head about that vow was the idea that there was work to be done.*

Wayne: There may be all kinds of work to be done, and organisms are created to do it. Clearly there is a tremendous number of things in this manifest universe that need to be done. There are cures for diseases that have to be discovered; there are murders that need to be committed; there are children that have to be molested; there are all kinds of things that have to be done, and organisms are created to do them.

*With no purpose.*

Wayne: You can supply the purpose afterwards.

*I'm stuck there.*

This touches upon what he brought up. Earlier you were asked what difference you thought it would make if all humans in the world were enlightened. And you said the world would be very different. And yet opposed to that there is the opposite idea that it doesn't make any difference at all. So there's this sort of pendulum between these two concepts.

Wayne: Well by different. I mean that the dynamic of human interaction would be different because without this sense of personal involvement hate is impossible, guilt is impossible, shame is impossible. Those qualities that are now part of 'what is' would not be part of 'what is' in that hypothetical future, so things would be different. How things would then play out is anybody's speculation. That's why I said they would be different; I did not say how they would be different.

Well, there is this sort of idea going around the universe that until all the possibilities of awakening have actualized in phenomenal reality, Totality is incomplete. It's just a concept, but it exists as a concept. It may actualize or it may not. And this touches upon the Bodhisattva idea that as long as there are body-minds that are not awake, this particular body-mind being awake or not being awake is incomplete until the transmission has somehow spread to every branch of the tree. I don't know.

Wayne: Well, I'm well aware of the concept. And it is understood to be purely a concept when seen within the context that all these things (that are supposed to become aware) are already one. There is no separation, so it's already complete. How can we talk of completeness in a totality that is whole? The completeness is only meaningful within the context of separation. And if there is no separation, with the understanding that it is all one, it makes no sense.

# MEDITATION & PRACTICES

December 2009

## *A Living Gem from Ramesh*

(previously unpublished)

Daily Living Made Simple

1. In any given situation, do whatever you feel you should do. Whatever you actually do would be based entirely on two factors which God made -- your genes and your conditioning. Therefore, whatever you do would be precisely what God expected you to do. There cannot be any sin for which you need to fear God.
2. Whatever happens after you have done what you felt like doing, would be according to God's Will/Cosmic Law. Whatever happens and the consequences -- for better or worse -- will have to be accepted by you; you have no choices.
3. At any time, do not judge anyone as good or bad, neither yourself nor the other; because no one, neither the sage nor the psychopath, does anything: everything happens according to God's Will/Cosmic Law.

November 2005

March 2009

## *A Living Gem from Ramesh*

(previously unpublished)

Intuitive understanding may or may not give one supernormal powers which function to the extent that they are not forcefully willed or claimed, for the truly awakened ones know that their real siddhi is everything going on in the universe. On the other hand, siddhi, such as telepathy and clairvoyance, may be cultivated by special disciplines just as exercises are used for physical hygiene. But however far such disciplines may be pursued they do not lead to prajna, but tend rather to obstruct it by encouraging the sort of egocentricity which is often noticed in great athletes and actors.

Courage in living, the grace in living, spontaneous living comes naturally from prajna - the intuitive realization of being one with all that exists.

1989

April 2006

## ***A Living Gem from Ramesh***

(previously unpublished)

Ramana Maharshi generally advocated the practice of self-attention or awareness of the I-thought, which begins as a mental activity, but as it progresses naturally, the thought 'I' gives way to 'subjectively experienced' feeling of 'I'. And when this feeling ceases to identify with thoughts and objects, there comes about an effortless awareness of being in which no personal effort is concerned. The final effect happens - the transformation is complete - when the 'me' thought never arises again.

6 January 2005

## ***A Webcast Transcript Excerpt***

*Does it help the world as a whole to instead of talking about being in the front lines fighting the systems or is it better to be in meditation and being in bliss?*

Wayne: Depends on who you ask!

*It's better for me but I don't know about the world. Is it the vibration that is going to make the difference in how the world is?*

Wayne: I have absolutely no capacity to foretell the future, unfortunately. [Laughter] What I'm sort of present with, is what's happening, What Is. And what is is that we've got people fighting on all fronts, violently, passionately, in a variety of ways, and energetically And then we have others who are passive, who are very expansive, who are very open, in a state of bliss. And both exist, you see, as part of the functioning of the universe, part of what is. The creation, of god's creation if you will.

*So could you say that God expresses through all of us, even those of that are fighting as well as those of us who are in meditative bliss.*

Wayne: Absolutely. That's the model here. That Consciousness or God or whatever - there is only One. There is only One. And thus all of the permutations of the Oneness are still the Oneness. So the fighting, ugly, monster is as much the Oneness as the beatific saint whose very presence inspires love and generosity in the hearts of all who perceive him or her.

*So what do you make of that?*

Wayne: I don't know, what do you make of it? [laughter]

*It just includes everything I guess, but how come those of us who are peaceful get to be that way and those of us who are in hell you know and anger and what have you, in resentment, hate...*

Wayne: Do you want me to answer that question? Do you want the Christian answer, the Buddhist answer, do you want the Jewish answer, do you want the Hindu answer? I mean we've got the karmic answer, we've got the original sin answer - we've got lots of answers for that particular question of why things are as they are. Why there's apparent imbalance in the spread of wealth, goods, generosity, kindness. I mean you look around - it's not evenly distributed. [laughter]

*So I don't even know what the question is.*

Wayne: Well the essential question is why are things as they are? Why is it this way? And you pick out why is this this way, why is that this way. And over the millennia, those questions are not unique to you. They've been asked before. [Laughter]

And so over the millennium there have come answers. I mean people go and they say you're the wise guy, we've put you up here in this house and you know put stained glass in the windows and we feed you and take care of you, now give us some answers, or we'll find somebody else who will basically, and so to keep his job the guy says, OK this is why... [Laughter]

And over time, these answers, the good ones, get turned into religions. So all that said, there's no shortage of those answers for you. You see. But really what we're dealing with here is simply pointing to What Is, saying What Is is the manifestation of the Source Full stop.

*But the Source has to go through filters in each individual who whatever they're conditioning was, is?*

Wayne: Yes.

*The energy that comes through them either comes out as anger or peace?*

Wayne: Yes.

November 2004

## ***A Message from Wayne***

Hello my loves,

When I started my spiritual quest - nineteen years ago or so - I got various books on meditation and began doing Tai Chi and such. I even cobbled together my own meditation. Basically, what I did was get up about 6:30 in the morning and sit quietly on the floor, cross-legged with my back up against a straight surface. I would watch my breath exit the tip of my nose, and I had a mantra that I went through - it was about 10 or 12 words. Each time I went through it I dropped a word, then when I got down to one word I went back up by adding a word on each repetition. I did this most mornings.

One morning I was sitting in meditation and all of a sudden an incredible rush of energy ran right up my spine and out the top of my head. My entire being flooded out the top of my head and started jetting out into the universe. I was sitting there thinking, "Oh, this is good! This is really good!" (I'd done enough drugs in the past to know what to do with an experience like this, so I went with it.) My whole being was expanding out the top of my head and merging with the universe. There was a continuous rush. It was absolutely extraordinary. It was so amazing! I never had a drug experience this good. Compared to any of the psychedelics I had ever done, this was the ultimate! Wow!

After fifteen or twenty minutes, it all settled back down and I was sitting there thinking, "This meditation stuff is great!" So, the next morning I get up at about 6:10, (I figured it wouldn't hurt to start twenty minutes early) I sit back down, settle into the same position and start the mantra. "Okay, here we go!" I said, urging the energy to begin its movement up my spine. No luck. Every day, for weeks, I was back in that exact same position and the energy-up-the-spine experience never came back.

I had a similar experience playing golf. I played a hundred and twenty rounds of golf that were crap. Then one day I played six holes in which the ball went precisely where I was aiming, it rolled to the exact spot it was supposed to; everything was perfect. Of course then I started thinking, "What did I just do to make that happen?" and my game went back to crap again.

I no longer feel compelled to sit in formal meditation or to swing a golf club. I am truly blessed.

With love,  
Wayne

## *A Living Gem from Ramesh*

(previously unpublished)

The only understanding is that there is no entity to be enlightened by any doctrine, and the only enlightenment is the understanding that there is no entity to be enlightened. Without this understanding, any kind of teaching or practice would only reinforce the illusion of such an entity.

27 September 2004

### *A Webcast Transcript Excerpt*

Wayne: Have you been interested in this subject for a long time?

*Yes. Quite a long time. I've found it quite fascinating, from what my focus has been of a lot of Zen meditation, to be reading people who are saying that [practice] actually is keeping it at a distance from you.*

Wayne: I'm familiar with that argument or discussion. I'm not enamored with it. To my mind, and this is purely my opinion, any practice - be it Zen practice or inquiry practice - happens as part of the functioning of Totality. The observation of course is that the ego may well claim that happening and become inflated by it: "I'm a Zen student. I can sit twelve hours, while people who are hitting me with stick, and not flinch. Look at how spiritual I am." That kind of ego involvement happens. Sure, you can point to that and say, see, this practice is producing a stronger ego and it is, in fact, the obstacle to greater understanding. But that, to my mind, is a very shortsighted vision, because if we expand the scope, we understand that happening - the happening of the meditation practice and the happening of ego becoming involved - are part of the same functioning of Totality. In another case the practice can "lead" to a very deep, humble understanding.

So, in all these spiritual circles the pendulum swings back and forth. It swings into some very heavily defined practices and those practices become the kind of fashion. And then the spiritual fashion pendulum swings back into, "Oh, all those things are crap; they block you from enlightenment. Our way of not doing anything, which is really doing 'not doing', is the way." Essentially, it's where you hit the swing of that arc as to what is currently in fashion.

Now you can stay in that community, out of the hustle and bustle of the people who are flitting from one spiritual teacher to another; that way you stay focused and the values of that community are rigidly maintained and you're reinforced in whatever you're doing. The same applies, of course, if

you're in the community of non-doers. They've all reinforced one another, as well: we're not doing anything and our not doing anything is the true way of not being, and none of us exists and none of us exists together as this great group.

What we're trying to do here is get beyond all of that, get beyond the swing of the spiritual fashion pendulum into a real look at what's going on, at 'what is' - without dogma, without saying this is how it is and that one is dangerous and another creates problems or any of that nonsense. They are all tools. They are all part of 'what is'. They all happen. We get back to the basics: What is it that is functioning? What's going on here?

14 August 2004

### ***A Webcast Transcript Excerpt***

Wayne: How long have you been meditating?

*Seven years.*

Wayne: So would you say that you're spiritual interests are more physical and practical than they are intellectual?

*Yes. That's kind of the way it was presented to me. You can read about it all you want, but you're going to have to actually try it and see.*

Wayne: What would you say the benefits of these seven years of meditation have been for you?

*Boy, that's hard to assess, because there was so much going on when I started to meditate (as far as things were changing in my life) that I don't know if I can pull apart that aspect of it and say what effect that had.*

Wayne: So what did you do with it then, if after seven years you stopped the practice?

*Well, I've taken some time off it recently. It became something I just do, I never looked at it as a goal-oriented thing, it was just 'do this'. I experimented with other things, but it's always a thing that I did on a regular basis.*

Wayne: You're not doing it now?

*No.*

Wayne: So you have a sense that you're in a transition space?

*No. It feels like I should be sitting, but I just won't do it. It got really difficult with the group that I sit with. We do these [meditations] for all night. I couldn't seem to go through it. I miss it.*

Wayne: So if you miss it, why do you think it is that you don't do it?

*I wish I had the answer for that. The work I've been doing for the past year (painting) is a lot more physically demanding than what I used to do. I was in the internet business for a long time. I've become older in the past few years and it's harder to get up in the morning and do it - a lot harder. It's more painful. If I sit at night, which I like doing as well, I notice that I'm having a much tougher time going to sleep. I'm more awake after I sit; it wasn't working. I feel like I really should do it.*

Wayne: Should is a very interesting word and a very interesting feeling as well: you should do something that you're not doing. It might be worth investigating the nature of that sentence, "I should be doing something other than what I am doing" because it stems from a very interesting presumption, which is that you are the source of the doing in the first place. Without that presumption, should makes no sense. Should is only applicable to the situation if you have some creative input to the situation, by creative I mean that you, as a source of action, are responsible for creating this action.

*It feels like the reverse. It feels more negative, like I'm saying no.*

Wayne: Whether it's positive or negative, it's still doing. Whether it's the source of the negation or the source of the assertion makes no difference. What we're looking at is the presumption of being the source, the presumption that 'I' am the one responsible for this. Now, there's no doctrine here; we're not saying that one thing or the other is true; we're not about that at all. Rather, we are directing your attention to see what these assumptions you quite obviously hold are all about. I say quite obviously because when you articulate that you should be doing something, it only can stem out of one place - this presumption of being the author.

Go back to this presumption and look at it. See if, in fact, you are the source of the negation of the doing, see if that is true. Does the buck stop there? Or is this you - Tim - an instrument through which the 'not doing' happens? Is Tim's aging, the fact that his body reacts that way, within Tim's control? Is that something that Tim decided to do or is it something that the universe has brought forward into the mix? If it's a universal influence - of time and space and age, of the constitution of the organization and the affects of the environment - where does Tim's 'should' come from?

What's making that happen is not Tim. You can see that these influences

are outside of Tim's control, yet they dictate the response - in this case, the negative response. In that seeing, perhaps comes some insight. Not necessarily, mind you, but perhaps.

# EGO & SELF

March 2010

## *A Message from Wayne*

Hello my loves,

I am not the body.  
And yet I AM

So what is the body?

An illusion? An annoyance?  
A vehicle for pleasure? A vehicle for pain?  
The fragile vessel for a life lived?

As I lay in the emergency room, my heart rate dipping into the low 30's, I was not afraid to die...  
I did however have plans and desires.  
I wanted to see my daughter and granddaughter, due to arrive in two days.  
I wanted to know how my wife, Jaki's new book was going to do.  
I wanted to have a few more great meals.  
I wanted to make love some more.  
I wanted to scuba dive again.

This body was born into an age of technological wizardry.  
The healers came and laid on their skilled hands.  
A device was inserted and connected to my heart.  
I was resurrected.  
My heart beats strong and steady.

Every day of life is a miracle  
In which the Oneness moves as the many.

I am not the body  
And yet I AM.

With much love,

Wayne

April 2009

## *A Message from Wayne*

Hello my loves,

Our language can tell us a lot about the assumptions of the society in which we live.

I often hear people say, "I made some bad choices that put me in the bad position I am in now."

On the surface this may seem obvious and indisputable, but it introduces a bigger question. What was the source of the choice?

In children it is clearer. If you ask a young child, "Why did you chose to hit Billy and take away his toy?" the child will look at you blankly. He cannot relate to the notion that he 'chose' to do what he did. In his mind, he just DID what he did. If pressed, he will explain it by saying, "I don't know, I just felt like doing it." Simply put, it was a happening. It HAPPENED.

As we grow older, we learn to play the adult game. We learn how to tell elaborate stories about what happens. We learn to give REASONS for what happens. We learn to take credit and blame, which quickly morphs into pride and guilt. At the root of the adult game is the claim of personal authorship, a claim that is deeply rooted in human culture and society. These deep roots are the greatest barrier to an open and unbiased investigation into the truth or falsity of the claim of personal authorship.

The Living Teaching encourages you to be tireless in your pursuit of the truth of What Is. If you find yourself curious and able to look more deeply into the Source, you have been touched in a way that is rare indeed.

With much love,

Wayne

## *A Living Gem from Ramesh*

(previously unpublished)

The individual person will usually identify with only those actions which are voluntary and controlled. It is the ego which is concerned with the motivation, the volition, the choice of action, and is not concerned with the 'other', the spontaneous and the involuntary, which the ego considers

untrustable, unreliable. The ego is concerned with common sense, logic and linear thinking and thus naturally distrusts anything that happens intuitively, spontaneously and involuntarily.

1989

January 2008

## *A Message from Wayne*

Hello my loves,

**Who Cares?** was the title of one of Ramesh's earlier books. This can be understood on two levels. On the surface level, the slang expression indicates a lack of concern or a carefree attitude. While everyone has moments of not caring, even the most god-crazed sadhu will have moments of caring about something.

Which brings us to the deeper meaning in **Who Cares?** Where there IS caring, who produces it? Do you as an individual body-mind mechanism have the capacity to create caring? Certainly you may choose to start or stop caring about something but can you always make your choice happen? If you find you can't always make your choice happen, then that would suggest that some LIVING FORCE other than the egoic you determines what happens. It is this LIVING FORCE that Advaita is concerned with and it was with the hope of helping you discover this LIVING FORCE that Ramesh asked **Who Cares?**

With much love,

Wayne

## *A Living Gem from Ramesh*

(previously unpublished)

Show me the ego and I will destroy it, guaranteed.

The ultimate purpose of life is to find life has no purpose - It is just a Leela, played by Consciousness.

Life is a movie, scripted by Consciousness, produced by Consciousness, being directed by Consciousness, all the roles being played by Consciousness and being witnessed by Consciousness.

'You' can never be enlightened - Enlightenment can happen, but not to

any person/entity - Enlightenment is an Impersonal event.

True witnessing is where there is no Witnessor.

There is speaking, but no speaker - there is thinking, but no thinker - there is no 'you' talking and 'me' listening - it is Consciousness talking and Consciousness listening.

1 March 2005

## ***A Webcast Transcript Excerpt***

Wayne: What is your name?

*My name is Sheila.*

Wayne: Hi Sheila. How is it you find yourself here today?

*My friend invited me.*

Wayne: I see. So what did he tell you, to induce you to come down?

*I haven't seen him in a long time, but we just had a conversation about spirituality, and he said he thought I might want to come down to Hermosa Beach and check things out.*

Wayne: I see. So what, about spirituality, were you talking about?

*Just being a better person, not being so material, just bettering myself.*

Wayne: What's wrong with you? [laughter]

*I feel like I'm too material. We had a three hour conversation about it.*

Wayne: Was he telling you that you were too material?

*No, I feel that way. I feel guilty a lot of the time. I feel like I don't send out enough love to people, and I'm too selfish. That's how I feel.*

Wayne: So, it might be interesting to take a look - I mean, I believe that's a genuine feeling - you feel that you're not loving enough, or that you're too selfish, or too concerned with your own...

*I'm too self-absorbed.*

Wayne: Okay, so assuming that you are self-absorbed, to whatever degree - we'll leave the 'too' out of it. We'll just say that there is self-absorption.

So that self-absorption is there. If we start there and work backwards to the source of the self-absorption, how is it that Sheila has become self-absorbed? Did you one day decide, "I think I'm going to be self-absorbed today?"

*No.*

Wayne: No. So the self-absorption happened.

*Yeah, little by little.*

Wayne: Okay, little by little, and we'll assume there's some genetic predisposition to self-absorption, and some sort of quality in your body that may predispose you to be self-absorbed. Then your experiences in life, little by little, may have fostered an increase in self-absorption. Now those events in your life, that may have increased the self-absorption – the real question is, did you engineer those events?

*I don't know, I think so. I have to take responsibility, right?*

Wayne: I don't know, I mean we're just asking questions here - there are no right or wrong answers. The process that's happening here is one of inquiry and examination; where you find out for yourself, by looking at your own experiences. So in the course of your life, experiences happen. The real question is, what was your part in bringing those experiences into being? Presumably people entered your life that you didn't even know existed. How could you have brought them in, if you didn't even know that they were alive? Do you see what I'm driving at?

*Yeah.*

Wayne: So there's stuff that's happened in your life - people that you've met - experiences that you've had - that were part of a much larger happening than what you could possibly create with your own physical being. So if you can look for yourself at your own experience and your own background, you may begin to see that how you are in this moment, with whatever degree of self-absorption that you have, is a product of huge forces outside of your egoic control. So what I'm doing here is simply pointing your attention to look, and then you need to draw your own conclusions from your own looking, you see?

Now if you look, and you see that these other forces were operative, and were instrumental in creating who you are today, then that guilt eases naturally, on it's own. You don't have to make any efforts to reduce it; it simply dissipates in the seeing, as you understand that who you are and what you are is a function of the universe, and that includes your finer

qualities and those qualities that you and others might not like. I mean, we're all a mixed bag - everyone is a mixed bag of qualities. Clearly, if you were in charge - if any of us were in charge and capable of creating our own realities - we'd all be saints! We'd be loving and kind and generous all the time, because when we're loving and kind and generous, you feel better, everybody feels better, and it brings more joy into your life. It's all this big, positive cycle.

It's easy to see. Once you open your eyes and look around, you say, "Yeah, the more generous I am, the more kind I am, the more loving I am, the more open I am, the more loving, kind, generous and open the world is." So once you identify that, presumably you do it, right? I mean, if you had the capacity to do that, everyone would. So the fact that despite your best intentions, and your most earnest observations and efforts, you're still filled with positive and negative qualities, seems to suggest a certain lack of control on the part of the organism, in terms of being the end point of the source.

How are we doing so far?

*Better. [laughter]*

15 February 2005

## ***A Webcast Transcript Excerpt***

*The use of the terms ego, doer, author - my understanding is that everything is within that context, it's all Consciousness. The ego is part of that Consciousness, so it's not like it's a bad thing, a wrong thing, or something to transcend. But there's this big conversation about it.*

Wayne: There is indeed. So, it's important to define the term. When I talk about ego, usually I'm talking about the sense of personal authorship. So then there isn't some higher state. The higher state is only in reference to a lower state. When you get rid of the higher/lower modality and you talk about this transcendence, there's nothing experiential about it.

So, as you swing higher and lower within your own psychology, there's no particular resistance to dropping into a particularly foul mood. There's no involvement by the egoic me in that process. The process happens in the absence of a 'me' to become involved. Some people refer to the false sense of personal authorship or the false claim of personal authorship as the ego. In my lexicon, the ego in fact does nothing. Its sole function is to claim the functioning of the universe as it happens through a particular organism as its doing. It is claiming the subjectivity of the source as this, identifying

with this and then claiming primacy as this. When you look into it, it is such a ludicrous point! It is the most ridiculous one - totally unsupportable. And, yet, that profound sense that I'm the one making it happen is a central feature of virtually every human.

Ramesh, who is my guru, coined a wonderful phrase 'divine hypnosis' to describe this sense that the ego has of primacy. And it has it even if the intellect fully acknowledges that it couldn't possibly be the source, that it's a limited instrument. Yet, despite this conviction, there is this profound sense of being the source. That's why the term 'divine hypnosis' is so beautiful. If everything is divine, if everything is one, then even the presence of the ego must be part of that. So it's not self-hypnosis; the ego can't even do that. It may claim that it does it, but again it's a false claim. It's a false claim.

*So even if someone would say, "Oh, I just washed my car," within that context you're saying that's perceived as authorship?*

Wayne: Not necessarily. It may be perceived as authorship. The sage can say, "I washed my car," and it's a statement as devoid of authorship as, "The sun rose at 6:53 this morning." Both are statements of fact. I - this organism - washed the car. That happened.

*The difference is?*

Wayne: The difference is if this 'authoring me' is present to claim the washing of the car as 'my egoic doing'.

*So, the fact that he was able to wash the car is only due to the understanding that they only exist because of the whole. So everything up to that point, including the conditioning of the organism, needed to be such that the car could even be washed.*

Wayne: Right. Certain organisms never wash their cars. They don't care about whether their cars are dirty; they don't have the energy to do it; they don't have the money to pay somebody else to do it. So the car is always filthy.

*But they might do that?*

Wayne: They will do something else.

*Something is doing all the time, but they're thinking they are doing.*

Wayne: That's correct. So it is the claim of authorship that is the point at which the suffering is created - this involvement by me in the action, whatever the action is. Something as mundane as washing the car has a lot

less potential for egoic claim. Now, "I went over and helped my neighbor put up his barn," is more likely an activity in which the ego will claim involvement: I did that because I'm a nice person; I did that because I'm a responsible member of society. All of those things that will inflate the ego and give it power and substance by claiming that it did those.

*The termination point is 'I did'. There is that process of doing, but it doesn't mean anything about you. That's where the ego wants to kick in.*

Wayne: So it is in fact the nature of *that* you. There's a functional you that is identified with the action on a functional level, knowing that 'I' as the apparatus did it. And then there is that egoic you that takes that one step further. It's really an interesting moment at which that happens. The thrust of this teaching is to point you back to see for yourself the moment at which in your own experience that occurs.

You're the testing ground for the teaching. It is at that point that it becomes real and immediate. At this level, it's all intellectual and kind of *hurry-carry*. But the point at which it becomes connected to your own action is the point at which insight can occur, profound insight into the true nature of what is occurring. It is a non-intellectual process at that point. So the intellectual pointers direct you there, but they can't carry you into it.

21 September 2004

### ***A Webcast Transcript Excerpt***

*For a while I was using, "Who am I?" And trying to use other things to get it. And then I read what you wrote - the analogy of the brain surgeon and the scalpel - and I realized that I was trying to manipulate my getting something. That's why it wasn't working. And then I would ask myself: what do I do then?*

Wayne: The pointer really is beyond that, you see? All of those occurrences happened as part of the functioning of Totality. You were led to this book; you responded to that particular image in a certain way in accordance with your nature. So these events coalesced to give you that thought; in the same way that you were led to the teaching in the first place and exposed to the notion of self-inquiry. All of that came to you. A day before you first heard of it you didn't know it even existed. You couldn't manufacture it; you couldn't make it happen. It came to you - unbidden, out of your control.

With that understanding, it's then the ego claims that 'I' self-enquired; I self-enquired for my own reasons, meaning I self-enquired badly and selfishly. But the pointer of the teaching is that the self-enquiry happened

as part of the functioning of Totality, and then it may have stopped happening as part the same functioning through the application of my book or hearing me and what I had to say. It stopped that. Then the ego said, "Oh, I finally see the light so I'm stopping it."

What we're doing here is shining the light of attention on this claim by the ego that I am doing all this stuff. The self-enquiry can produce all kinds of things. What we're saying is "when I used it." We're looking at the 'I' that would use it. It was happening; certainly, self-enquiry was going on and there was an impact on the organism for doing it. You say, "I felt more at peace; more insight came when I did that." Who did that? What was the source of that? That's where we're looking...

20 September 2004

### ***A Webcast Transcript Excerpt***

*Something was said of Ramesh's classic question, "Is there anything I can do here?" I'm not familiar with that. I was wondering if you could speak on that. I'm sort of struggling with personal responsibility.*

Wayne: If you have something you believe is your egoic doing, where you say, "I authored this. I am the source of this" - be it a thought a feeling or action - Ramesh suggests that you deconstruct it. Essentially, you take a look and see if that thing you are claiming to be your egoic action or thought or feeling is uninfluenced by externals: by your enculturation, by your genetics, by all sorts of influences. See whether anything exists independent of those forces. If it's not independent of external forces, at what point can you claim it to be yours? That's the essence of the question.

14 August 2004

### ***A Webcast Transcript Excerpt***

*One of the problems that I'm having right now is also about letting go and the ego. What I've been hearing, that is if I'm hearing it properly, is that ego has this self-perpetuating motivation. I'm having difficulty getting around that concept of, well, that the ego is tricking you now. I'm beginning to get to the point where I can't quite understand, I'm questioning everything that I'm doing: am I taking the right path? Am I seeking the right thing? Are you in agreement that the ego has that motivation?*

Wayne: I can only talk from my model, and the model I use is that what we call the ego is in fact a false claimer. The sole function of the aspect of self

that we call the ego is to claim what is happening - 'I' am doing it - not as a functioning element, but rather that 'I' am the source of it. This is a crucial distinction between being the source of what is happening as opposed to being the instrument through which things happen.

It is no question that these forms, these body-minds that we're identifying with as what 'I' am, do things, all kinds of things. They think, they feel, they act - they do all those things. The genetic coding that enables these apparatus to do what they do is mind-boggling in its complexity and its strength in terms of determining what these organisms do - up to and including learning, up to and including having conditioned responses based on experiences. So, the programming of these instruments and apparatuses is dynamic, changing every instant.

There is the additional quality that is uniquely human and that arises at around the age of two-and-a-half which is a sense within the organism that 'I' am separate and 'I' am the source of my thoughts, feelings and actions. It is an incredible occurrence when it happens. If you have children, you've likely seen this take place. We call it the 'terrible twos' because it's such a disruptive, painful process for the organism to go through. This process of moving from a state of essential unity and direct functioning with the universe to separation and the feeling "I'm" in control when I clearly am not can be incredibly painful.

There is continuous evidence of the universe that you are not this incredibly powerful, central figure that your ego says you are. So there is this clash, this huge problem of reconciling this continuous message of independence and autonomy with the ongoing experience of the universe of our impotence. Most people 'grow up' and adjust to this conflict within themselves in a variety of ways. In a few organisms, a questioning of this assumption arises: "Wait a minute. This doesn't feel right." Even if it's not articulated in quite that way, there is a sense that this isn't the way it seems to be. This isn't it. There's some other way that this holds together. That is the seed of the seeker and it expresses in a variety of ways.

One of the occurrences in the body-mind organism that happens from time to time, not necessarily connected to the seeking, is that the sense of separation, of claiming the operation of the organism as 'my' egoic doing, dies. It's gone - in the same way that it arrived: it came and now it's gone. That occurrence is what we call enlightenment or awakening or ultimate understanding. In my lexicon, there is a very precise definition of what we're talking about. This event of enlightenment is an event in the history of the organism in which something specific happens. That specific happening is the dissolution of that false sense of authorship. That's precisely what happens. And it does happen.

*Can the ego stay gone?*

Wayne: The 'stay gone' is the enlightenment. The 'coming and going' is what we call spiritual seeking. What's confusing is that sometimes it's gone for a while, so you are thinking this is it. But your thinking this is it is not it.

August 2004

## *A Message from Wayne*

Hello my loves,

As I have been traveling around, there has been a lot of interest lately in Ramesh's concept of the working mind and the thinking mind. The working mind is, as the name suggests, the aspect of the organism that does the work of keeping the organism functioning. It is the repository of genetic heritage, memory, knowledge, culture, identity, all of those qualities that are essential for day to day living. The working mind functions in accordance with its programming. This programming is dynamic; it's an ongoing process whereby new information is being added to the mix all the time.

What Ramesh calls the thinking mind is another term for what is commonly referred to as the ego. The thinking mind's sole function - the ONLY thing it does - is to claim the operation of the working mind as its own doing and become involved in that operation to the extent solely of preserving itself. It's a false claimer of primacy or authorship which arises in virtually every human at the age of about two and a half. The ego/thinking mind authors nothing. There is no such thing as ego-created action.

The body-mind organism that is popularly called a sage is one in which the thinking mind has died. Famous historical resurrections notwithstanding, dead is dead and there is no possibility of return. That is my working definition for what constitutes an organism called the sage and what the event of enlightenment represents. It is that very precise occurrence. Therefore, far from being a superman, the sage is completely ordinary. In this model the sage has not gained something more but rather is simply a human organism with one thing LESS....it is without the false sense of personal authorship.

With love,  
Wayne

## ***A Living Gem from Ramesh***

(previously unpublished)

If you want to know precisely what is meant by 'living in the moment', take a dog out for a walk: what the dog does is precisely that.

29 July 2004

### ***A Webcast Transcript Excerpt***

*Something that is usually associated with the ego is the need for recognition. Would this be absent in the sage, or does the body-mind mechanism desire recognition for things that it does or creates?*

Wayne: It's not quite as simple as that because the organism can desire recognition for different reasons. Often the motivation for recognition is to have fulfillment; there is the sense that when the ego is recognized, lauded and given credit for what it has done, then it is given power, it is given energy. The ego desperately seeks a replenishment of energy, of potency or power, because it has none. So, it is constantly seeking some sign that it has some, and one of those signs is recognition.

But there are other reasons the organism may seek recognition that have nothing to do with that sense of personal authorship. You can't necessarily ascribe that behavior or that desire to one aspect or another.

April 2004

## ***A Living Gem from Ramesh***

(previously unpublished)

The ego - without the sense of doership - the mere identification with the body-mind organism, is, as such, merely a reflection of the programming in action. In the absence of the sense of doership there is no personal involvement.

July 2003

### ***A Message from Wayne***

Hello my loves..

This is the month of Guru Pournima, a time when the Guru (both as the Source and as the teacher) is honored and celebrated. This year the Guru's Full Moon falls on July 13. In Mumbai, at Ramesh's flat, there will be refreshments served (Ramesh's wife Sharda will provide her famous iced coffee and some lovely sweets). For those of us not fortunate enough to physically make it to India for the occasion we might content ourselves with Ramesh's latest book entitled (aptly enough)...Guru Pournima in which Ramesh and some of us who love him have written about this most joyous and profound of all human relationships.

If you are in the Los Angeles area on Saturday, July 12, please come join us for our own little celebration to follow the 10AM Talk at my house in Hermosa Beach. The Talk will undoubtedly center on my history with my Beloved Ramesh. It is one of my favorite topics and one I am never tired of discussing though some of you may, by now, be tired of hearing about it. So consider yourself warned! If you are unable to come to the Talk, please join us via the live webcast. Like the Teaching itself, it is free for the taking.

I am very grateful to those who have, through their generosity, made it possible for me to live and Teach. Many of you have offered your love and support either directly or through your membership in the Advaita Fellowship. I want you to know that I have noticed and that I am most appreciative. It matters not if we have spoken or seen each other recently. This relationship makes no demands and has no set form. There are no requirements other than an open heart...and even that is seen as subject to change. So, wherever you find yourself on this Guru Pournima, whatever your current thoughts, whoever you find yourself attracted to....know that you are well and truly Loved.

Wayne

## ***A Living Gem from Ramesh***

(previously unpublished)

The 'direct method': Destroy the ego by seeking its identity, does raise a valid question - who is asked to destroy the ego?

Perhaps the explanation is that what is to be destroyed is not the ego itself but the malignant element in the ego... the sense of personal doership, volition. When the ego finally, totally realizes that it is not in charge of life,

but merely represents the body as a separate entity, a separate, uniquely programmed instrument through which the Primal Energy functions and brings about whatever is to be brought about in the moment, according to a Cosmic Law - then the ego realizes its impotency and remains placid and inactive. The ego realizes its passive role as a mere witness of all that is happening in the moment.

That is self-realization.

# SUFFERING & PAIN

February 2008

## *A Message from Wayne*

Hello my loves,

You have probably spent your whole life trying to control and modify the events you see are connected to your guilt and suffering. You try to be more patient, more honest, more loving, more chaste, more generous, more open, more tolerant, more productive or more effective. Despite your efforts it is likely that some, perhaps many of the events connected to your suffering and guilt continue to occur.

Now may be the moment for you to take a radically different approach. Rather than trying even harder to control your behavior, perhaps it is time to turn your attention to this OTHER aspect of your sense of guilt and suffering.

The Living Teaching invites you to stop here and take a fresh look at something. Look deeply into the assumption that you COULD have acted/reacted differently in the moment that you did what you did. Examine the claim by the ego that you were the author, the independent source of that event for which there is now a feeling of guilt.

Is it true?  
Is it really true?  
Could it have been different?  
Were you the independent source of it?  
Look deeply.  
If you don't see, look again.

With much love,

Wayne

February 2006

## *A Message from Wayne*

Hello my loves,

I have recently returned from Mumbai and my annual winter visit to see

Ramesh. As always, it was a truly joyous and blessed time. To spend time in the presence of one's guru is life's greatest pleasure.

I am often asked why I continue to visit Ramesh even though there is no longer any 'seeking need' to do so. For me, the seeking long ago morphed from a process of acquisition whereby I was hoping to GET something to a state of Acceptance wherein there was not only nothing left to GET but more importantly, no longer an egoic 'me' needing to get IT. What remained was a man named Wayne who loved a little Indian retired banker named Ramesh. For almost twenty years now, that love has flowed unabated. It matters not if we are in the Satsang room together or eating a meal together or watching cricket on television together or simply sitting together in comfortable silence, the love that is the very essence of the guru/disciple relationship is there.

Each year when I visit Ramesh I get to watch with amusement, awe and delight how his Teaching evolves and changes its emphasis. Never wavering from the fundamental Understanding, his approach continues to move and dance like a boxer's. This continued movement keeps the more 'advanced' and knowledgeable disciples alert and on their toes.

One of the greatest obstacles to a deepening of Understanding is the complacency inherent in knowing something. Once you have an answer there is no longer any movement. Inquiry is dead. What remains is a dull and lifeless repetition of a concept that may have once brought insight and is now mistaken for insight itself. Ramesh's continual changes keeps his disciples engaged and active. His current emphasis on the value of the Teaching in daily living is simply another door opening into the corridor of Truth.

The value of the guru is not in what you can get from him...it is the guru/disciple relationship itself which is its own reward.

With love,  
Wayne

## ***A Living Gem from Ramesh***

(previously unpublished)

Living in the NOW, living in the present moment, means living like God:

Doing whatever you feel like doing in any situation - total free will; you have no control what happens thereafter;

What happens thereafter is God's Will/Cosmic Law; therefore, enjoy the pleasure of the moment and suffer the pain, without blaming anyone: neither yourself nor the other;

Live from moment to moment, without any regrets for the past, without any complaints about the present, and without any expectations in the future.

"Have faith in God, but tether your camel" - an old Arabic saying. (In any situation, do whatever you think you should do.)

October 2004

## *A Message from Wayne*

Hello my loves,

Many people who come to my Talks say they are there because of an interest in enlightenment. But when we get down to what this thing called enlightenment actually IS, there is enormous confusion.

When I talk about enlightenment, I talk about it very, very specifically, and it's very simple. In humans, at around the age of two-and-a-half, a shift occurs whereby they change from free-flowing, uninvolved beings to experiencing everything in terms of 'Me!' and 'Mine!' It is that moment in which what I call the 'false sense of personal authorship' kicks in. It happens to virtually every human being. It is the false sense that 'I' as this body-mind am the source; that 'I' as this body-mind am responsible for making it all happen.

It is this false sense of personal authorship that creates suffering, because the sense is that 'I' am in control of things, and, yet, there is continuous evidence to the contrary - that I'm not in control. So a powerful tension is established. In some body-minds, for whatever reason, that sense of personal authorship permanently dissolves - dies. That event, for lack of a better name, is called enlightenment. Over the millennia, generations of seekers have mystified the hell out of it. Basically, it's an event that happens in the history of some human organisms.

Now, the reason this event is so interesting to people is that the organism through which it happens is no longer suffering. There is total acceptance within the organism. There is total acceptance because it is 'understood' that what is, is. There is no longer a separate sense of 'me' to become involved with what is and claim it as 'mine' - egoically mine. When that process is no longer occurring, that permanent lack of occurrence may be

called peace or bliss or enlightenment. What is crucial to realize is that it is a happening. It happens as part of the functioning of the universe. The pointer of this teaching is that everything happens that way; everything happens as part of the functioning of Totality.

With love,  
Wayne

27 September 2004

### *A Webcast Transcript Excerpt*

Wayne: I can tell you what my model is. When I talk about enlightenment, I talk about it very, very specifically, and it's very simple. In humans, at around the age of two-and-a-half, a shift occurs where they go from free-flowing beings to everything is 'Me!' and 'Mine!' It is that moment in which what we call the sense of personal authorship kicks in. It happens to virtually every human being. It is the false sense that 'I' as this body-mind am the source; that 'I' as this body-mind am responsible for making it all happen.

It is this false sense of personal authorship that creates suffering, because the sense is that 'I' am in control of things, and, yet, there is continuous evidence to the contrary - that I'm not in control. So a powerful tension is established. In some body-minds, for whatever reason, that sense of personal authorship permanently dissolves - dies. That event, for lack of a better name, is called enlightenment. Over the millennia, they've mystified the hell out of it. Basically, it's an event that happens in the history of some human organisms.

Now, the reason this event is so interesting to people is that the organism is no longer suffering. There is a sense of acceptance within the organism. There is total acceptance because it is 'understood' that what is, is. There is no longer a separate sense of 'me' to become involved with what is and claim it as 'mine' - egoically mine. When that process is no longer happening, that state is called peace or bliss or enlightenment; there are a lot of names for it.

*You still get angry and sad. It just doesn't make you suffer.*

Wayne: Exactly! You see, anger and sadness are functions of the human apparatus. This thing has been programmed to experience a variety of emotions and reactions. That in itself does not create suffering. What creates suffering is involvement in the ego in the sadness, in the anger, in

the pain; where this separate egoic me becomes involved in the pain of the moment and projects it into the past or the future. It is that projection of what is occurring in the moment into the past and future which is (for lack of a better term) suffering.

*How does enlightenment happen? How do you return to that state? It just happens?*

Wayne: It just happens. It happens as part of the functioning of the universe. The pointer of this teaching is that everything happens that way; everything happens as part of the functioning of Totality.

21 September 2004

### ***A Webcast Transcript Excerpt***

Wayne: My guru, this fellow Ramesh Balsekar, is an enlightened master. I was with him some fourteen or fifteen years ago when he was in the States on a speaking tour and news came to him that his son had died in Bombay. He had lived with him essentially his whole life. His grief was enormous, of course. People have this fantasy that when there is enlightenment there is no longer any pain and everything becomes fine, okay, beautiful - all sweetness and lights all the time. That's not true. Life is by its very nature exquisitely beautiful and exquisitely painful. As long as there is life in the organism we call the sage, there will be beauty and horror, joy and sorrow.

What we can call the blessing of the ultimate understanding is that there is no suffering attendant to the pain. There is not the slightest sense that things as they are, no matter how painful, should be different or that what has happened should not have happened. There is the implicit understanding that everything that happens is part of a massive functioning, a part of a huge tapestry of Totality, and it is inescapable - could not be otherwise. In that acceptance, there is peace even in the most profound grief, the most profound pain. The impact of this teaching is often to diminish that sense that things should be other than they are.

*Which is, of course, why I've struggled so much with it. How I used to feel is much more different now.*

Wayne: I have not lost a child, so I don't have that experience. But every experience, particularly those that are dramatically painful and emotionally devastating, does change the organism. They change the programming of the organism, and so life is viewed differently. There is a difference in perspective and perception in accordance with the occurrences of life. The good news is that the change in programming is dynamic, it is continuously

happening. So the fact this is how it is now does not mean it will be that way next week, next month, or next year; in the same way that where you are now is different than where you were three years ago because of the event that intervened.

14 August 2004

## *A Webcast Transcript Excerpt*

*Does your model recognize suffering in the world? I know that you acknowledge that there is suffering. I guess what I'm saying is that in the model I've been studying that is the focus. Suffering exists. I'm not too familiar with your model. Is suffering pertinent in it?*

Wayne: Suffering does exist, clearly, as part of the functioning of Totality. We can identify the source of the suffering as the involvement by the ego. In the absence of that, there's no suffering. Yes, we can point to all of those things. That is very much a part of this model.

*But I guess what brought that question to my mind was the fact you said the functioning of us, as separate thinking egos is part of what was divinely placed. It's almost like the suffering is integral, to use your word, but not necessarily something that should be displaced or escaped.*

Wayne: There is no 'should' involved at all. The whole notion of 'should' has no real significance in the context of the teaching. Yes, this is how it is. In the next instant, everything can change. Suffering is very much part of the model as it has existed historically and as it is experienced presently. What will happen in the next instant - absolutely anything is possible.

*But the suffering is a function of the ego.*

Wayne: Yes, the involvement by the ego in 'what is' is how suffering is produced. The ego isn't the source of the suffering. It is the instrument through which suffering is produced. That's the whole point. The ego is impotent. It does nothing. It will claim that it is producing the suffering, because it is in its nature to claim potency. But it's a false claim. It has none.

*And when you remove the self, the suffering still exists, I suppose. I guess I'm not formulating it well, but in my mind, I'm trying to see if the suffering is as much a part of your model. You admit it exists and you say the ego instrument is through which it is perceived.*

Wayne: No, through which it is created.

*Created?*

*Wayne: Yes. So if the ego is absent then there is no possibility of it being created through that organism. In that way, the sage does not suffer. The enlightenment is the end of suffering, but it's not the end of suffering for any one. Simply, the suffering does not arise through that organism anymore. There is no longer any one egoically identified with the organism.*

*So you're saying in that way things are just happening?*

Wayne: What I would say is almost exactly that, except I would take out the 'just'. Things are happening. They're happening, really happening! Check this: the ego says, "If I'm not the source of it then things are just happening."

*The fear is, okay, you have this ego and you know you should just let go of the ego and let things happen.*

Wayne: Who is going to let go of the ego and let things happen? The ego says, "I'm going to let go of ego and just let things happen and then everything is going to be great. Then I'll have mastered this situation."

*But in some sense, isn't there an effort of 'letting go of being in control'?*

Wayne: There may well be some effort exerted in letting go of being in control. Who is exerting the effort?

*The ego.*

Wayne: The ego does nothing. It only claims that it is exerting the effort - falsely claims. The organism exerts the effort. Whatever effort is required comes about as a result of untold forces of the universe. The ego says, "I did that."

*But the organism is still doing its thing?*

Wayne: Absolutely, until it's dead.

24 May 2004

## ***A Webcast Transcript Excerpt***

Wayne: You're asking, "How do I get what I want? How do I make myself more peaceful? How do I stay in the presence that I like and avoid involvement that I don't like?"

We go one layer beneath that and take a look and see if, in fact, you are

producing either the state that you like (a state of peace) or the state that you don't like (this state of involvement). If you are producing them, then produce the state that you like more often, and stop producing the one you don't like. That's simple. If you're not the one producing, if these states are, in fact, the product of forces much greater than your egoic self, meaning that this body/mind organism we call Cindy is the instrument through which a certain amount of peace happens and a certain amount of involvement happens, then in the seeing of that there may well come a degree of acceptance of what is happening in the moment. Whatever that is.

This is not to say that you won't continue to have preferences, meaning that you'll continue to prefer to have the peace over the involvement. The peace is pleasurable; the involvement is painful. So, unless you're a masochist, then the 'you' will prefer the peace or pleasure to the pain. The preference is a function of the programming of this organism we call Cindy. She's constructed in such a way to prefer pleasure to pain.

So the acceptance is total. The acceptance includes all the responses. The acceptance includes even the desire to have one thing over another. Without those preferences, you have no qualities or characteristics. You're just this bland, colorless lump. It is the preferences, it is the desires, it is the passions that give you thought, give you color, and give you shape as a person. It would be horrible if this ultimate understanding robbed you of that color, of the passion, of the vivacity of life.

*So, what about all the teachers who continue to say that those are the cause of suffering?*

Wayne: Yeah! What about all those teachers? It's pretty interesting, isn't it? I was right in there with that question, because I had the exact observation. I read the words of the third Zen Patriarch in Hsin Hsin Ming, which was translated by Richard Clark in 1972. It said, "The Great Way is simple for those who have no preferences." Unfortunately, that was the translation I found in the first place. And having now been plodding around in these fields for a number of years, I've seen the subtlety of simple words. However, thirty years later, Richard Clark got a little wiser and a deeper understanding, so he redid the book. This is how he retranslated that same passage: "The Great way is not difficult for those not attached to preferences."

There's a huge difference between not having preferences and not being attached to them. It reminds me of the story about a guy back in the thirteenth century who is traveling around visiting various monasteries. He visits this one monastery, and he's taken around by the Abbott on a tour. They come to a big room full of monks at their desks transcribing the texts of the holy books. As the head Abbott explains this whole process to him, he asks the Abbott, "Are all of these monks copying the book from the

original or they are copying from the copy?" The Abbott replied, "They're copying from the copy. We have the original safely down in the vault." So the monk asked, "What would happen if there is some discrepancy in the copy and you keep duplicating this error?" The head Abbott said, "Well, you may be right." So, he went down into the vault to look at the original text. About an hour or two later you hear this incredible, anguished cry come from the vault. Everyone rushes down to the vault and they find the head Abbott scratching his face, and he's crying, "Oh, I can't believe it. I can't believe it! The word was celebrate!"

So, there are numerous interpretations of and numerous statements to the effect that it is desire that is the source of all suffering, that it is our preferences that are the problem. The problem with these pointers - and they are pointers or tools; they are not truths - is that they are subject to enormous misinterpretation. The original pointer may have been about the involvement by an egoic me in what is happening as a function of the meat. The meat has preferences. It is genetically imprinted and programmed with these preferences. The meat has desires. And if you try and circumvent or squash the desires of the meat, you have weird shit happening.

The real pointer of the sage is that the suffering is a product of the involvement by an egoic me (what I call an authoring me) which claims these desires and preferences as 'mine', and becomes involved in them. That involvement is suffering. So it's true that involvement in desire, involvement in the preference is suffering. You can see from your own experience that that is the case. But it is not the desire or the preference itself that is the source of suffering.

February 2003

***A Living Gem from Ramesh***

(previously unpublished)

The result of Self-realization is that the ego no longer has to carry the burden of pride and arrogance for 'success' nor guilt and shame for 'failure', nor the burden of hatred and malice, jealousy and envy for the other - in his or her daily living.

# ENLIGHTENMENT, OR FINAL UNDERSTANDING

June 2009

## *A Message from Wayne*

Hello my loves,

*Believe those who are seeking the truth. Doubt those who find it.*

- Andre Gide (1869 - 1951)

I am very pleased to have my new book, **Enlightenment Is Not What You Think**, coming out this month. If it is at all successful in dispelling some of the myths about Enlightenment, I will be gratified.

In the Living Teaching it is recognized that seeking Truth is infinitely more valuable than finding it. The search is alive and vibrant. Once you think you have found it, the resulting knowledge is dead.

Knowledge is acquired. Truth is revealed. The nature of this revelation is an absence rather than a thing that is to be gained. Of course, it is impossible to describe an absence... we can only describe something that has properties. The impossibility of the task of describing Enlightenment, combined with the insatiable thirst on the part of the seeker to know what it is, has produced an incredible array of pointers. The inevitable fate of such pointers is that people hear them as descriptions and then take them to be Truths in and of themselves.

It would be an endless and thankless task trying to point out the fallacy in each belief about Enlightenment. I have contented myself with presenting a broader perspective on the subject, in which a new and deeper insight may be found. I hope you find it valuable.

As always, we shall see what happens.

With love,  
Wayne

March 2009

## *A Message from Wayne*

Hello my loves,

Freedom is a word that is often used interchangeably with the word Enlightenment. To be enlightened is to be free. But have you ever stopped to consider what it means to be free? It is curious. Ask people what they think of when they think of freedom and most people speak in terms of freedom to do what they please. Freedom to go where they want to go. Freedom to say what they want to say and do what they want to do. Freedom is often associated with choice. Freedom to choose a leader (vote). Freedom to choose a spouse. Freedom to choose a career. Boil it down and this kind of freedom is about getting what you want. Presumably, the freer you are, the better able you will be to get what you want and the more satisfied you will be. Such a notion of freedom is inevitably linked to power. If you have physical power you are then free to climb mountains you could not if you are weak. If you have financial power you are free to go places and acquire things you cannot if you are poor. In this way freedom becomes associated with acquisition or control and so it is that most people imagine that the road to freedom lies in acquisition or control. But the desire for such freedom is limitless and insatiable. The more you get, the more remains ungot.

We need only read the newspapers to see where such an approach has led in the material world. In the spiritual world this same desire for acquisition and control takes the form of a spiritual materialism in which more and deeper UNDERSTANDING is sought. Spiritual freedom is often thought to be freedom from attachment or freedom from anger or freedom from desire. In this way, equanimity and peacefulness are seen as states to be attained either through diligence or surrender.

In fact, freedom is never attained. It can only be revealed. Freedom is not a thing to be acquired but a condition that currently exists. It is here, now and it underlies everything. True freedom is total Acceptance.

With love,  
Wayne

October 2004

## *A Message from Wayne*

Hello my loves,

Many people who come to my Talks say they are there because of an interest in enlightenment. But when we get down to what this thing called enlightenment actually IS, there is enormous confusion.

When I talk about enlightenment, I talk about it very, very specifically, and it's very simple. In humans, at around the age of two-and-a-half, a shift occurs whereby they change from free-flowing, uninvolved beings to experiencing everything in terms of 'Me!' and 'Mine!' It is that moment in which what I call the 'false sense of personal authorship' kicks in. It happens to virtually every human being. It is the false sense that 'I' as this body/mind am the source; that 'I' as this body/mind am responsible for making it all happen.

It is this false sense of personal authorship that creates suffering, because the sense is that 'I' am in control of things, and, yet, there is continuous evidence to the contrary - that I'm not in control. So a powerful tension is established. In some body/minds, for whatever reason, that sense of personal authorship permanently dissolves - dies. That event, for lack of a better name, is called enlightenment. Over the millennia, generations of seekers have mystified the hell out of it. Basically, it's an event that happens in the history of some human organisms.

Now, the reason this event is so interesting to people is that the organism through which it happens is no longer suffering. There is total acceptance within the organism. There is total acceptance because it is 'understood' that what is, is. There is no longer a separate sense of 'me' to become involved with what is and claim it as 'mine'; - egoically mine. When that process is no longer occurring, that permanent lack of occurrence may be called peace or bliss or enlightenment. What is crucial to realize is that it is a happening. It happens as part of the functioning of the universe. The pointer of this teaching is that everything happens that way; everything happens as part of the functioning of Totality.

With love,  
Wayne

15 November 2005

### ***A Webcast Transcript Excerpt***

Wayne: [reading from chatroom] Jeff says, "A number of awakened spiritual teachers sound remarkably similar to your Advaita, but they speak about the temporary coming-back of identification as part of the dance of what is, but their true nature is untouched. Does this make sense to you?" I have no desire to talk about anybody else's teaching. If it makes sense to you, if you like it, terrific, but understand that all these teachings are pointers. They are not truths. So, if you like one representation, and the fact that it does not jibe with another, you're not going to uncover which one of them is

true, you see? Neither of them is true, none of them are true. They are all pointers. Now, I make a distinction between spiritual experience and the final understanding. That's my notional distinction. For me, I make it conceptually very clear that the final understanding is total, final, irrevocable, complete. Nothing is left to come back. That's my concept. The states, the stages, before that are what I would call spiritual experiences, in which the ego goes, and comes back, goes and comes back. So it's a matter of definition, and it is often called awakening, mainly because, in my feeling, people like it, people like to be told that they're awakened. What the seeker is seeking is to be awakened, so when you tell him he's awakened, and he's just stabilizing into his awakening, his awakening is becoming finalized, or whatever the explanation, it makes people happy.

21 September 2004

### ***A Webcast Transcript Excerpt***

Wayne: How is it that you find yourself here today?

*I was visiting my daughter in Redondo Beach. My friend Sherry told me about you. The same day another friend from Florida told me about you.*

Wayne: What did they tell you?

*They told me to go see you.*

Wayne: Why do you think they did that?

*They've been spiritual friends for a long, long time. I knew Sherry from New Mexico. I've been suffering very much spiritually. My twenty-one year old son died a couple years ago and it knocked me out.*

Wayne: Are you familiar with Ramesh?

*A little bit.*

Wayne: My guru, this fellow Ramesh Balsekar, is an enlightened master. I was with him some fourteen or fifteen years ago when he was in the States on a speaking tour and news came to him that his son had died in Bombay. He had lived with him essentially his whole life. His grief was enormous, of course. People have this fantasy that when there is enlightenment there is no longer any pain and everything becomes fine, okay, beautiful - all sweetness and lights all the time. That's not true. Life is by its very nature exquisitely beautiful and exquisitely painful. As long as there is life in the

organism we call the sage, there will be beauty and horror, joy and sorrow.

What we can call the blessing of the ultimate understanding is that there is no suffering attendant to the pain. There is not the slightest sense that things as they are, no matter how painful, should be different or that what has happened should not have happened. There is the implicit understanding that everything that happens is part of a massive functioning, a part of a huge tapestry of Totality, and it is inescapable - could not be otherwise. In that acceptance, there is peace even in the most profound grief, the most profound pain. The impact of this teaching is often to diminish that sense that things should be other than they are.

*Which is, of course, why I've struggled so much with it. How I used to feel is much more different now.*

Wayne: I have not lost a child, so I don't have that experience. But every experience, particularly those that are dramatically painful and emotionally devastating, does change the organism. They change the programming of the organism, and so life is viewed differently. There is a difference in perspective and perception in accordance with the occurrences of life. The good news is that the change in programming is dynamic, it is continuously happening. So the fact this is how it is now does not mean it will be that way next week, next month, or next year; in the same way that where you are now is different than where you were three years ago because of the event that intervened.

This is all summed up in what has almost become a corny phrase, but is really to my mind a very deep one with impact: "This too shall pass." It points to this basic law of life, which is change. Change is the very heartbeat of this dualistic manifest universe. That change is programmed into the most elemental building blocks of the manifest universe in the movement from wave to particle. It goes all the way up to the grossest structures such as the galaxies. It is all in flux, all changing. Everything is in movement. Nothing is static - even though it may appear to be.

30 August 2004

Webcast Transcript

*Before realization were you like I am now, i.e. attracted to that presence and pursuing it?*

Wayne: Absolutely! Once you taste that presence it's like a drug, you go after it. It's great. So you pursue it in accordance with your nature. If you're a wild man, you pursue it wildly. If you're more restrained, then perhaps

you'll pursue it in a more dignified, restrained fashion. But pursue it you will.

*Do you know if that helped or hindered the process that eventually led to realization?*

Wayne: In my mind it had nothing whatsoever to do with realization. It was an independent event. All I can say for certain is that in my case the experience of presence and the seeking for that experience of presence preceded the event of realization. But I would stop far, far short of saying that it caused it or hindered it.

*You said that the sense of intention is an aspect of the sense of authorship. Then all the other aspects of it, such as worry, fears, etcetera, must be impersonal happenings as well.*

Wayne: Yes. The pointer of the teaching is that all of the occurrences that happen through the organism are ultimately impersonal, meaning they are not personally sourced or personally authored. It is important to understand that there are two aspects of personalization that arise following the occurrence or action. The first aspect is a functional personalization in which the organism relates the occurrence to its physical form. It says, "I felt that, I experienced that." There's a functional identification with what happens and, thus, what happens becomes personalized as 'my' experience.

The second aspect of personalization is where there is a claim of authorship where the ego personalizes the action as being my egoic action or my sourced action. The egoic personalization and the functional personalization are often indistinguishable; they are intertwined and you can't readily see where one starts and the other stops.

The ultimate understanding is that they all are impersonal happenings. They are happenings that are part of the functioning of Totality. Every thought, every action, every feeling is part of the functioning of Totality - and they are then subsequently personalized.

*Was the presence you were attracted to and pursued before realization the same presence after realization? Or was the elimination of the sense of separateness the only difference?*

Wayne: It was a quantum difference, not an 'only' difference! It changed the whole ballgame. My point is that before the final understanding and realization there is an experience of presence. After the realization - which is the absence of the separation - the one who would experience the presence is no more. You can only experience something if you are separate from it. Therefore, the experience of presence no longer has any meaning because there is no separation. There is only presence.

*There was a quote by Ramesh in your last newsletter about walking the dog. The understanding I*

*had was that because there's no thinking mind there, there is no separation for the dog.*

Wayne: That is correct.

*Would it be correct to say that is in a sense a step of evolution - or that we're a step of devolution?*

Wayne: It depends on who is making the evaluation whether its evolution or devolution.

*But then is the sage closer in equivalency to an animal than to...*

Wayne: It depends on who you ask! I know what you're saying. What characterizes the organism we call the sage and what differentiates the sage organism from the baby or the animal (both of which are without a sense of personal authorship) is that the sage organism developed the sense of authorship and then it went away. It is this event, this 'going away' of the sense of authorship in the organism, which defines the sage. So it is distinct in that regard from the animal or the baby.

*And still it apparently has the capacity for self-reflection. It can talk about it. I mean it has other capacities it can verbalize.*

Wayne: Well, the point is that because it is human it can talk and it can conceptualize in human terms. I can't imagine a sage organism being moved to talk about 'it' in the absence of someone coming to ask about 'it' because there's nothing to talk about. In essence, it's not talking about something. If there were a something, then you could talk about it. There is only 'what is'. The only thing to talk about is in relation to the questions of the seekers. That is what we engage in during these types of gathering - when we're talking.

*It's like all the concepts and everything are just something to talk about.*

Wayne: Yeah. In the bhakti path, we sing bhajans to pass the time. Here we talk about 'what is'. There are different ways to occupy oneself during Satsang. In the karma yoga path, you just do something - helping. All of this 'fills the time'. It is the activity that describes the various paths. But what is truly happening is underneath all these activities, which is this presence.

So you can step outside of whatever you're doing and say, well, this is stupid; it's stupid that we're talking about this or it's stupid that we're singing these songs and always one lyric. It depends on whether you're involved in it, because it may be quite entertaining and equally meaningful. It's either subject to critical attention or its being involved in it and enjoying

it. It depends on where you are in the relationship.

*It occurred to me that there is a hint that comes up occasionally that there is this thing, I've heard you call the 'cumulative effect' of intellectual understanding, that could have some benefit to the organism.*

Wayne: Yeah. It doesn't have anything to do with enlightenment, though. It has to do with living; just doing.

*That's almost like the one thread that you just removed from being absolutely ridiculous.*

Wayne: But you can't hold on to that one. The big word there is 'could'. The cumulative effect could be negative as well. I could point to cases where we could arguably say that the cumulative effect has been negative, meaning that person's life was in the can. They didn't have a peaceful, happy life as viewed with a deep, intellectual understanding. From where I sit, I'm gratified to see when the teaching apparently has a positive impact on someone, and I'm saddened to see when it has a negative impact on someone.

*It would be hard to even suggest that those are direct causal relations, wouldn't it?*

Wayne: Oh, of course. Ultimately, we understand that this is the story in phenomena that we tell about something. We say, "It's the teaching that brought about this." Historically it seems that way, but that is part of this phenomenal way of interacting. We talk in terms of cause and effect relationships; we tell stories about things; it's part of that drama of life. And we react accordingly to all of it as human organisms.

There is an interesting book that Ramesh asked me to take a look at called **Visual Intelligence** by Donald Hoffman. The main message is that the brain creates reality. Specifically, the book made the case of how what you see is dependent upon rules in the brain. The brain uses rules that it applies to the patterns that register in the eye. Basically, the patterns have no meaning until the brain interprets those patterns according to its rules. It doesn't memorize each scene and then check that scene against its database because things are constantly changing. It has to evaluate and process according to rules. The book breaks down those rules of vision.

This also applies to the fabrication of our total reality: it is a process of the brain. Brains organize 'what is' and human brains organize what is generally in human terms. So there is a 'human reality'. It's very different from a dog's reality or dolphin's reality, because the sense organs are different and the processing cues inside the brain are different as well. Obviously, the realities are going to be vastly different.

We're not talking about some kind of objective reality that we all perceive. It's that we're assembling a similar kind of reality, a shared reality, based on the properties of the organisms. Because the organisms are essentially similar, we develop similar kinds of realities. But as we've discussed, if you've ever lived with anybody you know that two people experiencing the same thing can have different realities, different perceptions of the event. "What just happened?" What each person thinks just happened can vastly differ. Yet, because of the generalized structure of the human brain, there is a commonality of realities. When the brain does not form the normal structures, we end up with crazy people, those that we call autistic, or whatever. Their brains are processing differently from the normal shared reality - the reality of society.

[silence]

Wayne: Have you ever looked at the Advaita Press logo?

*I'm sure I have.*

Wayne: Here is the title page from **Acceptance of What Is**. Look at it closely.

[Wayne passes him a copy of the book]

So, how many cubes are there?

*There appear to be five.*

Wayne: Okay. Now look at it a little more deeply.

*It keeps changing.*

Wayne: To how many?

*I now see three.*

Wayne: You can ask someone how many cubes are there and they'll say there are three. You then ask someone else how many cubes are there and they say there are five. There can't be three and five. Are there three or are there five?

This is similar to the types of questions that people ask such as: is there free will or is everything determined? But what they really are asking is are there three cubes or are there five cubes. So, you can point out the three cubes and give the answer that there are three, or you can point to the cubes and say there are five cubes. But if someone asks, "How many cubes



logo for the  
Advaita Press

are there?" Really there are no cubes are there at all, it's a flat piece of paper with some lines on it. Back in the early days, I had a t-shirt that had the logo on it and it said "It's all in how you look at it."

That relates to your definition of a concept. Some people are going to see three cubes; some people are going to see five cubes. It's also true with any concept apparently. A concept can be taken in different ways by different people. So everything you talk about is interpreted depending on how that person looks at it.

Wayne: That's right. Everything.

*And like you've also pointed out, it changes from moment to moment - the hypnosis, the realization. In a second it's forgotten and not even noticed.*

Wayne: Exactly. You're looking at it in one moment and it's three cubes; in the next moment it's five cubes. The exact image is seen entirely differently one second later. And you can't see both three cubes and five cubes at the same time. It's absolutely impossible. You can switch back and forth really quickly, but you can't see them both at the same time; it's either one or the other.

*Does the sage also have the same experience seeing three cubes versus five cubes?*

Wayne: Of course. That's a physical phenomenon. We can say that in terms of the sage's perspective on reality there is an understanding that the reality is total; it embodies everything - the three and the five and the flat; it embodies it all. So, it is not a relative understanding. That's what we point at as the understanding of the sage - the apperception in which the question dissolves entirely.

August 2004

## ***A Message from Wayne***

Hello my loves,

As I have been traveling around, there has been a lot of interest lately in Ramesh's concept of the working mind and the thinking mind. The working mind is, as the name suggests, the aspect of the organism that does the work of keeping the organism functioning. It is the repository of genetic heritage, memory, knowledge, culture, identity, all of those qualities that are essential for day to day living. The working mind functions in accordance with its programming. This programming is dynamic; it's an

ongoing process whereby new information is being added to the mix all the time.

What Ramesh calls the thinking mind is another term for what is commonly referred to as the ego. The thinking mind's sole function - the ONLY thing it does - is to claim the operation of the working mind as its own doing and become involved in that operation to the extent solely of preserving itself. It's a false claimer of primacy or authorship which arises in virtually every human at the age of about two and a half. The ego/thinking mind authors nothing. There is no such thing as ego-created action.

The body/mind organism that is popularly called a sage is one in which the thinking mind has died. Famous historical resurrections notwithstanding, dead is dead and there is no possibility of return. That is my working definition for what constitutes an organism called the sage and what the event of enlightenment represents. It is that very precise occurrence. Therefore, far from being a superman, the sage is completely ordinary. In this model the sage has not gained something more but rather is simply a human organism with one thing LESS....it is without the false sense of personal authorship.

With love,  
Wayne

June 2004

## *A Message from Wayne*

Hello my loves,

There is a prevalent notion that there can be Awakening or Realization that comes and goes and finally stabilizes after some time. I do not believe that there is such a thing as 'partial realization'. I recognize there is seeking. I recognize there is intellectual understanding and there is spiritual experience, both of which are progressive and cumulative. And I recognize there is the final understanding, which is sudden, irrevocable, and after which there can be no further process, in the same way that you cannot be 'more dead'. You can only be dead; you can't be dead plus. Once dead, there is no question of stabilizing into your deadness. And realization, or the final understanding, is exactly like that.

In my definition of this final understanding, gradual or evolutionary enlightenment is not possible. What that refers to is this unveiling process of seeking in which you have spiritual insights. In that stage, there are

often very real spiritual experiences in which you know the oneness of things. Such experiences ebb, and then they often come back again. That's what I call the process of spiritual seeking. This process has increasingly been redefined as enlightenment or awakening. In fact, much of the modern Satsang movement is based on that model of spiritual experience being called enlightenment. So after your spiritual experience has been officially declared enlightenment by someone who had their spiritual experience declared to be enlightenment by someone else who once flew over Lucknow, you are then urged to teach that to others as being awakening or enlightenment.

Part of the appeal of such a model is that the goal of virtually every seeker is to gain this enlightenment. Therefore, if you tell them that they gained it, everybody's happy because they're getting what they wanted, and they are happy with the teacher for giving it to them. If they're honest and they say, "Well, this enlightenment, this experience that was so profound and important seems to have gone or ebbed," then the teacher says, "Well, it isn't really gone, you're just settling into it. You're just learning your new spiritual body. Your physical being is learning how to accept it" or some similar explanation often accompanied by a supporting quote from a sage who has been dead long enough to no longer be controversial. Implicit in the notion that enlightenment is progressive is that enlightenment is a state - an experiential state. The pointer in this teaching is that it is not an experiential state; an experiential state is by its nature transitory. If you're experiencing something, it will change. The very basis of duality is change. Change is integral to experience. In fact, what we call life is movement and change. In the absence of this movement, when it's localized in an organism, that state is what we call death.

So in terms of the experience of life, the states of life are always alternating, but this is not what is pointed to in this teaching as enlightenment. It is why sages like Nisargadatta Maharaj would speak from the standpoint of Totality and make statements such as, "I'm awake even when I'm asleep. I will live even after I am dead." They are linguistically pointing to that which is not conditional. That which is the source and substance of everything - what we 'truly are' - is not experiential except in its aspect. It's experiential only as what we can know and touch and taste and live. But enlightenment is beyond that kind of knowing because it is beyond the limit of experiential knowledge.

With love,  
Wayne

24 May 2004

## ***A Webcast Transcript Excerpt***

*Is the coming and going of the unity that the seeker experiences the only thing that differs from the unity of the sage?*

Wayne: That difference is total. It isn't a matter of being the only thing. It is a total quantum shift in the paradigm of reality. The coming and going of this state of unity is experiential, is knowable, is understandable. The final understanding - what we call the state of the sage - is not knowable, not experiential, and it cannot be referred to. All that can be referred to is this, this dualistic universe.

We can say that the final understanding is the knowing that everything is one, but it isn't a relative knowing - knowing it is one, experiencing it as one. All experience is of separation and duality. The Unity, this Oneness of the sage, is not something that he has, it's something that he IS. There is absolutely no separation possible unless there is no knowing of 'it' possible, because 'it' does not exist separate from the sage.

29 April 2004

## ***A Webcast Transcript Excerpt***

*One of the things I asked [Ramesh during a visit to his satsang] was: how can one know if one has what he calls the deepest understanding? And the reason I asked it is because there appeared to be a distinction in this teaching between simple comprehending versus the deepest understanding.*

Wayne: What did he respond?

*He said one could take a lie detector test! [laughter] What would you respond if someone were to ask a question like that?*

Wayne: Are you asking me that or is that hypothetical question?

*I find that it implies levels of understanding. So when one says 'deepest' there has to be a way of distinguishing from superficial understanding.*

Wayne: The distinction Ramesh generally makes is between intellectual understanding and total understanding or awakening; it is a way of saying that there are two distinct kinds of understanding. The intellectual understanding is a type of subject/object understanding, where someone understands some thing. While that kind of understanding can be quite

useful and productive in terms of making one's life easier and more complete, the final understanding is transcendent, which is to say that it is not some thing that someone has.

The limitation of the language is such that we have to use words, and all the words are in subject/object orientation. But the pointer of that term 'final understanding' or 'ultimate understanding' is beyond the finite, beyond that which is known by a knower. So what Ramesh calls the ultimate understanding, Wei Wu Wei would call 'apperception', which is a knowing without a knower, understanding without someone that understands- where the distinction between the known and the knower is dissolved.

*Essentially it's the difference between verbal versus sub-verbal; an understanding behind the words is what I consider the deeper understanding.*

Wayne: No. It's actually transcendent, rather than behind. It's not intuitive; it's not a non-verbal understanding. It is truly totally transcendent and non-experiential in nature.

*You mean it can't be experienced.*

Wayne: It is not experienced because it is not an object. It is not a thing. One can only experience some thing.

*Okay. So you have three types of understanding: verbal, non-verbal or intuitive, and the transcendent or the ultimate?*

Wayne: You could probably subdivide those into six, the six into twelve, and the twelve into twenty-four. The distinctions are useful for pointing to something. Thus, Ramesh would make an apparently hierarchal distinction between different kinds of understanding. Though I like his "take a lie detector test" answer better.

*It raises a peculiar point, mainly the possibility of the ultimate understanding existing and the body-mind not realizing that understanding is there - in that particular body-mind. It's hidden.*

Wayne: More precisely, when the understanding is expressed, when there is some need to express it, and that expression may come forth as a result of a question from someone, or it may come forth as a burst of creative energy, as in the case of spontaneous poetry or something like that; what is absent in the sage, if you will, is the slightest shred of belief that what is being said or being written or being thought is the Truth - with a capital 'T'. Any such comment is understood at the most fundamental level to be a pointer, a relative teaching tool.

That's why the sage is said to have a natural humility, because there is the total absence of the conviction that what the sage is saying is the Truth. The humility comes from the fact that of course it is relative, of course it can be argued, of course it can be disagreed with, and within that is the very basic humility.

So, I personally have no trouble with anybody's teaching. If someone says that you exist and another one says you don't exist, and this one says that you're god incarnate and this other one says that you're nothing, whatever the teaching tool, I don't care. What I object to, in an aesthetic sense, is when someone says, "What I am saying is the truth and what the other person is saying is bullshit." Because that lacks that essential clarity of understanding that it's all bullshit, and that one's teaching is a matter of enculturation and personal preference and a variety of influences that determine how the teaching is expressed...

Amigo Magazine #5, in Holland, February 2003

### *An Interview Excerpt*

*"Chopping wood before enlightenment and chopping wood after enlightenment." In other words: coming back to the point where one was before... Everything is the same but now it can be embraced, without resistance.*

Wayne: Mmmm... It is truly not an embracing. Embracing is what the seeker does. The seeker says, "Okay, life is glorious, I will not resist it, I will embrace it." For the sage, there is no one left to either resist or embrace. There is simply the 'river' of life.

*You mean "being here, seeing that there is nobody there."*

Wayne: Right, the reaction of the seeker upon having a spiritual experience is the reaction "I am embracing life, this is all Me. I Am It, We are all One." But that is still that separation of, "I am going to embody or take all of this into myself." For the sage there is no self to bring all of this into. That separation is completely absent.

*So after understanding or after seeing, there is still a process going on to see that it is not 'done' by anybody?*

Wayne: No. There is no process of seeing that. My saying that is simply a pointer or a teaching tool, but it is not the awareness of the organism that things are that way. There is no separate awareness about the nature of things. That whole question of one's relation to IT, one's union with IT, that

is gone. There is no One to relate to. For the sage after enlightenment there is no longer a process.

*But one day you discovered something, or you saw, or you had an Insight. Suddenly you 'knew': It is not me seeing it.*

Wayne: Yes, that point, that moment when the ME completely dissolved is a historical moment in the history of the organism. What happened in that moment we can point to and allegorically say, "There was then the realization, there was then seen that there is no separation." But that is not really accurate! In that moment the whole paradigm, the whole question, is dissolved! A false idea disappears, and nothing literally changes. And so the most precise thing you can say is that nothing happened!

On KAZU Radio, CSU Monterey Bay, September 1999

### ***An Interview Excerpt***

*It sounds like you are the sort of individual that we can ask questions of like, "What is Enlightenment?"*

Wayne: That is a question that is frequently asked.

*Yes, I am just going to start off with that one... that is a pretty major one. I would love for you to tell us about that. What the heck is it?*

Wayne: My feeling about enlightenment is that it is a concept that has been widely misunderstood to be a personal sort of development, and what Enlightenment is in fact is an impersonal event that happens through what we would call a body-mind mechanism. Which is simply this package that we consider ourselves to be, a physical body combined with a mind, a mechanism through which God or Totality or Consciousness, if you will, functions. One of the aspects of this body-mind mechanism is the development, around the age of two and half, of a sense of personal doership so that the actions that happen through it are considered to be 'my actions'. Most people go through their life without ever really questioning whether that is true or not.

*So part of enlightenment is asking questions of that process?*

Wayne: I would say that questioning whether "I am the doer" or whether I am an instrument through which doership happens is what I call... seeking. Now seeking happens in a relatively small percentage of body-mind mechanisms. Most people are content to get a new car every once in awhile

or a better job, or more money. In relatively few people does this quest develop for a direct experience of their true nature. The seeking which begins in certain body-mind mechanisms is a process through which perhaps this sense of personal doership will fall away. When the sense of personal doership falls away this is what is known as Enlightenment.

# **GURU & DISCIPLE**

May 2007

## *A Message from Wayne*

Hello my loves,

My beloved Ramesh, will celebrate his 90th birthday in a few days and if the gods cooperate I will be there in Mumbai to help honor the day. Nothing could give me greater pleasure. I consider myself to be infinitely blessed to have been give this connection with the man I call my guru.

When I first met Ramesh I was not looking for a guru. In fact, I didn't consider myself to be the sort of person to 'subjugate' myself to someone else. I subscribed to the notion that we are all equal and thus relationships such as guru and disciple struck me as antiquated and if truth be told, a bit cultish.

But I was to learn that the guru/disciple relationship is about love and devotion....not subjugation. The guru asks for nothing and gives everything in return. The disciple gives what he can and with grace, as time goes on, asks for less and less.

In the twenty years I have been privileged to be connected to Ramesh he has given me more than I could ever hope to repay. I consider it a blessing to have been able to help support him financially and to have in some small way contributed to facilitating his Teaching. Whatever I have done has been done without obligation or demand either by Ramesh or by me. I suppose you could say it is love in action.

Some of you reading this already know the unmitigated joy of having found your guru. For those of you who have not yet had this pleasure...know that life is full of surprises...anything can happen!

With much love,  
Wayne

## *A Living Gem from Ramesh*

(previously unpublished)

It may be observed that the guru is variable in his attitude towards his disciples. He is not concerned with the equality of his behavior towards the

individual disciples. His attitude towards each disciple will be precisely what is necessary for the disciple, and will be naturally so, rarely ever planned.

If the disciple compares the guru's attitude towards himself with that towards another and judges it – he does so at his own peril. It is not that the guru actively responds to the individual devotion of the disciple, whether in the form of service, or gift, or sincerity. The reaction of the guru to an act of devotion by a disciple happens as a natural response dictated by the need and maturity of the disciple himself.

The guru, like a mirror, reflects whatever aspect of the relationship, whatever emotion, is displayed by the disciple.

January 15, 1990

March 2007

## *A Message from Wayne*

Hello my loves,

Nothing gives me greater pleasure than to see this Teaching find a home in someone. It is like watching a flower bloom in the spring. To see the furrows relax between someone's eyebrows, to watch their shoulders drop as their tension fades, to see a smile creep onto their lips and the light begin to radiate from their eyes is for me, a thing of surpassing beauty. I notice it happening in nearly every gathering and I am awed by the incredible power of the Teaching.

Several years ago, Ramesh began to emphasize the impact of the realization of the Teaching in daily life rather than talking about the esoteric and the philosophical. It upset a lot of his devotees who had grown comfortable and complacent in the belief that they KNEW Ramesh's Teaching. But I thought it was great fun! A true Master shakes things up. He keeps the Teaching vibrant and alive by changing the presentation...because after all, life IS change.

This is a Living Teaching! It connects to who you are and what you are RIGHT NOW...in THIS moment. It challenges you and nurtures you. It is at once impossibly difficult and supremely easy. It forces you to work very, very hard but it does all the work itself.

We are truly blessed to have such a Teaching!

With much love,  
Wayne

## *A Living Gem from Ramesh*

(previously unpublished)

One of the immediate results of the Guru-disciple relation, when it begins to fructify, is that there is a sudden change in the viewpoint of the disciple. The disciple was, until then, in the habit of wanting something and expecting something from others. Now, when he sees the effects of the Teaching of the Guru in his own daily living, when he finds life becoming less stressful because of his being more open to, more vulnerable to, less suspicious towards others, he suddenly appreciates what the Guru has done for him and in turn wants to do something big for the Guru.

In other words, there is a great change: instead of wanting something for himself, the disciple finds himself in the position of wanting something for someone else.

June 2006

## *A Message from Wayne*

Hello my loves,

I am just back from spending Guru Purnima in Mumbai with Ramesh and it was completely glorious. I am often asked, "Is a guru necessary?" The question is actually misconceived. It is not that the guru is needed so that the spiritual seeker can get what he is seeking but rather that the guru is among the greatest of the Universe's gifts. Should you be fortunate to receive this amazing gift it is immediately apparent that the relationship with the guru is an end in itself rather than a means to some further objective.

Ramesh at 89 is as strong and as focused in his presentation of the Teaching as he has ever been. As I sit and listen to him it is as if listening to a beloved symphony in which every note is familiar and expected and yet each performance is unique and fresh.

This Guru Purnima was particularly meaningful for me as it marked exactly

ten years since that startling day when Ramesh concluded his Guru Purnima talk by saying, "You should all come back tomorrow, tomorrow Wayne will be giving the Talk." In that moment I could never have imagined where the Teaching would carry me...all the towns and cities and countries...all the men and women, old and young, some swelling with new life others preparing to die, all the hearts ready to burst open, all the brows unfurrowed and all the eyes bright with a new Understanding. What a surprise and delight this life is!

I consider myself to be amongst the most fortunate of men, to have found my guru in Ramesh and to have been filled, a most unlikely vessel to carry this magnificent Teaching.

For all of you who have sent donations and gifts and messages on this Guru Purnima, I thank you for your love and support.

With much love,  
Wayne

February 2006

## *A Message from Wayne*

Hello my loves,

I have recently returned from Mumbai and my annual winter visit to see Ramesh. As always, it was a truly joyous and blessed time. To spend time in the presence of one's guru is life's greatest pleasure.

I am often asked why I continue to visit Ramesh even though there is no longer any 'seeking need' to do so. For me, the seeking long ago morphed from a process of acquisition whereby I was hoping to GET something to a state of Acceptance wherein there was not only nothing left to GET but more importantly, no longer an egoic 'me' needing to get IT. What remained was a man named Wayne who loved a little Indian retired banker named Ramesh. For almost twenty years now, that love has flowed unabated. It matters not if we are in the Satsang room together or eating a meal together or watching cricket on television together or simply sitting together in comfortable silence, the love that is the very essence of the guru/disciple relationship is there.

Each year when I visit Ramesh I get to watch with amusement, awe and delight how his Teaching evolves and changes its emphasis. Never wavering from the fundamental Understanding, his approach continues to move and

dance like a boxer's. This continued movement keeps the more "advanced" and knowledgeable disciples alert and on their toes.

One of the greatest obstacles to a deepening of Understanding is the complacency inherent in knowing something. Once you have an answer there is no longer any movement. Inquiry is dead. What remains is a dull and lifeless repetition of a concept that may have once brought insight and is now mistaken for insight itself. Ramesh's continual changes keeps his disciples engaged and active. His current emphasis on the value of the Teaching in daily living is simply another door opening into the corridor of Truth.

The value of the guru is not in what you can get from him...it is the guru/disciple relationship itself which is its own reward.

With love,  
Wayne

August 2005

## *A Message from Wayne*

Hello my loves,

I am often asked, "Does everything happen as part of the functioning of Totality or is effort required by the spiritual aspirant?"

Effort by the spiritual aspirant may well be required as part of the functioning of Totality!

As always we must look deeply into the source of the effort. Does the spiritual aspirant have the capacity to author the effort? Or is the spiritual aspirant's actions and ultimately the spiritual aspirant himself part of a larger functioning?

These are the essential questions raised by this Advaita Teaching. But the Teaching does not truly value the answers. It is the investigation itself which is the heart of the Teaching.

It is for this reason that pure Advaita is without doctrine or precepts. The Teaching is humble. It makes no claim on the Truth. It is simply a collection of pointers, encouraging an investigation that ultimately ends in Nothing...the Nothing which we all truly ARE.

With much love,  
Wayne

## ***A Living Gem from Ramesh***

(previously unpublished)

Affective fixation on the personality of a Guru or Master can be a serious obstacle to what the Master himself may be trying to achieve because the Master himself becomes the jailer holding the disciple in bondage, unwittingly though it might be.

A true Guru like Nisargadatta Maharaj makes it repeatedly clear that treating the teaching as from one individual (however exalted) to another individual would be a complete mistake. It is as Consciousness speaking to Consciousness that the true Guru speaks.

6 January 2005

### ***A Webcast Transcript Excerpt***

*For me there's resonance here. And I know you've talked about the capital 'G' guru that's not in you, but I see myself still attending to you. Thinking - even though there's a part of me that knows, I don't say I know, but I think I have an intellectual understanding of what you've described enough times about what happened, and yet I sit here thinking - that you've got some special supernatural energy that's going to, I don't know what it's going to do. But I'm sitting here, it seems, thinking I'm getting something, something is going to happen differently than if I sit here looking around at random. So with that said, again the question comes up about the nature of these relationships. They're different almost by definition of who you are and who we are.*

Wayne: That, what you're describing are social relationships, number one, and number two you're talking about a resonant relationship. Now the relationships I've had socially with people prior to this event happening and subsequent, for the most part didn't change. Most people I retained my social relationships with them and they were not impacted in any way by that event. Now there's others of course - seekers started coming. At first they were highly discouraged and then subsequently through various events the teaching started to happen through me and these kinds of gatherings started happening. Now within this context the people who come do as you say often come with expectations. Sometimes they're fulfilled and sometimes they're disappointed. And in those cases where there is resonance then a whole different structure of interaction arises. But you've

been here enough to see people come and go. People with no resonance whatsoever. And so. The same people are in the room you see. I mean I'm the same person with the same capacities, the same energies. You see. So in the absence of the resonance there is no guru-disciple relationship. You talked about expectations and those arise inevitably in people. And they have to do with your own experiences and your own nature. And sometimes those expectations are fulfilled and sometimes they're not. If you're like most people when your expectations are fulfilled you're gratified and when they're not you're disappointed.

*Does the seeker through their own desire tend to create the resonance that might arise between them and a potential guru?*

Wayne: I would say that what I call resonance is not created by desire. Desire may accompany it or it may precede it but it is not causal in nature. The understanding is that that resonance is a happening between two organisms. And it happens or it doesn't. And there are people who approach a guru with tremendous desire for a guru disciple relationship, you see. They want it badly - looking for a guru. And it is something you can fake for a little while but ultimately it's there or it's not. And when I say fake it I mean that you can act the part of the disciple and you can make the other person the Guru and you act in accordance with certain ways that are quote unquote guru and disciple rolls. But when I talk about resonance I'm talking about that ineffable connection that occurs, when it occurs, out of which the sense of presence manifests. That connection. And it manifests in a variety of ways. It doesn't have a single way that disciples experience it. But it is an arising of connection and it arises out of the resonance.

*If one doesn't find a guru that one has resonance with, can their understanding still continue to deepen with their studying?*

Wayne: Of course! Understanding can deepen through a variety of means. And when I talk about resonance, one can have resonance with a book, one can have resonance with a teaching. The object that one has resonance with need not be human.

*Is that word resonance applicable in the case of very strong human relations of other kinds such as falling madly in love with somebody and worshipping that person?*

Wayne: I make a distinction in order to keep this term useful. And I use it to describe a very specific kind of interaction and it is not the passionate falling in love kind of thing. Although that may accompany the resonance. You see. I mean when resonance arises we may well respond with that kind of emotional response of falling in love. And that was certainly the case for me with Ramesh. You see. But the resonance we could say preceded it and was independent of that. Because that changed character a number of times

over these 17 years that I've been associated with Ramesh. What the reaction has been and the initial passionate love with its jealousies and its agonies and you know the staying up nights thinking about him and trying to get into his presence. And all of things one does in the throes of that kind of passionate loving feeling. You see. That's long gone and it's been replaced over time with a much deeper and different kind of relationship. You've heard me describe a number of times how the nature of the relationship shifted dramatically from a grasping kind relationship in which I wanted from him, to one of service and giving, in which I wanted to give. And so it was a dramatic shift in the structure and nature of the relationship.

*Resonance may not be only with a guru. I feel that my husband and I found the key to resonate together. It was a big part of our life for the last twenty years. We cut out a section of the day to do it to just be together and to look in each other's eyes and hold each other and there was a definite feeling of presence that was more than the two of us.*

Wayne: Absolutely, the resonance can take numerous forms and it may be in the form of relationship and as you describe it. That may well have been within the context of what I normally talk about as resonance.

27 September 2004

## ***A Webcast Transcript Excerpt***

*Is the sage a state that a human being is in or aware, or something that goes through a live human being? What is a sage?*

Wayne: What is a sage? This is one of my favorite things to read:

*What is a sage?*

*A sage is someone who has achieved a remote human possibility.  
It is impossible to say what that possibility is.  
I think it has something to do with the energy of love.  
Contact with this energy results in the exercise  
of a kind of balance in the chaos of existence.  
A sage does not dissolve the chaos;  
if he did, the world would have changed long ago.  
I do not think that a sage dissolves the chaos even for himself,  
for there is something arrogant and warlike  
in the notion of a man setting the Universe in order.  
It is a kind of a balance that is his glory.  
He rides the drifts like an escaped ski.*

*His course is a caress of the hill.  
His track is a drawing of the snow in a moment  
of its particular arrangement with wind and rock.  
Something in him so loves the world  
that he gives himself to the laws of gravity and chance.  
Far from flying with the angels, he traces  
with the fidelity of a seismograph needle  
the state of the solid bloody landscape.  
His house is dangerous and finite,  
but he is at home in the world.  
He can love the shapes of human beings,  
the fine and twisted shapes of the heart.  
It is good to have among us such men,  
such balancing monsters of love.*

*Part of that sounded very beautiful.*

Wayne: I think it's wonderful. It's written by a fellow named Leonard Cohen.

*But that answered the question. Thank you.*

[silence]

*How does the dissolution of the ego come about? Through inquiry?*

Wayne: It happens.

*It just happens?*

Wayne: Not 'just' happens. It happens!

*It happens?*

Wayne: Everything happens! That's one of the many things that happen. Then we tell stories about these various happenings, why they happened and how they happened.

*How did it happen for you? It happens for each person differently?*

Wayne: Yes. Each person's history is different; each person's story is different.

*I believe I've experienced that witness and dissolution of it before in my life, and I recognize it.  
Is it possible that it can come and go?*

Wayne: That is very much the experience of the seeker - to have moments of presence and witnessing, followed by moments of separation and involvement. That movement back and forth, in and out of that state, is the state of the seeker.

*That's what I have felt, but that's really not the awakening because it hasn't stayed.*

Wayne: What we call the awakening is the absence of either the presence or the absence. You see, what you've experienced is that you're going along and the sense of the separate egoic 'me' falls away. Right?

*Yes.*

Wayne: Life and living, of course, go on; the universe goes on. Then this 'me' comes back and looks at that period that is quantified by the going and the returning of the 'me' and says that was it.

*That's been my experience.*

Wayne: That is the experience of the seeker. And then you say, "I want that all the time." But that is all the time.

*Then how can I feel it all the time?*

Wayne: You cannot feel it all the time; that is the entire point. Because the fantasy is that when 'I' get it, I will know it all the time. You know it because it is quantified. It has a beginning; it has an end; it is knowable as some thing. This is what happens to the organism we call the sage: the sage is going along and that sense of the identified, involved 'me' dies – it's dead; life and living go on, but there is no me to come back and quantify 'what is' as some thing. So, we can say that the sage does not KNOW the Oneness; rather, the sage IS the Oneness.

But for the sage, does the 'me' come back?

Wayne: No. That involved 'me' does not come back and quantify 'what is' as some thing; therefore, the sage IS the Oneness and does not know or experience the Oneness. The seeker experiences the Oneness because it ends, and so it becomes something quantifiable and knowable. 'What is' is not knowable unless you are separate from it, and then you quantify it as something and then know it as Oneness. That whole model is not available any longer for the sage, because that which would come back and quantify, that which would be separate and know the Oneness, is no more.

*Obviously, intellectual understanding, or even having the experience of it as a seeker, does not remain in that state. What is the difference of remaining in that state? Why does it just happen*

*and then the 'me' comes back versus it happens for the sage and continues?*

Wayne: Why do you have blonde hair and I don't have any? Why do you wear glasses and she doesn't? Why? Why? Why? There's no end to those kinds of questions. The point is that it happens. We're simply pointing at what is; we're describing these various things that happen.

*Your experience has been that the 'me' comes back too?*

Wayne: No, no. When I was a seeker, I had the experience of the coming and going of the me. What we call that final dissolution or understanding is the death of that which comes back. So, it's not coming back.

*So, you just have to wait for it to happen. If that's what you want, you wait for it to happen.*

Wayne: You can wait for it to happen. You can run after it. You can sit on the pillow for twelve hours a day. You can go to the guy in Texas and fuck your way to enlightenment. There is every imaginable methodology for "getting there."

*So for you, one day it just happened? The total death – it happened?*

Wayne: That event happened. It happened, and that was it, and my life fundamentally did not change. The externals of my life continued pretty much the same way for seven more years before I got roped into this business of sitting in this chair doing this. But for seven years, I conducted my business, raised my kids, took care of my guru, generally doing what I was doing before...

20 September 2004

## ***A Webcast Transcript Excerpt***

*Someone said that the guru shows us a reflection of our own true nature.*

Wayne: I would interpret that to mean that out of the resonance between the disciple and the sage - two objects - arises the experience of the Guru (with a capital G) for the disciple. So there is an experience of Presence, which we call out true nature or Totality. It becomes experiential out of the resonance.

*But there is recognition of a sort, they're saying.*

Wayne: The essence, of course, is the experience of it. What makes it so

potent is in that connection with this other object we call the guru object - whether it's a mountain a person or whatever...

*It's an experience, not an object at all. It doesn't live in time even.*

Wayne: What I'm saying is that the experience, the resonance, is between two objects. (I'm telling you about the structure.) So that you have the two objects and, for whatever cosmic reason, there is a resonance between them. Lots of people go by Arunachala and don't have resonance; a lot of people go to visit Ramesh and there's no resonance. And, yet, when the resonance is present, the experience of the Guru arises out of the resonance.

*That's grace?*

Wayne: We call it grace because it feels so good. It feels so incredibly wonderful. Depending on the nature of the disciple, there is often a heart-opening feeling of gratitude for the object at the other end because it's the only substantive thing the disciple can attach the gratitude to. You see, the Guru has no form, has no substance; there's nothing to be grateful to or for. So, it is the guru/object that is the focal point for the gratitude, because it is such a wondrous human experience. But the guru/object at the other end, if he's a sage, knows that he is not producing the resonance.

*That's grace for him too.*

Wayne: He's observing that experience in the disciple, and it's a beautiful thing to see. One can have a deep appreciation seeing a beautiful flower bloom; it is this same appreciation the sage experiences when seeing that resonance happen in the disciple. But you don't have an appreciation for the bloom because you created it. There's no personalized sense of having been the source of the flower. It's an occurrence, a happening. And in this case, it's very beautiful; the resonance in the disciple is magnificence.

This can get funky, however, when there is still an ego present in the sage/object. Because what is seen then is that the disciple is looking at you - the object - and seeing God, experiencing the Totality. If there's still an ego present, it goes, "looking at me... seeing God... ah *ipso facto* I must be..." Then you don't want to drink the Kool Aid.

*Does there have to be a resonance with the other object or between two objects for the disciple to be awakened?*

Wayne: No, it has nothing to do with awakening. It has to do with the experience of the Guru, which is not awakening. Awakening is neither experiential nor relative.

*Could you explain that a little more? I'm not grasping that.*

Wayne: Awakening is the event in which the sense of personal authorship dies. The event is an experience by the organism, but it does not leave an experiential state that the organism experiences as enlightenment. The disciple, in the presence of the guru/object, experiences resonance. Out of the resonance comes the experience of unity, of Presence, Source, God. So it's the palpable experience, on the part of the disciple, of this connection. And it comes and goes; that's its nature: being experiential, it comes and goes.

For the sage, the dissolution of that false separation means there is no longer a separate 'one' to know the unity. It is unity. Unity is all there is. It isn't that the organism has now attained some thing. The language is the problem, because we talk about getting understanding or gaining enlightenment. But it isn't something that is acquired. The sage doesn't have anything more; the sage has one fundamental thing less - which is what has been laid on top of everything else - this sense of personal authorship that creates involvement and separation. It simply isn't there, in the same way that the stone isn't there in your shoe today. It's just not there. But there's no experience of the absence. It simply is what is.

April 2004

## ***A Message from Wayne***

Hello my loves..

Compassion is a quality that is much valued and discussed in spiritual circles. We need to look at what is generally meant by this term - compassion. The superficial meaning is "kindness"; a caring, heart-centered interaction, in which the recipient leaves feeling good.

Compassion is actually deeper than that. I have seen what I would consider to be compassion from a sage, specifically Ramesh, which from the standpoint of the recipient was harsh. Ramesh isn't a harsh character, but sometimes the stripping away of a false belief, while compassionate, is not a gentle or sweet action.

As we get older, often we become encrusted with those beliefs that were earlier used to create a sense of personal security. Of course, it never worked for very long. There is no security in life. The essence of life being change, there's always that underlying tickle of uncertainty, of not being secure. The usual solution to this is to try and patch up the structure by

applying new and stronger beliefs. Often the demolition of these encrusted false beliefs is a painful process; it leaves a person feeling uncomfortable, discontent, and uncertain.

The sage will sometimes raze the whole structure. It is, to quote Hafiz, "to take away those toys that bring you no joy." If you see a two-year-old with a sharp knife, and you take it away from him he's going to scream. As far as he's concerned, you've done him a great harm. "That was MY toy. I was having fun with that." That he was about to chop his leg off and you prevented that from happening, I would say was a compassionate act. But the child doesn't see it as a compassionate act.

So, often the action of the sage is not seen as compassionate. If I had to define compassion, I would say that the compassion of the sage is total acceptance. The total acceptance, which means you are accepted completely as you are in the moment.

The sage accepts the disciple totally as he is. This acceptance is, in fact, an underlying quality to every action by the sage. The action may be to take away the toys, to push the disciple into areas where the disciple isn't comfortable, to ask difficult questions and not let up. So the disciple goes away unhappy. "How can this be compassion? I'm unhappy. He wasn't kind and gentle with me. I feel worse now than I did when I walked in and met him."

It is compassionate for one reason: there is no personal agenda on the part of the sage. Every single act is compassionate because there is no "me" desiring something for itself as part of the action. This is truly the blessing of the sage.

With much love,  
Wayne

PS: I leave for Europe in a few days and look forward to seeing some of you there. The retreat at the beautiful and serene Gut Schermau in Germany is always one of the highpoints of my year.

July 2003

## *A Message from Wayne*

Hello my loves..

This is the month of Guru Pournima, a time when the Guru (both as the

Source and as the teacher) is honored and celebrated. This year the Guru's Full Moon falls on July 13. In Mumbai, at Ramesh's flat, there will be refreshments served (Ramesh's wife Sharda will provide her famous iced coffee and some lovely sweets). For those of us not fortunate enough to physically make it to India for the occasion we might content ourselves with Ramesh's latest book entitled (aptly enough)...Guru Pournima in which Ramesh and some of us who love him have written about this most joyous and profound of all human relationships.

If you are in the Los Angeles area on Saturday, July 12, please come join us for our own little celebration to follow the 10 AM Talk at my house in Hermosa Beach. The Talk will undoubtedly center on my history with my Beloved Ramesh. It is one of my favorite topics and one I am never tired of discussing though some of you may, by now, be tired of hearing about it. So consider yourself warned! If you are unable to come to the Talk, please join us via the live webcast. Like the Teaching itself, it is free for the taking.

I am very grateful to those who have, through their generosity, made it possible for me to live and Teach. Many of you have offered your love and support either directly or through your membership in the Advaita Fellowship. I want you to know that I have noticed and that I am most appreciative. It matters not if we have spoken or seen each other recently. This relationship makes no demands and has no set form. There are no requirements other than an open heart...and even that is seen as subject to change. So, wherever you find yourself on this Guru Pournima, whatever your current thoughts, whoever you find yourself attracted to...know that you are well and truly Loved.

With much love,  
Wayne

PS: I leave for Europe in a few days and look forward to seeing some of you there. The retreat at the beautiful and serene Gut Scherchau in Germany is always one of the high points of my year.

June 2003

## *A Message from Wayne*

Hello my loves..

I am recently returned home from Europe and I am again struck with what an incredible blessing this Teaching is and how tenacious. It reminds me sometimes of the plant that grows up through a crack in the sidewalk...

unexpected and rare and strong. On this trip I met Paolo, who came to the Talks in Rome from his home in Sicily. Somehow a translated copy of Consciousness Speaks had found its way into his hands and had affected him deeply. He talked about how the Teaching had changed his life, bringing a sense of Knowingness where before there had only been questions and confusion. As I listened to him and watched the tears of gratitude well up in his eyes I felt renewed. This Teaching, appreciated by so few, misunderstood by so many, has the power to transform lives in ways unimaginable. It goes where it needs to go, takes root in seemingly the most unlikely of places and just at the moment when we take it for granted it always surprises us.

It is indeed Grace to be the instrument through which this magnificent Teaching happens.

With much love,  
Wayne

## *A Living Gem from Ramesh*

(previously unpublished)

One of the visitors, on his first day, asked why so many people come to the Satsang day after day - some for several weeks and a few for several months. Promptly, several hands were raised, wanting to give the answer. The consensus was that the repetition of the basics, day after day, served not only as a reminder but that it gave them the opportunity to see, in depth, the interconnection between mind, thought-word, concept and knowledge. There are certain moments when the whole subject in its entirety - and its strange significance - in day -to-day living, seems absurdly simple and clear, though by no means easy to communicate.

What we are endeavoring to see in duration - with one sentence following another in the relativity of time - could really be apperceived only *sub spacie aeternitatis*,\* its essential nature seen only under the aspect of eternity. Therefore the essential nature of the basics which had eluded one earlier might suddenly, intuitively, flash itself in Consciousness, only when repeated the umpteenth time.

[\*roughly "from the perspective of the eternal"]

by Blayne Bardo, May 1998

## *An Interview Excerpt*

*Blayne: What role, if any, does the guru play in the seeking process?*

Wayne: The common question is, "Is the guru necessary?" My answer is that there are no requirements set forth by Consciousness. Consciousness can do anything It wants within the manifestation. Seeking is a phenomenal process, and that's what's crucial to understand-seeking is a phenomenal process. It happens within phenomenality; the various progressions that occur are in phenomenality; the impulse is in phenomenality; and the final event which is the dissolution of the seeking, actually the dissolution of personal doership, is in phenomenality. All that happens is in phenomenality. The result of the process of seeking is only notionally a result, because what it reveals is what is there all the time anyway. So there is really no progress in the absolute sense. Yet within the phenomenal structure of seeking and the seeker, the guru may play a role. In fact, in the lives of many seekers the guru is a figure central to the seeking. For those who have found a guru, who have found their true guru, there is no greater phenomenal experience.

When I first met Ramesh, I fell more in love than I have ever been in my life. To that point I had been fortunate enough to have experienced deep and profound love with several people - my children and wife and parents - but this kind of love pales in comparison to the love between the disciple and the guru. That is because the guru-disciple relationship has an additional quality that is of an entirely different dimension. When there is what I call resonance between the body-mind mechanism of the disciple and the body-mind mechanism of the guru, when that resonance is there, there is for the disciple an experience of the Oneness, which is the abiding non-phenomenal state of the guru. And that Oneness is one of inexpressible Love.

*This Love you're referring to is not the love that is commonly used in everyday speech.*

Wayne: No. It is not that love. That kind of love is essentially a social contract: as long as you continue to give me that which fulfills me, then I will continue to love you. The love which one experiences with the guru is what might be called love without condition, unconditional love, because there is no social contract implied or in any way associated with the interaction. It is one in which there is unbridled love, a desire to freely give with no thought of getting. From the disciple's side the pure love is often mixed with the phenomenal quality that is the counterpoint of hate and that we might call romantic love. There is often an element of that on the disciple's side of the relationship. And thus, the disciple may find himself

jealous of other disciples.

I can speak for myself. When I first met Ramesh, I was always scheming to get into his presence, to be with him as much as possible, and I hated the guy who was taking him out for meals and drives and who had the kind of relationship with him that I wanted. I mean I hated that guy with a jealous passion since he had the object of my love and devotion in his car. There was a 'me' that wanted Ramesh for its own purposes. Now, from the guru's side there is no desire in the relationship. There is no 'me' wanting anything from the disciple. Yet, there is an experience in phenomenality from the standpoint of the body-mind mechanism of the guru of pleasure in the love that exists in that resonance between the disciple and the guru. But there is no involvement in any of this by the guru. So from the guru's side it is an absolutely pure love. From the disciple's side it is that pure love mixed with a more romantic, personal kind of love.

*How is it possible for the guru to have these feelings of 'pleasure' since there is no 'me' left to experience them?*

Wayne: Well, that is a common misconception. When we say that the 'me' is absent in the guru, the 'me' is not absent to the extent that there is no reaction on the part of the guru. The guru is not some slab of human tofu, not some bland colorless blob without any characteristics of its own. He has a body, which has certain demands attendant to it. He has a mind that has been conditioned in certain ways and reacts in certain ways. You can say that there is a personality there—a person-ality. That personality has to exist or the body-mind mechanism of the guru could not function. What is absent, utterly and completely absent in the guru, is any sense of personal doership. The body-mind mechanism of the sage is like any other body-mind mechanism—an instrument through which God, or Consciousness or Totality, functions. But in the sage there is no sense of personal doership. In the personally identified individual there is a sense of "I am the doer" even where there is absolute intellectual conviction that that is not the case. The subjective experience of the ordinary individual is that of personal doership. This is what Ramesh calls 'divine hypnosis'. The sense of personal doership persists despite all evidence to the contrary. If you look at any of your actions in a bigger context, if you examine your own life, then the sense that "I'm doing it" falls apart immediately. Yet there is that sense within the body-mind mechanism of the identified individual that he is the doer, and until that is removed, it's there! For the sage there is only pure action or pure emotion—without any sense of personal doership.

*How does one find a guru?*

Wayne: You do not find a guru. The understanding is that the guru appears as part of the functioning of God, or Totality. The same Power that turns an otherwise happy and well-adjusted body-mind mechanism into a seeker either delivers onto that seeker a guru or does not. It may deliver onto that seeker a false guru, one with whom the interaction leads into the exact opposite direction of realization of one's true nature.

# ACCEPTANCE & FATALISM

April 2010

## *A Message from Wayne*

Hello my loves,

Of the many complex and often confusing concepts that arise in this Teaching, perhaps one of the most difficult is the distinction between duality and dualism.

This is made all the more confusing because this Teaching is often called Nonduality when it should more rightly be called Nondualism.

Dualism is by its very nature judgmental and exclusive. It suggests that there is no Unity now. Unity is imagined as the future perfect state in which what is presently considered to be bad, evil and painful is eliminated. Dualism is thus linked to suffering because in dualism, What Is manifest now--and this of course includes you--is thought to be incomplete, flawed and in desperate need of revision. In dualism, duality is seen as a flaw to be overcome. In dualism, Enlightenment is viewed as the end of duality.

The term duality is descriptive. It points to the experiential fact that the Whole is made manifest through the harmony of polaric opposites. The yin/yang symbol visually expresses this principle. Duality is a term that affirms What Is. It INCLUDES the negative, painful and unpleasant and acknowledges that they exist as part of the Unity. Duality can thus be considered to be the structure of the phenomenal world which is understood to be a manifestation of the Source. Implicit in duality is acceptance of What IS--which of course includes you. In duality, Enlightenment is viewed as the end of dualism.

I hope this helps.

With love,  
Wayne

September 2007

## *A Message from Wayne*

Hello my loves,

I am periodically taken to task for not having a teaching style more like

some of my preceptors – most notably, Nisargadatta Maharaj. Maharaj was famous for speaking from the standpoint of the Absolute. He would say things such as, “I was never born and I will never die” and “I am awake even when I am asleep.” Such assertively non-dual statements sometimes had the effect of shocking his listeners into a profound, transcendent Seeing.

I am sympathetic to this approach, but I have rarely been comfortable using it. I feel much more at home when I am meeting my listeners where THEY are... most of them believing that they were born and will die and that they are asleep while asleep. From this point of ‘obvious’ truth we can then proceed to examine the more profound, underlying nature of this ‘one’ who lives and dies and sleeps.

No one can deny that there is EXISTENCE here. The nature of that EXISTENCE can (and has been) debated endlessly. But this EXISTENCE is self-proving. It is not a philosophical debating point but a self-affirming Truth. It is here at the center when you pull off the onion-like layers of your apparent self - the self that lives and dies and sleeps and wakes.

We are the victims of our beliefs. When you ‘believe’ the pointers of a teacher such as Maharaj, the inevitable result is a kind of nihilism in which all that is apparent (including yourself) is denied as meaningless and illusory. When you believe the pointers of a teacher such as myself, the inevitable result is the sense of having a progressively deeper and truer knowledge about the nature of Existence.

So pick your poison. With a little luck...either one will kill ‘you’.

With much love,  
Wayne

January 2009

## *A Message from Wayne*

Hello my loves,

The Living Teaching is built on the principle of investigation. True Faith is understood to be sighted rather than believed. It arises naturally out of the Understanding of the nature of What Is. Within the Living Teaching, faith and Acceptance are bound together. Whatever you look deeply into may lead you to confront The Mystery that lies at the root of everything. Faith is the profound Understanding of what truly Is.

Deep looking happens through a variety of channels. People we call Thinkers, look primarily with their intellects. People we call Feelers look primarily with their hearts. People we call Doers, look primarily through their deeds. People we call Yogis look primarily through their breath and bodies. The Living Teaching embraces and enfolds all these channels. The Living Teaching can be understood as the river from which all the separate channels break off and to which all the separate channels inevitably return.

With love,  
Wayne

## ***A Living Gem from Ramesh***

(previously unpublished)

The real secret of life is to understand that the past must be abandoned, that the unknown cannot be avoided, and that nothing can be ultimately fixed. When a man knows this, he really lives for the first time in his life. By holding his breath, he loses it, by letting go he finds it.

1989

15 February 2005

## ***A Webcast Transcript Excerpt***

*You were talking about acceptance, and how that is sort of an all-encompassing acceptance beyond the sense of acceptance or non-acceptance. For me, it just didn't seem to sit straight. Even if we are unable to change conditions, that itself is within the acceptance of everything, so then I was curious as to who is the person who finds that hideous.*

Wayne: Actually, what I found hideous was the suggestion that the reason you were sick was because of some limitation on your part: That you weren't spiritually fit enough, you hadn't aligned yourself properly with the will of God, and therefore the reason you were sick was essentially your fault. So, it doesn't contradict the notion of acceptance, because acceptance is total; acceptance is not specific. Within acceptance is the realization or understanding that every organism has preferences in accordance with its nature. I can both say I think that that idea is hideous, meaning I don't like it, and there is also complete acceptance, because included in the acceptance is acceptance of the fact that I don't like it.

*Precisely, your opinion that it's hideous?*

Wayne: That's right.

*So, then we need to look at the sense of the 'I' in the organism. You could break it down to the sense of who is asking this question. Is it really myself asking about myself if I'm coming from the space that everything is me?*

Wayne: Yes.

*But then there seems to be this delineation or this slightly different categorization of the 'I' or the ego. It has no opinion or likes or dislikes. I'm just trying to come to terms with that.*

Wayne: In my model, and it is simply a model, all of the separate organisms, with their individual characteristics and qualities, are aspects of the whole. In no way separate. So they are at once identifiable as entities, with qualities and characteristics...

*[cell phone rings] I apologize. Of course, that would be fine if that happens.*

Wayne: It's funny that you should say that.

*I apologize, nonetheless.*

Wayne: Your apology is certainly accepted. About eight months ago, there was a fellow sitting precisely where you're sitting, and his cell phone rang AND he answered it. My response was, "Get the fuck out of here right now! Go!" I was furious! Absolutely furious at the utter disrespect for the teaching. And I found that was incompletely intolerable, and I kicked his ass out and told him, "Don't come back!" I was yelling at him!

So, there was another guy who had actually come with him - I didn't know it at the time; after a bit he hesitantly raised his hand and said, "You were talking about acceptance. So, how does this work?" [Laughter] It was great, because it was pointing precisely to this question.

When I talk about acceptance, it is non-specific. It is total. The acceptance includes everything, all the dualistic opposites. Acceptance is often confused with approval, where you have to like everything, where you say everything is fine and you have no resistance to anything. And this is held as some kind of ideal in certain circles. But it is totally unrealistic. It is as impossible a notion as the idea of a one-ended stick or single-sided coin.

*In fact, the more one refuses one thought, the more one inspires the other.*

Wayne: Indeed. Because it is understood that within each opposite is the

totality of the other. That's the beauty of the yin-yang symbol. You can separate them and say, "Oh, I only want the good; I only want the white part." But it will complete itself out of itself. The balance will be restored, because that is the very nature of this dualistic universe.

*Before the phone rang, you were talking about the point of the separate organism, acknowledging the fact that whatever one wants to call oneself - an organism or a person or a Peter from England, whatever it might be...*

Wayne: The essential pointer of Advaita - which means not two - is that everything is one; everything is Consciousness. With the understanding that everything is one, then how do we explain the multiplicity? Now, one of the ways the multiplicity has often been talked about is that this is all illusion. But that notion, as classical as it may be, is only part of the story.

It is not that the appearance is illusory, what is truly illusory is the appearance of separation, the sense that each independent thing is in fact independent. The underlying understanding is that each object is an aspect of the one, in no way separate, it is simply that one does not see the linkage because it is the nature of the senses to objectify things, to quantify and make them into discrete objects. That's what the senses do in order to know. So, the universe is illusory in that aspect.

*Of course, there was nothing wrong with the frustration anyway.*

Wayne: There was frustration.

*Who was frustrated?*

Wayne: The same one who asked the question, "Who's frustrated?"

*So, then where do you delineate between God that came in the three times and you?*

Wayne: The distinction is purely poetic. But we make these kinds of life distinctions between forces greater than our physical selves and our physical selves. I have absolutely no problem using personal pronouns - saying I and mine and me - and to talk about this organism named Wayne as a separate apparatus, functionally speaking, as a convention that we use as part of this dance of life. In the same way that I am not compelled to go down to the beach in the afternoon when everybody is standing out watching the sunset and say, "My! What a magnificent rotation of the Earth obscuring the sun," because I know the sun isn't setting, and to say sunset would be an indication of one's stupidity. So I can still very comfortably say it's a beautiful sunset, while at the same time know perfectly well that it is the Earth moving in relation to the sun.

*You might say that perhaps there's a delineation of a God from you that is purely poetic because of the functions of language.*

Wayne: Functional, it is a functional difference between this limited apparatus, which was born and will die, and the Totality, of which it is an aspect, which is eternal.

*That which gives its life?*

Wayne: That which is its essence and which infuses it with life, yes.

October 2004

## ***A Message from Wayne***

Hello my loves,

Many people who come to my Talks say they are there because of an interest in enlightenment. But when we get down to what this thing called enlightenment actually IS, there is enormous confusion.

When I talk about enlightenment, I talk about it very, very specifically, and it's very simple. In humans, at around the age of two-and-a-half, a shift occurs whereby they change from free-flowing, uninvolved beings to experiencing everything in terms of 'me!' and 'mine!' It is that moment in which what I call the "false sense of personal authorship" kicks in. It happens to virtually every human being. It is the false sense that 'I' as this body-mind am the source; that 'I' as this body-mind am responsible for making it all happen.

It is this false sense of personal authorship that creates suffering, because the sense is that 'I' am in control of things, and, yet, there is continuous evidence to the contrary - that I'm not in control. So a powerful tension is established. In some body-minds, for whatever reason, that sense of personal authorship permanently dissolves - dies. That event, for lack of a better name, is called enlightenment. Over the millennia, generations of seekers have mystified the hell out of it. Basically, it's an event that happens in the history of some human organisms.

Now, the reason this event is so interesting to people is that the organism through which it happens is no longer suffering. There is total acceptance within the organism. There is total acceptance because it is "understood" that what is, is. There is no longer a separate sense of 'me' to become involved with what is and claim it as 'mine' - egoically mine. When that

process is no longer occurring, that permanent lack of occurrence may be called peace or bliss or enlightenment. What is crucial to realize is that it is a happening. It happens as part of the functioning of the universe. The pointer of this teaching is that everything happens that way; everything happens as part of the functioning of Totality.

With love,  
Wayne

20 September 2004

## ***A Webcast Transcript Excerpt***

*Wayne, in acceptance, does the pendulum swing the other way to non-acceptance?*

Wayne: The acceptance that Ramesh and I refer to is not something that is dualistic in nature. The acceptance is absent, so it is not the kind of acceptance that swings into non-acceptance. We can call it Acceptance (with a capital A) as a way of separating it from the acceptance that comes and goes, where you accept something and then you don't accept it. The Acceptance that is being pointed at is total; it is not relative, it is not specific and it is not personal. It is total.

*Would you say it is an acceptance that includes non-acceptance?*

Wayne: It includes everything. It, of itself, does not move. The specific reference here was to the pendulum model I used to use a lot, that the energy of swinging into something carries with it the energy to swing into its polaric opposite. Whenever there is one thing, implicit in it is the movement into its opposite. That is the very essence of the manifest universe, the very essence of that which is dualistic in nature. So, the Acceptance that is total is not relative; it is that within which the relative exists.

*Is there another word for acceptance?*

Wayne: Lots of them.

*Because the word acceptance for me brings it into duality. If I look at the state where I'm really all right with everything, it's not even acceptance; there's no acceptance or non-acceptance.*

Wayne: We can call it Presence; we can call it Totality; we can call it Source; we can call it Consciousness. The 'Acceptance of What Is' as in the 'Totality of What Is', Totality. So the Acceptance we're talking about is not

approval, which comes and goes - approval and disapproval.

*It's the language.*

Wayne: Ultimately, we're stuck with language, and any word, of course, is by its very nature dualistic. Any concept, any experience - even the experience of Presence - is relative and dualistic. It must be. It absolutely must be. Much in spirituality and spiritual circles is about transcending that which is dualistic, to get to that which is this noumenal - this total undefined Presence. It's a movement of homing in on "it," a ridding oneself of a connection or association with all of this. So, you get rid of the distractions, you get rid of all of the muck of the mundane, and then you home in on what is essential, on what is total and spiritual and godly and, ultimately, nothing.

This was my path as well. I was involved in a variety of practices that would get me more centered, get me more present, to this place that I considered to be spiritual. When I met Ramesh, the whole paradigm shifted. Instead of homing in on what was spiritual, this inward seeking energy moved out and expanded to include all that was manifest as spiritual. It was understood that everything is an expression of the source. So if you want to connect with what is God, just relax; touch yourself or touch somebody else. Enjoy. Laugh. Live. That is God manifest. It was a wonderful change.

*This is always the part that I have a little trouble with, because I always imagine a murderer walking into this house with a gun pointing at my son or daughter, and it is very difficult for me to call that spiritual.*

Wayne: It is difficult. You have to really expand your definition of what is spiritual, beyond what you like, beyond what feels good to you, to include the most horrific thing imaginable, so it is in the all-inclusive nature of "what is." The pointer is to specifically that: every thing - good and bad, what we like and don't like, that hurts our heart and expands our heart - is a product of the same source.

We're conditioned from very early on with the notion that God is the good stuff. The bad stuff is suggested to be the devil. Or you: human beings are the source of the bad stuff, and when you get rid of the human qualities then you will be more like God. This very basic notion infuses not only this culture, but all cultures: God is the big perfect thing, and that which is here and earthbound and mundane is sullied, is somehow tarnished or dirty.

So, this all-inclusive notion - which is what I found so expansive about Ramesh's teaching - broadened the scope of what was Godly, what was spiritual. When he used the term Totality, he really meant it. This Totality is actually total; it includes everything. The bad, the ugly, the greatest

murderers, the torturers, the child molesters - all of the horrors - are included in what was ultimately god.

The Acceptance that is pointed at, of this Totality being what it is, does not preclude the human response. You're programmed as an instrument to respond in a human way, and if somebody comes in and points a gun at you, you'll respond based on your programming. You may run or make a counterattack; you'll act in accordance with whatever your nature is in that moment. This acceptance is not passivity; it has nothing to do with action or response. It includes every imaginable response.

When I was in Bombay in January, some idiot came to one of the sessions and thought he would be really clever and test Ramesh. He pulled a toy gun on him to see how he would react, because he thought it would determine how much of a sage Ramesh was, or some nonsense. Since Ramesh didn't react, he thought he had determined that Ramesh was the real thing. When I saw Ramesh a little later, he said he didn't respond with fear because the guy wasn't a very good actor!

There is no litmus test of reaction that is an indicator of one's spiritual condition or spiritual awareness. The reaction of the organism is in accordance with its program and nature. It reacts in the moment based on its programming in that moment...

April 2004

## *A Message from Wayne*

Hello my loves,

Compassion is a quality that is much valued and discussed in spiritual circles. We need to look at what is generally meant by this term - compassion. The superficial meaning is 'kindness'; a caring, heart-centered interaction, in which the recipient leaves feeling good.

Compassion is actually deeper than that. I have seen what I would consider to be compassion from a sage, specifically Ramesh, which from the standpoint of the recipient was harsh. Ramesh isn't a harsh character, but sometimes the stripping away of a false belief, while compassionate, is not a gentle or sweet action.

As we get older, often we become encrusted with those beliefs that were earlier used to create a sense of personal security. Of course, it never worked for very long. There is no security in life. The essence of life being

change, there's always that underlying tickle of uncertainty, of not being secure. The usual solution to this is to try and patch up the structure by applying new and stronger beliefs. Often the demolition of these encrusted false beliefs is a painful process; it leaves a person feeling uncomfortable, discontent, and uncertain.

The sage will sometimes raze the whole structure. It is, to quote Hafiz, "to take away those toys that bring you no joy." If you see a two-year-old with a sharp knife, and you take it away from him he's going to scream. As far as he's concerned, you've done him a great harm. "That was MY toy. I was having fun with that." That he was about to chop his leg off and you prevented that from happening, I would say was a compassionate act. But the child doesn't see it as a compassionate act.

So, often the action of the sage is not seen as compassionate. If I had to define compassion, I would say that the compassion of the sage is total acceptance. The total acceptance, which means you are accepted completely as you are in the moment.

The sage accepts the disciple totally as he is. This acceptance is, in fact, an underlying quality to every action by the sage. The action may be to take away the toys, to push the disciple into areas where the disciple isn't comfortable, to ask difficult questions and not let up. So the disciple goes away unhappy. "How can this be compassion? I'm unhappy. He wasn't kind and gentle with me. I feel worse now than I did when I walked in and met him."

It is compassionate for one reason: there is no personal agenda on the part of the sage. Every single act is compassionate because there is no "me" desiring something for itself as part of the action. This is truly the blessing of the sage.

With much love,  
Wayne

## ***A Living Gem from Ramesh***

(previously unpublished)

The ego - without the sense of doership - the mere identification with the body-mind organism, is, as such, merely a reflection of the programming in action. In the absence of the sense of doership there is no personal involvement.

March 2003

## *A Message from Wayne*

Everyone is talking about THE WAR because the news is talking about THE WAR. The Teaching of Advaita has no position on such matters other than to point to the fact that war exists. Acceptance of this fact leads to a peace that exists at the center of the storm. This peace may exist along with actions that represent opposition to whatever is going on. So it is quite possible to Accept and at the same time march in a peace demonstration or commit a violent act. The Acceptance this Teaching points to underlies action and non-action but advocates neither.

I really enjoyed our trip to Sedona last week. The group there was particularly sweet...interested, loving and alive. And we even got a bit of snow to dust the magnificent red rocks. Some photos from the trip can be found under EVENT PHOTOS on the advaita.org website. ENJOY!!

With much love,  
Wayne

## *A Living Gem from Ramesh*

(previously unpublished)

There is nothing more surprising and mysterious than perfectly ordinary objects and ordinary happenings. Can there truly be anything more wonderful than the astonishing fact that we exist, we breathe, eat, sleep, walk, laugh and cry? The danger of scientific investigation is that in attempting to explain these mysteries it may imagine that they have been explained away. But it has been the actual experience of many true scientists that the more you know, the more mysterious everything becomes until you are forced to roar with laughter at your efforts to make yourself the equal of God.

Does Consciousness exist in matter or is it the other way around?!

# TRUTH

February 2010

## *A Message from Wayne*

Hello my loves,

The bondage of certainty.

To believe that you know the truth is to live in a prison.

From there there can be no further movement. Perhaps you know that all is One. Perhaps you know you do not exist or that everything is an illusion. All you are convinced you know is true are the shackles that restrict your ability to live freely.

It IS the way of things. But occasionally comes the courage to escape. A crack opens in the cell wall and you dig through it toward the light beyond. It is however a narrow passage and to squeeze through it you must leave everything behind.

To walk naked in a world where most everyone else is clothed takes courage indeed.

May it find you now.

With much love,  
Wayne

June 2009

## *A Message from Wayne*

Hello my loves,

*Believe those who are seeking the truth. Doubt those who find it.*

- Andre Gide (1869 - 1951)

I am very pleased to have my new book, **Enlightenment Is Not What You Think**, coming out this month. If it is at all successful in dispelling some of the myths about Enlightenment, I will be gratified.

In the Living Teaching it is recognized that seeking Truth is infinitely more

valuable than finding it. The search is alive and vibrant. Once you think you have found it, the resulting knowledge is dead.

Knowledge is acquired. Truth is revealed. The nature of this revelation is an absence rather than a thing that is to be gained. Of course, it is impossible to describe an absence... we can only describe something that has properties. The impossibility of the task of describing Enlightenment, combined with the insatiable thirst on the part of the seeker to know what it is, has produced an incredible array of pointers. The inevitable fate of such pointers is that people hear them as descriptions and then take them to be Truths in and of themselves.

It would be an endless and thankless task trying to point out the fallacy in each belief about Enlightenment. I have contented myself with presenting a broader perspective on the subject, in which a new and deeper insight may be found. I hope you find it valuable.

As always, we shall see what happens.

With love,  
Wayne

April 2008

### ***A Living Gem from Ramesh***

(previously unpublished)

Planets, solar systems and nebulae appear and disappear; energy is transformed into matter and matter is transformed into energy, but there is something which does not appear and disappear but is eternal and that is the great cosmic ocean of Consciousness, from and into which come all forms of energy. This is what modern science tells us, confirming the intuitive insight of the mystic.

December 26, 1989

March 2008

### ***A Message from Wayne***

Hello my loves,

This Living Teaching is right here, right now. It is, in fact, as close to you as your breath. When you look deeply into yourself you may be able to see

that there is, in this moment, a quality of aliveness that is animating you that is not philosophical and is not abstract. It's there! It is coursing the blood through your veins, it is animating your breath, it is what makes it possible for you to think and speak and see and hear.

This is something that is essential and fundamental and true. It's independent of what you think about it, what you believe about it and what you feel about it. It is here, and with Grace you dissolve into it. You recognize your true self in it. It is this living force, this animating force that has manifested into the complexity we call Life. It is this living force that has manifested into this being which you call yourself.

It is at once wondrous and simply obvious.

With much love,  
Wayne

December 2007

## *A Message from Wayne*

Hello my loves,

For those of us who remain so spiritually backward that time and space still exist for us, another year is drawing to a close. It is an opportunity to stop for a moment and reflect on the miracle that is this Livingness. Within the Livingness are the polaric opposites... birth and death, joy and sorrow, pleasure and pain, inhalation and exhalation... and it is the continuous movement between the polarities that is the EXPERIENCE of being alive. Some people believe that death is the end of the Living, when in fact death is simply the end of a particular experience within the Livingness. The Livingness continues even after a particular point of experience is extinguished.

When birth and death are known for what they are -- linked opposites within the Livingness -- much of the fear and drama drain out of the process.

Sometimes this Living Teaching facilitates an extraordinary insight:

What you TRULY are is not limited to a particular point of experience. What you TRULY are is the Livingness itself.

Happy New Year to ALL!

With much love,  
Wayne

### ***A Living Gem from Ramesh***

(previously unpublished)

To suppose that realization can be attained by accepting and repeating formulas is like expecting to climb the Hamalyan peaks by repeatedly studying the relevant maps. While a map is indispensable as indicating the direction which the traveller must set out, one can never forget that maps are essentially symbols, and not the most accurate or adequate ones at that.

September 12, 1989

August 2007

### ***A Living Gem from Ramesh***

(previously unpublished)

Perhaps it may be because so much hypocrisy prevails among the supposed religious people and because organized religion has turned it into a rigid frame of ritualistic do's and don'ts - whatever may be the reason - it is a matter of fact that when the word 'God' is mentioned a certain uneasiness arises among the company present, even among people who really have no reason to think disparagingly of themselves. And the beauty of the matter is that the truly religious people are aware that there is no need to refer to 'God' -- it is enough to be aware of Him.

July 1, 1990

May 2006

### ***A Message from Wayne***

Hello my loves,

To judge something you need a scale and since everyone has their own

scale, judgments of the same thing often vary. The question then becomes, whose scale is RIGHT.

The human mind has a hunger for certainty. It is as if it senses its own inherent limitations and seeks to overcome them with concepts such as Absolute Truth, Absolute Goodness, Absolute Love, Absolute Beauty etc. The traditional method of certifying the RIGHTNESS of these Absolutes is divine revelation, meaning God tells you either directly via a 'vision' or a 'voice' (with or without 'spiritual' drugs and practices) or indirectly via the recorded accounts (scriptures) of someone else's interaction with God.

Modern variants on this theme seek to use scientific or pseudo-scientific methodology to determine the properties of the Absolute, but as with the religious methods agreement is impossible to come by.

There is an inherent arrogance associated with believing you know the Truth. It is the ego's ultimate empowerment.

For me, the beauty of this Teaching is that it does NOT claim to be the Truth. It is simply a collection of pointers. It directs the student to look for him or herself into the Mystery that is the essence of existence. It is often a frightening journey without an Absolute scale by which to measure your progress. In the end, however, the Understanding reveals itself in a humility that is at once transcendent and sublime.

With much love,  
Wayne

## *A Living Gem from Ramesh*

(previously unpublished)

There is the thought 'I'. There is the vocal 'I'. There is the 'I' that acts. Behind all the 'I's that think, that talk, that act, behind all thoughts, words, acts, is the WITNESS of every single thing.

The only way to know oneself is to be aware of one's own awareness -- here and now.

Dec. 11, 1989

March 2005

## *A Living Gem from Ramesh*

(previously unpublished)

The only truth is that 'Truth' is beyond all forms of mental activity. The Truth is the absolute absence of any kind of relative knowledge.

February 2005

## *A Message from Wayne*

Hello my loves,

You want your purveyors of Truth  
To look and act special.  
You want them different  
And separate  
And powerful.  
You prefer to imagine them  
Cloaked in light  
Than sitting on the toilet.  
You like them passionless, sexless,  
Mellow, gentle and kind.  
You like the idea of miracles  
And will invent them when necessary.  
Your strategy is to keep them  
Out there  
Far away from you  
Exotic and mysterious.  
You revel in the myth  
Of the Enlightened individual  
Hoping to someday be so empowered.  
What you can't tolerate  
Is for them to appear  
As ordinary as you.  
Ram Tzu know this...  
You always miss the Truth  
Because it is too plain to see.

With love,  
Wayne

## ***A Living Gem from Ramesh***

(previously unpublished)

True religion means living with all one's daring, with full awareness of the harmony of the whole.

6 January 2005

### ***A Webcast Transcript Excerpt***

*Seems like this teaching does have certain, I don't know if they'd qualify as postulates, but something like the law of interconnected opposites. It seems so useful as a tool to help understand some of these sort of seemingly odd happenings, like these imbalances that you talk about.*

Wayne: I would say it is in fact a very useful tool. But to call it a law is going a little further than I would be comfortable with. I would say it is a way of ordering the universe to talk about it in terms of interconnected opposites. And for some, in some cases, this is a very useful way of understanding it. But it is not a truth, it is not a law. It is a tool.

*So is there a hazard in viewing it as a truth? I mean, I don't see, I haven't been able to see it. I mean I don't know how to put it; it seems for me just recently it seems like this, it's almost omnipresent, it's like it's something that's been just circulating in me as these questions come up for me. And it seems like and I've been treating it almost as an explanation. It's seems there's no, it seems like it's irrefutable. It seems like it's just apparent. So I guess I have been, I would consider it, even though presumably nothing that we talk about here is a truth. It seems so compelling. It seems like it's just true.*

Wayne: OK. So we can say, what we can certainly say is that "it feels like a truth to me." Fine, I have no problem with that at all. It feels like a truth to me. That is your experience. That is how it feels now. Which is different from this is how it IS. And there's a curious kind of humility in the realization that this is how it seems to me and it feels very true. But it isn't a universal truth - this is my truth. It's the only one that I have at the moment and, but in the recognition that it's mine, not universal, there is a fundamental humility. And you're much less likely to take up your saber and defend it when you realize that yes others may well have as equally a profound truth.

*So this doesn't then qualify, cause you said the other day that this teaching has no doctrine.*

Wayne: Right.

*So literally the kinds of things that came to me, well isn't the law of - it's not described as a law, I understand that, but it seems so close to a doctrine the doctrine of interconnect opposites I'd not even considered that prior to this teaching. Not in the way I do now. And it came through this teaching. So, its just another pointer, another concept that can be argued by some?*

Wayne: Clearly.

*Um-hmm. And the nature of my mind wants to have these anchor points or something to order the universe so currently, I'm ordering it using these concepts?*

Wayne: Yes.

*Does Advaita believe in affirmative prayer?*

Wayne: Advaita doesn't believe or disbelieve in anything. Because there is no doctrine, you see.

*No principle?*

Wayne: No principle at all. Advaita, as I talk about it - and there's lots of different flavors, brands, denominations calling themselves Advaita - as I talk about it, has no doctrine, has no principle. It is a series of pointers, which always point you back to answer the question for yourself. You see. All of these statements are all pointers for you to question, for you to test.

*Self-inquiry then.*

Wayne: If we can call it - I even hesitate to call it self-inquiry because self-inquiry now we've labeled it, we know what it is and say "OK I did that and, I've been there done that got the t-shirt went to Ramanaashram and sat there, now I've self-inquired and now I'm on to whatever the next thing is." So it's not self-inquiry in that way. It is a constant pointer back to the nature of what is...

21 September 2004

## ***A Webcast Transcript Excerpt***

*Wayne, where does your knowledge come from?*

Wayne: The concepts that I'm articulating come from my experience; they come from my background, my education. The programming of this organism produces these utterances we call communication, these expressions of my knowledge. I'm not claiming to speak from a truth,

meaning that I know something that someone else doesn't. I have no such knowledge, because any knowledge has to be relative. If it's relative, it can be argued, disagreed with. So, the only absolute knowledge or understanding is that which cannot be spoken and cannot even be known.

May 2004

## *A Message from Wayne*

Hello my loves,

Since I often start my Talks with the admonition that what I am about to say is not the Truth, people frequently follow that up with the question: So why do you teach?

In short 'I' do not teach. The teaching is expressed without any personal agenda. The expression may come forth as a result of a question from someone, or it may come forth as a burst of creative energy, as in the case of spontaneous poetry or these lines you are reading now. What is absent is the slightest shred of belief that what is being said or being written or being thought is the Truth. Any expression is understood at the most fundamental level to be a pointer, a relative teaching tool. That's why the sage is said to have a natural humility, because there is the total absence of the conviction that what is being expressed is the Truth. The humility comes from the deepest possible conviction that what is being expressed is relative.

So, I personally have no trouble with anyone else's teaching. If one teacher says that you exist and another one says you don't exist, and this one says that you're God incarnate and this other one says that you're nothing, I don't care. They are all understood to be relative teaching tools. There is never a question of the hammer being Truer than the screwdriver. What I find objectionable (in an aesthetic sense) is when someone says, "What I am saying is the truth and what the other teaching is saying is bullshit." Such an assertion lacks the essential clarity of understanding that it's ALL bullshit, and that a given teacher's teaching is simply a matter of enculturation and personal programming that determine how their teaching is expressed.

As you navigate the shifting reefs and shoals of the spiritual sea it may be useful to remember that that which is the most solid is also the most likely to sink you.

With love,  
Wayne

## *A Living Gem from Ramesh*

(previously unpublished)

If you are not content with one, you try for two; if you are not content with two, you try for three, if you are content with three, you have peace and harmony. If you are not content with three, it is likely that you will be discontent even with ten. Without peace and harmony you will want to 'do' more and more.

