

Into the Stillness

Dialogues on Awakening Beyond Thought

GARY WEBER and RICH DOYLE

NON-DUALITY PRESS
UNITED KINGDOM

Gratitude to Suzanne Winters for her tireless efforts
on behalf of Stillness.

INTO THE STILLNESS

First edition published May 2015 by Non-Duality Press

©Gary Weber and Richard Doyle 2015

Cover design by John Gustard

Gary Weber and Richard Doyle have asserted their rights under
the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as
authors of this work.

All rights reserved

No part of this book may be reproduced or utilized in any form or
by any means, electronic or mechanical, without prior permission
in writing from the Publisher.

Non-Duality Press | PO Box 2228 | Salisbury | SP2 2GZ
United Kingdom



ISBN: 978-1-908664-53-2
www.non-dualitypress.org

Contents

<i>A book has occurred</i>	v
Predestination, control, free will and the illusion of time	1
Using dialogue for awakening... ..	11
Can you “do nothing” and awaken?.....	17
Why do we fear emptiness, silence and stillness?.....	23
Attachment and suffering	30
Can inward revolution change sustainability?	39
DIY non-dual awakening	45
Does the world need to be “fixed” or is it “perfect”?	54
Dysfunctional evolution of the mind	61
Enlightenment is a process not a goal... ..	72
Functioning without thoughts: sex, psychedelics and non-duality	77
Getting to stillness in a crisis	83
Guessing others’ minds through mirrors.....	89
Guilt and shame... useful or dysfunctional?	95
Higher functioning without thoughts	102
How much should teachings cost?	107
Is your energy level important in awakening?	111

Letting go into the bliss and joy of stillness.....	117
Making awakening too complicated... pitfalls and barriers ...	126
Non-dual awakening obstacles, tactics, misconceptions and delights	134
Oneness... What is it? How does it arise? What does it mean?	142
Psychedelics, sex and/or non-dual awakening?	151
Religion has failed...now what?	154
Self-inquiry practices on a busy schedule.....	164
Sleep	171
Spiritual practice with partner/wife/family as Zen masters	175
The difference between pain and suffering... ..	181
The “I” can’t dance	185
The neuroscience of non-dual awakening	189
The wonderful surprises of awakening beyond thought	199
What is a teacher?	205
When, where, why you get stuck on the ‘path’	210
Why the resistance to having fewer narrative thoughts?.....	218
Working with relationships, emotions and grief.....	227
<i>Endnotes</i>	233
<i>Index</i>	236

A book has occurred

Rich: So, you know, strangeness. A book has occurred.

Gary: Strangeness. A book has manifested out of thin air.

R: It's totally unbelievable. Where did it come from?

G: Well the whole thing came out of no place, as you know. It just arose in meditation that we should do some dialogues. So we started doing dialogues and they clicked.

R: And then somehow they manifest out of the Stillness and it's like a book just popped up out of the void, or out of the nothing, out of the Stillness. What should people do with it?

G: Well, we've talked many times... the good thing about it is that it's spontaneous. But we've found out that as we do this thing what emerges from each one of us moves into something that's much larger; $1 + 1 = 3 \frac{1}{2}$ or something. So stuff that we didn't know we knew is in this video and in the dialogues.

R: So that can happen to other people: they can pick up the book and engage in the dialogue and experience the dialogue. And they don't really need to begin or start anywhere in particular.

G: Any place, any page will work, any dialogue will work. They're equally useful... or not.

R: I even think you can start mid-dialogue, you know, just open it. It's like the book is designed for bibliomancy...

G: Oh yes, exactly. Any place in the book will work.

R: Just dip into it, start riffing...

G: Well, we've talked about this idea of showing people how to do dialogue, which is something that people don't do much anymore... given that we're doing this (*texting with thumbs*) all day long, we don't spend much time trying to get into dialogue with somebody. We're just so afraid to have an open discussion without anybody feeling threatened and just let the whole thing unwind its way out.

R: Indeed, you know when I'm teaching and I talk about dialogue in the classroom, I've found that people think dialogue is what you do to avoid fighting. (*Laughter*)

R: Like where we get together and figure out how we can agree, and that's not what it is! It's an exploration.

G: Ahhhh, that's great!

R: Isn't that funny?

G: It is! But it is having that confidence, a fundamental trust in each other, and enough self-confidence and awareness to be able to just work your way through this stuff, piece by piece, and kind of feel your way into what the next thing is as it comes up.

R: And it's practice in strengthening the "letting go" muscle because you can just let go into it, don't try to anticipate what the other person is saying—just hear it and respond.

G: And see what comes up.

R: And when we do that it's like a practice for filling our self with Presence all the time. Just feel what the refrigerator door feels like when we open it. See what the light looks like inside. Taste what the onion tastes like when we're cooking it. It's the same thing isn't it?

G: Yes, it's a very tactile thing. It's the feel of what it feels like to be in dialogue, to be the emptiness and just feeling something come up out of no place as the next thing to be manifested.

R: Sometimes I feel like what we're going through is actually a re-awakening of feeling. Not feeling in the sense of an "emotion"—but that somehow we've been through this period where we've atrophied the sense of access to the flow of what comes from that no place. It's still there, but you have to sort of look for it and use it and practice it. It's an inner feeling? It's the sensing of what it feels like inside.

G: Oh, totally. We've talked about how it's very important in this work, since a lot of it is DIY, to get a good sense for when things feel like they aren't working anymore; what they felt like before, and what they feel like now. Have things gotten flat? You can feel that in a tactile way, as you can do with this work. You can feel if you're in honest, authentic dialogue or you can feel yourself being inauthentic. Can you feel yourself not coming out fully with what you want to say, or what is manifesting for you? Or do you hold back?

R: So by following along with our letting go, other people can learn to let go.

G: Let go of themselves... just trust the process and surrender to your Self.

R: So, who wrote this book?

G: It came from no place. One of the mysteries is just how do these things write themselves? This book came out of no place. The initiative to do it just arose in meditation and we just said well, let's do a dialogue and see what happens. You had set it up within a space of three or four days and we had found somebody to do it with and we had found a filming studio... it just manifested.

R: Miraculous even.

G: Miraculous!

R: But of course everything is miraculous because everything comes out of this place, which is no place.

G: It does!

R: But in this case it was obvious, it was very obvious. If there are any royalties who should we send them to?

G: I don't know where it goes to, because really, as we've observed, there is nobody doing this speaking. It's just coming out of no place, spontaneously, and we get synergies out of it; $1 + 1 = 3$.

R: It's only insofar as each of us gets out of the way that it emerges so...

G: Yes.

R: It's not us speaking.

G: No.

R: But something else speaking forth...

G: Right. Things we don't know we knew, come up and they join together in a way that's much more powerful than either individual speech.

R: Indeed. I'm convinced we didn't know. You know what I mean?

G: We didn't even know it.

R: It isn't just that we knew it and didn't know it. It's that by creating this space knowledge emerges.

G: It may also be that we had pieces and parts in different parts of the brain, and as we start to do this we call upon

whatever the topic is, it goes out and grabs pieces and puts together a story. Out of that comes something that we hadn't known before, or at least it hadn't been organized in quite that way, and it matches with what you're saying and then you do the same thing. So the pieces were there, they just weren't assembled in a coherent way.

R: That's why it's going to be interesting to see what pieces people pull out of the book. It's going to be a situation where they get pulled like a magnet to this dialogue or that line or this line. It will differ individually. Then to see what they make of it. It's going to be like a mashup of our mashup.

G: Well, one of your favorite words is "bibliomancy", and in fact this will be an ideal text for that. We can just pick it up, open it at any page, any line, any paragraph, and it may be useful to you. It came out of us spontaneously.

R: It's almost as if it's a book written for bibliomancy. Most books are not written for bibliomancy. It's against the grain.

G: Right.

R: But this one, you just pick it up, you open it, you look, you see what it's saying... you feel the response in you. Then you feel the response in whoever is responding in the text. Now you've got three responses happening. You can start to tune your own ability to let go into that response.

G: It came out of the space. Speaking about feeling, we've talked a lot about feeling, about getting a sense of what it feels like to come from down in here (*chest*) as opposed to coming out of here (*head*). If you come from down in here (*chest*) out of Stillness, something of a whole different quality emerges. That's what this is. This is full of those individual pieces coming out of who-knows-where place and putting them together. If you can read that and get that same sense of it, you can feel in yourself something coming out of your own space.

R: You can feel that—it's a very particular feeling, or the very particular absence of other feelings. It's going to be interesting to see what people do with it.

G: It could be a very useful book.

R: So what is the context for this book?

G: An important aspect is, as we talked about in the episodes as well, that there is no context. We aren't trying to set a context. We don't have a set and setting that we're coming from or moving into. We just let whatever manifests come out. Something else, or some "energy else", is creating its own context. This is just manifesting out of that. There is no storyline, there's no message, there's just coming out and it doing itself.

R: How should other people understand it then?

G: Just recognize that this is completely spontaneous. There is no precognition, there's no premeditation. It just comes out of no place. People are amazed that it can happen but it does happen. We're still speaking in voices or tongues; it's just coming out of nowhere, coherent as it is, with no background, no setting, and no storyline.

R: That is the context then.

G: That is the context.

R: In other words, if you want to understand this book, use the book to get to that place where things are coming out of Stillness. So the Stillness is the context.

G: Yes. If it has a purpose, the purpose would be to get people in the situation to recognize that they can work this way themselves. They can feel the energy in the book of spontaneous speaking and feel it in themselves; they can manifest exactly that same thing. We (Gary and Rich) are not particularly empowered this way. Anybody can do this. They just get

out of the way and feel it coming from down here (*points to belly/chest*) not up here (*points to head*) and just wait for it, be present, be patient and let it come out. It's astonishing what can happen.

R: In fact it's the only way they've ever created anything anyway.

Predestination, control, free will and the illusion of time

R: So, has all of cosmic history been leading up to this dialogue on predestination?

G: Yes. Everything since the big bang has conspired to bring us to this very point at this time.

R: I'm not quite sure how you come up with that logic but maybe we can examine it a little bit.

G: Yes. If you just look back at our lives, and think how many things had to take place before now—in your life, and in mine, to come to this point at this time. Not that this is the *only* best place in the whole world...

R: But it's where I am.

G: But it's where you are, it's where you are. And arguably, if almost any one thing of thousands of things—perhaps millions of things—in your past had been different, you wouldn't be here right now. You're not aware of those; you can't—nobody can—go back and cognize all of the possibilities and choices that were made some time in the past that led you to be right here at this point at this time.

If your grandma had gotten on a different bus or had gone to a different party or your grandfather had gone some other path that day, you wouldn't be here today. We certainly wouldn't be here together today. So you get into the consideration of what do you take out of the entire stream of events that brought you here to this point that wouldn't matter?

And the difficulty is, that you don't know which one of those really did matter, and how much it changed everything that came after.

R: Right. This is what the time travel theme in science fiction stories always get into... which event can change in the past without the present disappearing? As we've discussed, that makes a lot of sense in terms of deconstructing the idea that we are in control.

Because you know that when you look at the past or you look at your involvement in an event that unfolds in the near future, you can see that there's just way too much complexity there for you to possibly have made that a decision to cause yourself to come into being. The long and the short of it is, did you decide when you were going to be born?

G: Right.

R: No. Are you going to decide when you're going to die?

G: No.

R: No. So that seems to me that if we'll really look at it, we'll see that this illusion of control that the "I" has is just that, it's an illusion. It's a kind of a cursor that we use to move through the world and maybe in certain evolutionary situations it was favored. But it's not the case that we exert control. It may be sexy to other primates to make it seem like we were in control, but we're not in control.

G: Right.

R: But there's a more subtle philosophical question. Just because we're not in control doesn't mean that everything is predestined, right? In other words, we can imagine a lot of scenarios on the continuum between total chaos and total order where, true enough there's too much complexity for our "I" (if it existed) to be in control.

But how does that play into this idea that everything is predetermined when we can't even predict, for example, when a drop of water is going to drop out of a faucet because of the sensitivity of that drop of water to initial conditions? So it seems to me there's another piece of that discussion that has to happen. You were alluding to it before, but another piece of that discussion has to happen in order to feel the truth of the predestination aspect.

G: It's funny how different people feel about the three things. If you ask, "Well, are you in control of every facet of your life?" almost nobody will say "yes". They've all been through natural disasters, seen calamities, family members have died, they've seen car wrecks that clearly were out of their control. So then they say, "Okay, I'm not in control of everything in my life, but for some things I am."

R: I can choose fries rather than onion rings.

G: I can choose fries, not onion rings. Or I can choose the small drink or the big drink.

R: Right, super-size it.

G: Yes. But those come to the same thing though. Which one of those choices that I can make were unimportant? They say, "Well if I can't control that, what can I control?" And the problem with choice and control is that we don't know the implications of our decision. I make a decision which takes five seconds more in line at the Thai restaurant or wherever. Just 5 or 10 seconds longer in line. At some level that has perturbed the entire universe. Everybody's universe has been moved by five seconds because of my five second delay. All of their universes are moving at the same time.

We don't know who that might impact. Some other diner might have been there, who then went out in the street five seconds later and got hit by a car. Their whole family's lives

changed. We just don't know what the implications are of any action that we did. As far as my saying that I know what's going to happen from my actions, I don't. Because 3, 4, 5 days down the road many, many thousands of things could have happened that were perturbed by my seemingly insignificant decision.

R: But you see how that could actually be an argument against predestination then. Because the present does not allow us to know what the future is going to be, precisely because it's not determined.

G: But you can't step out of it. I mean, the thing is that nobody can step out of the dance. We presume that if it isn't predestined, we can step out of the dance. And if I step out of the dance then everybody has to wait on me to do something before the dance can go on.

R: No, that's not what I intended. I mean, so, we give up personal control, individual personal control.

G: Okay.

R: And so we are dancing along and buffeted even, by all the events that are happening absolutely everywhere in the cosmos since the beginning. Whether or not those events themselves are deterministic is then, it seems to me, a different question. For me, the reason why they appear to be deterministic is, because what you're alluding to is that, if everything is one thing, then that includes past, present, future... that there is no openness in the future. It's all already happened as it were...

G: But it doesn't have to have already happened. The argument to me is that there are your two poles—it's either completely chaotic, or completely ordered. And I don't have any sense in my life that my life is chaotic. On the contrary, my life is massively serendipitous... I can watch things being arranged

—or arranging themselves—in an astonishing way: such low probability events occur in my life, and over and over and day by day by day. And so, I don't think it's just me... most of us, if we can just step back and watch, can see that our life is highly serendipitous.

R: Sure.

G: Arranged by?

R: They wouldn't be here if it wasn't.

G: They wouldn't be here if it wasn't. If it was just chaos then you know we'd be just as likely to be sitting over in that corner never seeing each other again. And that isn't the case, that isn't what happens. So there is a lot of predestination in our lives to bring us from minute to minute to second, second, second. So if I gotta choose between chaos and predestination, predestination or order—let's just say order first.

R: Yeah.

G: Order is certainly obvious to me... and those seem to be logically the only two choices. And so if I've got order then I say well, do I have any ability to change the order myself? Can I change order? Well, not discretely, to your point. I can't step out, alone, of this massive interconnected universe and say "I'm going to make a decision different from what's moving through the dance." There can't be a possibility to do that because we've got 7 billion people right now running around the planet. If everybody was able to step out of the dance, we're back into chaos again. So to keep this web working, logically it follows, to me at least, that there has to be some way that we cannot step out of the dance. If we could the whole thing could disintegrate.

R: No, we definitely can't step out of the dance precisely because of our interconnection with each other and with the

cosmos. But I think this question about predestination comes into focus when we say, “Are the only two choices total disorder and total order?” Or is it that what’s unfolding is different levels of order, that we have a kind of emergent experience of order where not even the system knows what is going to happen? Not even the cosmos itself knows what is going to happen. Which undermines the idea of it being predestined in the usual sense that we mean that, right?

G: Well, maybe it’s a question of temporal scale.

R: Yeah.

G: Everything’s predestined from the beginning of the Big Bang to the end of this next collapse, which is, you know, *n* billion years in the future. You don’t need that. For me it’s as if we have an anthropomorphic all Oneness/She. If there is the Universal field we can see everything as one thing. And if the Higgs field or whatever name we’re going to use for the Universal field exists—and we think we have the Higgs field pretty well defined now—if that is self-aware, but we have no indication that the Higgs field is self-conscious. We have no way of knowing that. But you could posit that if there is an All-Thingness that is self-aware, as many scientists are saying, then everything gets explained. Quantum mechanics gets explained, collapse at the electron level gets explained, and this very question gets explained. Because She doesn’t have to know that far out. All She has to know is this far out. And She is local as well as non-local; She is learning and seeing each moment by moment. We are not in charge of that thing. That doesn’t mean there isn’t something...

R: That’s it.

G: ... that is all-knowing that is beyond my very humble intelligence and capabilities that is in fact dancing this thing picosecond by picosecond. That’s the part that we can’t step

out of. That's the part that's predetermined. Not a billion years in the future...

R: Right.

G: ... but the next picosecond is not within anybody's control except the Universal field.

R: Well that's where this experience of Oneness is really the major premise of this argument. If you experience Oneness and you experience synchronicity, then it becomes obvious that, at least at the scale that we exist on, everything is unfolding exactly as it should...

G: Perfectly.

R: ... as it were. But if you don't experience that Oneness then you think that the future is somehow separate from the present...

G: Right.

R: ... Right, that there's a dualism between the present and the future. And because we can't know what is going to exist with that drop of water as it drops in the next however many picoseconds, then it's unknown. But what's interesting is to experiment with in terms of whether or not the Higgs field is self-aware, is that we can sort of shift that question a little bit. We can know that in a way it's self-aware because we know about it, and we are an attribute of that field, rather than in any possible way separate from it.

G: Right.

R: So, if we know about the Higgs field¹ and all of cosmic history can be experimented with as the unfolding of our

1.The Higgs field is an energy field that exists everywhere in the universe. It is accompanied by a fundamental particle called the Higgs boson, which the field "uses" to interact with other particles continuously.

knowledge of what we really are, which is an attribute of this Higgs field...

G: Right.

R: ... then it's not a stretch at all to say, "Well of course it has self-awareness, that's how we know what it is!" As opposed to the dualist perspective which would say, "Well, how do we know that that is self-aware?" Right? Well if we could separate the Higgs field from us, well then of course we can't really get our mind around the idea that it is or isn't self-aware.

G: We can't.

R: But if we can't be separated from it, and it appears to be the case that we are aware...

G: Right.

R: ... then of course it has self-awareness.

G: ... and it is incontestably all-pervasive. Nobody's saying it isn't all-pervasive.

R: All-pervasive, manifests matter...?

G: Yes, we know that part.

R: What else do we know about it?

G: We know it's all-pervasive, we know it actually makes matter come into being.

R: And, we know that we're conscious.

G: We know we're conscious.

R: So you put those three things together and what seems like a kind of wildly unwarranted speculation that there's an attribute of the cosmos itself that pervades all things and is itself conscious...

G: Right.

R:...becomes instead something that can be observed empirically...

G: Right...

R: Oneself!

G: Almost “Duh?”

R: Yes.

G: But then also you mentioned in addition to the importance of, the value of, being able to see that everything is one thing, you can also see that our perception of time is an illusion.

R: Yes.

G: Where you fall out of the sense of time, and live only in now. Not just because Eckhart Tolle says that. There only is now. There’s never a past or a future that you can really grasp, it’s old stored stuff which is...

R: It’s now again.

G: It’s now again, it’s now again. That changes the point about the speculation about long-term predestination. I think our predestination is zero—except other than the fact that the field is moving, modifying, picosecond by picosecond. And when you get out of this having a sense of time, then that’s much more apparent to you. In fact you can grok that... “Yeah, I get this!” The field is continuously reformatting, changing, and modifying itself picosecond by picosecond.

R: So this looking at predestination helps us come up against the fact that the future itself is a kind of fiction because it relies on the separation of ourselves from present moment.

G: Right, right.

R: And if we dwell in present moment the question of predestination doesn't even arise.

G: No.

R: Because we just *are*.

G: Right. And there's no sense of time. Without a sense of time the whole idea of predestination doesn't mean anything.

R: Exactly.

G: There's just now, now, now, now, now, unfolding.

R: And the feeling of predestination is, "I have always been, and I always will be."

G: Right... right. Yes.

R: Useful.