

YOU ARE ALWAYS PRESENT AS THE REALITY OF ALL PERCEPTIONS

Extract from 24th April 2021 Dialogue 'Knowing means Perceiving and Understanding'

Questioner: What I experience is perceptions, but I cannot say I experience gaps between them. While this does not say that all there is is perceptions, if Consciousness is not a perception, I cannot know it.

Francis - I agree with that. It depends what you mean by 'knowing', Through the human mind we know only perceptions. So if Consciousness is not a perception, we cannot know Consciousness through the categories of the human mind. In other words we cannot know Consciousness as a perception, but when there is a perception this perception is made of Consciousness. Then we know Consciousness that reveals itself in that moment as a perception.

When I was a child we used to write secret messages on a piece of paper with lemon juice and with a feather we would write secret messages on the piece of paper. When the juice dried out the paper was blank, and then if you heat the paper with a flame, the hidden message written in lemon juice would reveal itself. In this metaphor, the hidden message is like Consciousness: it is there whether you heat the paper or not, but it manifests only when you burn the paper. Likewise, Consciousness appears in the form of perceptions. You as Consciousness are always present as the Reality of all perceptions.

Questioner: Why do you say 'I am the Reality of all perceptions?' How do you separate perceptions? When does a perception end and another start?

Francis: First, we can separate them in hindsight. Like when we talk right now we can distinguish past events. It is the recollection that puts together event A and event B, it separates them and at the same time it puts them together saying, for instance, event A came first and event B followed.

The question you are asking is 'are there gaps between perceptions?' It's a tricky thing to understand, because it is true that the perceiving - the Reality of perceiving - is continuous. However, perceptions are not continuous, and what tricks us is that we attribute the continuity of Consciousness to perceptions. The reason why we do this is because the absence of perceptions, the gap between two perceptions does not leave any recoding in memory, because we can only remember perceptions, we do remember the absence of perceptions.

Since we establish only by hindsight whether there is a gap between perceptions or not, and since the mind does not have access to the gap between perceptions, we say 'I don't remember a gap, therefore there was no gap.' But that is a faulty argument: the fact that we don't remember something does not mean it did not happen.

But the fact that we don't remember is not evidence that it happened either, so I have to find another way to show you that there are gaps

The example of a gap is a sudden understand, and that is an example. If you do mathematics for instance, you cannot understand half the proof of a theorem, either you understand or you don't. [...]

Likewise, if I tell you 'all humans are mortal, Socrates is a man, therefore Socrates is mortal', either you understand this or you don't, there is no half a way.

So when you understand something there is a clear gap: before it you have not understood, after it you have understood. [...]

Let me give you another example to point to these kind of gaps in our perceptions. When we suddenly come to grip with something.

For instance, we are looking for the keys of the car. We don't know where they are, if we knew you wouldn't be looking for the keys. And then all of a sudden we remember 'Ahhh when I came back I washed my hands in the sink in the garage, and I left my key there, on the vanity!' And you are certain.

Before, you did not know where the keys are, you are looking for them, all of a sudden, you know where they are. There is a difference, something has happened between 'not-knowing' and 'knowing', and you say "I suddenly became aware that I left the keys on the vanity" I am giving you all these examples to open you to the possibility of an experience in which there are no perceptions.

Questioner: I see that I was taking 'perceiving' to be undistinguishable from the 'perceiving of perceptions'.

So the continuity is in the understanding, not in perceptions. Am I wrong to say that 'mind' is itself a phenomenon?

Francis: No, we could say that 'mind' is the phenomenal aspect of our human experience. In other words it is everything we perceive. And that's what mind is experientially: the set of all perceptions, meaning

thoughts, bodily sensations and external sense perceptions - and include recollections that belongs to the category of thoughts.

Let me open a parenthesis. 'Mind' as an experience is different to 'mind' as used in psychology which is simply as a model to explain perceptions. A model is a theoretical concept to explain something else, like quantum mechanics is a model to explain physics at the microscopic scale. This definition of 'mind' is useful and has its domain of application and of validity, but here we are interested only on 'mind' as the phenomenal part of our human experience.

Questioner: If perceiving, (understanding, knowing) is continuous, and there are gaps between perceptions, why are these gaps not always noticed?

Francis: It depends what you mean by 'noticed'. Let me replace this word with two options: 'remembered' and 'experienced'. Do you mean the gaps are not experienced in the moment itself, or do you mean they are not remembered after the fact?

Questioner: I mean that the gaps are not remembered. They seem not to leave any trace.

Francis: let's go that point that is very interesting. Let's first start with the gap of understanding. When you understand something, let's say the proof of a theorem in mathematics, do you agree that it is not someone rather than you that understands?

Questioner: Yes.

Francis: Doesn't that mean that in the moment of understanding - in the gap - you are present and conscious?

Questioner : Yes.

Francis: This gap, has it not operated a change in the mind?

Questioner: That's true

Francis: Before, for instance, you did not know whether this theorem was right or wrong, and now you know. And you now have in memory how to move it and if you are a teacher you can teach it to your students, you can prove it to them.

So from this we have reached three conclusions:

- (1) the mind does not understand the gap itself, which does not mean that you were not aware during this gap;
- (2) During this gap it was you who were aware
- (3) This gap has operated a change in the mind.

Once we have ascertained that particular gap, which is the understanding, we move beyond and ask ourselves: how do perceptions change? We are under the impression that our perceptions change in a continuous fashion, just as when we watch a movie it seems that people in the movie move in a continuous way, but if we slow down the movie we see that they move in a succession of still frames. So could we not be that all perceptions that we have just gives us the impression to be continuous, but that in fact all the is continuous is Consciousness, not the perceptions, because the gaps do not leave

any residue in memory. The perceptions borrow their continuity and their reality from the Consciousness that perceives them.

We have to understand what the term 'knowing' means. 'Knowing' means both 'perceiving' and 'understanding.'

'Knowing' refers more to the 'gap' knowing, and perceiving refers more to the aspect of 'knowing' in the presence of perception. But the dynamism - in other words the fact that things change, is due to the gaps. In a certain sense, time is an illusion that is created by the gaps. The gaps are the engine that create the evolution.

Questioner: To understand this [i.e., Francis's previous answer] I have to think in terms of depth of the gaps. Why some gaps are glimpses and others are not.

Francis: By the 'depth of the gaps' you mean the levels of reality. Let me try first to hint at the fact that perceptions are discontinuous from the vantage point of science, and this is not at all my field of expertise, but it is my understanding that the activity of the nervous system can be described by the firing of neurons, and that the mechanism of the way the neurons fire is a kind of binary one: yes or no, there is a built up, and there is a release, any specific neuron either fire or does not fire. Therefore there is an assumption that, since our perceptions are a creation of the nervous system, at a very elementary level our perceptions are discreet, because what we perceive is the sum total of the firing of all neurons, which are in finite quantities; and the subset of the neurons that are firing on any given moment are even more limited. According to this model, if we go down to a more fundamental level, at the quantum scale, then all the phenomena that takes place in the

atoms our nervous system his built on would be granular, quanta. A that level it is a discreet process. So if we take the view that our perceptions are the product of our nervous system, a case can be made that at a microscopic level, or at a time scale that is small enough to look into the nature of the perceptions has to be granular, discreet.

Questioner: To understand this [i.e., Francis's previous answer] I have to think in terms of depth of the gaps. Why some gaps are glimpses and others are not.

Francis: By the 'depth of the gaps' you mean the levels of reality. Let me try first to hint at the fact that perceptions are discontinuous from the vantage point of science, and this is not at all my field of expertise, but it is my understanding that the activity of the nervous system can be described by the firing of neurons, and that the mechanism of the way the neurons fire is a kind of binary one: yes or no, there is a built up, and there is a release, any specific neutron either fire or does not fire. Therefore there is an assumption that, since our perceptions are a creation of the nervous system, at a very elementary level our perceptions are discreet, because what we perceive is the sum total of the firing of all neurons, which are in finite quantities; and the subset of the neurons that are firing on any given moment are even more limited. According to this model, if we go down to a more fundamental level, at the quantum scale, then all the phenomena that takes place in the atoms our nervous system his built on would be granular, quanta. A that level it is a discreet process.

So if we take the view that our perceptions are the product of our nervous system, a case can be made that at a microscopic level, or at a

time scale that is small enough to look into the nature of the perceptions has to be granular, discreet.

It's just a model, a scientific way to give you a hint. What we are interested in is the experience of the gap.

It's because of the recollection issue I was alluding to. How do we remember a glimpse?

We cannot remember a glimpse, we can simply notice the difference between before and after. If the difference in the mind before before and after is infinitesimal, we won't notice it, and therefore it won't remain in memory that something has happened. But if there is a big difference between the before and the after, then we will go back to this difference and we will recall in memory that there was a big difference.

That's why it seems to us that we only remember discontinuity in our experience. But the fact that we remember some opens the door to the understanding that it is our constant experience, so that our view of reality changes drastically.

And here is how it changes: before we thought that everything that was real was perceptions, and the gaps between perceptions seemed to be not existent. But once we understand the reality of the gap, all of a sudden everything changes drastically. It's a shift like the Copernican turn about the motion of the celestial bodies: everything changes completely. Everything - most of everything - are the gaps, and the perceptions hang in there, tiny tiny in infinite spaces.

To give you an analogy. It's like matter.

When we look at a piece of steel it seems to be compact, opaque, it seems that there is no space. But this piece of steel is made of atoms, and atoms are made of nuclei and electrons in orbit around the nucleus.

And to give you an idea of the scale, the nucleus of the atom would be like an orange in New York City and the electron in orbit around the nucleus would be like a little pea located in Los Angeles. All the rest in between is empty space.

So this piece of metal that seems so dense, so compact is in fact most empty space. Because then when we look at the nucleus and the electron themselves we go down further into quarks and gluons ... we encounter only forces that gives this impression of being compact, but it's all empty space. So physics changes our idea of matter from one that is compact to one in which is mostly space.

This is just an analogy, the same thing happens when we understand and this understanding changes our view of Reality. We first have this view according to which that which we perceive (objects / perceptions) is real and the space, the gap between perceptions, are not remembered. Then, when we understand, this view switches completely to one in which that which now is real is the gap, infinite, huge, while the perceptions are tiny tiny and being made of awareness themselves. [...]

It is a shift of reality: the reality that was attributed to perceptions is now attributed to the Awareness, it's a complete reversal of the order of Reality.

Krishna in the Bhagavad Gita says "that which is light (meaning, the objects) for the ignorant is night for the sage who sees, that which is night for the ignorant (that which the ignorant ignores) is light for the sage who sees"

The glimpse into the light of Awareness is the liberation. It's the move from ignorance to wisdom.

THE ABOVE TRANSCRIPT IS OF THREE VIDEOS POSTED ON
FRENDS OF FRANCIS LUCILLE GROUP, LINKS TO VIDEOS:

(1)

[https://www.facebook.com/groups/98221155624/permalink/
10159595759375625](https://www.facebook.com/groups/98221155624/permalink/10159595759375625)

(2)

[https://www.facebook.com/groups/98221155624/permalink/
10159595818165625](https://www.facebook.com/groups/98221155624/permalink/10159595818165625)

(3)

[https://www.facebook.com/groups/98221155624/permalink/
10159595885100625](https://www.facebook.com/groups/98221155624/permalink/10159595885100625)