

OPEN
SECRET

WEI WU WEI

First Sentient Publications edition, 2004

Copyright © 2004 by Hong Kong University Press.

Reprinted in the United States by Sentient Publications, by arrangement with Hong Kong University Press, Hong Kong.

Chapter 6, “I Am Not, but the Universe Is My Self;” chapter 53, “Seeing It Simply;” and chapter 54, “The Essential Identity,” are reprinted by kind permission of the Editor of *The Mountain Path* (issues of January, July, and October 1964), Shri Ramanashramam, Tiruvannamalai, S. India.

Grateful acknowledgment is made for permission to use Matt Errey’s editorial notes.

All rights reserved. This book, or parts thereof, may not be reproduced in any form without permission, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical articles and reviews.

Cover design by Kim Johansen, Black Dog Design
Book design by Anna Bergstrom

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Wei, Wu Wei.

Open secret / Wei Wu Wei.-- 1st ed.

p. cm.

ISBN 1-59181-014-0

1. Buddhism--Doctrines. 2. Suffering--Religious aspects--Buddhism.

I. Title.

BQ4235 .W45 2003

294.3'42--dc22

2003018029

Printed in the United States of America

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

SENTIENT PUBLICATIONS

A Limited Liability Company

1113 Spruce St.

Boulder, CO 80302

www.sentientpublications.com

Contents

Inscription	v
To Each Reader	vi
Preface	xiii
Part I	
1. Time and Space	2
2. The Pseudo-Problem of "Suffering"	3
3. The Will-Inference	4
I.	4
II. Volition	4
III. Definition of Volition	5
IV. Observations	6
4. Saying It Simply	7
I.	7
II.	10
5. Geometrically Regarded	11
6. "I Am Not, but the Universe Is My Self"	13
Logical Analysis of This Intuition	13
7. Gone with the Mind	15
8. The Fasting of the Mind	16
9. Aren't We All? . . .	17
I.	17
II. Who Done It?	17
10. Utter Absence as Us	18
11. Echoes - I	20
The Positive Expression	21
Again	21
Definition of "Noumenal Living"	22
Hara-Kiri	22
Inseeing	22

12. The Cosmic Continuum	23
13. Past, Present and Future	24
14. Who Is There to Be Enlightened?	24
Dreamer, Awake!	25
15. Tathata	26
16. Seeing	26
I.	26
II. Once More	27
17. The Logic beyond Logic	27
18. Is the Man-in-the-Moon in the Puddle?	29
19. Suggestions	30
Unborn and Undead	31
Comedy	31
Comment	31
20. The Mechanism of Appearance (As It May Be Conceived)	32
21. Hommage à Hui Nêng	34
Replacement of Responsibility	34
22. To Hell with It All!	34
23. Echoes - II	35
All Said and Done	37
 Part II	
24. The Logic of Non-Logic	40
The Meaning of "Noumenon"	40
25. Living Without Tears	41
26. Why We Cannot Be	43
27. Transcendence and Immanence	43
28. Integral Seeing	44
29. Rumours - I	45
In Both Kinds of Dream	45
30. "Alive, Alive-O"	47
31. They Said It Was Simple	48
32. The Disappearance of Subject	50
33. Let's Talk It Over!	50

34. Non-objective Relation	53
Self-portrait	53
Portrait of You	53
35. “Where, Oh Where? . . .”	54
I.	54
II.	55
36. Quod Erat Demonstrandum	57
37. I-I: This Universe Which We Are	57
38. As Long As . . .	58
39. Practice? By Whom, on What?	59
40. Speaking of God . . .	60
I.	60
II.	60
41. Rumours - II	62
You	62
Practice	63
Part III - The Heart Sutra	
42. Concerning the “Heart Sutra”	66
Section I	66
Section II	70
I. A Rendering of the Sutra of the Divine Inseeing Mind	72
II. In Technical Terms - I	78
III. The Burden of the Heart Sutra - I	81
IV. The Burden of the Heart Sutra - II	82
V. The Burden of the Heart Sutra - III	83
VI. The Burden of the Heart Sutra - IV	85
VII. The Burden of the Heart Sutra - V	87
VIII. Bodhisattvic Vision	89
IX. Omnipresence	91
Part IV	
43. The Resolution of Duality	93
44. Shadows	94

45. Seeing, Seeing, Seeing . . .	95
46. The Illusion of Enlightenment	96
47. Grammatically Speaking	96
48. Whose Mind?	99
49. In Technical Terms - II	100
The Apparent Mystery	100
I Am—but There Is No “I”	101
Definition of Non-objective Relation	101
50. Saying It Even More Simply	101
51. Disillusion	103
Identity	103
52. Let Us Do This . . .	104
53. Seeing It Simply	109
54. The Essential Identity	113
I.	113
II.	115
55. Observations Concerning Causation	116
Only That Which Is Objective Can Be Bound	116
56. For Síle	119
I.	119
II.	120
57. The Golden Key	121
58. This and That	122
59. Who?	123
60. Presence and Absence	125
61. Self and Other	127
62. An I-Concept, Analytically	128
63. Causality or Indeterminacy?	129
64. Aria	131
Moderato	131
Forte	132
Fortissimo	132
65. Pseudo-Problems	133
I.	133
II. Again	134

66. The Quest	135
67. Un-lost and Un-findable	136
68. The Ultimate Symbol	137
69. Enlightenment as Disappearance of Nescience	139
70. Apperceiving	140
Identity of Opposites	140
71. <i>In Fine</i>	142
Colophon: <i>All It Is</i>	143

Part V

72. Dialogues	
I. The Pure Land	146
II. Indeterminacy	149
III. As Far as I Am Concerned	153
IV. The Monkey's Banana	157
V. Custard-Pies	163
VI. The Question	168
VII. Bodhisattvas and All	169
VIII. Seeing	173
IX. Non-Objective Relation	177
X. Words That Mean What They Say	181
XI. Who Was the Buddha?	188

Index	197
--------------	-----

Preface

AS LONG as subject is centred in a phenomenal object, and thinks and speaks therefrom, subject is identified with that object and is bound.

As long as such condition obtains, the identified subject can never be free—for freedom is liberation from that identification.

Abandonment of a phenomenal centre constitutes the only “practice,” and such abandonment is not an act volitionally performed by the identified subject, but a non-action (*wu wei*) leaving the noumenal centre in control of phenomenal activity, and free from fictitious interference by an imaginary “self.”

Are *you* still thinking, looking, living, as from an imaginary phenomenal centre? As long as you do that you can never recognise your freedom.

Could any statement be more classic?

Could any statement be more obvious?

Could any statement be more vital?

Yet—East and West—how many observe it?

So

Could any statement be more needed?

Note: Wu Wei merely implies absence of volitional interference. Whom do I mean by “you”? I mean “I.” I am always I, whoever

Open Secret

says it, man or monkey, noumenally or phenomenally, identified or free—and there is no such entity.

P.S. If you have understood the above it is quite unnecessary for you to read any more of this book.

Part One



Bye and bye comes the Great Awakening,
and we find that this life is really a great
dream. . . .

Then we are embraced in obliterating Unity.
There is perfect adaptation to whatever may
happen—and so we complete our allotted
span.

Chuang Tzu, ch. 11

1 · Time and Space

WE TEND to misunderstand the nature, and exaggerate the importance, of “time” and “space.”

There are no such “things” (they do not exist in their own right): these come into apparent existence, i.e. they “function” only as a mechanism whereby events, extended spatially and sequentially, may become cognisable. They accompany events and render their development realisable. In themselves they have no existence whatever. They are appearances, and their apparent existence is deduced from the events they accompany and render perceptible. They are hypothetical, like the “ether,” symbols, like algebra, psychic inferences to aid in the cognisance of the universe we objectify, and they neither pre-exist, nor survive apart from, the events they accompany, but are utilised in function of each such event as it occurs.

Where there is no event there is no need of “time” or of “space”—and in their absence we are no longer in bondage—for there is no one to believe that he is bound.

Time is only an inference, devised in an effort to explain growth, development, extension and change, which constitute a further direction of measurement beyond the three that we know and at right-angles to volume; and “past,” “present” and “future” are inferences derived from this temporal interpretation of the further dimension in which extension appears to occur. All forms of temporality, therefore, are conceptual and imagined.

Thus prophecy or precognition is perception from a further direction of measurement, beyond that of time, a fourth right-angle, wherefrom—as in the case of each superior dimension—the inferior ones are perceived as a whole, so that the “effects” of “causes” are as evident in what we call the future as they are in what we call the past.

The event only occurs in the mind of the perceiver of it, singular or plural as the case may be, and no event could be anything but a memory when we know it. No event is anything but a psychic experience. Events, or memories of events, are objectivisations in consciousness.

2 ·- The Pseudo-Problem of "Suffering"

WHO IS there to suffer?

Only an object could suffer.

I am not an object (no object could be I), and there is no I-object nor I-subject, both of which would then be objects.

Therefore I cannot suffer.

But there appears to be suffering, and its opposite, both pleasure and pain. They are appearances, but they are experienced. By whom, by what, are they experienced?

They are apparently experienced, and by means of an identification of what I am with what I am not, or, if you prefer, by what we are not, illusorily identified with what we are.

What we are does not know pain or pleasure, what we are does not, as such, know anything, for in neither case is there an objective entity to suffer experience.

Whatever intensity sensations may appear to have, in the dream of manifestation they are effects of causes in a time-sequence, and apart from the time-sequence in which they develop they *are not* either as cause or as effect.

There is no one to suffer. We appear to suffer as a result of our illusory identification with a phenomenal object.

Let us at least understand.

What we are is invulnerable and cannot be bound.

3 - The Will-Inference

I

THE MECHANISM of living seems to be based on the notion that what sentient beings do is due to an act of volition on the part of each such phenomenal object.

It is obvious, however, that they react rather than act, and that their living is conditioned by instinct, habit, fashion, and propaganda. Their way of life is primarily a series of reflexes, which leaves a limited scope for deliberate and considered action; that is, purposeful action which, superficially considered, might appear to be the result of volition, or what is called an act of will.

Nevertheless “volition” is only an inference, for, search as we may, we can find no entity to exercise it. All we can find is an impulse which appears to be an expression of the notion of “I.” It would seem to be unjustifiable to assume that such an impulse could be capable of affecting the inexorable chain of causation or, alternatively, the process of manifestation which produces apparent events, unless itself it were an element of one or of the other.

II. Volition

Volition, then, would seem to be an illusory inference, a mere demonstration on the part of an energised I-concept, resulting either in frustration or fulfillment and thereby being the source and explanation of the notion of *karma*. Sentient beings are entirely “lived” as such, as has often been noted by philosophers and endorsed by metaphysicians, and the psycho-somatic phenomenon is inexorably subject to causation. That is why sentient beings as such, as the Buddha is

credited with stating and re-stating in the Diamond Sutra, *are* not as entities. That, also, is why, since as phenomena they are *not*, noumenally—though they cannot *be* as entities or as anything objective—nevertheless, they *are* as noumenon.

And noumenon, by definition being integrally devoid of any trace-element of objectivity, is *not*, cannot *be*, in any sense whatever—since all forms of being must necessarily be objective. Here language fails us and must be left behind like the raft that has carried us across the river. All we can say is something such as “this, which is all that sentient beings are, itself is not.”

If this is not understood it will appear unsatisfying but, if understood, it will appear luminous and revelatory, and for the obvious reason that the understanding is “itself” this noumenon which we are.

But here the eternal reminder is necessary: phenomena which, as the term asserts, we *appear* to be, are nothing but noumenon, and noumenon, which is all that we are, though as such itself is not, *is* as phenomena (as its appearance).

“Volition,” therefore, though it is not—is only an appearance phenomenally—*is* noumenally and may be regarded as an objectivisation of noumenality. As such we know it as *buddhi* or *prajna*, as intuitional inseeing and, knowing it, it is ourselves, all that we are, which—in the knowing of it—we are knowing, for this which we are *is* this knowing of it.

All very simple, evidently, until you try to objectify it in words.

III. Definition of Volition

Perhaps the question of volition may be most readily understood just by asking who there is to exercise volition and who there is to experience the results of it.

Phenomenally there is an apparent cause, which can be called ego-volition, and a psychic effect, which may be fulfillment or which may be frustration.

The effect of conditioned “volition” is the result of causes of which the volition is a mediate effect-cause, and an apparent psycho-somatic apparatus experiences that effect.

And as regards that “volition” which is non-volition, *wu wei* or *bodhi*, the ultimate effect is integration.

In order that there might be volition and the result of volition there would need to be an entity to exercise the one and to suffer the other. If it is found that there are no such entities then no such thing as volition can exist other than as a concept.

Noumenally there is no volition—because there is no I. Phenomenally spontaneity alone is non-volitional.

But by understanding what volition is not, the way may be found to be open whereby that “volition” which is non-volition may liberate us, as apparent objects, from the bondage which is due to that identification with an objectivisation, which we have never been, are not, and never could be.

IV. Observations

Living non-volitionally is a contradiction in terms (unless it implies being “lived”).

Not reacting to events as a result of understanding this is living non-volitionally (or being “lived”).

Intellectual understanding is a conditioned cause. Intuitional understanding might be a non-mediate cause.

For cause and effect are divided in Time, but Intemporally they are one.

4 · Saying It Simply

I

ONLY AN object can suffer, but phenomenally subject and object, being one whole, spin like a coin so that the intervals between *pile et face* (heads and tails) are imperceptible. Consequently pain, or pleasure, appear to be continual.

Noumenally, on the contrary, there is no object to suffer pain or pleasure. Noumenon is invulnerable, and cannot be otherwise. Noumenon is the unmanifested aspect of what we, sentient beings, are: Phenomenon is our manifestation.

Therefore, manifested, we must suffer pain and pleasure; unmanifested, we cannot experience either. Both aspects are permanent and coeval, the one subject to time (which accompanies all manifestation, rendering the extension of events perceptible), the other—timeless.

Noumenon—timeless, spaceless, imperceptible being—is what we are: phenomena—temporal, finite, sensorially perceptible—are what we appear to be as separate objects. Phenomena, subject to time, are impermanent, illusory figments of consciousness, but they are *nothing but* noumenon in manifestation, in a dream context (one of several dream contexts—psychic conditions due to sleep, drugs, asphyxiation, etc.). Similarly noumenon is nothing; factually, demonstrably, cognisably (and therefore objectively) is nothing, that is, no *thing, but*—apart from—its manifestation as phenomena.

That is the meaning of the “mysterious” contradictions enunciated by the Sages: “Form is nothing but void, void is nothing but form,” “Samsara is Nirvana, Nirvana is Samsara,” “Phenomena and Noumena are one,” etc., etc.

That is why Huang Po can say:

“People neglect the reality of the ‘illusory’ world.” (*Wang Ling Record*, p. 106)

“On no account make a distinction between the Absolute and the sentient world.” (p. 130)

“Whatever Mind is, so also are phenomena—both are equally real and partake equally of the Dharma-Nature. He who receives an intuition of this truth has become a Buddha and attained to the Dharma.” (p. 111)

“All the visible universe IS the Buddha.” (p. 107)

But quoting Hui Nêng he can also say, and often in the same context:

“There’s never been a single thing,
Then where’s defiling dust to cling?”

“Full understanding of this must come before they can enter the way.” (p. 111)

“Finally, remember that from the first to last not even the smallest grain of anything perceptible (graspable, attainable, tangible) has ever existed or ever will exist.” (p. 127)

And lastly:

“On seeing one thing, you see ALL.” (That is, all perceiving is Buddha-mind, the living-dream is itself Buddha-mind.) (p. 108)

“Hold fast to one principle and all the others are identical.” (p. 108)

What, then, is this principle?

“Once more, ALL phenomena are basically without existence, though you cannot now say that they are non-existent. . . . Moreover, Mind is not Mind. . . . Form, too, is not really form. So if I now state that there are no phenomena and no Original Mind, you will begin to understand something of the intuitive Dharma silently conveyed to Mind with Mind. Since phenomena and no-phenomena are one, there is neither

phenomena nor no-phenomena, and the only possible transmission is to Mind with Mind.” (p. 106)

“Moreover, in thus contemplating the totality of phenomena, you are contemplating the totality of Mind. All these phenomena are intrinsically void and yet this Mind with which they are identical is no mere nothingness.” (p. 108)

This, chapter 37 of the Wan Ling Record, is probably the clearest and most valuable statement of the ultimate truth that we possess. In this he states, as quoted, that in seeing one thing you see ALL. What is this one thing, and have we seen it? It surely is just that phenomenon and noumenon are one. In differentiating between Appearance and its source, neither of which exists other than conceptually, we must never forget this “one thing”—which is that they are one.

However, if we see this one thing as “one,” we have not seen it, we have missed it. It is not “one thing,” for a thing is an object. In fact we can never “see” it, for here, this is the seeing which is non-seeing, in which no “one” is seeing and no “thing” is seen as such.

Have we not understood? Can we not perceive intuitively what this must be? An eye cannot see itself. That which is sought is the seeker, the looked-for is the looker, who is not an object. “One” is a concept, objective therefore, and “it” is *“devoid of any trace of objectivity.”* (Huang Po, p. 35)

We cannot see (find, grasp, attain, touch) it, because “we” are not at all objects, nor is “it” an object, and whatever “we” are noumenally is what “it” is noumenally. Thus we are one—and there is no such object as “one” in noumenon, since, as we have just read, there is no such thing (object) as noumenon either.

This is the non-seeing, by non-seeing which you see ALL, the one principle with which all others are identical, the one problem which, solved, solves all others at once, the centre of centres from which all can be perceived.

II

But phenomenal objects, noumenon in manifestation, although they are nothing but noumenon, and can know that, even realise it via their phenomenal psychic mechanism called “intelligence” etc., cannot “live” it in their individual, space-time, conceptual existence, which is subject to the temporal and illusory process of causation. Although it is all that they are—and despite the fact that in it, therefore, they have nothing to attain, grasp or possess—in order that they may “live” it in any sense apart from having objective understanding of what it is, that is, of what they are, they must de-phenomenalise themselves, disobjectify themselves, disidentify their subjectivity from its projected phenomenal selfhood, which is dominated by a concept of “I.”

This adjustment has been given many names but is nevertheless not an event or an experience—for, except as an appearance, there is no object to which such can occur; it is a *metanoesis* whereby a figmentary attachment or identification is found not to exist, nor ever to have existed—since it is a figment. This displacement of subjectivity is from apparent object to ultimate subject in which it inheres, from phenomenon to noumenon, from illusory periphery to illusory centre (for infinity can have no centre), from supposed individual to universal Absolute.

This is awakening from the phenomenal dream of “living,” confined within the limits of sensorial perception and suppositional “volition,” into the impersonal infinitude of noumenality in which every possible problem of phenomenal “life” is found to have vanished without leaving a trace.

Ed. Note: All Huang Po quotations above taken from “The Zen Teaching of Huang Po: On the Transmission of Mind” by John Blofeld. Grove Press, New York. 1st pub. 1958)

5 - Geometrically Regarded

FROM EACH further dimension all antecedent dimensions can be perceived as a whole; for example, cubic space or volume contains within itself length and breadth (i.e., plane surface) and height. Does it not follow that we must necessarily be seeing volume from a further, a fourth, direction of measurement, and consequently, that in order to perceive that, we would need to observe from a fifth?

So we observe the universe of phenomena, which appears to us in three directions of measurement—length, width and height—from a fourth direction, which might be what we know as duration but whose geometrical character we may only be able to perceive when we develop the ability to observe from a further direction at right-angles to those with which we are already familiar.

Phenomenal seeing, then, is normally in three dimensions observed from a fourth. That is the perceiving of appearance as volume. It is likely, however, that some sentient beings only perceive in two dimensions—length and breadth, or plane surfaces, horizontally or vertically—and that the third, volume, is an inference of which they are not conscious, although it is from that that they are looking.

If phenomenality may be equated with tri-dimensional perception, then may we not assume that the essential characteristic of noumenality is perception from a further direction? Should that be so, then—geometrically regarded—what we term “Awakening” is waking up to a further field of vision, that what we term “Liberation” is freedom from the limitation of the cubic vision within which we have been confined, and “Enlightenment” is the sudden brightness of a further “universe” encompassing the three in the limited darkness of which we have been groping; i.e., that these are

three terms for the displacement of the subject to a centre from which he can perceive objects in a further, richer, and more complete perspective.

If this should be so, then those who are “awakened,” perceiving a further dimension—*that one from which we normally observe and which therefore is ours*—are themselves perceiving from a still further direction, from a fifth. If, then, there were any entity to perceive the “awakened,” such entity would perceive the fifth dimension from a centre in the sixth.

Here metaphysics may intervene in order to point out the illusory futility of the purely theoretical notion of a perpetual regression. There could be no entity, there is only a *perceiving* anyhow, and the whole process is phenomenal interpretation of noumenality. This, then, is within the illusory science of phenomenality, and may only enable us to understand the *apparent* mechanism whereby a phenomenal object can come to know noumenality.

We know—from the words of the Masters, unless from our own experience—that “Awakening” is accompanied by the immediate, if not simultaneous, abolition of all phenomenal “problems.” It is like knocking out the bottom of a barrel, by which all the confused, and so “impure,” contents of our phenomenal mind (phenomenal aspect or reflection of Mind) vanish. Instead of solving problems one by one, like striking off the heads of a Hydra, which grow again, all disappear simultaneously and forever (as an effect), like stabbing the Hydra herself in the heart.

But is not this the exact counterpart of what we have sought to establish geometrically? We have suggested that a displacement of the centre of the supposed entity (pseudo-centre) to a further, more profound centre will reveal a further dimension wherefrom all inferior dimensions are perceived in a greater perspective. Assuming that this is the ultimate

perspective, or even if it is not, even if there be perspectives *ad infinitum*, is this not precisely a description of the mechanism of what the term “Awakening” connotes?

6 · *“I Am Not, but the Universe Is My Self”*

—SHIH T’OU, A.D. 700-790

Logical Analysis of This Intuition

OBJECTS ARE only known as the result of reactions of the senses of sentient beings to a variety of stimuli.

These stimuli appear to derive from sources external to the reagent apparatus, but there is no evidence of this apart from the reagent apparatus itself.

Objects, therefore, are only a surmise, for they have no demonstrable existence apart from the subject that cognises them.

Since the subject itself is not sensorially cognisable as an object, subject also is only a surmise.

Since the factual existence of neither subject nor object can be demonstrated, existence is no more than a conceptual assumption, which, metaphysically, is unacceptable.

There is, therefore, no valid evidence for the existence of a world external to the consciousness of sentient beings, which external world is therefore seen to be nothing but the cognisers of it, that is—sentient beings themselves.

But there can be no factual evidence for the existence of sentient beings, either as subject or as object, who therefore are merely a conceptual assumption on the part of the consciousness in which they are cognised.

It follows that “consciousness” also can only be a conceptual assumption without demonstrable existence.

What, then, can this assumption of consciousness denote? This question can only be answered in metaphysical terms, according to which consciousness may be regarded as the manifested aspect of the unmanifested, which is the nearest it seems possible to go towards expressing in a concept that which by definition is inconceivable.

Why should this be so? It must be so, because conceptuality cannot have conceptuality for source, but only the non-conceptual, because that which objectively conceives must necessarily spring from the objectively non-existent, the manifested from non-manifestation, for conceptuality cannot conceive or objectify itself—just as an eye cannot see itself as an object.

Therefore consciousness can be described as pure non-conceptuality, which is “pure” because unstained either by the conceptual or the non-conceptual, which implies that there is a total absence of both positive and negative conceptuality.

Not existing as an object, even conceptual, there can be no “it,” there is no “thing” to bear a name, no subject is possible where no object is, and total absence of being is inevitably implied.

All we can do about this which we are, which to us must be objectified as “it” in order that we may speak of it at all, is to regard “it” as the noumenon of phenomena, but, since neither of these exists objectively, phenomenally regarded it may be understood as the ultimate absence from which all presence comes to appear.

But consciousness, or “Mind,” does not “project”—the phenomenal universe: “it” IS the phenomenal universe which is manifested as its self.

Metaphysics, relying on intuition or direct perception, says no more than this, and points out that no word, be it the Absolute, the Logos, God, or Tao, can be other than a

concept which as such has no factual validity whatsoever.

This-Which-Is, then, which cannot be subject or object, which cannot be named or thought, and the realisation of which is the ultimate awakening, can only be indicated in such a phrase as that quoted above:

I am not, but the apparent universe is my self.

7 → *Gone with the Mind*

THE PAST is gone. But the Present has become the Past before we can know it, i.e. before the complicated phenomenal processes of sense-perception, transmission and conception have been completed. Therefore the Present has gone too.

And the Future? We cannot know it until it has become the Past—for it can never be known in the Present. Then how can it be at all, for we cannot know the Past (which is gone)? Surely we cannot: neither Future, Present nor Past can we ever know.

How, then, do they exist—if existence they have? And if any of them exist, which exists? Or do all of them exist as a unity unextended in time and space, a time and space which only come into apparent existence with them, hypothetically, in order to render them cognisable?

Clearly none of them exists as a thing-in-itself, as objective events in their own right, as phenomena separate from the cognisers of them.

Future—Present—Past appear to be three illusory aspects of a single subjective phenomenon known as “cognition.”

8 · *The Fasting of the Mind*

PHENOMENAL LIFE in an apparent universe is nothing but objectivisation: all that we know as “life” is only that process.

Living, for the ordinary man, is a continual process of objectifying. From morning till night, and from night till morning, he never ceases to objectify except in dreamless sleep. That is what manifestation is, and it is nothing but that, for when objectifying ceases the objective universe is no more—as in deep sleep.

But when Ch’an monks “sit” they seek to empty their minds, to practise a fasting of the mind, for while the mind “fasts” there is no more conceptualisation; then no concept arises, not even an I-concept, and in the absence of an I-concept the mind is “pure” (free of objects); then, and only then, it is itself, what-it-is and as-it-is. When that is permanent it is objectively called enlightenment, when it is temporary it can be called *samadhi*.

In that state of fasting the mind is only “blank” in so far as there is a total absence of objects; itself it is not absent but totally present, then and only then. Nor is “objectivising” replaced by “subjectivising”; both counterparts are absent, and the subject-object process (whereby subject, objectifying itself as object, thereby becomes object, which object is nothing but subject), the “spinning of the mind,” ceases to operate and dies down. The mind ceases to “do”; instead, it “is.”

In the absence of objectivisation the apparent universe *is not*, but we *are*; which is so because what we are is what the apparent universe is, and what the apparent universe is—is what we are; dual in presence, non-dual in absence, sundered only in manifestation.

9 - Aren't We All? . . .

I

HAVE YOU noticed? How many of us, writing our thoughts about Buddhism, even the purest Ch'an, express our thoughts in such a way that a sentient being is envisaged as a medium, that is, by inference, having objective existence? Is this still not so even when the very subject of our thesis is the non-existence of a self? Indeed, how many of us are there who do *not* do this? Let us even ask how many texts are there in which this is not done or implied?

Yet many of us seem to know that it is not so, that it cannot be so. Surely we have read the Diamond Sutra, perhaps many times, in which the Buddha is credited with having said again and again in varying contexts that there is no such thing as a "self," a separate "individual," a "being," or a "life"? If we have not seen for ourselves that this must be so, would it not be reasonable to expect that we would provisionally take it on trust from the lips of the Buddha, and apply it?

Alas, no. It is too hard, too much to ask: conditioning is too powerful. Yet without that understanding, that *basic* understanding, that *sine qua non*, for what can we hope? However much else we may have understood, have we in fact even started on the way—the pathless way that leads no body from no there to no here? We have no phenomenal masters, no *gurus*; our masters, our *gurus* are immanent. What a sad, sardonic smile they seem to wear when we look within!

II. Who Done It?

"What did you say?" "Who are they?," "Who is writing all this?" Well, who is reading it? Who is there to do, or to

appear to do, the one or the other? Really, really, what a question! Who indeed! Why, no one, of course; who could there be? Surely that is evident, axiomatic, elementary? From the beginning there has never been a single “who,” as Hui Nêng approximately said; “who,” utterly absent noumenally, is ubiquitous phenomenally.

Whoever asks the question, that is “who?”

He is the seeker who is the sought, the sought who is the seeker.

He done it!

10 ·- Utter Absence as Us

DESPITE APPEARANCES to the contrary, nothing that is other than conceptual is done by a sentient being, for a sentient being objectively is only a phantom, a dream-figure, nor is anything done via a psycho-somatic apparatus, as such, other than the production of illusory images and interpretations, for that also has only an apparent, imagined or dreamed, existence. All phenomenal “existence” is hypothetical. All the characteristics of sentient beings—form, perceiving, conceiving, willing, knowing (the *skandha* or aggregates)—are figments of mind which “itself,” i.e. as such, also is hypothetical only.

Each and every action, every movement of each, in the extension and duration imagined so that they may be sensorially perceptible (that is, in the framework of space and time) are dreamed or imagined by a dreamer which has no quality of selfhood, of objective being—that is to say, by hypothetical mind.

This hypothetical mind is the Perceiving, Discriminating Division of mind in its subjective aspect phenomenally

conceived, and the Perceived, Discriminated Division in its objective aspect, but the perceived is the perceiver, the discriminated the discriminator, and the subjective and objective aspects only appear as dual in manifestation. We are the former: we appear to be the latter, but they are not two unmanifested.

All that is cognisable is part of the phantasy of living, all that we can think of as ourselves is an integral part of this hypothetical universe; sentient beings are totally therein and in no way or degree apart from it, as they often suppose when they imagine themselves as instruments whereby the objective universe is produced, for it is produced not by, but with them as one of its manifestations.

This is more readily perceived in the case of a dream, which we can consider when awake, whereas in the living dream we are still asleep; i.e., “ourselves” are the dreamed figures, phenomenal objects of the dreaming subject in the dream of living.

Our dreamed “selves,” autonomous in appearance, as in life, can be seen in awakened retrospect to be puppets totally devoid of volitional possibilities of their own. Nor is the dream in any degree dependent on them except as elements therein. They, who seem to think that they are living and acting autonomously, are being dreamed in their totality, they are being activated as completely and absolutely as puppets are activated by their puppeteer. Such is our apparent life, on this apparent earth, in this apparent universe.

All this which is dreamed is the product of the dreaming mind, of the subject-object process called “causation,” within the consciousness in which it occurs; it is integral in consciousness, it is consciousness itself, and there is nothing else whatever that IS. But “consciousness” is only a concept *as such*: it is no thing, no object, has no subject therefore. It can only

be indicated as the Unmanifested, and even such indication can only be a manifestation of the unmanifested.

But these elements in the dream, in either dream, are not nothing in the sense of annihilation. Viewed “noumenally” they are “something” indeed. They are whatever their dreamer is, whatever This-Which-Dreams them is, indeed everything in the dream is the dreamer thereof, and that, as we have seen, is the subjective aspect of consciousness—for object *is* subject, the subject which in-forms it, which is subsistent to it. Therefore this “something” which they are is “everything”: objectively, phenomenally everything, which, subjectively, noumenally, is “nothing,” but which as “nothing” is still everything, total absence phenomenally, which is total presence noumenally. Everything is nothing, nothing is everything, for neither either is or is not, and only is-ness is by neither being nor not-being.

It is *as the subjective aspect of consciousness* (not as the objectivised aspect) which is all that they can be said to BE, that sentient beings dream the universe by objectivising it.

11 · - Echoes - I

THE IDEA of a separate individual, an ego, self or I-concept, is an object. I become an object—inevitably—every time I think of my self. Also, every time I act as my self it is an object which acts.

Once in a while, however, I act directly—but then no “I” acts.



“I” am not conscious of anything: never. “Consciousness” as such is all that I am.

The Positive Expression

Noumenon is the sub-stance of phenomena, whose being it is, the being of Noumenon being the being of Being as such—which is the absence of Non-being.

Void is the sub-stance of Form,
Form is the manifestation of Void.

Again

There is no cogniser apart from the “thing” cognised; there is no “thing” cognised apart from the cogniser of it. But the “cogniser” is only an act of cognition (a cognising), of which the “thing” cognised is the counterpart.

Therefore the “cogniser” and the “cognised” are not different, “not two”: they can only be the “function of cognising,” the functional aspect of pure potentiality, which, as such, has no phenomenal or objective existence apart from its manifestation as cogniser-and-cognised.

The observer cannot observe the observer.



The Asker is the Answer.



“If you suppose that anything is NOT Prajna, let me hear what it is.”—*Hui Hai*, p. 118.

So why call it “Wisdom”?

Open Secret

Definition of “Noumenal Living”

To be in non-objective relation with all things is to live noumenally.

To live without volition is to be in non-objective relation with all things.

Ceasing to objectify, or pure thought antecedent to “name and form” (interpretation) is living without volition.

That is the *nien* of *wu-nien*, the *hsin* of *wu-hsin*, the *wei* of *wu-wei*, “moved only by the Will of God.” (*Chuang Tzu*)



You have no objective existence (as “you”),
Nor any subjective existence (as “you”),
Because “existence as subject” would make subject an
object—which it could never be.
You only exist as existence itself.

Hara-Kiri

If attachment must be renounced, renunciation itself must also be renounced.

But renunciation, being also an act of volition, it is volition that must renounce itself.

Can we renounce what we have never possessed?

What is there to “do” or to “have” anything?

Let us start by locating this “we.”

Inseeing

Everything is what we are: every object is its subject, and what we *are* is “our” subject.

Noumenal seeing is enlightened seeing, phenomenal seeing is unenlightened seeing: that is the only difference between them.

How so? Because noumenal seeing sees phenomena noumenally—and then phenomenon is as noumenal as Noumenon itself.



Identified with non-being, you can only be a mirror. “One must become identified with non-being and mirror the whole, for the truth is one and final.”—*Hsieh Ling-yün* (A.D. 385-453)

12 · The Cosmic Continuum

A CIRCLE HAS only one centre. But the cosmic circle, being infinite, has an infinite number of centres, and each one is the centre of the whole, which, on account of its infinitude, is neither a circle nor not a circle, so that its centre, also, is neither a centre nor not a centre.

Therefore the centre, being ubiquitous, is itself the circle, and the notion of individual centres within the infinite circle is a vain and superfluous concept.

Metaphysically such is a diagram of the cosmos, and a simple illustration of the position of phenomenal beings in a five-dimensional phenomenal universe, in which they are neither something nor nothing, neither centres nor not centres—for they are at the same time the centre and the whole.

13 ·- Past, Present, and Future

THE PAST is a mnemonic impression of an event extended in duration, the extension being a psychic device to render the event perceptible and conceivable as a consecutive incident. There is no such “ens” or “thing-in-itself” as the “Past,” which only implies an “event” that has been extended in imagination into a succeeding “event” and so on *ad infinitum*.

The “past,” therefore, is only a method of indicating replaced elements in the seriality of extension in a hypothetical “time.” The “past” has no autonomous existence whatever, nor has the “present,” which is purely theoretical, since it has no duration, and the “future,” which is only a speculation concerning the possible extension of events in the same hypothetical seriality.

The serial development of any kind of dream-story is an aspect of the mechanism of its presentation, whereby it is elaborated conceptually.

The attribution of actuality to such contrivances, however ingenious, is gratuitous.

“Life,” therefore, as a series of events, is imagined and not “lived,” as every kind of dream is, and “Time,” if anything at all, is surely and very literally “all my eye”!

Note: “Causation,” dependent on “Time” (duration, extension) is a laboratory instrument only, and itself, as a “thing” entirely illusory.

14 ·- Who Is There to Be Enlightened?

I DON'T BELIEVE that there is anyone to wake up! Sentient beings are not *there* at all as such—as the Buddha pointed out in the Diamond Sutra, so how can they wake up? And *what*

is there to wake up? They are concepts or thought-forms, objects—and objects cannot either go to sleep or awaken! What nonsense all that doctrine must be! It all begs the question, for phenomenally they are appearances, and noumenally they are not asleep.

The subjective element of mind is awake, and always has been, untouched by any concept such as that of time. But the dreamer seems to become identified in split-mind with his own dreamed object. So the identified personal dreamer always has to wake up: it is always the individualised dreamer which awakes—not his dreamed objects. There can be no awakening for dreamed objects in any kind or degree of dreaming.

Dreamer, Awake!

Living is dreaming too. The “dreamer” becomes identified with his object and snores loudly. “He” and his objects dream and dream, in which every act of the objects is in-formed by the dreamer. In the degree of such in-forming by the dreamer the dreamed objects “exist.” But they are totally dreamed, totally in-formed; therefore they partake totally of the “existence” of the in-forming dreamer.

In fact, however, the appearance that is dreamed is nothing but the source thereof which is dreaming. But it is only the in-forming source which can awaken: the objects as such have never slept, and cannot awaken; of themselves they have never been at all, for they cannot have any nature of their own. Nor has the in-forming mind of either dream any nature of its own, for mind, whole or split, is *non-entity*.

Note: Objects are purely imagined in *all kinds of dreams*. They are ropes seen as snakes, in the old analogy, when even the ropes were

never there non-phenomenally. That is all we are as objects.

15 ·-· *Tathata*

“SUBJECTIVITY,” NOT having any objective existence, can never die—for therein is no thing to suffer extinction, nor can “it” be born—for therein is no thing to come into being. Therefore “it” must be eternal (*aeternitus*, that is beyond the concept of “time”).

Only objects can be born and can die, only objects can be perceived, only objects can be thought of or conceived, only objects can appear to exist. And all that “exists” is appearance (phenomena) only.

About what is indicated by the word “subjectivity” nothing whatever can be cognised, not because “it” is *some thing* that is not cognisable, but because by definition “it” is not any “thing” at all. And yet, and inevitably, “it” must necessarily be all that is and all that we are.

What, then, is it? No sort of “what.” Just sheer phenomenal absence, whose *absence* is us (THIS which we are).

16 ·-· *Seeing*

I

HOW CAN there be a “seeing”? Surely the “seeing” is false; the object is not over there, it is at home “here.” I am it, it is I. How, then, can I “see” it? There is no object there: therefore there cannot be any subject here.

All my eye! My eye and whatever lies behind it.

II. *Once More*

The conclusion is simple and evident. There is no one to “see” and no “thing” to be “seen”; the “seen” is the “see-er” and the “see-er” is the “seen,” and that is a definition of noumenon. This applies to each of the senses by means of which phenomena are cognised.

“Noumenon” has no more existence than “phenomena” since each is merely a concept of divided “mind,” itself the sixth sense, interpreter of its fellows. And all that each *is* is neither “there” nor “here” nor any “where.”

No name, nor any description, can ever be given to what remains, for that is by definition no object, because as ultimate subjectivity it could not see itself which is therefore no “thing” other than objectified as every “thing,” i.e., all phenomena.

Therefore “it” is ultimate and absolute phenomenal absence and the absence of that concept of “absence,” which is *absolute presence*.

Note: Phenomena are noumenon objectifying itself, or Noumenon is subject objectifying itself as phenomena.

17 ·- *The Logic beyond Logic*

AS LONG as one is employing concepts, as long as our mind is split, every such concept is subject to the Double Negative (*Shen Hui*, A.D. 686-760) or the Theory of Double Truth (*Chi Tsang*, A.D. 549-623), that is to say that noumenally it neither is nor is not, but the moment whole-mind is invoked there is no longer a question of dual counterparts, of a perpetual regression; for instance “total phenomenal absence is

total noumenal presence” (total disappearance of being is total appearance of non-being) no longer need imply some “thing” beyond dual concepts.

It no longer need imply noumenally that *neither* either is or is not, but states that both, thus, absolutely are. Phenomena are Noumenon, Noumenon is phenomena, being becomes empty and emptiness becomes being—as the early sages expressed it—so that what is dual is not dual, and what is not dual is dual.

Expressed otherwise, once the statement is understood split-mind is no longer objectivising by means of dual concepts: the process of objectivising is transcended, functioning has returned to the source and whole-mind is functioning directly.

Total noumenal presence and total phenomenal absence are ONE as they stand: never can they be two, there is no beyond; whatever a logician may maintain semantically, this statement is final and states the absolute in so far as that can be stated.

Semantically there appear to remain five concepts—“noumenal and phenomenal,” “presence and absence” and “one.” That is so—as long as there is an entity, or supposed entity, objectifying these concepts, i.e., occupied in conceiving objects. As such they are not—“it is the mind, not the flag or the wind, that causes the apparent movement.”* But there is no such entity, the supposed entity has vanished: impersonal “mind”—whole-mind which objectively is not—the source, which is not objectively, which, therefore, is neither “noumenal nor phenomenal,” “present or absent,” nor “one” (which also is an objective concept), which is pure and total non-objectivity, alone is in question.

* *Ed Note:* Hui Nêng

Philosophically this is indicated by saying that all that we are is the absence of our phenomenal absence, i.e., the absence of an *I-entity*, an “ens,” to conceive our phenomenal absence.

Note: The moment the subsistent notion of any entity is abolished, whole-mind alone remains, the pseudo-centre which unceasingly objectivises is automatically abandoned, and mind may be said to reintegrate its source.

Phenomena may be said to be Noumenon objectifying itself, or Noumenon may be regarded as Subject objectifying itself as phenomena, neither phenomena nor Noumenon having any objective *existence*.

18 – Is the Man-in-the-Moon in the Puddle?

WHAT CAN be the utility of exposing this or that object, or all objects, as “empty” or “void,” *en détail ou en bloc*? It is not the *objects* as such that are this or that, “real” or “empty,” for they are not anything we can call them, except the mind which is perceiving them, and that “mind,” being only a name, is just the perceiving itself.

Objects are *neither k’ung* (empty) *nor not-k’ung*: they are just their subject, their source.

Judging objects is as futile as all “problems” are, for only *the mind itself* is concerned. All judgements and “problems” vanish when split-mind is made whole. Judgements and “problems” are like cutting off the heads of a Hydra, which grow again; let us turn to the source and tackle the Hydra! The revelation of Hui Nêng in the monks’ dispute as to whether the flag or the wind was moving, settles that perfectly for all time.

Object-subject (absence of both as separate concepts, before they are split) are not then dual; i.e., subject becomes object, and object becomes subject, or being becomes

“empty,” and “emptiness” becomes being, duality is non-dual and non-duality is dual. In short, if you return objects to their source, that source is the responsible cause of their appearance, but their *appearance* is nevertheless inseparable from its source, so that trying to affect (act upon) objects as such is as absurd as trying to cure diseases via their symptoms, to affect substance via its shadow, or objects themselves via their reflections.

If your phenomenal objects are returned to whole-mind, instead of being judged by split-mind, there will be nothing to judge—for they too are whatever that whole-mind itself is.

19 ·- Suggestions

NEED THERE be purpose—since there is no choice?



All I am is “*seeing*” when I see,
All I am is “*hearing*” when I hear,
All I am is “*sentience*” when I feel,
All I am is “*understanding*” when I know.



True-seeing is non-seeing—no one looking.
True hearing is non-hearing—no one listening.
True action is non-action—no one doing.
True thinking is non-thinking—no one thinking.
Spontaneity alone is non-volitional—and there is no I.

“That which hearing is—is beyond thought, mind and body.”
(*Surangama Sutra*) What is heard is the hearer thereof.



The totality of an action is in function of the totality of the absence of the performer thereof. That alone is pure action.

Unborn and Undead

There is neither birth nor death; birth and death are objective only.

Objective living is *phenomenal*. This which we are is not phenomenal: a shadow is not its substance. But it has no existence apart from its substance.

Comedy

Phenomenal objects apparently desperately hunting for themselves as subject! How could an object seek its subject? All it *is* is subject, and all it does is done by subject, so that subject itself is desperately hunting for itself!

Comment

The “subject” which they then find that they are is no entity, for *subject can never be that*.

Once more: the subject of object is itself an object as “subject,” just as the object of “subject” is itself nothing but subject. That is, they are one, and how they are one, two sides of a single coin, without the coin: they are subject and object alternatively and at once.

Is this semantic jugglery? Perhaps, but it could never be

anything else, for it can be understood but cannot be expressed as a logical proposition. It might help, but would change nothing, if the words “object” and “subject” were replaced by the words “phenomena” and “noumenon.” All phenomena are nothing but noumenon, and there is no such thing as noumenon: *noumenon is “noumenon” only as phenomena*. Thought of, they appear as two things, but they *are* not even as dual concepts: as such they are both phenomenal. They are one whole—and that is no thing.

This understanding is, perhaps, the essential understanding—and it cannot be syllogistically expressed.



Even the best writing is like taking pot-shots at the moon.

20 - The Mechanism of Appearance (As It May Be Conceived)

THE APPARENT universe neither arises *via*, nor independently of, sentient beings. The apparent aspect of sentient beings arises *with* that of the universe, and the universe becomes apparent concurrently.

Their sentience is responsible for their interpretation of arisal, or manifestation, their sentience being the *perceptive* aspect of “mind,” and their appearance being the *perceived* aspect, as is that of all phenomena.

The apparent difference between what are known as animate and inanimate objects is inexistent objectively, that is as objective phenomena, but, subjectively, non-apparent sentience, though as such it does not occasion arisal or

manifestation (which is causal), is responsible for perception.

One might say that sentient beings as phenomena arise, are manifested, “directly,” like all phenomena whatsoever, but that the apparent universe *as known to sentient beings* is an indirect arisal, or manifestation via their sentience, such sentience being expressed by means of cognitive faculties (known as the *skandha*), themselves conceptual, but *in itself* a direct manifestation of whole-mind.

Can this be made clearer by saying that sentience is that aspect of arisal, or manifestation, by means of which phenomena are cognised as such, although itself is not responsible for their arisal? Sentience may be seen as an expression of the dynamic aspect of manifestation (whereas appearance itself is the static aspect), by means of which the faculties of cognition interpret, but are not causative elements in, such manifestation.

The mechanism here described is all purely conceptual: this is not, therefore, a description of anything factually existing, but a schema illustrating the position and function of apparent sentient beings in the phenomenal universe in which objectively they are integral, but in the perception, conception and interpretation of which they constitute a functional element.

Metaphysically nothing of this kind can be said to *be*, for the mechanism of causation is entirely phenomenal.

Metaphysically there is only the apparent manifestation of non-manifestation, of which latter nothing whatever can be cognised since it has no objective quality whatever, and sentient beings themselves are nothing but what “it” IS.

21 ·- Hommage à Hui Nêng

Replacement of Responsibility

THE USUAL displacement of responsibility is on to the object! But objects have none whatever: total responsibility lies with their subject.

Bring it home! Keep it at home!

Where is the flag flapping, and *what* causes it to flap?

Where is the cow-bell ringing, and *what* causes it to ring?

Where is the shoe pinching, and *what* causes it to pinch?

Where is the odour of the rose, and *what* causes it to smell so sweet?

Where is the flavour of the wine, and *what* gives it that flavour?

Where is the knowledge of these phenomena, and *what* causes them to be known?

Re-establish responsibility where it belongs. Return it to its source (which it has never left).

Return every thing to its source, to which it belongs, and which it has never left!

That is the practice of non-practice.

22 ·- To Hell with It All!

FOR GOODNESS' sake let's give up all this objectivising nonsense! It has gone on altogether too long! Wasting our apparent lives objectivising from morning to night, and from night to morning—except for deep sleep when we go sane for a short respite.

Take the absurd idea people have about there being a moon in the sky! What is a “moon,” what is a “sky,” and where

is either the one or the other to be “inside” or “outside” the other or the one? Did you ever hear such balderdash?

We know perfectly well, you who are reading this know perfectly well, where the so-called “moon” comes from, where it belongs, and the so-called “sky” along with it! They belong with all the other phenomenal objects we objectify day and night, dreaming “asleep” or dreaming “awake”—rhinos and roses, beetles and bodhisattvas, dandelions and dragons.

Aren’t you heartily sick of them all? No? Very well, then, admire them, do what you like with them, but for Heaven’s sake don’t go on thinking that they “exist” as such in some sort of way somewhere or other “over there,” “up there,” “down there” or any other sort of “where”!

You know quite well where they “exist,” how they “exist,” and that their only “existence” is at home where they belong, which is where you perceive them.

That is living practice.

23 · Echoes - II

HOW CAN A shadow eliminate itself?



There are no “things” (objects) apart from the cognising of them: there is no cognising apart from the “thing” cognised, *because there is no cogniser.*

That is the naked truth, and it is why phenomena and noumenon are not two, nor Samsara and Nirvana, object and subject, etc., etc. *ad infinitum*—and full understanding proceeds therefrom.



There is no such “thing” to aim at, seek or look for, as what one is. On ceasing to seek or to look—one is present.



“Being” is “becoming,” since it comports duration. Every sentient being—being nothing but mind itself, can find mind itself, mind his, her, or our self, just by ceasing to search, for the act of searching is precisely that which, by externalising itself turns itself away from this which it is.



This which is free is not an entity,
That which is bound is not what you are,
This which is unconditioned is void,
That which is conditioned is not you.



Any apparent advance in which your self is of the party is only going round in a circle.

Why? Are you anything but a rumour?



Of every direct perception, however luminous it may be, we should know that to the majority of the readers of its expression it will appear nonsensical, to a minority a mystery, and to a very few a faint reflection of a luminosity that glimmers within themselves.

For it is the nature of such expression to appear impenetrable to the deductions of the objectivising mind.



All things considered,
Bondage is wholly the notion of “I,”
And liberation is liberation from the idea of liberation.
Is there any one to be bound, any one to be free?
So what?



An “I” of which one is conscious is an object.



Whatever you may be, you are being “lived.” You are not travelling, as you think: you are being “travelled.”

Remember: you are in a train. Stop trying to carry your baggage yourself! It will come along with you anyhow.



“Pure Thought” is seeing things as they appear—without arguing (thinking) about them, just “seeing, seeing, seeing,” as Rumi said. Above all, without *inference*.

All Said and Done

Everything is I, and I am no thing.

All phenomena are subjective manifestations (objectivisation of subjectivity). What I am objectively is the totality of

Open Secret

phenomenal manifestation. What I am subjectively is all that all phenomena *are*.

Nothing personal about it anywhere or at any stage. The personal notion is not inherent and is the *whole trouble*.

Part Two



What do you have to do?

Pack your bags,
Go to the station without them,
Catch the train,
And leave your self behind.

Quite so: the only practice—and once.

24 · *The Logic of Non-Logic*

The Meaning of "Noumenon"

The phenomenal is conceptual—appearance or form, the interdependent counterpart of which is *the non-phenomenal*, which is also conceptual—non-appearance or formlessness.

The source of the phenomenal and the non-phenomenal ("the world of form and the formless world" as the Masters referred to them) is *noumenon*.

"Noumenon," therefore, is not the interdependent counterpart (or the opposite) of "phenomenon" but the source of "phenomena and of non-phenomena." All this is purely conceptual.

Phenomena are both positive and negative, both appearance and non-appearance, form and non-form, both presence and absence of form or of appearance, for each is dependent on the other and can have no hypothetical existence apart from the hypothetical existence of the other.

"Noumenon" is a symbol indicating double phenomenal absence—the absence of both counterparts or, as sometimes expressed, the absence of the negative counterpart (a double absence), which is also the absence of the absence of the positive.

Even as such, philosophically speaking, "noumenon" still appears to be dualistic; that is, to be an objective concept requiring a "cogniser" of some "thing cognised." But here there is *no thing cognisable*, and precisely because "it" (noumenon) is also the cogniser, and indeed all hypothetical cognisers that ever were or ever could be.

As such "it" is unfindable, unknowable, simply because "it" *could not be* as an object of anything but "itself" and "it" could never know "itself" as an object, so that the symbol is just a

phenomenal ruse contrived in order to indicate some “thing” which is not such. Referring to “it” as “Suchness” or “Tao,” or in any other way whatever, is equally futile logically—since “it” is the supposed cognising element, the supposedly cognised, and the apparent act of cognition.

25 - *Living Without Tears*

THERE CANNOT be any such thing as “non-volitional living”; taken as a verb it is in fact a contradiction in terms, for the act of living non-volitionally must constitute an act of volition—the volition of non-volition. Like other negatives it is a mode of its positive, as its positive is a mode of itself.

But the fact, not the act, indicates something which phenomenally can be, for it can imply “being lived,” whereby “non-volitionally” is understood, since there is no place for volition in the process of *being* lived.

Since, however, there is every reason, total evidence, to suppose that we are in fact lived, entirely and absolutely lived, like all dreamed figures in every sort and degree of dream, there cannot be any such factor as volition in the serial development of our lives.

“Volition,” then, is not an effective element at all in phenomenal life, but one that is imagined to be such. It is in fact an expression of an I-concept, an “ego” appearing to function, and as such may be seen as pure clowning, a psychic activity which, by pretended interference in the chain of cause-and-effect, produces the reactions recognised as satisfaction or frustration, according to whether the attempted interference has been in accordance with what had to occur or has been opposed to that.

Volitionally inhibiting “volition,” therefore, in no way

factually effects the serial evolution of our lives, in no way has any impact on events, and endeavouring to abolish “egotic” volition can only reinforce it by such an exercise of itself. For instance, when we are told to “lay everything down,” that means abandoning volitional activity—for everything we are required to “lay down” is a supposed effect of supposed volition, and it could only be “done” by a voluntary act, that is by a supposed “ego” or independent “self”; from which it follows that such is nothing more than an act of clowning or mummery.

If, then, it can effectually be done it must be a result, an effect of cause, and that cause can only be in the chain of causation which cannot in any degree be affected by an act of will on the part of a supposed “ego” or I-concept. Such cause can only arise as an effect of prior causes which, in such a case as that under consideration, can only appear as a result of understanding, the development of which may be described, somewhat metaphorically, as “our” only freedom. (It is, of course, not “ours,” and phenomena cannot have “freedom,” which anyhow is only a concept applicable conceptually to them, but perhaps the “noumenality” which informs phenomena manifests directly so that understanding may arise or “appear.”)

Therefore non-volitional living, “laying down” everything by an abandonment of volitional activity, or “letting ourselves be lived,” can only be effected by non-action (*wu-wei*); i.e. as a result of understanding arrived at by identification with the noumenality of *prajna*; that is, as an *effect* of *in-seeing*.

No apparent volitional interference is involved, nor, if it were, could it have any bearing on the effect except in so far as its absence or latency, the non-arising of ego-activity, leaves the mind open for the direct or intuitional apprehension which is represented by the picturesque Sanscrit concept

called “prajna.”

The intuition, indeed, is direct, but the result appears to us as indirect, for, to us, what we regard as “direct” is a supposed effect of “volition.” That is integral in the illusion of separate individuality and the notion of an “ego” or I-concept, just as “volition” is the apparent expression or activity of that, whereas in fact non-volitional life or being-lived is direct living, spontaneous living, *wu wei*, and at the same time is living without tears.

26 -> *Why We Cannot Be*

ALL EXISTENCE is objective.

We only *exist* as one another’s objects, and as such only in the consciousness that cognises us, for our experience of one another is only an act of cognition in mind and in no way asserts the experiential existence of the object cognised.

Our objective existence, therefore, is in mind only; that is, it is merely conceptual.

As regards subjective existence—is not that a contradiction in terms? That implies an objectivisation of subject, which as subject-object represents the hypothetical “being” which we imagine that we are. Subjectively there can be no “us.”

Thereby is clearly demonstrated our total “inexistence” other than as concepts in consciousness.

27 -> *Transcendence and Immanence*

I AM THE dreamer of myself in the dream in which I appear, but *as such what I am is not the objective (dreamed) appearance,*

and so I am no entity.

It is not the object that awakens, but it is the identification of the dreamer with his object that causes the illusion of bondage.

Awakening is disappearing, dissolving, vanishing as an object. Awakening is the *dissolution of appearance*, the evaporation of a dream or an illusion.

Awakening is the dis-appearance of phenomenality (of the objective, of all objectivity as such). Awakening is the discovery that the apparently objective is in fact “subjective,” and the apparent entity has dis-appeared with the total appearance.

28 ·- Integral Seeing

SEEING PHENOMENA as noumenon is true seeing.

It is seeing noumenally—that is, in non-objective relation with “things,” instead of seeing phenomenally—which is in objective relation with “things.”

Seeing phenomenally is seeing phenomena as *our* objects.

Seeing noumenally is seeing phenomena as our selves, as all they are, as their source and as our source. It is very precisely not seeing them as our objects but as their subject, not objectively but subjectively, not as being “without” but as being “within.” It is reuniting the separated with their *integer* which is all that we are.

Such true seeing, therefore, is no-seeing (of some thing by some thing), ultimately neither seeing nor non-seeing—since there is then no object to see or not to see, and no subject of no object.

It is re-absorption, re-union, re-identification of the dis-united, making split-mind whole, at-one-ment.

Note: True seeing might perhaps be indicated by the term “apperceiving” as sometimes used herein.

29 · Rumours - I

In Both Kinds of Dream

WE ARE all part of the party: the party goes on even if we fall asleep, but our falling asleep is also part of the party.



Do you remember?

When you look at a reflection of the moon in a puddle you are the moon looking at itself.



You are merely an inference. Only *objects* are knowable.

So they must be all you can know of yourself.

Therefore the apparent universe is all that you are as a “you.”



We are required to cease looking at objects as events apart from ourselves, and to know them at their source—which is our perceiving of them.



Your only self is other—there is no other that is not yourself.



Until we know what we are not,
Which is the inferential phenomenon
That we think we are,
We can never know the immensity
Which is our noumenal non-being.



Intention can make you a saint,
But it can prevent you from becoming a sage?
Appearance only: there is no entity to be either.



All forms of practice are learning to kill dragons.



“You look like a man riding a tethered horse.”—*Chuang Tzu*, chapter XIII, p. 138

Each of us spends his time “riding a tethered horse.”
The horse cannot be set free;
But each of us can forbear to ride.



How can it or anything be an illusion? What is the “it” or “anything”? There is no “it” or “anything” to be illusory! Since there is nothing to be illusory—there is no such thing as illusion.

Nor, then, is there any thing to be *anything*, even to be not—to be or not to be.

That is true seeing.



Owing to misuse of words one should not say, “Don’t meditate!” One has to say, “Don’t call it ‘meditation’ if it is not, but if it is—don’t do it!”



It is not for me or another to accept your notion which you call “meditation”: it is for you to give whatever you do a name which suggests what it is and not what it is not! Only then will it become possible to discuss it.

Words *must* be used in a sense which is in accordance with their etymology or, at *least*, in a sense accepted by a dictionary.



Unless you hate you cannot possibly love.
And vice-versa.

30 - “*Alive, Alive-O*”

SURELY TO-DAY, and increasingly, there is an exaggerated tendency to overestimate the importance of the fact of living—of our apparent existence as individual phenomena? It is almost a dictum to say that we “have only one life,” and “must make the most of it”—understood.