

## Article

# Science & Spirituality

Steven E. Kaufman\*

### ABSTRACT

The key to unlocking the door to the nature of Reality, i.e., the nature of What Is Actually There, including the realization of our own True Nature, lay in both science and spirituality. Science has discovered that to observe is to create the observation, at least at the quantum level, although the same is true of all perception and conception. This discovery has opened the door to a conceptual understanding of Consciousness as being What Is Actually There where experiential reality appears to be. However, it is spirituality that has to arise to bridge the chasm between the conceptual understanding of the world as composed of Consciousness and the direct realization of one's self as that Consciousness. Spirituality makes it clear that if one is to truly know What Is Actually There, which includes knowing one's own Nature as That, then one must move beyond concepts and into the Formlessness Itself, devoid of concepts.

**Key Words:** science, spirituality, reality, Consciousness, nature, formless, void.

## 1. Introduction

Imagine that you had no ability to perceive visually what is actually there in the world around you. But then you find that you can make an etching of what is actually there, after which you can then visually apprehend the etching and so in this way form an image as well as an idea of what is actually there.

The fact is, we have no ability to perceive visually What Is Actually There in the world around us. Nor do we have the ability to form an idea that is itself What Is Actually There in the world around us. All that we perceive visually, as well as all that we conceive mentally, are etchings that we create as What We Actually Are here forms some relation with What Is Actually There.

The reason that we do not have the ability to perceive or conceive What Is Actually There is because perception and conception deal only in forms, only in etchings that have been created through some relation of What Is Actually There to Itself, meaning that What Is Actually There is completely different in nature than the created etchings.

For this reason perception and conception do not and cannot present us with an accurate image or idea of What Is Actually There, because if it is an image or an idea then it is an etching, and if it is an etching then it is, by its very nature, not What Is Actually There.

---

\*Correspondence: Steven E. Kaufman, Independent Researcher. <http://www.unifiedreality.com>  
E-mail: [skaufman@unifiedreality.com](mailto:skaufman@unifiedreality.com)

That having been said, the world as described by science both in terms of perception and conception, i.e., the world-view that science presents to humanity, is a world-view that is ultimately nothing more than an etching of What Is Actually There. And although the etching that science presents to humanity bears some slight relation to What Is Actually There, as an etching bears some slight relation to what it was that was etched, because the world-view that science presents to humanity is an etching of What Is Actually There and not What Is Actually There, the world-view that science presents to humanity can never be What Is Actually There.

Because the world-view that science presents to humanity is ultimately no more than an etching of What Is Actually There, the most science can do is explore and map the surface of Reality, the surface of What Is Actually There, and having done so present us with a perceptual and conceptual view of the world that it then calls reality, which reality science and most of humanity take and so mistake for Reality, i.e., for What Is Actually There.

Thus, anything that science defines and presents to us is an etching of Reality, an etching of What Is Actually There. Even at the level of quantum physics, where Reality is being etched and presented to us as a probable reality through the abstract mathematical equations and concepts that take the form of the wavefunction, what is being presented as reality is still but an etching of What Is Actually There and so by itself says nothing about the nature of What Is Actually There, in the same way an etching of a temple carving reveals only the surface features of the stone that is there, while saying nothing about the nature of the stone itself.

The fact is, no matter how deeply science probes, What Is Actually There will elude its grasp, because What Is Actually There can never itself actually be contained in what must always be what is only an etching of What Is Actually There.

At one time science presented us with the etching of atoms and told us that that was what was actually there. And then What Is Actually There where atoms appeared to be was unraveled and etchings were then made of the smaller threads of What Is Actually There that were exposed by that unraveling, and we were then told that subatomic particles were what was actually there.

However, the etchings referred to as subatomic particles were different than the other etchings that science had previously produced. That is, when science made an etching of what is referred to as an atom or of anything larger than an atom, an etching that was consistent in appearance was always produced. On the other hand, when science made an etching of what is referred to as a subatomic particle, or of anything smaller than that, what was produced at different times was an etching that was not consistent in appearance. And not only were the produced etchings not consistent in appearance, even more strangely, the produced etchings had opposite appearances, such that sometimes the created etching had the appearance of a particle and at other times, through other relations, the created etching had the appearance of a wave.

For a time this threw the professional etchers of Reality, i.e., scientists, into a bit of an uproar. For up until then it had been assumed that the etchings that science produced were what was actually there. However, if the etchings were what was actually there, then how could what was actually there appear as etchings that were completely opposite in nature, i.e., as wave or particle? Further, if the etchings were what was actually there, then why did making one etching

of what was there, thereby revealing one characteristic, make it impossible to simultaneously make an etching that would reveal the opposite characteristic, introducing into the creation of any etching of Reality at these very small levels what is referred to as uncertainty?

In some physicists clarity arose as a result of the strange appearance and behavior of the etchings that were being made at these very small levels, as they realized that what they had been calling reality, what they had been observing, what they had created as an etching, was not what was actually there. In that moment, i.e., in the early days of quantum physics, there was the opportunity for science as a whole to realize that what they were observing at any level was only an etching, only a surface feature of Reality, and not What Is Actually There. However, that moment passed as scientists discovered and developed abstract probability equations as a way of etching Reality at the quantum level.

That is, because the probability equations, i.e., the new and improved etchings, accurately described and predicted to some degree what could be created as an etching through relation to Reality at the quantum level, science reentered the delusion that what it was describing in the form of these new and improved etchings was what was actually there, even though science no longer knew what to make of what was actually there, since the new etchings took the form not of definite things or events, but of only probable things and events, of things and events that might or might not be, of things and events that had only the potential to be.

And so now, instead of telling us that what is there is some sort of defined and particulate physical reality, science now tells us that what is actually there is some sort of probability wave. However, the wavefunction, which expresses reality in terms of probabilities, is itself just a more elaborate, abstract, and so more subtle etching created as the product of the relation of What Is Actually There to Itself, and so cannot itself actually be What Is Actually There.

Quantum physics is like the rare Individual that is slowly waking up to the realization that what they experience as reality is not what is actually there where that reality appears to be, and because of this quantum physics, in that moment of realization, presents humanity with an opening and opportunity to realize What Is Actually There. However, the rest of science is like the majority of humanity that remains lost in the delusion that the created etchings, the experiences, the observations, the measurements, are what is actually there. In this way, the majority of science not only does not present humanity with the opportunity to realize What Is Actually There, but to the contrary, it actually assists humanity in maintaining and deepening the delusion in which it has so long been mired.

However, as previously stated, the moment of realization for quantum physics seems to have passed, as quantum physics now seems caught up in the delusion that the probabilistic etchings that have been created are in some way actually directly representative of what is actually there. And so the opportunity for at least this branch of science to realize What Is Actually There seems to have passed, at least for the moment. But there will be other moments, and the next moment will come, as it came for me, when it is finally realized that the only way to consistently, logically, and reasonably account for the seemingly bizarre etchings that quantum physics keeps producing is by understanding how it is that the Consciousness that apprehends the created etchings actually creates those etchings, because the only way to understand how it is that the

Consciousness that apprehends the created etchings actually creates those etchings is by understanding that it is formless and uncreated Consciousness alone that is always What Is Actually There where any etching that we call reality seems to be.<sup>1</sup>

When I read recently about how much the founders of quantum physics, such as Bohr and Heisenberg, as well as many others, clearly understood about the implications of their discoveries, in that they understood that what they had discovered meant that what science observed could never be what was actually and directly there, I was struck by the fact that since that time, in the past hundred or so years since the advent of quantum physics, that this realization seems to have been lost, such that not only has there been no progress in that direction, or very little, but to the contrary, there has actually been a regression back to the delusion that what science describes as reality, as its created etchings, is what is actually there.

Science, in its present mode of thinking, which mode is one that by its nature is completely devoted and committed to upholding some sort of form as the primary reality, is anathema to spirituality. Nonetheless, the key that for me unlocked the door to understanding the nature of Reality, i.e., the nature of What Is Actually There, including the direct realization of my own True Nature, lay in both science and spirituality. However, the direct realization of my own True Nature did not lay in what science told me about the nature of reality; rather, it lay in what science allowed me to discover for myself regarding the nature of reality and Reality, which discoveries themselves came by way of understanding the discoveries of quantum physics outside the narrow confines of what science, according to its current dogma, claims is and is not real.

Understanding the seemingly bizarre nature of the phenomena that lie at the heart of quantum theory was relatively easy, since it was clear that science itself had and continues to have no reasonable, logical, or consistent explanation for what it has etched at the level of quantum reality. And so in approaching the basis of quantum phenomena, there were fewer obstacles to overcome, since it clearly remained an open question.

From the perspective of someone who, unlike the vast majority of scientists, already understood, at least at the conceptual level, that in the hierarchy of reality that it is the apprehending Consciousness that is primary and that it is the apprehended reality that is secondary, in that context the phenomena that lie at the heart of quantum physics were relatively easy to understand in a reasonable, logical and consistent way. On the other hand, from the perspective of someone who, like the vast majority of scientists, assumes that Consciousness is secondary, these phenomena have no reasonable, logical, or consistent explanation whatsoever, which is why science as a whole remains clueless as to their basis, while for Consciousness in the form of a Podiatrist living in Milwaukee that knows the world to be actually composed of Consciousness, the phenomena were a relatively simple puzzle to solve, a clever riddle.

---

<sup>1</sup> Kaufman, S.E., [The Nature of Quantum Reality: What the Phenomena at the Heart of Quantum Theory Reveal About the Nature of Reality](#), Journal of Consciousness Exploration & Research | January 2014 | Volume 5 | Issue 1 | pp. 01-84

As soon as Nothing looks at Nothing, which is all that is ever actually happening, because the formless nothingness of Consciousness is all there actually is, it creates something, i.e., an emotion, a concept, a physical experience. Put more accurately, whenever Nothing is in relation to Nothing, a boundary is created where Nothing becomes defined in relation to Itself, like a line that arises where the tips of two fingers touch. And that created boundary is what Nothing then apprehends as the something we call experience or experiential reality. However, in the case of human Consciousness, Nothing thinks that the created something is what's actually there, when what's really actually there is the Nothing that is both creating and apprehending the something.

Science has discovered that to observe is to create the observation, at least it has been forced to accept this fact to some degree at the quantum level, although the same is true of all perception and conception. However, science has yet to understand the implications of its own discovery, still believing that physical reality is primary and that Consciousness, or That which apprehends all experiential reality, whatever name you want to use to point toward it, is secondary and somehow a product of the machinations of a reality that no one has ever encountered outside the context of a Consciousness that apprehends it as such, i.e., as a reality.

Science cannot solve the riddle it has itself uncovered in the form of quantum physics because, by its very nature, it has to look at the riddle in the wrong way. And that is the secret to solving most riddles; just looking at them in the right way, i.e., in the proper context. Science, no matter how much it tries, is conditioned by the idea that what it etches as reality is what is actually there, even when that etching appears as an abstract mathematical statement referred to as a probability wave.

The key to solving the riddle regarding what quantum physics actually says about the nature of reality and Reality is understanding that nothing that we experience, nothing that we create as an etching of reality, no matter how abstract, complex, or subtle, can be what is actually there, because the nature of What Is Actually There and the nature of the etchings are completely different.

And if the etchings are not What Is Actually There then what does that leave us with as a candidate for What Is Actually There? Take away experience, take away the etchings, and what remains? Only the formless Consciousness that is aware of or apprehends all experience.

Quantum physics made it clear to me that whatever was created as an etching required a relation occurring between What Is Actually There in order to create that etching. Approach What Is Actually There from this perspective and you create this etching; approach it from the opposite perspective and you create an etching that is the opposite of the one created from the opposite perspective. This is the essential understanding; everything else are just details that follow naturally and unavoidably from this central understanding regarding how it is that Consciousness, through relation to Itself, creates what it apprehends as experiential reality, i.e., the etchings that we, in our delusion, mistake for What Is Actually There.

Science is a tool, but like the tool that is the mind, of which science is an outward or external manifestation or extension, it has run amok and taken over our lives, our Awareness, our Consciousness. Or more accurately, we have infused science with the energy of our Being and in

so doing have given it permission to take over and rule our Consciousness, to dictate to us what is and is not real, what is and is not our nature.

Science is considered the opposite of religion, because it supposedly deals only in logic and reason, and what can be objectively proven, whereas religion has no problem making claims that cannot be in any way verified. And yet, the central illogic of science, and what is really the central dogma of science, is the idea that if a thing actually exists then it should be able to be scientifically proven to exist, and therefore if a thing cannot be scientifically proven to exist then it must be considered to not actually exist. However, this unspoken yet pervasive claim that science continuously makes and holds up whenever it seeks to disprove the claims of spirituality itself has no basis whatsoever, but rather is a statement that, when considered outside its context as unquestioned dogma, is itself clearly a statement that, like all dogma, is completely self-serving, and by any measure of logic or reason is by its nature a statement that is, like the statements of religious dogma, completely unverifiable.

And yet science has used this bit of dogma to build an entire industry around trying to explain and uphold the idea that physical reality somehow creates the Consciousness by which it is apprehended. Because Consciousness, or more accurately, that which is being pointed toward by the word-concept Consciousness, can never be proven to exist in the way science proves things to exist, which is by converting them to an etching of some sort, a form, an object. Therefore, according to the central and unspoken dogma of science, physical reality, which can be proven to exist, except at the quantum level where it seems to dissolve into probability, must be more real than the Consciousness that apprehends it, because no one can prove the existence of Consciousness, i.e., it can't be made into a form, an etching.

The absurdity of the dogma of science regarding the relation of what can and cannot be considered to actually exist to the verifiability or provability of a thing lies in the fact that this bit of dogma itself cannot be proven, and so by its own expression should be considered by science to be unreal, which it actually is, and yet it is nonetheless held up as some sort of proof that physical reality is more fundamental or real than Consciousness, simply because physical reality can be objectively analyzed and Consciousness cannot.

It was in fact when I encountered this particular dogma of science while still an undergraduate studying the natural and physical sciences that it first occurred to me that science might itself be, with respect to some topics, quite as full of solid organic waste as religion can, on occasion, but not always, be. The very idea that science held as an unquestioned and therefore dogmatic fact the clearly and inherently improvable and therefore non-factual notion that if a thing actually exists then it should be able to be scientifically proven to exist, and therefore that if a thing could not be proven to exist then it could be considered to not actually exist, led me to have an open mind regarding certain things which it was clear that science at present had no clue regarding, such as the ultimate nature of Consciousness, as well as the relation of Consciousness to the rest of reality.

At the time I first became aware of this flaw in science, or aware of this quite unscientific dogmatic assumption, this corruption of dogma, as it were, that lie very near the heart of science, (although not at its heart, for at the heart of science still lies the pureness of logic and reason

unsullied by dogma) I knew nothing of spirituality. At that time I knew only of religion, which I had learned from my catholic upbringing. This is not to say that there is not great and abundant spirituality in catholicism, it is simply buried very deep, as occurs in all religions over time as the central teaching, which almost always tries to point the Individual toward their True Nature, becomes lost in the dogma and concepts that come to surround that central teaching over time, which dogma and concepts serve more to support the religion as a power structure or institution that to elucidate or illuminate the central teaching from which it first sprang.

So, when science tried to present to me as fact the idea that Consciousness was a product of brain function, and made all these claims about what Consciousness was and was not in the absence of any actual evidence or proof to back those claims up, other than its own unproven and unprovable dogma, I chose at that point not to drink the cool-aid, choosing instead to leave the question of Consciousness wide open for the time being. And so, unlike most scientists, I kept an open mind regarding the relation between physical reality and Consciousness, not having bought into the unproven and dogmatic notion that physical reality in some way produces the Consciousness that apprehends physical reality.

For me, deciding which was most likely primary, Consciousness or physical reality, or any experiential reality, came down to the logical conclusion that since the only way we could even know or be aware of any experiential reality was through our conscious apprehension of it, that it was far more likely that Consciousness was primary and that experiential reality was secondary, since there was clearly no such thing as experience in the absence of some Consciousness apprehending that experience. Name one experience of which you are not aware, or are not conscious. It can't be done. Therefore experience is, in some way, dependent upon Consciousness. On the other hand, there is no actual evidence that Consciousness is dependent upon experience; rather, there is only the unproven and therefore unscientific assumption that the machinations of the physical brain, which itself we can only know through the vehicle of Consciousness, somehow produces the Consciousness by which it is known.

Nonetheless, still being a scientist at heart, which I admit I still am, minus the unprovable and illogical dogma, and having postulated that Consciousness is primary and experiential reality secondary, I then set about trying to understand how it is that Consciousness could give rise to physical reality, i.e., how form could arise from the Formless, how something could come from Nothing. As part of my undergraduate liberal arts education, for which I shall be forever grateful, I learned about wave-part duality and quantum uncertainty, after which I had the sense that there was now enough information that if one approached all of this with an open mind, free of any assumptions other than the opening postulate that Consciousness is primary and experiential reality secondary, that it should be possible to understand how the Former creates the latter, if one could solve the riddle posed by these quantum phenomena.

And so after nearly thirty years I came to understand how Consciousness creates experiential reality, and so came to understand and know at a conceptual level with complete certainty that it must be Consciousness that is What Is Actually There where any experiential reality appears to be. Armed with this understanding I began to deprogram myself as much as possible from my cultural and scientific conditioning. I would wake up in the morning and my first thought would be something along the lines of; "the world is not composed of physical reality, it is composed of

Consciousness; it only appears to be composed of physical reality, but what actually lies beneath the surface of that appearance is the Consciousness that apprehends physical reality." This idea became my mantra, so to speak.

As a scientist, or as someone who still thought of myself as a scientist in the truest sense, as an adherent of logic and reason, I needed or wanted some sort of proof before I would fully allow myself to believe that Consciousness was the primary Reality, since my cultural conditioning had been the complete opposite. And the proof I came up with to satisfy this desire was a model of reality and Reality that was so simple, so reasonable, so logical, so internally consistent, that everywhere I turned I was able to use that model to understand something else about the nature of reality that had heretofore remained a mystery. And when that model allowed me to understand with complete and utter clarity the nature of quantum reality, allowed me to understand something that minds far far greater than mine have remained baffled by for nearly the past one hundred years, that is when it seems that my mind essentially said "screw it," and finally gave up completely on the idea of trying to convince me that my early programming regarding the nature of reality and the relation between physical reality and Consciousness, i.e., that physical reality was primary and Consciousness secondary, had been correct, and so no longer offered any resistance whatsoever to the idea that the universe was ultimately composed of Consciousness, or more accurately, composed of That which apprehends experience, which is pointed toward using the word Consciousness.

However, there was still something missing, and that is where spirituality had to arise to bridge the mentally uncrossable chasm between the conceptual understanding of the world as composed of Consciousness, and therefore myself as being actually composed of Consciousness, and the direct realization of myself as that Consciousness, as That of which the world, and the universe, is actually and ultimately composed, absent any conceptualization, and so absent any intervening and obscuring form.

It was spirituality that pointed out to me that owing to the nature of Consciousness as formless, and so being beyond even conception, that if there was to be true knowledge, true understanding of That of which the world is composed, of That of which I am composed, that all concepts regarding What Is Actually There had to be released, or not be clung to as actually being What Is Actually There, but at the very most had to be considered as signposts pointing toward What Is Actually There. That is, spirituality made it clear that if one is to truly know What Is Actually There, if one is to know one's own True Nature, then one must move beyond concepts and into the Formlessness Itself, devoid of concepts.

To know What Is Actually There as That, not as a concept but as the direct realization of It, as the direct realization of one's own Nature, one simply has to become aware or conscious of Consciousness or Awareness, or whatever you want to call, it in the absence of any conceptualization of it, which means in the absence of thinking, in the absence of the seemingly endless and ceaseless functioning of the mind. One simply becomes aware of Awareness, or conscious of Consciousness, not as a concept, but as the formless apprehending Presence that always is directly where one is, and in the absence of which apprehending Presence nothing whatsoever, either real or illusion, could ever be known.



To know directly What Is Actually There one must first see the etchings for what they are, which is as just etchings and not What Is Actually There, no matter how abstract or subtle. For as long as one takes the etchings for What Is Actually There, whether it be the abstract etchings of quantum physics, or a very useful model of reality and Reality, What Is Actually There remains obscured, even though it is with us at all times as our own Awareness, our own formless and timeless Consciousness.

When Consciousness flows in relation to Itself, or encounters Itself, an etching is always created. The etching has form. But if the etching, the form, is taken by the apprehending Consciousness for what is actually there then the form becomes an object, as the form then literally objects to or blocks the Consciousness that apprehends it as such, i.e., as what is actually there, from realizing or apprehending that it Itself, i.e., Consciousness, is What Is Actually There.

This is why the human condition is one in which there always seems to be something missing, because there is something missing, and what is missing is our True Nature, our True Self. It's not that our True Nature isn't there, it's just that it has become hidden from us as That while still in plain sight as our Consciousness. What almost every human considers to be their nature is ultimately nothing more than a collection of concepts, an aggregate of created forms, referred to collectively as the ego. Because we, as formless Consciousness, have taken the forms we create and then apprehend as experience for what is actually there, our formless Consciousness has identified Itself with form, i.e., has mistaken Itself for what is ultimately its own creation, and in so doing it hides Itself from Itself, from its own Awareness, behind the veil of form. This is maya, the veil of illusion. And as long as we continue to identify with form, we cannot identify ourselves with and as the Formlessness within which and out of which all forms arise.

We are not just an ocean that has mistaken itself for a wave; we are an ocean that has mistaken itself for what is only an etching of a wave, for something that is completely different in nature than What We Actually Are.

From a particular perspective, even Consciousness cannot simultaneously know Itself as both form and Formless, for all knowledge, even the knowledge that is the direct realization of one's nature as That which is indicated or pointed toward by the word Consciousness, requires the involvement of that Consciousness in a relation with Itself in order to create that knowledge, and as quantum physics has shown, involvement of the Individual Consciousness in one relation that creates any knowledge makes it impossible for that same Individual point of Consciousness to be simultaneously involved in the opposite and so mutually exclusive relation required to create the opposite knowledge. And the relation in which That which is indicated or pointed toward by the word Consciousness must be involved with Itself in order to create its form-identity is the opposite of the relation in which it must be involved with Itself in order to create its Formless-identity, its awareness of Itself as Awareness, its consciousness of Itself as Consciousness, its awareness of Itself not as an object, not as form, but as that timeless and formless Beingness out of which all forms arise and by which all forms are apprehended.

What Is Actually There is the ocean of Consciousness, and not the wave-form of experience, emotional, mental, or physical, that arises on the surface when the Ocean probes into Itself, or

flows in relation to Itself. The wave-form of experience is only a surface phenomenon, and can never tell us or be What Is Actually There below the surface.

Nor does the word Consciousness, nor Awareness, nor Formlessness, nor any other word or phrase tell you What Is Actually There, as these too, as words, as concepts, as mental forms, are themselves only etchings of what is there, and as such can at most be signposts that point one in the direction of What Is Actually There.

To know directly What Is Actually There you first have to stop thinking that the forms, the objects, the etchings are what is actually there. Because as long as you think that the etchings are what is actually there, you cannot know That which apprehends the etchings as What Is Actually There, cannot know that what you call the Awareness, the Consciousness, that Is directly where you are to also be that which Is directly everywhere else as well.

What Is Actually There is beyond words, beyond conceptualization, beyond form, but it is not beyond knowing. What Is Actually There cannot be known as an object, cannot be known as a form, cannot be known as an experience, but can be known directly as That out of which all experience arises and by which all experience is apprehended. That is, Consciousness can be conscious of Itself, but it cannot be conscious of itself as an object, as a form, because What Is Actually There is not an object and does not have form.

Thus, there are two kinds of knowing; no-ing and now-ing. I have long been aware that all perceptual and conceptual experience, i.e., physical and mental experience, is created as the product of some relation of Consciousness to Itself, like a boundary that arises where the tips of two fingers touch. The creation and apprehension of perceptual and conceptual experience is the form of knowing that is represented by the word no-ing.

The creation of perceptual and conceptual knowledge through no-ing involves always some opposition of Consciousness to Itself, or Consciousness being in some way in opposition to Itself.

As humans, we have what is called an opposable thumb, i.e., a thumb that is able to be in opposition to the other fingers of the same hand. This is said to be one of our great advantages.

It might also be said that we have an opposable mind, i.e., a mind that is able to be in opposition to itself. This is probably our great advantage in terms of our ability to think and conceptualize to such a high degree, but this great advantage that gives us the ability to conceptualize to such a high degree has become, for most humans, a disadvantage, because it has become, for most humans, the only way they have of knowing. That is, although we have the innate ability to take part in no-ing and now-ing, i.e., in both types of knowing, most humans are so persistently in a state of no-ing that they are unable to take part in now-ing, and so do not even know that this other type of knowing, i.e., now-ing, is even possible.

I had long ago read that this other type of knowing was possible, but had myself never actually been able know in that way until very recently. Franklin Merrell-Wolff described this other type of knowing and referred to it as *introception* in order to differentiate it from perception and

conception, which create form-based knowledge. Introception, referred to in this writing as now-ing, was defined by Merrell-Wolff "as the power whereby the Light of consciousness turns upon itself toward its source."<sup>2</sup>

When Consciousness turns its attention upon Itself so that It, rather than some created form, becomes the object, or what is apprehended, there is an identity and unity realized between the Subject and Object, such that the duality between Subject and Object vanishes, leaving one in a non-dual state of Consciousness that Merrell-Wolff pointed toward with the phrase "Consciousness-without-an-object."<sup>3</sup> The knowledge realized by the introceptive process, i.e., now-ing, is what is referred to as mystical or transcendental knowledge, i.e., knowledge of that which has no form, or knowledge of that which is beyond and so transcends form.

The relations of Consciousness to Itself involved in the processes of no-ing and now-ing are opposite, and therefore they are mutually exclusive. That they are mutually exclusive means that if you are involved in one type of relation, e.g., the relation of no-ing that creates form-based knowledge, then you are not involved in the other relation, which in this case would be the relation of now-ing that makes possible the realization of the Formless.

The hand can be in a state where it is in opposition to itself, where the thumb is placed in opposition to the other fingers, or it can be in a state where the thumb is not in opposition to any of the other fingers and so not in opposition to itself. These are opposite and so mutually exclusive relations.

The so-called normal human state is one that is analogous to a hand that is continuously in opposition to itself, and so never relaxes into the opposite state where it is not in opposition to itself.

It is the mutual exclusivity of the relations in which Consciousness must be involved with Itself in order to create the form-based knowledge derived from no-ing and the formless knowledge realized by now-ing that is responsible for our state of self-ignorance, or not knowing what we are, because knowing What We Actually Are requires that we be involved in the relation of now-ing, and we just cannot be in that relation while we are fully engaged in the opposite and mutually exclusive relation of no-ing that is creating form-based knowledge.

The knowledge that is created by no-ing and realized by now-ing are both apprehended by Consciousness. There is a lot that can be said about the knowledge that is created by no-ing, because the knowledge that is created by no-ing has form, and so we can use form, i.e., words and concepts, to legitimately and accurately describe the form that is created.

On the other hand, there is not much that can be legitimately and accurately said about the knowledge that is realized by now-ing, because the knowledge that is realized by now-ing is, like the Consciousness with which it is identical, formless and so unable to be truly delineated through form, i.e., words and concepts.

---

<sup>2</sup> Merrell-Wolff, F. *Transformations in Consciousness*, SUNY Press, 1995, pg. 144

<sup>3</sup> Merrell-Wolff, F. *The Philosophy of Consciousness Without an Object*, Three Rivers Press, 1983

The perceptual and conceptual knowledge that is created as a result of the oppositional relation of Consciousness to Itself referred to as no-ing, which relation is analogous to the hand forming a relation to itself through the opposable thumb touching the tip of a different finger on that same hand thereby causing a line or boundary to arise where they meet, is different in nature than the Consciousness that, through this oppositional relation to Itself, is creating and apprehending the form-based perceptual and conceptual knowledge.

Conversely, the transcendental Knowledge that is realized as a result of the non-oppositional relation of Consciousness to Itself referred to as now-ing, which relation is analogous to the hand forming a relation to itself by relaxing into a state of non-opposition to itself, is of the same Nature as, and so is identical to, the Consciousness that, through this non-oppositional relation to Itself, is directly realizing Itself as that Knowledge.

Thus, the Knowledge realized through introception, i.e., through now-ing, is not created, but only seems or appears to be created when considered from the perspective of form-based knowledge. That is, the Knowledge realized through now-ing cannot be a creation because the Consciousness that realizes it is identical to it, and Consciousness is not created. So it is that when this Knowledge is realized directly, as opposed to being described through form as is necessary when writing about it, it does not present the appearance of having been created, but rather presents Itself as the revealing or revelation of That which is always there, or put more simply, and directly, presents Itself as the revelation of That which Is.

And from this transcendental perspective forms still arise, perceptions and conceptions can be and still are being created. However, from this transcendental perspective, where the attention of Consciousness is primarily upon Itself, those created forms clearly arise out of and exist only within the field of Consciousness by which they are being apprehended. Thus there is, from this perspective, no confusion regarding which reality is primary and which reality is secondary, or which reality is ultimately more substantial and enduring, just as when one observes waves upon a large body of water there is no confusion regarding the relation between the waves and the body of water.

But is one were to look at a body of water and think that all that is actually there are the waves, then one would not see the body of water itself, and so the body of water would still be there, but it would be hidden in plain sight, as it would be obscured by the wave-forms that only arise on its surface. The Knowledge that is realized by introception, or now-ing, is like the body of water that is always there beneath the waves, underlying the forms, appearing or revealing itself to itself once one is no longer locked into the relation of no-ing that causes the waves appear to be what is actually there. The ocean does not cease to be when someone mistakes the waves that arise upon its surface for what is actually there, it just becomes hidden from them. Likewise, What Is Actually There does not cease to Be when it mistakes the forms that are created and arise within Itself for what is actually there, it just becomes hidden from Itself.

When Consciousness is conscious of Itself as form, as an object, this is an illusion that places such a Consciousness in a state called delusion, and such delusion is the human condition. The illusion of knowing Itself as form is the veil of maya that Consciousness seems to unavoidably cast over Itself as it projects Itself into the dimension of physical experience, into the level of

Self-relation and no-ing where physical experience is created. This illusion and its resultant delusion is like a cloak or set of clothing that we seem to have no choice but to don as we emerge, as Consciousness being human, into this particular level or dimension of Reality.

However, it is not physical experience that is the great obstacle to realization and the lessening or cessation of delusion; rather it is mental experience and the thoughts we harbor and cling to regarding the nature of reality and our own nature as forms, as objects, as ego's, that keeps us immersed in what appears to be a world of form and objects devoid of the real Life that underlies and is the source and basis of all form, all objects.

The present delusion of science regarding the nature of reality and its dogmatic obsession with form is the internal delusion of humanity externalized, or more accurately, the internal delusion of humanity that results from our seemingly compulsive and complete identification with form has become externalized as the delusion of science and its complete identification with form. And as humanity has increased its knowledge of the surface features of Reality, increased its knowledge of form, thinking that all that is needed is a more detailed etching to discover what is actually there, the actual result has been that Reality Itself, i.e., What Is Actually There, has only become more and more obscured, buried deeper and deeper under mountains of concepts that can never in all of eternity be the Formlessness that is What Is Actually There where experiential reality seems to be.

I am not actually trying to tell you What Is, for there are no words that can do that, since What Is is different in nature than words. However, I am using words as signposts to point you in the direction of What Is, which is also not different from What You Actually Are, not different from or other than the formless Presence, the formless non-conceptual non-perceptual Consciousness that Itself apprehends these words, and that task words certainly have the ability to do, if only you let them, if only you do not consider the word to be or even represent What Is, but instead see it only as a pointer, a signpost, pointing toward That which is, by its Nature, beyond all words because it is beyond all form. For this reason it has become my habit to differentiate between words that point toward That which is beyond form, and so beyond conception, and those that do not, by capitalizing those words that are being used as signposts to point toward what is, by its very Nature, beyond form and so beyond words.

There is no concept here to be grasped. If you try to grasp It, try to grasp That which the capitalized words are pointing toward, It will be obscured. If you try to grasp It, you are treating the words as the actuality and not as the signposts that they are.

If you are heading toward chicago and come across a sign that points toward chicago and somehow come to think that the sign is chicago, then you stop where you are, thinking you have arrived at your destination, and so you never actually get to chicago, even though in your delusion you think that you are already there.

We think we know what we are, but because what we think we know we are is not what we truly Are, we think that there is something missing from what we are, and so we go off in search of it, looking to find it in form, in objects, in concepts. But these always come up short leaving us looking for more of the same. And in all of this looking for what seems to be missing we never

look in the one place that it can only and ever be found, which place is directly where we are in this moment, in the Now, as the formless Awareness or Consciousness that is apprehending in this moment, and only ever in this moment, only ever in the Now, all that we call reality, be it of the emotional, mental or physical variety.

As Eckhart Tolle is fond of pointing out, you will not find yourself in the future or in the past, because future and past are nothing more than forms, conceptual constructs that no one has ever actually experienced directly. The future is a thought form that is being created and apprehended by Consciousness Now, as is the past, as are all experiences. Consciousness Is the Now and the Now Is Consciousness. Two different signposts that point toward the same formless Reality out of which all forms arise and by which all forms are apprehended.

We sense something is missing and so we look around but don't find it in this moment, because it is obscured, and so we habitually project ourselves into some future moment, which future moment is really only a thought form, a concept, where we think what seems to be missing might be found. But as long as we do that, as long as we look somewhere other than where we are right Now for what is missing, what is missing has to remain missing, or more accurately, what is obscured has to remain obscured, because what is obscuring what then seems to be missing are the forms, the concepts, that we continuously habitually create as we, in complete and utter futility, look for what is obscured and therefore missing in what is only thought form that we ourselves are creating in this Now. And as long as we are looking for what is missing in some form, in any concept, we cannot in that same moment realize that What Is Actually Missing, or that What is Actually Obscured, is the formless Consciousness that is Itself creating and apprehending all the different forms.

If you get bogged down in the concept, bogged down in the words used to point toward What You Are, then you may think that you have already arrived at knowledge of What You Are, when all you have done is set up camp at a signpost. I speak here from personal experience, having spent the last thirty or so years knowing to one degree or another at the conceptual level that the world was composed of Consciousness, while failing to understand until recently the difference between the concept, no matter how subtle or abstract, and the direct Reality that is actually there that the word Consciousness is pointing toward. And it was not until I ceased to identify with form, ceased to think of myself as having any real form, that it even became possible for me to instead identify with the Formless, not the Formless as a concept, but directly as the Formlessness by which all form is known and out of which all form arises.

It is not the ego that had this realization, not the conceptual illusion of myself that had this realization; rather, it was the Awareness that had until that moment mistakenly thought of itself or known itself as the ego that had this realization. What you think you are does not and will not realize That which is your True Nature. What you think you are is by its nature a thought, a concept and so has form, and so can never be That Which You Actually And Always Are And Always Have Been And Always Will Be, which is the field of formless Awareness or Consciousness that both creates and apprehends, through its relations to Itself, the ever changing forms that arise out of It.

Consider a river. In physical terms what is actually there, the river or the swirls that arise and come and go where the river flows in relation to itself? Try to grab onto a swirl and there is nothing there but water. The swirl is ephemeral, a form that arises in the field that is the river.

Now consider our own situation as humans. What Is Actually There, the Consciousness that is always there or the experiential forms that come and go within that field of Consciousness?

This is why it is essential to understand the illusion of the swirls of form relative to the Reality of the River of Consciousness, because as long as the swirls are mistaken for what is actually there, the River will identify with the swirls, with the forms, because in that condition there is nothing else for the River to identify with, because in that condition, i.e., where the forms are taken for what is actually there, the River of Consciousness, as What Is Actually There, no longer presents Itself as one of the options for creating an identity, having obscured Itself, its very Presence, behind the veil of maya, which is nothing more than the veil of form mistakenly apprehended as what is actually there.

What We Actually Are is that which both creates and apprehends reality, and so reality is whatever we say or believe it is, at least at the mental-conceptual level. So if we conceive and so believe that form is real, then form becomes our reality, and Formlessness then must appear as unreal, and so as something that is not a candidate for creating an identity, as it then appears as something that does not even actually exist. And so it is that Consciousness becomes hidden in plain sight of Itself by nothing more than a mistaken idea that by its nature tends to perpetuate itself, until for whatever reason the mind stops working long enough that the illusion of form-identification in that moment cannot be maintained, as the illusion of form-identification requires concepts, requires form. And as the illusion ceases to be created the veil of maya is lifted, and in that moment, and only in that moment, before the mind starts working again and generating the concepts that again obscure Awareness from Itself, there is the opportunity to become aware of Awareness, conscious of Consciousness, and in that moment know one's Self to be That directly, absent any concept.

And once that is done you just keep doing it over and over and over again: misidentifying with form, finding an opening to become aware of Awareness and knowing one's Self as that, misidentifying with form, finding an opening to become aware of Awareness and knowing one's Self as that: misidentifying with form, finding an opening to become aware of Awareness and knowing one's Self as that, misidentifying with form, finding an opening to become aware of Awareness and knowing one's Self as that and on and on it goes. And as this goes on the moments one spends in delusion grow more shallow whereas the moments one spends in Knowing become deeper.

There is the mistaken notion that once Awareness is aware of Itself as That, i.e., as Awareness, that the ego just goes away and one is forever free of its influence, but this is very very rare, e.g., the Buddha, Jesus, and Eckhart Tolle are three examples that come to mind. For most people it is a matter of slowly diminishing the influence of the ego, the form-identity, by just paying less attention to it, by becoming aware of its illusory nature, and thereby spending more time in awareness of Awareness, so that like a structure that is not kept up, the ego just slowly fades away.

For the ego is not autonomous; rather it is a conceptual structure that can only function through the force of the attention of Awareness to it, like a paddlewheel placed in a river, turned and energized by the flow of the river through it. It's just that when there is nothing but form-identity virtually all of the attention of our Awareness goes to the ego, and so it is then very forceful in calling more attention to itself and presenting itself as one's identity. But as attention is diverted from the ego toward Awareness or Consciousness Itself, toward identification with the Formless, suddenly the paddlewheel of the ego does not turn with the same force, and so it is not as effective at performing its self-perpetuating function of drawing attention to itself, making it progressively easier for one to identify instead with the formless field of Awareness or Consciousness that had always been there, but had for so long remained obscured by its own ceaseless attention to the forms that it was Itself continuously creating within Itself.