



## **Clarifying the New Map of Essential Me *Questions and Answers***

### ***What is the meaning of subconscious me?***

It is a part of consciousness that is difficult to define because of its subconscious nature, which simply means that we are not consciously present in its experience. Subconscious me can be experienced in two ways. The first is when our observer is unconscious of essence-me and connects to thoughts in an entirely subconscious way. Each thought is linked to essence-me but that me can be present to different degrees. Even when me is not conscious of itself, one still has an exteriorized sense of me as being the subject to thoughts, or else we could not think at all. So there is always identification between me and the information that a thought contains; both a mental and emotional identification. An ordinary human actually lives in the dimension of the subconscious me, with perhaps some rare moments of lucidity where he or she can sense that me more strongly and come to the threshold of the self-conscious observer.

The second way subconscious me is experienced is when we have already embodied conscious me. But seeing as conscious me is the root-identity of the observer, how can subconscious me still exist? To answer this, we need to contemplate the different ways that conscious me connects to external attention. If external attention is conscious, our thinking is conscious. But if it is subconscious, our thinking is subconscious too. Subconscious thinking from conscious me can occur only when the observer is overly relaxed to the point of losing alertness. For external attention to be conscious, the observer has to focus to some degree. Here, it is not the kind of coarse focus that the false observer manifests in ordinary people. Rather it is a very fine, gentle focus where we pay attention to the external reality or to our own thoughts.

When the observer is spaced-out, meaning it does not pay attention to things and is not intentionally involved in the mind's content, external attention becomes subconscious. However, if we are still embodying conscious me, we experience this subconscious external attention from our pure subjectivity. We call this 'conscious subconscious thinking' or the 'conscious subconscious observer.'

If the observer is not paying attention to our thoughts, who is thinking then? Even when the observer is fully relaxed and not directly involved in thoughts, there is still a natural link between essence-me and thinking. In fact, this link goes beyond thinking into the general psycho-somatic awareness that runs through our whole body. In this way, everything that occurs in our body or mind is linked to a sense of me, in this case the subconscious me.

There is natural place for the subconscious in our holistic consciousness. It represents the spontaneity of intelligence that has to go through different process without direct interference of the conscious observer. Often, we experience our relative me as neither conscious nor subconscious but in-between. For instance, sometimes upon reflection you cannot really say that you have been consciously involved in your thoughts, but yet you have a sense of being present in your thoughts. This indicates that the observer was very relaxed and non-alert, in a mode in-between paying and not paying attention to thoughts.

***Is there are a gap between awakening of conscious me and pure conscious me, or they should awaken at the same time?***

In the ideal scenario they awaken at the same time, or at least pure conscious me awakens very soon after conscious me. Conscious me alone is not very comfortable and does not have enough stability to reach freedom from external attention. As such, it will inevitably exist most of the time as the conscious observer. And indeed, the conscious observer is not a place to remain, but more of a passage to the transparent observer.

So yes, you need to awaken conscious me and pure conscious me more or less simultaneously and in this way shift as soon as possible into the transparent observer. If you have already realized pure consciousness, and then you realize conscious me, you can experience transparent observer in this way. However, it will be unstable unless pure conscious me is present. Why? Because pure conscious me is the soul-body of conscious me, and its connection to verticality and restfulness.

In addition, pure conscious me is also unstable without the fundamental me, hence awakening of the fundamental me should occur soon after realizing pure conscious me as well.

***The old conscious me (now pure conscious me) could have either unconscious/subconscious observers or conscious observers. Is that still true of the new pure conscious me?***

Yes, it is the same principle: pure conscious me can be conscious and the observer unconscious, meaning pure conscious me can exist without conscious me or conscious me can be temporarily lost when the focused observer is activated. So we can have the paradoxical situation where we embody pure conscious me, but our observer is false.

The fact is that the closer we are to essence-me, the more it is difficult it is to be truly conscious on that level. A person can be profoundly awakened on one level, but remain unconscious as the observer.

For the observer to be truly conscious, the presence of conscious me is required and the secondary center of conscious me, the center of external attention, has to be conscious as well. So there are two main scenarios of how we can be unconscious in essential me: pure conscious me is conscious while conscious me is unconscious (hence the observer is by default also unconscious); or pure conscious me and conscious me are conscious but the secondary center of conscious me is unconscious.

***Why can fundamental me not go lower than the upper cheekbones? Is there a portal there to the absolute I am?***

The question why its lowest portion ends at the level of the cheekbones is interesting and revealing. There is certainly a portal to absolute I am there. And in fact, if we were to draw a horizontal line through the headspace, we would see that the point where fundamental me enters absence at the front of the head, is on the same level as where pure me of consciousness enters vertical absence, at the back of head. It is somewhere on that line where the essential channel actually intersects with the central channel.

This explains why one cannot reach samadhi of essential me without first arriving at absolute consciousness (samadhi of pure me of consciousness in the absolute I am). The central channel of surrender has to be fully open before the essential channel can become linked to it.

***Why does conscious me have to transcend through absolute I am in order to reach internal samadhi in its own core of essence-me, the immanent I am? Can't it happen directly?***

Unless conscious me merges with the transcendental I am, it cannot access immanent I am. This is because it must be first freed from the dimension of presence. The realization of primordial I is in fact a union of two samadhis: samadhi in absolute I am and in samadhi in immanent I am, which in turn allows us to realize the primordial I am.

***Are primordial me and primordial I the same?***

No, they are not the same. The previous distinction between the two is still valid. Conscious me merged with the absolute I am is primordial me. Conscious me merged with immanent I am is primordial I.

***Can the absolute me realize the immanent I am?***

You are mixing up concepts. Pure conscious me does not have essence-me, and immanent I am is hidden in the core of the essence-me. Only conscious me, which is the conscious owner of essence-me, can realize immanent I am. But of course, it has to first reach vertical absence and become primordial me.

***Does the realization of primordial I by conscious me mean that it has merged with the primordial I am?***

Yes, it does. We spoke about this in the revelatory articles that we released after the India season last year. Primordial I am is the source of absolute I am. Absolute I am is another name for the inner universe which contains our manifested universe. The bridge between absolute I am and this world is universal I am, which is the source of the waking consciousness of this universe.

Our surrender to transcendent I am cannot lead to the realization of primordial I am; it is too hidden to be revealed in this way. To realize primordial I am we must come even closer to our very self, into the kernel of essence-me, into the immanent I am. For this to be possible, and for the immanent I am to be revealed, we must first achieve internal samadhi. And for internal samadhi to be possible, conscious me has to first of all reach the state of absence in absolute I am.

***It seems there are four samadhis of essential me: samadhi of pure conscious me (absolute me), samadhi of fundamental me (fundamental state), samadhi of conscious me (primordial me) and the internal samadhi of conscious me (primordial I).***

***Can you elaborate on this, particularly on the role of the fundamental state?***

The three samadhis of fundamental me, absolute me, and primordial me occur in absolute I am. Only the realization of the primordial I allows us to access primordial I am, because it is the immanent I am that realizes primordial I am.

Fundamental me needs to enter samadhi, the fundamental state, because it is a bridging identity for pure conscious me; it is not merely an opening into the absolute. Conscious me does not have to merge with the fundamental state because it reaches absolute I am through absolute me. We could call the unity of absolute me and absolute I am the 'fundamental absolute state'. The purpose of fundamental me is very clear. It is a bridge for pure conscious me into the absolute I am, and it is also its extension into absolute I am. Absolute me alone does not enter absolute I am, does not enter the inner universe – it only merges with it. So, in the essential me, it is only fundamental me that actually enters,

rather than merely merges with, the inner universe; it can actually travel to the other side.

***Regarding the samadhi in immanent I am, do the recent understanding change anything in the understanding of its dynamics? For example is it happening within what is now pure conscious me or within conscious me?***

The mechanism of this samadhi remains the same, but it is indeed happening in a different center. Before it was in what we presently call pure conscious me, and now it is in what we call presently conscious me.

The understanding behind the realization of immanent I am has not changed, but its description has become more precise. For instance, in the previous model one could very easily confuse the samadhi of conscious me in pure conscious me for the realization of primordial I, while it is in fact the realization of primordial me. Do you understand this?

What is primordial I? It is the deepest realization of our light, the original light of I am. How does it happen? By the merging of pure attention with the immanent I am which is hidden in the kernel of the essence-me. And whose pure attention is it? Here is the paradox: the source of pure attention is immanent I am and yet to realize this I am, pure attention has to merge back into its source.

When we have realized immanent I am, what happens to our me? Essence-me is still present, but now it is no longer the 'essence' but rather an expression of the deeper essence of immanent I am. While immanent I am is the source of pure attention, essence-me is the source of external attention. At the meeting of these two sources, conscious me is born. Then, when immanent I am is realized within the conscious me, it transforms into primordial I.

What is the difference between immanent I am and primordial I? Primordial I is the unity of immanent I am and essence-me – where the true realization of our me and our I am become one.

***Why do conscious me and pure conscious me (or primordial me and absolute me) not enter the absolute I am?***

Well, they do enter the absolute I am, but then they stop their descent. This stop is what we call samadhi. Only fundamental me retains its dynamic quality of penetrating more and more deeply the dimension of the source. Looking at it from another angle, fundamental me is the identity of the dynamic pure attention of the essential me, while the immanent I am is the identity of the substance of pure attention. Pure conscious me (or absolute me) is the bridge between these two. While pure conscious me is a pure me, it is a kind of pure me that is bound by the principle of presence inherent to essence-me.

Primordial I does not have to go anywhere. It is already where it supposed to be. It is beyond dimensions, because its very essence is the embodiment of primordial I am through immanent I am. In the realization of immanent I am we return to the state of singularity prior to both inner and outer universe.

***Can pure attention also to be said to be 'self-love' which is drawing us home?***

Yes, this is a nice way of putting it. We speak of self-love as the spirit of the path without which there is no path and there is no true awakening. This self-love is experienced on several levels: love between pure attention and the substance of me, love between me embodied by pure attention and transcendent I am, and love between pure attention and immanent I am.

***I was wondering why if you have already realized the states you describe, you still need to modify different concepts in the teaching. Shouldn't it be clear to you from the beginning?***

It is a good question. To have the correct realization does not mean that one has grasped it conceptually. In addition, truth can be presented in very low or very high resolution. For instance, when non-dual teachings speak of consciousness as one state beyond and without me, they reflect some level of truth, but the resolution of their understanding is so low that the picture is highly distorted, to the point of being false. If you were to look from outer space at our planet, you would see a round shape suspended between other celestial bodies. It is indeed the earth, but the earth is much more than round object. And to know this, we must come closer to it. The closer we come, the more we understand it.

Conversely, when you are too close, you have no distance to see the bigger picture. To know the earth of the inner realm, we have to land on it, but we also need to have some conceptual distance to gain the necessary perspective required for understanding. So the soul is the one who lands in our nature of pure subjectivity, and the observer is the one who maintains just enough distance to understand it. In the process of this landing, the observer has to make sure that we land in the right place and then illuminate with intelligence that multidimensional reality. Otherwise, we could discover only one part of the inner earth, such as the ocean, and never get to know the peaks of Himalayas or the lush forests of the Amazon.

When Ramana Maharishi spoke of the self or “one-consciousness”, he was depicting truth from too great a distance. If you depict truth in low resolution, you cannot help people because while intellectually they maybe happy to follow a simplistic teaching, in practice they have no understanding who they are and how to co-operate with their evolution. We could say that Advaita and Buddhism have seen a forest, but have not seen the trees. But in reality, there is no such a thing as a forest – there are just many trees that we call forest for convenience. When we

take the concept of a forest as a thing in itself, we lose touch with the reality of the living trees. Seeing a forest is a low-resolution picture of reality, like a blob on the map of the inner realm. One has to come closer to see the individual trees and then to begin to see that each tree itself is composed of branches and leaves...and so forth.

Here, we are teaching a quantum theory of self, a constant transcendence of the mechanistic and primitive concept of self-realization that has brainwashed the spiritual community. Our teaching is evolving into a higher and higher resolution of truth, and different pieces of the puzzle become revealed gradually. We are solving a puzzle, and there is tremendous joy in that. We are getting to know our inner reality intimately and with a precision that is closer and closer to absolute. Can our understanding ever be absolute? It is not meant to be absolute – it is meant to be approaching absolute understanding while never reaching it. Reaching it would defeat the purpose of living.

***So how could you yourself reach these states, such as primordial me, without having the correct conceptual vision from the start?***

It is called spiritual instinct. My spiritual intuition and the sense of inner orientation are exquisite and always have been. This has allowed me to do the right things on the path without having the complete conceptual tools. Of course, having these tools would have radically accelerated my personal evolution in the past.

Blessings,

Anadi