

Solid not separate: how the appearance can be confused for separateness.

In a recent Tony Parsons meeting (see <http://www.theopensecret.com>) there was a comment concerning “solidness” of objects in the world. This article looks at this point.

When we observe things in the world we see everything as having a physical form and those materials which have density and solid matter such as wood or metal or even water, all feel solid and material to our senses. There is an equating of solidness with “reality”. When we think of something which we feel is “real” or when people talk about “reality” it is all about seeing a material expression, something “real” means something solid. Even when people talk about having a “real relationship” it’s often concerning the idea of people living and being in the same space, “reality” is defined by a physical sense.

The origin of this way of looking at the world, which we can call “materialism” for want of a better word, is the situation of looking at the universe through a belief system. The core of this belief system is “me”, the belief that I am a “solid” thing that is separate from the world. “I” am over here and “you” are over there and this can be confirmed by touch, “I” feel this solid body here and “you” over there are a different solid body. However this view of the world always has the underlying premise of separateness and so effects all of the information from our sense which cannot see out of this way of thinking unless the process is totally disrupted by something completely different. Tony describes the nature of the human-condition as the “me” being an accumulation of energy within the contracted state of the human body. But of course this amassment of energy is not disconnected from anything else, it is completely unified with the whole of existence, it is just that in the state of contraction there is a “fullness” that forms the materialist belief system.

The perception is obscured by the contraction of energy, fear. What would happen in the natural or wild state is that the energy of response in nature such as when a lion chases a gazelle, is simply an energy passing through these expressions. However somewhere in human history the process of allowance of energy to pass through the body got stuck, probably for physiological reasons related to the human standing posture, and so the emotion of “fear” formed within the human. This is the fundamental basis of all other emotions (meaning “disturbances”) of the human-condition. The emotion is all about the “me”, which is a feeling that has been attached to, the “me” is sticky so emotions attach to it that impede the energetic flow throughout the body. This stuck fear is in contraction and contraction is a withholding of energy over long periods of time, from the age of three or four onwards it forms a kind of “shell” or “armouring”, creating the belief of “me” inside and the world “out there”. This divide or detachment is simply the nature of the contraction called “myself”. “Me” is the name given to the state of contraction, so by naming the contraction we are actually always naming the “dis-ease”. This is interesting, it means that the “solid” body called “me” or “David” *is* actually the dis-ease (not a surprise to some!). The point is that materialism is engendered by the nature of contraction and the sense of separation, which in turn engenders a loss of sensitivity as there is now an armouring between “me” and the world. So there is a sense of numbness, in a way a depression about all of this because what was originally there in infancy has now been

“taken away” or seems to have been. As Tony explains, in fact what is, has always been, nothing has been taken away or lost but from within the contracted state the true felt sense of connection to everything *seems* to be cut off. It isn’t, but just feels like that.

Then there is the idea that with due process, such as various religious methodologies of meditation and mindfulness, there could be a way through this maze and back to reality, an intentional “softening of me” even. But in fact everything undertaken by the process of “me” cannot aim to destroy itself, for this state of contraction has now become stuck and believes itself to be “alive”, in as much as it is solid and separate. So to make it non-solid and not separate would be the very thing that “me” tries to avoid. In fact, meditation processes commonly reinforce the process of “me”, the notion of a “meditation” or “qi-gong” “master” says it all, how can it be possible to “master” what you already were and something that has never changed? It is never about mastering anything, it’s about a letting go or dissolving, a loosening of an image of what “I” think I should be, then all that is left is life as it is. When the whole construct falls away, there is nothing else left but what *is*.

When the arrogance of taking a horse to water passes, the horse finds water and drinks.

So what is there outside of the contracted state? This isn’t really worth putting into words as it is an Unknown, rather than a knowable or definable expression. Energetically one could describe it as being when the state of contraction of the “self”, dissolves there is simply a natural flow of energy without impedance or amassment of resources. It takes perhaps 60% of the body’s energy to perpetuate the daily existence of the nature of “me” so when this drops away the energetic system is far more efficient.

It is very hard for the senses to let go of materialism, the idea of “me” being solid and “you” being solid over there. Everything in the world is set up for “individualism”, the solid-state idea that “I am a real thing” provable by the physical body and “my” physical expression, including the names and labels of objectifying life. However what is solid is only actually the appearance of solidity. Science is baffled by the fact that what atoms mostly consist of is no-thingness or space and the actual “real” or “massive” aspects of an atom are made up of energy which is constantly turning on and off or going into and out of existence every billionth of a second, so in fact *every* moment is another big-bang. The point is that even on an intellectual or a conceptual level the nature of life and things that appear to be solid is actually only an appearance, in fact they are not solid or absolute or bordered, there is no edge to anything that is absolute, everything is One-thing.

But what prevents us from seeing this? Why is it that we seem to live in a world where there is dual nature, a “you” and a “me”, a “subject” and an “object”? There is always this divide. This is because there is a looking at the world through the filter of “me”. The energy contraction is like an hallucinogen for the senses, it creates the illusion of separation because there seems to be a “locality” or centre to “me”, whereas no such thing actually exists. If “I” doesn’t have an absolute centre then in fact it never existed at all, the fundamental premise is completely annihilated and then the house of cards of “me” drops out. However, this doesn’t mean that one can walk

through walls or bend spoons, it simply becomes obvious that the natural reality is one where there is an outer appearance that is unified beneath this surface. This applies to everything, even waves on an ocean, instead of them being isolated and objectified they exist contextualized by the fact they are One with the ocean. This does not discount the wave, neither does it discount the ocean. The never-ending question for the seeking “me” is “how do I know that the waves and the ocean are One?” or “how do I feel the ocean?” but again these are all questions asked from the perspective of the “me”. Eventually the questions can’t find an answer, and as a result there comes a point of giving-up which can turn in one of two directions: there is either a passivity of questions which simply don’t get asked and remain within, with the conclusion that “I know the answer to this ‘cause I’ve heard it all before”, or there can be the beginning of a falling away of the questions themselves and as a result, or at root there is the loosening of the sense of “I am” as an absolute. This is the general expression of what happens at a Tony Parsons meeting, eventually all the questions asked and responses given seem to be coming from one singularity.

So that which has physical density or seems solid is a formation of a surface energy that is either dense or soft, but this is nothing to do with the fact that it is all made of a Unknowable Oneness at root. From this perspective everything is both real and unreal, full and empty, what seems solid is actually no-thingness, so it is really a paradox of *nothing being everything*.

David Nassim
7/ 5/ 2012