

Realization

The Two Relations of Consciousness to Itself

Steven E. Kaufman*

ABSTRACT

We are the Creators of form. We are not created by form, nor are we form. We are the Formlessness in which form arises and by which form is apprehended. And what causes form to arise so that we can apprehend it? What causes form to arise is always some relation of Formlessness to Itself. And there are really only two fundamental relations of Formlessness to Itself: Self-alignment or Self-opposition. With Self-alignment comes Self-Knowledge, Knowledge of one's true Nature, as well as the absence of suffering, whereas with Self-opposition comes Self-ignorance, the obscuring of one's true Nature, as well as the presence of suffering.

Key Words: creator, Consciousness, form, formless, self-alignment, self-opposition.

We can easily say yes to the wanted, but tend to say no to the unwanted. Yet the unwanted is just as much our creation as is the wanted. To reflexively allow the wanted while reflexively resisting and rejecting the unwanted is the reactive and unconscious state in which most humans spend their lives.

In this state there is only the illusion of freedom, as we are really then the slave of external circumstances; feeling good when the wanted arises and we reflexively allow it and feeling bad when the unwanted arises and we reflexively resist it. This leads to chasing after the wanted so that we can obtain it and reflexively allow it and so feel good. This also leads to fearing the unwanted, as we want to keep it away so that we won't have to reflexively resist it and so feel bad.

In all of this we do not realize that the good and bad feelings, the wanted and unwanted emotions, do not inhere in the external circumstances that seem to produce them, but instead are produced by the internal relation of Self-alignment or Self-opposition in which What We Actually Are becomes involved with Itself as we reflexively allow or say yes to the wanted and reflexively resist or say no to the unwanted.

How can we know that there is this internal relation occurring when we do not know What We Actually Are? We cannot and so we do not. This is why the emotions, good and bad, wanted and unwanted, seem to come from or inhere in the external circumstances with which they are associated, i.e., in the external circumstance that we are either reflexively allowing or resisting.

*Correspondence: Steven E. Kaufman, Independent Researcher. <http://www.unifiedreality.com>
E-mail: skaufman@unifiedreality.com

For example, some external unwantedness arises and we reflexively say no to it, internally push against it, internally resist it, and this creates an internal relation within our own Being that produces an unwanted emotion, which is just a created form that arises within, and so is apprehended by, our Being. Or some external wantedness arises and we reflexively say yes to it, internally allow it, internally do not resist it, and this creates an internal relation within our own Being that produces a wanted emotion, which is also just a created form that arises within, and so is apprehended by, our Being.

But when we are blind to What We Actually Are, when What We Actually Are has been obscured, as is the case when there is only the awareness of the form-identity, when there is only identification with form, then there can also be no awareness of this internal relation of Self-allowing or Self-resistance, Self-alignment or Self-opposition, that is actually producing the emotional form, and so the created emotion, the created form, whether wanted or unwanted, good or bad, must then seem to inhere in or emanate from the external circumstance that we are either reflexively allowing or resisting.

And so something arises that we do not want, some circumstance, perhaps one's partner or spouse is doing something that is unwanted, and so we reflexively resist that external unwantedness and so become unconsciously involved in an internal relation of Self-opposition, which then creates an unwanted emotion that we then associate with the unwanted circumstance or behavior, and so we say, "you have made me mad " or "you have made me feel bad," not knowing that it is only our own unconscious and conditioned reaction to the circumstance or behavior, which creates an internal relation within our own Being, that is actually producing the emotional unwantedness, the emotional form, that truly seems from the unconscious or conditioned perspective to be caused by the circumstance or person.

And the same is true of emotional wantedness. That is, something arises that we want, some circumstance, perhaps one's partner or spouse is doing something that is wanted, and so we reflexively allow that external wantedness and so become unknowingly involved in an internal relation of Self-alignment, which then creates a wanted emotion that we then associate with the wanted circumstance or behavior, and so we say, "you have made me happy" or "you have made me feel good," again not knowing that it is only our own unconscious and conditioned reaction to the circumstance or behavior, which creates an internal relation within our own Being, that is actually producing the emotional wantedness, the emotional form, that again truly seems from the unconscious or conditioned perspective to be caused by the circumstance or person.

Conversely, when one becomes aware of themselves as the Creator of form, then it becomes possible to understand how the different relations of the Creator to Itself create what the Creator apprehends as different forms, and especially as the different emotional forms, in which case it then becomes possible to see beyond the illusion that makes the characteristics of emotional wantedness or unwantedness seem to inhere in the perceived or conceived form one is either allowing or resisting, respectively, which in turn helps to lessen one's attachment and aversion to form, i.e., one's desire of and fear of form, either seeking form as the source of good or running from form as the source of bad.

We are the Creators of form. We are not created by form, nor are we form. We are the Formlessness in which form arises and by which form is apprehended. And what causes form to arise so that we can apprehend it? What causes form to arise is always some relation of Formlessness to Itself. And there are really only two fundamental relations of Formlessness to Itself: Self-alignment or Self-opposition. With the relation of Self-alignment comes Self-Knowledge, Knowledge of one's true Nature, as well as the absence of suffering, whereas with the relation of Self-opposition comes Self-ignorance, the obscuring of one's true Nature, as well as the presence of suffering.

So it is that, as Eckhart Tolle often states in one way or another, the opening or doorway to What We Actually Are, which he refers to as Presence, Spaciousness, Essence Identity, Consciousness, or the Now, to name but a few of the words he uses to point toward the non-conceptual Formlessness that we Are, lies in becoming friendly with what-is, becoming friendly with whatever forms are arising in this moment, so that one ceases to either cling to or resist what-is, whatever form it takes.

This is because the conscious decision to cease to cling to or resist what-is, to cease to cling to or resist whatever forms are arising in this moment, in this Now, within your Awareness, is simultaneously a conscious decision to internally align your Being with What-Is, to internally align your Being with Itself.

There are only these two relations, Self-alignment and Self-opposition, and if you are not actively involving your Being in one, then you are actively involving your Being in the other, because What-Is, What You Are, by virtue of the fact that It Is and so cannot help but Be, must Be in some relation to Itself: either Flowing in alignment with Itself or Flowing in opposition to Itself, and so must in each moment, in what is always the Now, be creating either Self-Knowledge and the absence of suffering or Self-ignorance and the presence of suffering, respectively.

Suffering is the diminishment of the Flow of What We Are to What We Are that comes with the internal relation of Self-opposition, whereas the absence of suffering, or the Fullness of Life, is the full or undiminished Flow of What We Are to What We Are that comes with the internal relation of Self-alignment.

Saying that What-Is must be involved in either a relation of Self-alignment or Self-opposition is not saying that What-Is is dual, or not One. What-Is is singular, or non-dual. It is the relations of the non-dual What-Is to Itself that create the forms that are themselves always dual, always this or that, wave or particle, good or bad, wanted or unwanted, yin or yang, which created forms then create the appearance of duality, or the appearance that reality is ultimately dual. But beyond that apparent duality lies the one Being, the one Consciousness that is, through relation to its non-dual Self, creating and apprehending the duality of form.

It seems that Consciousness has no choice but to be involved in some relation with Itself, but that it is able to choose which relation with Itself in which it is involved; aligned or opposed. However, it may be that it only seems like there is a choice from the perspective of

unconsciousness, whereas from the perspective of enlightenment there is perhaps really no choice at all.

Would you like a nice massage or a poke in the eye with a sharp stick? There is certainly the appearance of a choice but only a madman would choose the latter over the former. Would you like the Fullness of Life or suffering. Here too there also appears to be a choice, but only Consciousness that has lost sight of Itself seems to choose the latter over the former.

Consciousness seems never to be intentionally creating suffering, but only does so when unconscious. It always seems to be the intention of Consciousness to feel better, to create wantedness for Itself. It's just that once Consciousness loses sight of Itself the mistaken idea arises that the way to get to what it wants, whatever that might be, is through some sort of clinging or resistance to what-is, which clinging or resistance to what-is then involves the clinging or resisting Consciousness in a relation of Self-opposition, thereby perpetuating the Self-ignorance that makes clinging or resistance to what-is seem like a good idea, i.e., like a way to get to the wanted, to the good, or even back to God, back to Itself.

And so Consciousness is always really making the same choice, to move toward a greater wantedness, toward the ultimate good, which is, whether It knows it or not, always Itself. The difference then is not in the choice that is being made, for that is always the same; rather, the difference lies only in the two different contexts in which that singular choice is being made, i.e., the context of Self-Knowledge or the context of Self-ignorance.

That singular choice, made or exercised from within the context of Self-Knowledge, produces that which is not-suffering. That same choice, made or exercised from within the context of Self-ignorance, produces suffering. The difference then lies neither in That which is making the choice, nor in the choice that is being made, for both are singular in Nature. Consciousness that is in a state of Self-Knowledge is not separable from or other than Consciousness that is in a state of Self-ignorance, which is why both, as it were, always make the same choice. The difference then can only lie in the apparent difference in the nature of the forms that are produced and apprehended by singular Consciousness operating within these two different contexts, within what appear to be these two different states of its own singular Being.

The created forms are different; some are wanted and some are unwanted, some are this, some are that. But the created forms, the experiences, are not Real, they are only real, they are not What-Is, they are only what-is, only what exists, only what comes out of or out from the Is-ness. However, That which gives rise to or creates the different forms, the different experiential realities, the always dual forms, is not Itself ever actually different, is neither wanted nor unwanted, but is rather the singular inseparable non-dual formless Is-ness that can never Itself be a form, and so can never Itself actually be spoken, can never Itself actually be a concept, can never Itself actually be a word, but can only be pointed toward using the forms that both arise within and are apprehended by It.