

Article**On the Nature of & Relation between Formless God & Form:
Part 3: The Identification of the Formless God with Itself (1)**

Steven E. Kaufman*

ABSTRACT

In the third part of this work what is described is how the Formless God, owing to the way in which it naturally relates to the world of forms once it has lost sight of Itself though identification with form, unknowingly keeps Itself caught up in, and so bound to, the relation with Itself that is creating its identification with form, and so unknowingly perpetuates both its identification with form as well as its inability to become aware or conscious of the Formlessness that is Itself, thereby also perpetuating the illusion that reality, i.e., apprehended form, is what is actually there where it appears to be. Also described in the third part of this work is what form-identified God must do, so to speak, in order to extricate Itself from the cage of form-identification in which it is, owing to the way it naturally relates to Itself through the proxy of form while still identified with form, unknowingly keeping Itself trapped. And what form-identified God must do, in order to extricate Itself from the cage of form-identification in which it has trapped Itself, is change the way it naturally and habitually relates to the universe of experiential forms, owing to its identification with form, while still identified primarily with form.

This first article of Part 3 contains the following sections: The mutually exclusive nature of identification with form and identification with the Formless; The self-perpetuating nature of the Movement into identification with form; & The way out of form-identification.

Key Words: God, Consciousness, formless, form, physical reality, creation, nature.

The mutually exclusive nature of identification with form and identification with the Formless

As mentioned previously, the purpose of this writing is not to provide the reader with additional concepts, with additional form-based knowledge, that one can then add to one's form-identity. Rather, the purpose of this writing is to demonstrate to the reader the reflection or shadow-like nature of form in order to weaken the reader's identification with form. And the ultimate purpose of weakening one's identification with form is to facilitate the turning of one's Attention toward the Formlessness that must remain hidden in plain sight as long as one's Attention remains fully fixed upon form, as it does while one is fully identified with form and thereby unavoidably involved in the reactive Movements of attachment and aversion. To turn one's Attention toward the Formless, which is an internal Movement, and to thereby become aware of Awareness,

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

E-mail: skaufman@unifiedreality.com

conscious of Consciousness, is to wake up to some degree from the dream of form-identification in which most of humanity dwells, and to thereby Awaken to some degree to one's true Nature, which Nature remains unavoidably hidden as long as the dream continues, which is to say, as long as individualized Beingness continues to move or flow Itself into form-identification at full Force. Thus, if an individualized Beingness is not able to Move in that direction, i.e., not able to turn its Attention toward the Formless, such a Beingness must then continue to dream the dream of form-identification, and while dreaming that dream continue to remain completely unaware and unconscious of its true Nature, which is not other than the true Nature of the universe itself.

It is important to understand that no one can take this step for you, that no force outside yourself can turn your Attention away from form and toward the Formless, because you yourself, as you truly are, are the Force and Flow of formless Beingness, albeit individualized Beingness, but formless Beingness nonetheless. However, it is quite possible that, as of this writing, you are an individualized Beingness that is fully identified with form and so flowing Itself only toward form, flowing all of its Attention toward form, and as a result conscious only of that, conscious only of form. That having been said, to paraphrase Eckhart Tolle, pointing out the possibility of your complete identification with form is nothing personal; rather, it is just a statement that has as its basis the recognition that the vast majority of human Beings are, at the time of this writing, completely identified with form and so have no idea whatsoever that there is a completely different, much more pleasant, much more satisfying, and much more fulfilling, way to Be. All that having been said, in order to flow at least some of your Attention toward the Formless, and thereby become to some degree conscious of That, conscious of the Formless, conscious of Consciousness, conscious of what is ultimately your true Self, you must at some point withdraw some of your Attention from form, i.e., you must direct some of the flow of your Beingness in a direction other than toward form, because in the absence of that Movement you have no Attention to give to what is ultimately your Self, and so no way of Knowing what is ultimately your formless Self.

The Formless can become conscious of Itself, can become conscious of Consciousness, in the same way it can be conscious of form, but it cannot do so under any and all conditions. For individualized Consciousness to be conscious of Itself requires the involvement of that individualized Consciousness in a particular relation with Itself, and because the consciousness of Consciousness requires a particular relation, and because for every relation there is an opposite relation, there then must be an opposite relation in which individualized Consciousness can be involved with Itself in which individualized Consciousness is not conscious of Itself. And that opposite relation with Itself, in which relation individualized Consciousness is not conscious of Itself, in which relation individualized Consciousness cannot be conscious of Itself, is the relation in which individualized Consciousness is involved with Itself when it is identified with form, which is to say, the relation in which individualized Consciousness must be involved with Itself in order to create the knowledge or experience of itself as some form. And as long as an individualized Beingness continues to be involved in that relation, i.e., in the relation that is creating its identification with form, that individualized Beingness is simply not able to become involved in the opposite relation necessary for it to become directly conscious of Itself as Formlessness, directly conscious of its formless Self, directly conscious of its formless Nature, absent any intervening form, including the concept of formlessness. The impossibility of being involved simultaneously in opposite and so mutually exclusive relations is not a condition that a

single individualized Beingness is able to overcome. If an individualized Beingness is involved in one relation with Itself then it is by definition not involved in the opposite relation with Itself. Thus, in order for an individualized Beingness to become directly conscious of Itself as it Is, i.e., as a Formlessness rather than as a form, that Beingness must withdraw to some degree from its complete involvement in the relation with Itself that is creating its identification with form so that the possibility of its becoming involved in the opposite relation can arise.

Throughout time there have been many human Beings, many teachers, who have Awoken to one degree or another from the dream of form-identification, and having done so they did what they could to point their fellow Beings in the direction of the Formlessness to which they Awoke when the dream more or less ended, for those who have Awoken to the Formlessness know that all that can be done with words is to point toward it, because they know that what they are pointing toward is Itself beyond words, because it is beyond form. And none of those teachers, living or otherwise, no matter how great, no matter how fully Realized, no matter how fully Awake, can carry you across the threshold from form into No-form, across the threshold from form-identification, where what you are remains hidden from you, into identification with the Formless, where what you are is revealed to you. All those teachers can do, the very most that any one of them or even all of them can do, is use form to take you to that threshold and then use form to point you in the direction beyond which no form may pass, which threshold into No-form you may cross because you are not a form, but which threshold into No-form you may not cross while still carrying with you your form-identity, which is to say, while still knowing yourself fully as form.

You cannot cross the threshold into No-form while still knowing yourself fully as form because as long as you remain fully identified with form you remain fully involved in the Movement that is the opposite of the Movement in which you must become involved in order to cross the threshold into No-form. Put another way, you cannot cross the threshold beyond which no form may pass while still primarily identified with form because the ceaseless Movement of one's full Attention toward form that is part and parcel of both form-identification, as well as the reactive Movements that identification with form makes so seemingly natural and necessary, is the opposite of the Movement of Attention toward the Formless that is the awareness of Awareness, the consciousness of Consciousness, that is itself the crossing of the threshold into No-form.

Every movement of individualized Consciousness, every flow of individualized Beingness, makes it impossible for that same point of Beingness to simultaneously Move or Flow in the opposite way. This is the limitation which Beingness that is being in relation to Itself unavoidably imposes upon Itself. And since this universe is composed of Beingness that is being in relation to Itself, thereby becoming Form and apprehending form, this is a limitation that we, as Beingness operating in this universe, cannot ourselves avoid. This limitation produces all appearance of the world as this or that form, as this limitation makes it impossible for a single individualized Beingness to simultaneously become involved in the opposite relations with Beingness necessary to create what that individualized Beingness would apprehend as opposite forms, so that everything must, in any one moment, appear to a single individualized Beingness as either this or that form, as either this or that reality. And this same limitation of relation is also what makes it impossible for individualized Beingness to Know Itself as it Is, i.e., as a Formlessness, while actively knowing itself as some form. Put another way, it is for the same

reason that when a wave-form is observed that the particle-form becomes hidden, which phenomenon is referred to as wave-particle duality, or that to the extent to which any form is observed that to that same extent the opposite form becomes hidden, which phenomenon is referred to as uncertainty, that to the extent to which we know ourselves as form that to that same extent our true formless Nature becomes obscured, which phenomenon is referred to as maya, because in all of these cases, i.e., wave-particle duality, uncertainty, and maya, what is actually happening in order to allow what is apprehended to be apprehended, whether it is some form that is being apprehended or the Formless Itself that is being apprehended, is Beingness being in relation to Itself, Beingness flowing in relation to Itself, and as a result *becoming conscious of what its involvement in that relation has its Attention flowing toward*. And because whatever individualized Beingness is conscious of requires its involvement in some relation, be it the consciousness of this or that form or of the Formless Itself, and because it is not possible for an individualized Beingness to be simultaneously involved with Beingness in what are opposite and so mutually exclusive relations, what a single individualized Beingness can be conscious of in any one moment is unavoidably limited by whatever relations in which that individualized Beingness is already and presently involved as it apprehends whatever it is already and presently apprehending.

However, although individualized Beingness' apprehension of form, as well as its apprehension of the Formless, both require its involvement in some relation with Beingness, there is a difference between the apprehension of form and the apprehension of the Formless, because form must first be created by some relation of Beingness to Itself in order to be apprehended, whereas the Formless already Is and so does not need to be created in order to be apprehended. That is, when individualized Beingness apprehends form, i.e., becomes conscious of some reality, what it is apprehending has been created by some relation of Beingness to Itself. On the other hand, when individualized Beingness apprehends the Formless, i.e., becomes conscious of Consciousness, what it is apprehending has not been created, although the apprehension of the Formless by individualized Beingness does require the coming into being of Form in order to allow for the relation of Beingness to Itself, i.e., the movement of Beingness toward Itself, that is the consciousness of Consciousness. Thus, the apprehension of the Formless does involve Attention being directed primarily toward the Formless rather than primarily toward form, and so does involve some relation of Beingness to Itself. But what is apprehended when it is the Formless that is being apprehended is not something that has been created as a result of that relation, because the Formless already and always Is. The apprehension of the Formless by individualized Beingness may require a relation, but what individualized Beingness apprehends as a result of that relation is, unlike what it apprehends as form, Itself Non-relational, Itself not dependent upon any relation in order to Be. Before the relation it already Was, during the relation it continues to Be, and absent any relation it still Is. And so the relation is necessary, or at least seems to be necessary, to bring about, within this universe of Form, the apprehension of the Formless by the Formless, but that relation is not necessary to bring into Being the Formless Itself, not necessary to bring into Being either That which apprehends or That which is apprehended, which are not two different things but are rather a singular formless Non-thing. Here the mind reaches a limit as we approach with words, with forms, that which is, in its essence, a formless Singularity lying beyond the concepts of form and No-form. Conversely, in order for individualized Beingness to apprehend form as reality, the form apprehended as reality must itself be created by some relation of Beingness to Itself in order for it to even exist as a dual

or two-sided something, one side of which individualized Beingness can then apprehend from its always limited perspective upon that created form as a particular and polarized reality, i.e., as this or that, or as some portion of this and some remaining portion of that.

This is why what formless Beingness apprehends as form, even though it is created by and so arises within formless Beingness, is not Beingness, is not the nature of Beingness, and so creates delusion when Beingness thinks of itself as being this or that, i.e., as being some form. Beingness cannot be found within form any more than substance can be found within shadow. Lesser form is an appearance, an existence; formless Beingness is what Is. Metaphysically speaking, differentiating between the apprehending Formlessness and the forms which that Formlessness apprehends has often been referred to as discrimination between the real and the unreal. However, now that it is possible to understand that reality is simply apprehended form, it seems more useful and internally consistent to speak of this difference as a discrimination between the Actual and the real, referring then to What Is Actually There and the reflection or shadow that only appears to be what is actually there, respectively. This approach does not require that we redefine reality, but allows us to accept reality as it appears, which is as real, but it does require that we understand that that which appears as reality, and so that which we call real, is of the nature of a reflection or shadow, and so only appears to be what is there because it is not what is actually there where it appears to be. In this way of describing the universe, What Is Actually There where reality only appears to be is not Itself then a reality, not Itself real, but is something beyond real, something beyond the collection of diverse reflections that we call reality, and in this particular classification and conceptualization that something beyond real is referred to as the Actual. All these words are just signposts, but the more consistent the signposts that we use are, the more clearly they are able to point, as a group or as a whole, in the direction in which they are intended.

And it is because from within this Dimension of Form, constructed of formless Beingness flowing in relation to Itself, that the apprehension of the Formless, the apprehension of the Uncreated, does require some relation of Beingness to Itself, some relation of the Formless to Itself, that it becomes possible, within this Dimension of Form, for Beingness to lose sight of Itself, to obscure Itself. This Self-obscuring becomes possible within the Dimension of Form because, for the relation that brings about individualized Beingness' apprehension of the Formless to even be possible, through which relation individualized Beingness can Know Itself directly as unconditioned and non-individualized Beingness while still flowing through Form, it must also be possible for individualized Beingness to become involved in the opposite relation which brings about the opposite apprehension, which opposite apprehension in this case is not just the apprehension of form, but is individualized Beingness' apprehension of itself as form, which is another way of saying the identification of individualized Beingness with form. Put another way, for it to be possible for individualized Beingness to Know Itself as it Is within the Dimension of Form it must also be possible for individualized Beingness, operating within the Dimension of Form, to know itself as it is-not. Put yet another way, for there to be the possibility of Self-knowledge within the Dimension of Form, there must also be within that Dimension the possibility of Self-ignorance. The wave-form can only be known where there was, prior to that knowing, also the possibility of knowing the particle-form, and vice versa. Likewise, Self-knowledge can only be had where there was, prior to that Knowing, also the possibility of acquiring Self-ignorance, and vice versa.

The potential for both Self-knowledge and Self-ignorance has always been there and is always there, for that potential rests in the Infinite Potentiality that is the Formless. But the Formless did not evolve Itself into Form, did not become Form, did not mould Itself into the Universe, for the potential to Know Itself to remain only potential. To the contrary, the Formless moulded Itself into the Universe, became Form, in order to actualize and realize directly the Infinite Potential within Itself, the Infinite Potential that is Itself. The Infinite Potential has no form, and also has no Form. The Infinite Potential is beyond form and even Form. But if the Formless remained completely formless, i.e., without Form, it would also remain only potential, and not become either actualized or realized. Converting the Infinite Potential that is the timeless and spaceless Singularity of unconditioned Beingness into the Actual requires formless Beingness to smear Itself out, as it were, into space and time, into Form, to provide seemingly different places and times for the Indivisible Singularity that is the Infinite Potential of Unconditioned Beingness to become an infinity of Actualities appearing as infinitely varied realities. And the way unconditioned Beingness spreads Itself out, as it were, becoming different points in space and different moments in time, while all the while still remaining a spaceless and timeless Singularity, is through iterative and progressive Self-relation, remaining always what it unconditionally Is while simultaneously becoming what it conditionally Is in relation to Itself. What unconditioned Beingness unconditionally Is is Consciousness. What unconditioned Beingness conditionally Is in relation to Itself is Form.

In this Dimension of Form, constructed of formless Beingness flowing in relation to Itself, where all relations of Beingness to Itself are potentially possible, and thus where one relation is possible the opposite relation must also be possible, the only way in which a particular relation of Beingness to Itself becomes no longer possible in a given moment is because the opposite relation is, in that same moment, also no longer possible because it has become Actual, or Actualized. Thus, moving one relation from the realm of the Potential to the Actual also takes the opposite relation out of the realm of the Potential, but does not create its Actuality, but rather makes the simultaneous creation of its Actuality impossible. This is how the evolution of Form has proceeded. We begin with Infinite Potential, and with each relation and each Actualization that Potential becomes constrained to a particular Form. And yet, although the Form is constrained by the relation of Beingness to Itself of which it is composed, because the Form is composed of unconditioned Beingness, albeit unconditioned Beingness flowing in relation to Itself, the Form nonetheless Itself contains Infinite Potential, leaving that Infinite Potential to then express Itself through the Form, through some now and newly possible relation of formless Beingness to Itself that brings into being another constrained Form, through which the Infinite Potential of which the new Form is composed can then express Itself through some now and newly possible relation of Beingness to Itself that brings into being another constrained Form, through which the Infinite Potential of which the new Form is composed can then express Itself, and on and on and on it goes until here we are, that Infinite Potential, that unconditioned Beingness, that Consciousness, flowing through a constrained Form of Itself, Individualized but nonetheless containing ourselves Infinite Potential, and so the potential to become involved in this relation or that relation and so to bring into being this or that Actuality, this or that Form, while simultaneously creating this or that form which form we, as the unconditioned Beingness of which all the Forms are composed, apprehend from a particular perspective within the Dimension of Form as this or that reality.

But for every relation in which we become involved out of the Infinite Potential of relations that lies within us and is us, thereby taking one of those relations from the level of Potential to the level of Actual, thereby bringing into being Form while simultaneously creating form apprehended as reality, we also simultaneously remove from the level of Potential, at least for our Individualized Self, the possibility of our becoming involved in the opposite and so mutually exclusive relation, thereby making it impossible for us to simultaneously bring into being the opposite Actuality, thereby making it impossible for us to simultaneously create the opposite form, thereby making it impossible for us to simultaneously apprehend the opposite reality. And it is only because we ourselves are the Infinite Potential that our involvement in some relation removes from the realm of the Infinite Potential the opposite relation, because once we become involved in some relation, and as long as we are involved in a particular relation, we, i.e., the Infinite Potential, are simply not available and so are simply not able to become involved in the opposite and so mutually exclusive relation, in which case the opposite relation is, for as long as we are involved in a particular relation, no longer part of our now constrained, and yet still infinite, Potential.

However, this removal of a particular relation from the realm of the Potential while we are Actualizing the opposite relation lasts only so long as we continue to Actualize the opposite relation, which is to say, as long as we remain involved in the relation that is bringing into being the Actuality and also creating the form apprehended as reality. That is, if we cease to be involved in a particular relation, then both relations, i.e., the previously Actualized and the non-Actualized, return to the realm of the Potential because we are now available and so able to become involved in either relation, i.e., our involvement in either relation once again becomes possible, in which case the bringing into being of either Actuality and so either reality also once again becomes possible. And so it is that, while involved in the relation in which we bring into being an Actuality within which is created a form that is apprehended or realized as a particular reality, e.g., a particle reality, we simultaneously remove from the realm of the Potential the possibility of our involvement in the opposite and so mutually exclusive relation needed to bring into being the opposite Actuality within which would be created the opposite form that would be apprehended or realized as the opposite reality, which in this case would be a wave reality. However, if we cease to be in the relation that creates a particular reality then our involvement in either relation once again becomes possible and so both relations once again become potential, until one is Actualized thereby simultaneously taking the other off the table, so to speak. Likewise, while involved in the relation in which we identify with form and thereby create Self-ignorance, we simultaneously remove the opposite relation from our individualized Potential and so make impossible our involvement in the relation that is identification with the Formless and the realization of Self-knowledge. However, if we can, even for a moment, cease to be involved in the relation in which we identify with form then both relations return to the Potential and identification with the Formless then becomes possible. But as we shall explore in the next section, the great barrier to Self-knowledge is not the effort, or really the absence of effort, it takes to become involved in the relation in which one identifies with the Formless; rather, the great barrier to Self-knowledge is the difficulty in ceasing to be involved in the relation in which one identifies with form, once one has become involved in that relation, so that the opposite relation that would allow us to identify with the Formless can once again become part of our individualized Potential and so once again becomes even possible.

The self-perpetuating nature of the Movement into identification with form

As described in the last section, the duality between the Knowledge and the Ignorance, which is to say, between Self-knowledge and Self-ignorance, is not a duality between the apprehension of form and the apprehension of the Formless, but is a duality between Beingness' apprehension of itself as form and Beingness' apprehension of Itself as formless Beingness, a duality between Beingness' identification with what it is aware of or conscious of as form and Beingness' identification with what it is or can be aware of or conscious of as formless Beingness. And so, the duality between Self-knowledge and Self-ignorance arises from a duality of opposite and mutually exclusive movements of Beingness in relation to Itself, one of which Movements causes individualized Beingness to become identified with form and the other of which Movements allows individualized Beingness to become aware of Awareness, or conscious of Consciousness, absent any intervening forms, including the concepts of Awareness and Consciousness, thereby making it possible for formless Beingness to Know and identify with Itself. Those then are the two mutually exclusive relations, those are the two mutually exclusive movements of Beingness within the Dimension of Form, within the Dimension composed of Itself flowing in relation to Itself, that underlie the opposite states of Being that are Self-knowledge and Self-ignorance.

And as mentioned at the end of the last section, the difficulty individualized Beingness faces with regard to becoming involved in the relation that would allow it to identify with the Formless does not confront individualized Beingness as a result of that relation being a difficult relation in which to become involved, as it is not. Rather, the difficulty faced by individualized Beingness with regard to becoming involved in the relation with Itself that would allow it to identify with the Formless is the difficulty that surrounds individualized Beingness' ceasing to be involved in the relation with Itself that is creating its identification with form, in which relation it must to some degree cease to be involved in order for there to arise the possibility of its becoming involved in the opposite relation that would allow it to identify with the Formless. The difficulty that surrounds individualized Beingness' ceasing to be involved in the relation with Itself that is creating its identification with form has as its basis the self-perpetuating nature of the movement of Beingness into the relation with Itself that creates its identification with form. That is, once individualized Beingness moves or flows Itself into the relation with Itself that causes it to identify with form, the delusion of form-identification which that Movement and relation creates sets into motion a process that has as its result the continued and ongoing movement of form-identified individualized Beingness into the relation that causes it to identify with form, regardless of any effort made by that individualized Beingness to disidentify with form, because, as will be described, the perpetuation of that process is fueled by the efforts that naturally arise as individualized Beingness tries to escape the suffering that unavoidably and inevitably arises within Itself once it has identified with form.

The reason that the movement of individualized Beingness into the relation with Itself that causes it to identify with form is self-perpetuating, which movement into that relation simultaneously removes from possibility its opposite movement into the relation with Itself that would allow for its identification with the Formless, is because, from within the reality of form-identification, any movement that form-identified individualized Beingness makes to extricate its illusory self from the suffering it inevitably experiences as a result of its identification with form

is actually a Movement that is a continuation and so perpetuation of the movement of Beingness into the relation with Itself that is causing it to identify with form. Thus, any effort to escape the suffering created by its identification with form only perpetuates the relation in which individualized Beingness is involved with Itself that is itself the cause of its suffering. And as long as an individualized Beingness remains completely involved in the relation that creates its identification with form, it simply is not possible for that individualized Beingness to become involved to any degree in the opposite and so mutually exclusive relation with Itself necessary to allow for its consciousness of and identification with its formless Self, i.e., with the Formless. This perpetuation of the relation that creates Beingness' identification with form occurs once individualized Beingness has identified with form because virtually all Movements made from within the reality of form-identification tend to be reactive Movements that have the individualized Beingness' identification with form as their basis, as form-identified individualized Beingness reacts to apprehended form with either attachment, aversion, or reflexive allowing. In any case, regardless of whether the reaction to form is one of attachment, aversion, or reflexive allowing, because these reactive Movements have the Movement and so relation that creates form-identification as their basis, they serve to lock, knot, and bind individualized Beingness into the relation that creates its identification with form, as shown in figure 31.




Figure 31 Depicted on the left in the form of a rope or string is the movement or flow of individualized Beingness into the relation with Itself that creates, for that individualized Beingness, the reality that is its identification with form. Depicted on the right is a reactive movement or flow of that now form-identified individualized Beingness into a relation of attachment, aversion, or reflexive allowing, which reactive Movement follows naturally and unavoidably once Beingness has identified with form. What this drawing shows is that, since the movement of individualized Beingness into the reactive relations of attachment, aversion, and reflexive allowing are secondary Movements and relations that have as their basis the already present and so primary Movement and relation of individualized Beingness into form-identification, that these reactive secondary Movements must then lock, knot, and bind individualized Beingness into the primary Movement and relation with Itself that is creating its identification with form, thereby effectively trapping that individualized Beingness in the reality

of form-identification as long as that Beingness remains engaged and involved in the reactive Movements and relations that seem to be both natural and necessary while it is identified with form.

In general, a Movement that has another Movement as its basis can only continue as long as the Movement that is its basis also continues. Therefore, the presence of a secondary Movement not only implies the presence of the primary Movement that is its basis, but even more importantly, the presence of a secondary Movement essentially forces or causes the continuation of the primary Movement that is its basis. Every movement of Beingness is ultimately a Movement in relation to Itself, because there actually is nothing else, and so ultimately every movement of Beingness brings into being some relation of Beingness to Itself. The Movement that brings into being the relation that allows individualized Beingness to identify with the Formless is one Movement, whereas the Movement that brings into being the opposite relation that causes individualized Beingness to identify with form is the opposite Movement. Likewise, the reactive Movements of attachment, aversion, and reflexive allowing also bring into being a relation of Beingness to Itself. However, since the relation that is brought into being by the reactive Movements of attachment, aversion, and reflexive allowing has as its basis an already present Movement and relation, those reactive secondary Movements not only create a new relation of Beingness to Itself, but they also lock into place the primary Movement and relation that is their basis, since these reactive Movements are ultimately a progression of the primary Movement of Beingness into identification with form.

What figure 31 shows is that secondary Movements and relations cannot do other than lock into place and so perpetuate the primary Movement and relation that is their basis. For this reason, the reactive, unconscious, and secondary Movements of attachment, aversion, and reflexive allowing bind individualized Beingness to the primary Movement and relation that is creating its identification with form, because it is not possible for individualized Beingness to cease to be involved in that primary Movement and relation as long as that primary Movement and relation is serving as the basis for that individualized Beingness' subsequent reactive Movement. Thus, a reactive Movement is simply a Movement or Action that is actually the continuation and natural progression of a previous Movement or Action, and is therefore a re-Action, and so is called a reactive Movement. Put another way, the primary Movement and relation cannot itself cease as long as it is fueling a secondary Movement and relation, because the secondary Movement and relation can only be Actualized as long as the primary Movement and relation itself remains Actualized.

The reason this binding of individualized Beingness into a primary Movement and relation as the result of its subsequent involvement in a secondary Movement and relation that has that primary Movement and relation as its basis is important to understand is because this is the essential mechanism that causes the perpetuation of form-identification once individualized Beingness has identified with form. And the reason it is important to understand the essential mechanism that perpetuates form-identification is because, as long as form-identification is being perpetuated by this mechanism, which means that as long as individualized Beingness is locked into or bound to the primary Movement and relation that is creating its identification with form by its subsequent involvement in the reactive secondary Movements of attachment, aversion, and reflexive allowing, then it is not even potentially possible for that individualized Beingness to undertake the opposite primary Movement and so not even potentially possible for that individualized

Beingness to become involved in the opposite primary relation that would allow it to identify with the Formless. In other words, as long as form-identified individualized Beingness is moving or flowing Itself into attachment, aversion, or reflexive allowing, it is not even potentially possible, in that same moment, for that individualized Beingness to identify with the Formless, and so not even potentially possible for that individualized Beingness, in that moment, to do other than remain in Self-ignorance, blind to its true nature as formless Sachchidananda, i.e., Beingness-Consciousness-Bliss.


As stated previously, individualized Beingness contains Infinite Potential because it is Infinite Potential. Thus, even while identified with form individualized Beingness remains Infinite Potential. However, while identified with form that Infinite Potential seems to be constrained to reactive Movements, two of which create suffering for the individualized Beingness, and all of which bind that Beingness to its identification with form. These reactive Movements, i.e., attachment, aversion, and reflexive allowing, appear to be the only Movements possible once individualized Beingness has identified with form and so is viewing the world through the egoic lens, i.e., filtering all experience through the form or collection of forms it takes for itself. For this reason, once individualized Beingness has identified with form it either reactively Moves to cling in some way to those forms that seem to be needed to enhance its form-identity, reactively Moves to push away, run from, or eliminate in some way those forms that seem to diminish its form-identity, or reflexively allows those forms that already seem to be in some way enhancing its form-identity, whereas those forms that appear to do nothing to either enhance or diminish the form-identity are simply ignored.

Here it must be noted that the reactive secondary Movement that is the reflexive allowing of form, which Movement does not directly produce suffering, only becomes possible and only arises in those relatively rare moments when the reactive Movements of attachment and aversion do not seem to be needed in that moment to either enhance or avoid the diminishment of the form-identity, because the forms being apprehended in that moment appear to have already reached an optimal arrangement toward those two ends. But the moment a form arises that is not arranged optimally, then the reactive Movements of attachment and aversion resume, along with the suffering those Movements create, because the reactive Movement of reflexive allowing, even though it did not directly produce suffering, nonetheless sustained the primary Movement into identification with form and so sustained the primary Movement that invariably and inevitably leads to the reactive secondary Movements of attachment and aversion that do produce suffering. In this way, even reflexive allowing, which causes Beingness to flow in alignment with Itself and so produces a form apprehended by Beingness as a wanted emotional experience or reality, is itself an indirect source of suffering, as it serves to maintain or sustain the primary Movement into form-identification that invariably and inevitably leads to the reactive and Self-oppositional Movements of attachment and aversion. Perhaps this is why St. Francis, as well as many others, sought hardship rather than comfort, and why Lao Tzu wrote, "Which is more dangerous, success or failure?"

The way out of form-identification

This limitation that arises for individualized Beingness once it has identified with form, limited to the reactive and unconscious Movements of attachment, aversion, and reflexive allowing, two of which Movements directly create suffering, and all of which Movements serve to bind Beingness to its identification with form, thereby making impossible the identification of that Beingness with its formless Self, is the only bondage there is. To free one's Self from this bondage, to free one's Self from being trapped within this self-perpetuating pattern of Flow that both blinds one to their true Nature and causes one to suffer, is the goal, so to speak, of Beingness as it flows individualized through human Form. And once that goal has been reached, to whatever degree, an additional goal arises, and that goal is to assist other individual flows of Beingness, in whatever way one is Moved, in their attempts to release themselves from that same bondage. It is toward both of those ends that all of this has been written, and it is toward both of those ends that I will now describe, to the best of my present ability, understanding, and Realization, the way out of the seemingly inescapable trap of form-identification into which we unavoidably Flow as we Flow through human Form.

So much has just been written regarding the way in which we become trapped in form-identification through our involvement in the reactive Movements of attachment, aversion, and reflexive allowing because once a trap is understood the way out, if there is a way out, becomes obvious, or if not obvious at least perhaps easier to locate. And there is always a way out, because there had to be a way in, else one would not find themselves trapped. And as has just been described, the way in which we become trapped in form-identification is not so much through our identification with form, because that Movement, while necessary, is not itself the Movement that springs the trap shut. Rather, as shown in figures 32 and 33, the way in which we become trapped in form-identification, once we have unavoidably wandered into it by virtue of being born human, is through the secondary and reactive Movements of attachment, aversion, and reflexive allowing in which we also unavoidably become involved once we have identified with form.



Infinite Potential of individualized Beingness constrained to the secondary and reactive Movements of attachment, aversion, and reflexive allowing that bind it to the primary Movement that is creating its identification with form

Figure 32 What this drawing shows is, at the bottom, the cycle of Self-ignorance in which human Beings become trapped once they unavoidably identify with form and so begin to naturally and reactively move or flow their individualized Beingness into the relations of attachment, aversion, and reflexive allowing with apprehended form. What is shown at the top is the movement of individualized Beingness into identification with the Formless, which primary Movement can only occur once individualized Beingness is no longer binding Itself, through its involvement in the reactive secondary Movements of attachment, aversion, and reflexive allowing, to the opposite primary Movement that is creating its identification with form. As long as individualized Beingness is identified with form, its secondary Movements are limited almost exclusively to reactive Movements, as such a form-identified Beingness feels an obligation to react to whatever forms it apprehends according to its particular conditioning, i.e., according to the particular set of forms it knows as itself. Conversely, once the primary Movement of individualized Beingness is a Movement into identification with the Formless, its secondary Movements are no longer reactive and so are no longer constrained, but are instead

able to fully express the Infinite Potential inherent in the individualized Beingness. Also, the secondary Movements that have the primary Movement of identification with the Formless as their basis also serve to bind individualized Beingness to the primary Movement that is their basis, but because what the individualized Beingness is being bound to in this case is a Movement into the direct Realization of its nature as the Infinite and Eternal, the Spaceless and the Timeless, the result of its becoming bound to that primary Movement by any subsequent secondary Movements is not Self-delusion and bondage, as is the case when the primary Movement is into form-identification, but is rather a deepening or intensification of the direct Realization of its formless Nature.




Figure 33 The particular trap in which we find ourselves, i.e., the trap of form-identification, is sort of like a Chinese finger trap, inasmuch as it is a very easy trap to Move into, but once in that trap almost any Movement we make, including any effort to try and extricate ourselves from the trap, is a Movement and effort that only serves to keep us held within the trap, which in this case means we remain bound to the Movement that creates our identification with form. This is because the only Movements that seem either reasonable or possible while identified with form are the reactive Movements of attachment, aversion, and reflexive allowing, which Movements are actually secondary Movements that bind us to the primary Movement that is creating our identification with form, and so are Movements that trap us in the state of form-identification. And while operating completely in the state of form-identification, as occurs while involved in these reactive secondary Movements, our formless Nature becomes hidden in plain sight, as all of our Attention is then being directed toward form. Thus, the problem, such as it is, is not so much our Movement into form-identification; rather the problem, i.e., that which actually keeps us trapped in form-identification and so keeps hidden from us our formless Nature, are the reactive Movements in which we remain almost continuously involved once we have Moved into identification with form.

Thus, the reason so many seek but so few find is because the nature of the trap of form-identification is such that any effort to escape the trap is actually a Movement that activates the trap, because all efforts to escape the trap, since they are efforts and so Movements that arise while identified with form, are ultimately reactive Movements of either attachment, aversion, or reflexive allowing that bind one to the state one is, through one's efforts and Movements, actually trying to escape. Even trying to feel good and succeeding at it still keeps one trapped within form-identification, if that success at creating emotional wantedness has as its basis a reactive and so reflexive allowing of apprehended form. Additionally, what so many are seeking

but so few find is a way out of the suffering that is unavoidably created as form-identified individualized Beingness reacts to the world, both inner and outer, through the inherently Self-oppositional Movements of attachment and aversion. And the reason so few find a way out of that suffering is because in seeking a way out one almost always, without knowing it, eliminates the only way out, because one almost always seeks the way out through some effort and so through what is actually a reactive Movement into either attachment or aversion, thereby locking into place the Movement into form-identification that is ultimately the source of the suffering one is trying to escape.

It is this understanding of *the utter futility and counterproductivity of any effort to escape the trap of form-identification* that itself points the way out of the trap. As just stated, almost all efforts to escape the trap of form-identification are efforts to escape the suffering we unavoidably create and endure as a result of our subsequent involvement in the reactive, secondary, and inherently Self-oppositional Movements of attachment and aversion that follow naturally, but not effortlessly, from our primary Movement into identification with form. The only way to escape the trap is to cease trying to escape the trap, the only way to put an end to the suffering is to stop trying to put an end to the suffering. Thus, the only way out is to cease all efforts to get out. But *how does one cease effort in a way that is not itself just a more subtle effort?* That is, how does one, while still identified with form, cease effort in a way that is not just a more subtle Movement into the relations of attachment or aversion by which one is unknowingly chaining themselves to the wall of the dark and yet shadow-filled cave that is the state of form-identification? This is where the difficulty arises, and it is the Seeker's failure to understand and identify this difficulty that keeps one forever seeking, forever looking for a way out of the cave that one is, through one's own efforts to escape the cave, unknowingly keeping themselves chained within.

Thus, with regard to ceasing to be bound to the primary Movement that creates one's identification with form so that one is then free to become involved in the opposite primary Movement that is identification with the Formless, the crux of the matter is as follows: *How does one, while fully identified with form, cease to involve themselves in reactive Movements in a way that is not itself just a more subtle reactive Movement* that serves to maintain one's complete identification with form? And the answer to this perennial conundrum is as follows: One has to realize, while still identified with form, i.e., from within form-identification, that another Movement is possible, a Movement that is not a reactive Movement, and having realized the possibility of this non-reactive Movement, one must then convert that possibility into an Actuality by simply Moving in that way.

This non-reactive Movement involves nothing more than individualized Beingness being what it already and always is, but being what it does not know it is while identified with form. And what individualized Beingness already and always is, but what it does not know it is while identified with form, is pure Awareness or Consciousness. That is, *the non-reactive Movement* that unravels the knot of form-identification while simultaneously Moving one in the direction of identification with the Formless *involves Beingness doing nothing more than simply being aware or conscious of the forms which it is, in that moment, already aware or conscious*, which forms it would otherwise be reacting toward with attachment, aversion, or reflexive allowing. Thus, it is the non-reactive Movement toward apprehended forms in simple or pure Awareness or

Consciousness of those forms, as opposed to the reactive Movement toward those forms in attachment, aversion, or reflexive allowing, that is the Movement which can free form-identified individualized human Beingness from the self-perpetuating trap of form-identification into which it has unavoidably wandered. Any other Movement, from within form-identification, can only be a more or less subtle reactive Movement that binds one to, rather than frees one from, the form-identification that is itself the source of the suffering that individualized human Beingness is trying to escape.

There is nothing more natural than your Being Aware or Conscious. Being simply Aware or Conscious requires no effort because it is intrinsic to and inseparable from your true Nature. You cannot help but Be Aware or Conscious, because beyond the veil of form that you may think you are, you actually are, whether you are aware of it or not, Sachchidananda, i.e., Beingness-Consciousness-Bliss. On the other hand, reactive Movement toward form is something extra, something not actually needed, but something that arises as seemingly needed and necessary, and so seemingly naturally, from within form-identification, which is to say, once individualized Beingness has identified with form and so sees itself as something that can be made more or less, enhanced or diminished. And because that reactivity toward form is a Movement that is a continuation of the Movement that creates the identification of individualized Beingness with form, that reactivity toward form is a Movement that can only perpetuate the identification of individualized Beingness with form, and in so doing also perpetuate the seeming need and necessity for, and the seeming naturalness of, the reactivity toward form that is perpetuating the identification with form, which identification with form perpetuates the reactivity, which reactivity perpetuates the identification with form, and on and on and on it goes. And because this cycle in which formless Beingness becomes trapped in a Movement into identification with form is fueled and perpetuated by its own reactive Movement, the only way out is for Beingness to cease that reactive Movement. But the only way for Beingness to cease that reactive Movement in a way that is not just a more subtle reactive Movement is to become involved instead in the opposite Movement, which opposite Movement is the Movement of non-reactivity toward apprehended form. And because non-reactivity toward form is the Movement that is the opposite of reactive Movement toward form, and because reactive Movement toward form is a continuation of the Movement into identification with form, non-reactive Movement is therefore a Movement that is the opposite of the Movement into identification with form and is therefore Movement in the direction of realizing and identifying with the Formless, as shown in figure 34.




Figure 34 As shown at the top, once Beingness moves into identification with form, the reactive Movements of attachment, aversion, and reflexive allowing then seem to be the natural Movements, and so then seem to be the only Movements possible. And while involved in any of these reactive Movements the flow of individualized Beingness becomes bound to the flow that is creating its identification with form, thereby effectively trapping the flow of that individualized Beingness completely within form-identification, in which state of complete form-identification Beingness becomes unaware of the pervasive Formlessness that is its true nature, owing to its complete Attention being given to the forms that are arising within that Formlessness, i.e., within its formless Awareness. However, as shown at the bottom, if individualized Beingness, while still identified with form, is able to not become involved in these reactive Movements when faced with a form or forms which it would normally react to, then its non-involvement in those reactive Movements is itself a Movement that is the opposite of those reactive Movements. And this non-reactive Movement, because it is a Movement that is the opposite of the reactive Movements, which reactive Movements are continuations of its Movement into form-identification, is also a Movement that is the opposite of the Movement into identification with form, and so is the Movement that not only causes form-identified Beingness to stop depressing the lever that has it trapped in form-identification, but is also the primary Movement that will, if it is maintained long enough or if it is intense enough, take individualized Beingness into the direct Realization of its true Nature and so into identification with the Formless.

This non-reactive Movement is an allowing of form, but it is not a reactive allowing, and so not a reflexive allowing that derives from identification with form, and so is not a Movement that perpetuates Beingness' identification with form. This is a subtle but vital distinction. This non-

reactive Movement that is a non-reactive and so non-reflexive allowing of form is not a reaction to form, but is an unconditional allowing of form, which unconditional allowing of form must be differentiated from the reactive, reflexive, and conditional allowing of form in which form-identified individualized Beingness usually engages. In the reactive and so reflexive allowing of form Beingness allows, i.e., does not in some way internally oppose, only those forms that appear to be in some way already serving the needs of its form-identity. This is the condition under which form-identified individualized Beingness reacts to forms with reflexive allowing or non-opposition, with all other apprehended forms being either ignored or reacted to with attachment or aversion. However, when a form that is being reactively, reflexively, and so conditionally allowed begins to change, such that that form no longer seems or appears to be serving the needs of one's form-identity, then that reactive and reflexive allowing very quickly turns into the reactive Movements of either attachment or aversion, in which case the thing or person that once seemed to make you happy now seems to make you sad or angry instead. On the other hand, in the non-reactive and so unconditional allowing of form Beingness allows, i.e., does not in some way internally oppose, whatever forms appear or arise within its Awareness or Consciousness, regardless of how those forms seem or appear to affect its form-identity. Thus, the relation of such a Beingness to form, as well as to Itself, is unconditional, or not dependent upon a condition, and so does not change from one sort of reactivity to another as the form invariably changes, but remains instead non-reactive and consistent throughout. Both Movements, i.e., reactive and non-reactive allowing, create emotional wantedness, but only the latter Movement allows the veil of form to fall away from the Formless, because the latter Movement, unlike the former Movement, does not derive from the Movement of individualized Beingness into identification with form and so does not perpetuate that Movement, and so does not perpetuate the delusion and illusion that Movement produces through its obscuring of the Formless, which delusion is the idea harbored by formless Beingness that it is form, and which illusion is the idea harbored by formless Beingness that form is what is actually there where it appears to be.

It is important to note that the non-reactive Movement that is the non-reactive allowing of form does not mean non-action, it only means that whatever action does arise, if action arises, arises not as a limited and constrained reaction to form based upon whatever idea one has regarding how that form can best be manipulated to serve the needs of the form-identity, but arises instead unconstrained from the Formlessness that is the field of Infinite Potentiality from which all Movement and Action, whether constrained or unconstrained, ultimately arises. Along those same lines, it is also important to note that what is being discussed here as both reactive and non-reactive Movements refer to internal Movements, to Movements that are occurring at the level of formless Beingness, as formless Beingness flows Itself this way or that, into this or that relation with Itself. And it is as an extension of those internal Movements and relations that all external action or movement arises. Thus, it is relatively easy to predict how a completely form-identified human Being will act under certain external circumstances, because their actions extend from the very limited set of internal reactive Movements that are available to such a form-identified Beingness. Conversely, it is impossible to predict how a human Being that is no longer identified with form will act under certain external circumstances, because their actions extend directly from the Infinite Potential of the Formless, as that Potential is allowed to non-reactively flow through the Form, and so allowed to non-reactively express Itself through the Form, without being diverted, inverted, and perverted by any reactive Movements toward form.

If this non-reactive Movement is the way out of form-identification and the suffering such form-identification invariably produces, then why is this non-reactive Movement almost always overlooked by individualized Beingness as it searches for a way out of the suffering that unavoidably arises within Itself while it remains identified with form? The reason this non-reactive Movement is almost always overlooked by form-identified Beingness is because, while fully identified with form, the only Movements that seem reasonable and worthwhile to such a Beingness are the reactive Movements of attachment, aversion, and reflexive allowing. This non-reactive Movement is always there as an option, but the non-reactive Movement does not present itself to form-identified Beingness as a truly valid option, because it is an option that, from the perspective of form-identified Beingness, i.e., from the perspective of the Ego, not only does not appear to do anything for the form-identity, which is to say, does not do anything for what form-identified individualized Beingness mistakenly knows itself to be, but even more importantly, this non-reactive Movement actually seems or appears, from the perspective of the Ego, to be detrimental to the form-identity, since it seems to the Ego that making no effort to cling to that which is wanted or to push away that which is unwanted represents a passive diminishment of its form-identity. It is for these reasons that the non-reactive Movement is actively avoided by the Ego, which is to say, by form-identified Beingness. Thus, the first difficulty faced by form-identified Beingness in undertaking this non-reactive Movement lies in realizing or becoming aware, while still identified with form, that such a Movement is both possible as well as worthwhile.

The second difficulty faced by form-identified Beingness in undertaking this non-reactive Movement has to do with the mutually exclusive nature of the reactive Movements that bind one to identification with form and the non-reactive Movement that frees one from identification with form. That is, while fully involved in any of the three reactive Movements that seems to naturally follow once one has identified with form, i.e., attachment, aversion, or reflexive allowing, the non-reactive Movement cannot possibly be Actualized, because the non-reactive Movement is a Movement that is the opposite of, and so therefore mutually exclusive of, the reactive Movements into attachment, aversion, and reflexive allowing. Thus, the non-reactive Movement only becomes possible, and so can only be Actualized, in a moment when one is not already completely involved in one of the reactive Movements, because to not become fully involved in those reactive Movements when faced with a form or forms that one would, under "normal" circumstances, i.e., while identified with form, react to with either attachment, aversion, or reflexive allowing, is itself the non-reactive Movement that is the opposite of the Movement into identification with form.

All that having been said, how can one put this information to use while still fully identified with form, and so while fully involved and caught up in the reactive Movements that are mutually exclusive of the non-reactive Movement that is necessary to free one from complete identification with form? To begin to become involved in the non-reactive Movement while still fully identified with form, and so to begin to lessen one's Flow or Movement into identification with form while still identified with form, and so while still seemingly limited to the reactive Movements of attachment, aversion, and reflexive allowing, *one need only become aware or conscious of one's involvement in those reactive Movements* as that involvement is occurring, because to become simply aware of a reactive Movement is itself the non-reactive Movement. And so, to begin to become aware or conscious of one's involvement in the reactive Movements

is itself the beginning of one's involvement in the opposite Movement, and is also then the beginning of one's withdrawal from full participation and involvement in those reactive Movements, because the only way to become aware of one's involvement in those reactive Movements, while still engaged in those reactive Movements, is to withdraw some portion of the flow of one's Beingness from that Movement, which withdrawal from one Movement is then, by definition, an entry into and involvement in the opposite Movement. As an analogy, one cannot see the flow of a river in which one is completely immersed, But if one steps out of that flow to some degree, then one is able to see the flow of the river. Likewise, while completely immersed in reactive Movement one cannot be aware of that Movement. It is only when one steps out of that Movement to some degree that one is able to become aware of that Movement, which simple and pure Awareness of that Movement is itself the opposite Movement.

How then does one begin to become aware of one's involvement in the reactive Movements while still involved in those reactive Movements and so still Moving into identification with form? One begins to become aware of one's involvement in the reactive Movements by simply becoming aware of the emotional form or reality that one is creating in that moment through whatever reactive Movement in which one is, in that moment, involved, without reacting to that emotional form, because being aware of a form and not reacting to that form is itself the non-reactive Movement. And it is only once one has withdrawn to some degree from involvement in the reactive Movements, by becoming non-reactively aware of the emotional forms that are most immediately and directly being created by those reactive Movements, that one is then able, from that perspective of non-reactive Awareness, to become simply aware of their involvement in the reactive Movement itself, and so in that way to further withdraw from the reactive Movement by becoming more involved in the non-reactive Movement.

If you are fully identified with form, which is quite possible, but nothing personal, then you cannot, in this moment, just cease to identify with form, owing to the self-perpetuating nature of form-identification, because trying to cease to identify with form is itself a reactive Movement of aversion that can only perpetuate your Movement into identification with form. However, what you can do in this moment, and what you can do in any moment, is participate and become involved in the opposite non-reactive Movement by simply becoming aware or conscious of the reactive Movements in which you are becoming involved, by becoming non-reactively aware or conscious of the emotional forms that are arising through those reactive Movements. However, the trick here is to become aware of your involvement in those reactive Movements and the emotions they produce without then reacting to your awareness of your involvement in those Movements or the emotions they produce, because if you do that, then you are just once again entering into full reactivity and so full Movement into identification with form at a more subtle level. At this point a concrete example of how one can become involved in these different Movements would probably be helpful.

Let us say that you are driving to or from work and are in a hurry to get where you are going because that is just how form-identified human Beings live, almost always in a hurry to get from where they are to where they are going, because where one is is almost always never quite enough, and so where one is going almost always seems more important. In any case, as you are driving the light turns red just as you get to the intersection and you feel yourself become slightly or even greatly irritated at this delay. The actual cause of this feeling of irritation is not the red

light itself, but is an internal Movement that is your reactive Movement of aversion to the red light that is keeping you from getting, for the moment, to where you want to go or be. If there is, at that moment, only the irritation then there is only the reactive Movement. But if there is, at that moment, not just the irritation, but an Awareness of the irritation, which Awareness is not itself caught up in the irritation, but is just observing or aware of the irritation, then that pure Awareness of the irritation is that portion of your individualized Beingness that is not Moving reactively, but is instead Moving non-reactively. The portion of your individualized Beingness that is Moving reactively is also aware of the irritation, otherwise you would not feel irritated, but the portion of your Beingness that is Moving reactively is not able to be aware of the irritation as something separate or distinct from itself, but instead only knows itself as irritated, or as being irritated, because that portion of your Beingness, i.e., the portion that is engaged in reactive Movement, is fully identified with the forms of which it becomes aware. In contrast, if you are able to become, to any degree, simply aware of the irritation, and so non-reactively aware of the irritation, meaning that you are aware of the irritation but not reacting to it, not trying to push it away, then that non-reactive portion of your Beingness is able to be aware of the irritation as something separate and distinct from Itself, because that portion of your Beingness is not identified with the forms of which it becomes aware. Thus, in such a situation, Beingness that is Moving only reactively thinks "I am irritated," because to such a Beingness what it is and what it is aware of as the irritation are one, as they are linked through the reactive Beingness' identification with form. On the other hand, Beingness that is Moving at least to some degree non-reactively thinks "I feel irritation," because to such a Beingness what it is and what it is aware of are not one, as non-reactive Beingness is not identifying with that form, and so not linking or tethering Itself to that form, i.e., to the apprehended irritation. This is a subtle but important distinction, as this is the difference between continued unconscious Movement completely into form-identification and the beginning of conscious Movement out of identification with form and into identification with the Formless.

And so let us say that you become non-reactively aware of your irritation, and so to some degree have withdrawn from completely reactive Movement and have instead to some degree entered into non-reactive Movement. At that point what usually happens, at least in the early stages of withdrawal from complete identification with form, is that once you become aware of the irritation there then arises a reactive Movement of aversion toward the irritation itself, as you then think that you should not be irritated by a little red light. In this reactive Movement one then no longer seems to be irritated just by the red light, but now seems to be irritated also by themselves and their unconscious reaction to the red light, when in actuality the irritation once again has as its source a reactive Movement toward some apprehended form. Become aware of the emotion and become aware of the reactive Movement toward form that is creating the emotion, and then do not react to either. But if you do react to either then just become non-reactively aware of the emotional form that is being created by that reactive Movement. Non-reactive Awareness or Consciousness, that is all that is required to withdraw one's Beingness from continued and ceaseless Movement into identification with form. It does not matter where you begin to withdraw from reactive Movement, it only matters that you do begin to withdraw, at some point, by becoming involved instead in the opposite Movement, by doing nothing more than allowing yourself to be aware of whatever forms you are presently aware of, both internal and external, without reacting to them. Anything else, any effort to cease or end one's Movement

into identification with form, only ends up being another reactive Movement that binds one to the Movement one is trying escape.

(Continued in Part 3: The Identification of the Formless God with Itself (2))