Answer to the dilemma of existence.

- Student:
When you say that the ultimate objective of all religions is to return to the origins, I ask myself, Why do we have to go back to where we have come from, and why did we leave in the first place? This is something I do not understand!

- Sesha:
I have been asked this question many times, and it is one of the few that make any sense. I asked it to myself when I was fifteen, when I began to think about these issues. For instance, I analysed that the Sanskrit word *yoga* comes from the root word *yuj*, which means *unite,* or that etymologically the word religion comes from the Latin *religare*, meaning rejoin, join up again. I asked myself where do I have to return to and what point is there in doing so when, ultimately, I do not even know how I came to be here or who sent me to this place.

You can analyse this question from two points of view and therefore it has two answers. The first way to look at the question is by analysing what you pretend in asking it, that is, assuming this world exists, existed and will always exist, and that the conditions are always similar all the time. But apart from the mistaken assumption that things are "something" – when at bottom, there is no continuity, but rather appearances of existence within *thresholds*[1]-, there is a second mistake of appreciation: assuming that whoever asks this question is "someone" within this Something".

It is assumed then that on one hand there is a place where the "I" resides and, on the other an "I" that finds itself in this place; that is, it is presumed that both the "I" and the universe are real. This is where the problem arises in this question; it is not that it is mistaken, it is that, even though it is a valid question it is badly put. When your mind tries to establish and recognise the cause of something that on a day-to-day basis it considers unstable and changeable, the contradiction of the presumption that the universe and subject are stable arises, yet when it comes down to it they are continually evolving.

The threshold is the intersection between states of consciousness and the point where change from one state to another happens. It is absolutely a-dimensional, without any location, and it has a totally unknowable nature.

One possible solution lies in asking yourself the following: is the subject that asked the question the same subject as after having asked it or is it another? And if you ask the same question later, is it one of the previous subjects asking this or is it different one? And is the universe the same? The answer is that the universes are changing and at the same time so are the subjects. Therefore, the solution does not lie in asking about the nature of the universe but about its cause, as the cause of any universe must be the same. If you look at it from the point of view previous to the differentiation of the subject and universe, this instant is before the birth of the mind and for this reason unknowable, at least at a mental level.

Therefore, this approach leads us to state that this dilemma has no solution, because the instant the query is asked this is after the instant before it came into being and in this way we get into a vicious circle, hence the absence of any solution.

A second way of approaching the question is to move it to another state of consciousness to establish a comparison and in the end a solution – for instance, the dream state. Anybody who is asleep, experiences their dreams as if they were real; that is, while the dream is unfolding it feels as if it were real, to the point where you could say that this precise instant in which we are now in is no more or less valid than any instant of any of our dreams. In other words, this actual moment could be the dream of someone here or maybe somebody far away is dreaming it, because the reality with which we perceive things is the same in a dream as when awake. Therefore the feeling of reality that there is in this very moment could be what we feel in a dream.

In this dream, which we use as an example, resembling as it does the reality of this present wakeful state, the dreamer sees him/herself as being different to the elements in the dream, be it the ceiling, the floor, the clouds, mountains or any other thing or person that may be perceived in the dream; however, everything which is projected in the dream is a figment of the mind of the dreamer.

Imagine that in the dream a lecturer talks about the universe and the dreamer asks the lecturer why return to our origin, and he/she answers that the universe is non-dual, that it is non-differentiated, etc. – emulating what I am always seeking to teach you. This answer and commentaries have a partial reality, since some will understand this explanation and others will not, just as is happening here and now. Then it is worth asking yourselves: does this universe in the dream have a cause? Does this universe projected in a dream but perceived as being real, have a cause? If you ask an anthropologist who happens to be in the dream they will begin to talk about Palaeolithic or Neolithic eras; if it is a

astrophysicist that person will speak about how black holes come about and how white stars can evolve into dwarf stars; they would say that there are thousands of galaxies that have evolved over millions of years. Any of these commentaries are valid in the dream, but are they real?, does anyone take any notice if they are or not?

The error in the question, then, is asking it in the dream itself and believing that the universe that is generated there is "something" and that whoever asks the question is "someone". For this reason the question can be asked but it has no meaning, because the cause of the universe in the dream lies in whoever dreams it; In the same way, the answer to the question about the cause of this universe is not to be found in this universe, because neither it nor the subject has a cause in itself, just as nobody in the dream has a cause, the cause lies in the dreamer.

Of all those who appear in the dream, the only one that can resolve the question is the dreamer, because it is their dream; the others apparently evolve within the dream thanks to the dreamer making them "someone", but none of them are. The universe perceived is not "something" either, and the belief that one part of the dream is different to the other is mistaken. Yet the paradoxical thing is that they are felt to be such.

The same thing happens in the waking state; the perceptor resembles the character dreamt by the dreamer in the dream state, and if we want to know the cause of this a second explanation comes to mind: we are God's dream. The solution to the dilemma of existence is only to be found at the point where one notes that the reality of things does not depend on a differentiated "I" or "that", that is, they are essentially non-different to the reality. While there is this apparent differentiation, what there is in the universe is an intersection of absurd ideas created by the "I" and "that", which generate all types of thresholds between realities, making us fail to recognise the essential nature of what they really are.

Paradoxically, there are always thresholds flowing between each condition of "I" and each condition of "That". It is precisely in the exploration of these that you can understand the nature of any "I" or any "that". To get to know the cause of each of them you need to shatter your false idea that the universe is "something" and the subject is "someone". Once you do this, that is, while once we verify that between them there are only the thresholds of reality, what is appreciated is that the universe has always been, is and always will be, and that the events that happen and the present where they happen are identical, always have been and always will be.

Therefore, just as there is no answer to the proposal of trying to perceive a squared circle, since the proposal itself is mistaken, the answer to the cause of the universe is made based on the presumption that both subject and universe exist.

Asking, Where do I come into this?, or when can a circle be seen as square?, seems to be valid but is insubstantial. The words seem to have some logic in them, but on structuring them mistakenly we present ourselves with a problem, an illogical situation, while presuming it is correct. It is similar to trying to capture a threshold between two events; in the moment we think we have captured it, it is not there. We made what seemed to have been a logical move but it is not valid, That is all it is, it is not that the question does not have an answer, it is that it is mistakenly asked.

- *Student:*
The conclusion I come to after listening to you is that none of the questions that I could ask from my state of consciousness are going to have an answer. On the other hand you encourage me to reach certain states of consciousness whilst in inner meditation, but I do not understand why I should do so.

- *Sesha:*
The objective of meditative practice that I promote is not to reach a certain state, but that everyone should witness their own experience and check this against what I teach; so, the only thing I ask is for each person to situate themselves in the present and observe their inner world; the first thing you experience is the distancing of mental objects so that later on you are awakened to other forms of cognition.

-*Student:*
Yes, I agree. What I really wanted to say is that there is no point in asking myself questions, because the answer is in Non-duality.

- *Sesha:*
Asking questions has the advantage that it allows you to be more completely in the present, with less doubt.

-*Student:*
The problem is that instead of finding more peace, which is my purpose, I am confronted with more conflict.

- *Sesha:*
The idea is to ask the question properly. From the perspective of my teachings, struggling to be happy is like struggling to have more Present when there's already oodles of it. From my point of view the question makes more sense if it is constructed another way: Can we

be more in the present now? Can one ask for more than being in the absolute and unlimited present?

The problem, therefore, is not asking questions, but asking them correctly. When you ask a question correctly, the answer will appear on its own, because the content of the question is completely organised. The answer is included; you only have to be silent, and it will promptly appear.

And if you do not succeed in forming valid questions, you must exercise your mind so that it enables you to do so. This happens when you are in a state of constant attention, and for that reason you need to pay attention to everything you do all the time, all your life. There is nothing easier and at the same time nothing more complex than this.

The following collaborated in the transcription, correction and editing of this text:

MERCEDES FERRER, AMAIA AURREKOETXEA, JOAN FERRER, ENRIC FERNÁNDEZ, FÉLIX ARKARAZO Y JORGE ROJO.

This text has received final revision and authorisation by Sesha.

.