NO-POINT



ANDREAS MÜLLER JUSTIN ALLEN

Acknowledgements from Andreas Müller: Thanks to Nadine and Soham, Tony and Claire Parsons

Acknowledgements from Justin Allen:

Thanks to my family, close and far friends and Andreas

CONTENTS

Preface: March 31, 2022 PREFACE: JUSTIN ALLEN

Introduction: March 31, 2022 INTRODUCTION: ANDREAS MÜLLER

Talk 15: January 24, 2021 THISNESS

Talk 16: February 28, 2021 WHAT'S REALLY REAL?

Talk 17: April 21, 2021 | ROBOT

Talk 18: May 21, 2021 POST-LIFE

Talk 19: June 24, 2021 I WAS NEVER HAPPY BEING ME

Talk 20: July 21, 2021 EVEN THE MICROSCOPE CONFIRMS YOU'RE NOT THERE

Talk 21: December 21, 2021 (winter solstice) PLACEBO



March 31, 2022 JUSTIN ALLEN

PREFACE

This is a continuation of talks about nothing between Andreas and myself. Again, there is no meaning and nothing to gain or learn from these 7 additional talks. Not that the talks from *No-Point Perspective (2020)* offered something, but this series offers even less; less talks, less pages and less paintings, but it may more tightly explore the topic of "no one" being there.

Our last talk from *No-Point Perspective (2020)* happened on March 23rd, 2020 and our first talk for *No-Point (2022)* took place on January 24th, 2021. Almost one year after our last talk from *NPP (2020)*, we started to talk again, for no clear or real reason, they just seemed to happen and were recorded and shared live and now transcribed. Having already covered teachers and gurus and various "misunderstandings" from our first set of talks, this series is possibly more relaxed and, dare I say, focused.

It is just incredibly enjoyable to talk about nothing with someone that also seems to enjoy talking about nothing. We have created a book that has essentially recorded "smalltalk," with even less meaning than the dreaded conversation you may have with someone about the weather. This series of talks took place from January 24^{th} , 2021 to December 21^{st} , 2021.



March 31, 2022 ANDREAS MÜLLER

INTRODUCTION

After having published *No-Point-Perspective* in 2020, there did not seem to be a point in making another book. We already covered a lot in the first book and seemed to have approached this (non-)issue from various angles. However, Justin and I had the energy to continue our conversations and so, 7 more talks happened. We slightly changed the format for these talks, as they were not done privately via Skype, but broadcasted online, so people could watch us talk in real-time. Of course, this may not make a difference for you as a reader.

I love that our conversations continued in spite of there being no-point to them. Enjoyable as before, covering other aspects here and there, these conversations are the very no-thing apparently happening through the talks transcribed in this book.



January 24th, 2021 Talk 15

THISNESS

Andreas Exactly. All right. I think that's about it regarding Müller: the explanation (laughing). I'm ready. Justin All right (both laughing). We don't have a plan Allen: but I did write a question before. All right. Andreas Müller: Justin So, in that sense, it's a little bit planned. Allen: (laughing) Andreas Okay. Well, when we talked two days ago, there Müller: was no plan. Justin Yeah (laughing). This is 30 minutes before this Allen: conversation plan. Andreas That's almost no plan. Müller: Yeah. I wrote it down, but I'll be able to Justin Allen: paraphrase it once I read it again. You start off a lot of times when you talk, you say, "So this is it." Right (waiting for confirmation)? And we could boil it down to that statement that this is it and this is all there is. Justin And what you're pointing to when you say this Allen: or a kind of logical question would be, "What do you mean by 'this'? What is 'this'"? And the way that I would try to paraphrase that, is that in this context, it would be the blue wall behind you and the curtain, and the bed frame, yourself with the shirt (referring to the actual scene behind

Andreas).

Justin And then the same going on here, a bookshelf Allen: behind me, our voices. And that's what "this" is. Yeah (waiting for confirmation)? And then to that, you would say that even though this is it, what I just described as "this," it's all apparent. It's apparently "this."

Andreas Yes. Yes. Müller:

Justin Yeah. So, it's apparently this. And then for the Majority of us...

Andreas ... (laughing and waiting in excited expectation) Müller: ...

Justin No, but I'm saying something different now. For Allen: the majority of us, there's also what's happening in this "this," is an apparent "me."

Andreas Yes. One could say so. The illusion to be Müller: someone. Yes.

- JustinRight. And that would also be part of theAllen:description of "this."
- AndreasThis would also be what seems to beMüller:happening. Absolutely. Yes.

Justin And then conversely, for the minority, there is Allen: an apparent "no me" happening.

Andreas There isn't anyone. Yeah. Well, you can't sayMüller: that because it's not really "a happening," but yes, there isn't anyone there. Yes.

Justin Allen:	Yeah. Or there's nothing happening.
Andreas Müller:	Or not the illusion. Yeah.
Justin Allen:	Okay. So, for the majority, there's the illusion apparently happening.
Andreas Müller:	That's what seems to be happening.
Justin Allen:	And that's part of the "this," the "thisness."
Andreas Müller:	Absolutely. That's wholeness. Yes.
Justin Allen:	And a "me" not happening, or an illusion of a "me" not happening is also a part of "this."
Andreas Müller:	Yeah. It's not really a part of, but yes. That's also what seems to be happening. Exactly.
Justin Allen:	When I put it that way, then for me at least, it really evens the playing field (both laughing). It just takes away any potential excitement. Kind of like how you might previously imagine or how it could be imagined, what you're talking about.
Andreas Müller:	Exactly. Yes. What we speak about is very unexciting because it's all there is and it's natural in a way.
Justin Allen:	The way that I just put it in that context, at least for me, it makes it so (looking for the word flat) It's not unique It also doesn't feel as

mysterious in a way because it's almost like nothing different is being said and there's no difference (laughing).

Andreas Well, in the end, that's what's constantly being Müller: said.

Justin Right. Allen:

- Andreas There is no difference between anything and...
 Müller: Not as a teaching, but of course, there is no difference. And the illusion of "I am," that I'm "me" and I'm different, and Andreas is different from me, and wholeness is different from me is a complete illusion, of course.
- Andreas What's being pointed to is very ordinary and Müller: normal. The natural reality, so to speak, is normal. It's nothing special. The person, so to speak, might get excited about it with the idea of, "I will get that. It's great and I will have it. I will own it." That's the excitement basically.

Justin Yeah. The potential for excitement. Yeah. Allen:

Andreas Yeah. Exactly. Müller:

Justin But it's really clear when you say, at least in Allen: that structure that I just put it in, saying that "this" is it, this is all there is, and part of... Maybe that's not the right word to use, but part of that description of "this" and this is it, is also the apparent "me's" that are apparently happening, and then the nothing happening or

	the non-illusion of a "me," which isn't happening but that's also in this description of "this."
Andreas Müller:	So to speak. Yes.
Justin Allen:	So then in that sense, automatically, there's no hierarchy, there's no separation, there's no one better than the other.
Andreas Müller:	Not a single bit. Absolutely. This is it exactly as it is. The person, of course, thinks that I want to show something that the person can see, "Ah, it's this," in order for "this" to make a difference.
Andreas Müller:	The person would hope, "When I get that, then there will be a difference." But no, that's not what is meant. It's exactly "this," exactly as it is. That's all there is, so to speak.
Justin Allen:	Yeah.
Andreas Müller:	Yeah. Yep.
Justin Allen:	Okay.
Andreas Müller:	That's why there is no message, so to speak. It's not saying this to anyone in order to create a difference.
Justin Allen:	Yeah. Because also, there can be no difference (laughing).

Andreas It can't be. There just isn't. Yes. And the pointing Müller: to "this" doesn't make a difference either. The person is constantly complaining about that, "Nothing changes. I'm listening to this and nothing happens..." (laughing). Yes, there is no change really.

Justin Yeah. Allen:

Andreas Or difference. Müller:

- Justin Okay. And the next thing is... I guess this is Allen: similar to what we just talked about, but it's put a different way. I wrote, "As obvious as it is that someone is there... (pause)"
- Justin If you have these kinds of conversations, and Allen: we mentioned this in the book (referring to *No-Point Perspective*), but it's so obvious that there's someone there for the majority of the people.

Andreas Yes. Müller:

- Justin When they try to define themselves or to define Allen: what it is (what they are), you (they or someone) can't really do it, but your final sentence if you've been questioned to answer, "What are you?" You just say, "Well, it's just obvious that I'm there. It's so obvious. It's natural." (What a typical answer is)
- Justin And then you (someone) might give reasons.

Allen: You say, "Well, it's obvious that I'm there because I'm

here hearing myself talk and I'm emitting words and I know what happened yesterday and one minute ago." But you (they or someone) can't really pinpoint what you (actually) are or what it is that you (actually) are. You just know that you "are."

Andreas Yes. Exactly. Yes. Müller:

Justin And then the same as, at least how I've heard Allen: you talk about what it's like over there (referring to Andreas on the other side of the Zoom meeting) for you is that it's also obvious (laughing) that there's "no one" there.

Andreas Well, yeah. I sometimes say that, but not really. Müller:

Justin I'm not trying to trap you... where you say... Allen:

- Andreas Yeah. I understand. Yeah. It's just the word Müller: "obviousness" doesn't really fit there anymore because the person would imply obviousness exactly with this knowing "I am," with this kind of awareness thing. And in that sense, there is no obviousness that there isn't anyone. There just isn't anyone.
- JustinBut it's not just been said by you. It's been saidAllen:by the other people that are pointing to this
topic, pointing to this "nothingness." Because

you get questioned a lot about what it's like for you or what happened to you.

Justin For you, it's like the story of "me" and then Allen: there's nothing after that point. But then trying to explain... when you try to describe it or explain it, it's just obvious. A sentence that you might say is that it's obvious that there's "no one" there.

Andreas Yes.

Müller:

- Justin It's just natural. Allen:
- Andreas It's natural. That's what this description of Müller: "obvious" tries to say.
- Justin But that's not so dissimilar to the... It's Allen: dissimilar in the sense, if I were to say (crosstalk)...

Andreas I know. Oh, yeah. Oh, yes, absolutely. Müller:

Justin One could say, "It's obvious that I'm here." The Allen: one difference is that it's obvious for the experience of a "me" where I'm saying it's obvious, but aside from that, it's also just... Even without the experience of a "me," it's how I would say it's just natural that I'm here. It's natural that there's an "I" that I refer to and the sense of "me" that I would refer to.

Andreas Yeah. Müller:

- Justin And I feel like you can switch it around and say Allen: that's how you would have to always describe it. You'd still have to... It'd be different because there wouldn't be a "me" there that it's obvious for. But still, it's obvious and natural.
- Andreas Yeah. I understand. Yeah. In a way, both are the natural reality. One can't really say that one is natural and one isn't. It's actually exactly what we talked about in the beginning. Both just is what seems to be happening.

Justin Right. Allen:

Andreas Absolutely. Müller:

Justin For me, I don't know why I was thinking about Allen: This but I was just thinking about how... If people speak about enlightenment from, let's say the spiritual or religious frame of reference (laughing), then they might say that it became clear that there was just

> "awareness" or they would say that there was an "enlightenment," ... "There was a moment and I became one or one with something, or I just wasn't there anymore or something."

Justin And they would say that it was an experience Allen: and it was an obvious experience, and it was a shift or a change.

Andreas There was a change. Exactly. Müller: Justin Yeah. Allen:

Andreas Yes. Yeah, absolutely. Müller:

Justin And then they would say, "And then 'this' Allen: became the new point of view or the new perspective or the new..."

Andreas Truth. The new experience. The new reality for Müller: them, so to speak. Yeah.

Justin And for me, I get more... Based on what I just Allen: said or what we just talked about is that there isn't a change and it just stays natural. So just like how it's obvious... Like for you, there's not a change.

Andreas Yes, absolutely. Yes.

Müller:

Justin And there can't be. By the way that you're Allen: describing this, there can't be a change because there was "no one" there ever in the first place to have transformed or changed into something else.

Andreas Yes, absolutely. Müller:

Justin And that's why, to me, just like this sense of, if Allen: you say the "me" and then take the "no me," ... It's natural in both cases and it's obvious in both cases.

Andreas Yes. One could say so. Oh, absolutely. Yes.

Müller:

- Justin And that is also part of the kind of un-Allen: excitement of it or the extraordinary ordinariness of it, is that it all just stays and remains obvious (laughing).
- Andreas Oh, absolutely. In a way, the claim saying, "Well, Müller: I'm still 'me,' I'm still a seeker, so to speak," is as much an honest report as saying, "Well, there is no one." In that sense, again, both is natural and both are the same. Absolutely. It's (crosstalk) what it is, an illusion, because there never really is anyone. But yeah.

Justin And both are obvious in both cases.

- Allen:
- Andreas Yeah. You can't really compare those because Müller: the obviousness that the person would speak of is an awareness, describing a circumstance. And there being "no one" is not really a circumstance, it's not the opposite of being someone.

Justin Yeah.

Allen:

Andreas So when I speak of obvious, actually, I also try
Müller: to take it back immediately because
obviousness immediately is somehow mixed up
with being aware of. And in the end, I'm not
running around in some kind of obviousness. In
the end, there actually is no obviousness.

Justin But it seems similar to the experience of a "me" Allen: ... It seems like, fundamentally, you can talk

about how it's obvious that "I am" or that there's a "me," but when you talk about it, that's where it becomes a little bit like you give cause and effect or you say it's obvious because of this reason.

Andreas Yes, of course. But the person lives just in this Müller: reality.

Justin Yeah. It's natural that they're there or at least Allen: that that sense is there.

Andreas Yeah. Of course.

Müller:

- Justin They couldn't describe it any better than you. Allen: Really, a person, an apparent person trying to describe themselves is just as failing as you trying to describe...
- Andreas Oh, of course. But the person wouldn't notice Müller: really. The person would somehow still believe there is "someone," and this "someone" is somehow knowable or experienceable.
- Andreas But yes, I know what you mean. Practically, they Müller: Would fail. They would tell their name and who they are. In the end, they'd end up saying, "Well, I'm pure awareness, but I don't know what this actually is," which is one of those spiritual teachings. And they say what you are is pure awareness, but they also admit that you don't know what this actually is.

Justin Yeah. Allen: Andreas But in their teaching, this doesn't count for very Müller: much.

- Justin But even outside of the teaching or a teacher, Allen: that (natural) obviousness of there being an "I," it's kind of like when you try to talk about the sense of "me" as a "me", you can't do it. You fail at it.
- Andreas Absolutely. Oh, absolutely. That's the thing.Müller: Knowing oneself is an illusion. No one knows themselves.

Justin Right.

Allen:

Andreas And in a funny way, as you say, when theMüller: person tries to describe itself, it may even come to the

point that it can't really do it but it would still be from a separate perspective. But yes, knowing oneself is a dream. No one knows themselves.

- Justin But that's kind of what I'm trying to get at, is Allen: that because it's so obvious, it's equally obvious to the "me" that they're there, but also that they're not there or that there's not something. No (seeing the expression of Andreas)?
- Andreas No. Because for the person, there's only Müller: presence. And the rest would be already conclusions, understanding, noticing. But it would never really... Even in the noticing that it can't know itself, the person would somehow confirm itself.

- Justin And let's say that it apparently happens that Allen: this person really can no longer confirm themselves, where they can't even say, "I'm not there anymore." Because that's just not something that they can rely on anymore that there's an "I" there to even say that they're there or not.
- Andreas Well, this would just be the melting away of the Müller: separate energy, but it wouldn't...
- Justin But that's what I mean. That's what I'm trying Allen: to say is that imagine that there was a "me" and the "me" started to go, "Is there a 'me'"? What is this "me"? And it feels so obvious that they're there, but at the same time, it starts to feel "obvious" that they're not there.

Andreas Yes. This can happen. Yes. Yes.

Müller:

Justin And that is such a... (crosstalk) ...

Allen:

Andreas (crosstalk) ... half-dead or half-alive then. Müller:

Justin Yeah. But they're still the same. You know what I Allen: mean?

Andreas Oh. It would just be what apparently happens.Müller: Absolutely. It would be...

Justin Let's say that you did... for lack of a better Allen: word... this isn't the right way to say it, but that you transition from an apparent "me" to a "no me."

- Andreas Yeah. Fade out. That's basically my story. This Müller: would be my story in the end.
- Justin Yeah. But the fade-out would be so natural, it Allen: wouldn't be a change. You know what I mean? It would just be the exact same obviousness of... The reality of the "me" is it's unknowable, even for a "me" or a "no me."
- Andreas Oh, yeah. Absolutely. It is natural. The illusion toMüller: be someone is natural and the end of that isnatural too. Nothing changes in them.
- Justin Right. But nothing changes also because even Allen: as convinced as you (someone) are that you're there, (crosstalk)...
- Andreas You don't know it. Oh, absolutely. Oh, totally Müller: (laughing). Totally. That's what I mean, that someone knows themselves is an illusion. It never happened. Let's say through your whole life, you never knew who you are and that you are and what you are. So, yes, this will not change. Exactly. One could say that how it was all the time will not change.

Justin Right.

Allen:

Andreas But this isn't really logical because, of course,
Müller: from the sense of the person, there is constantly this illusion. As you say, seen from the person, one's own presence is so natural, you don't even really think about that.

Justin Yeah.

Allen:

- Andreas Even when you're working with those concepts Müller: of "me," "no me," it's so natural that "I am" and that I'm on a path and that this is my life, and that "me"/ "no me" is what I'm interested in and all, but nothing changes. Absolutely.
- Justin And what's artificial in that? ... If it's just natural Allen: that you're not there, then the artificial is? ... the explaining and the describing of how you are there?
- Andreas Well, artificial is a story because nothing's really Müller: artificial in that sense.
- Justin That's the story. If you were to say, "I'm here Allen: because when I look at my photos from 10 years ago, I see a difference and I have memories that verify that there's been this change, and that I've been witness to the changing," that's artificial.
- Andreas Well, no, the assumption that there really is Müller: someone who experiences all of that.
- Justin Yeah. To experience that is artificial... You're Allen: already explaining...
- Andreas Something that doesn't happen, that doesn't Müller: have any reality.

Justin Right. Allen:

Andreas Yes. Yeah. Müller:

Justin Allen:	I think that's a better word to use is artificial than What's the word, the other option? Illusion.
Andreas Müller:	Yeah.
Justin Allen:	I like artificial better than illusion.
Andreas Müller:	Yeah. Yeah. Illusion has this connotation in a way. It's also the spiritual connotation. And it still sounds as if there is something in a way.
Justin Allen:	But artificial would be a good alternative.
Andreas Müller:	Yeah. But it's (crosstalk) description, I think, because artificial has this negative connotation. No one wants artificial in a way (laughing). Artificial has a bad reputation.
Justin Allen:	Yeah. But it would be a good alternative word as far as they can be used in the same context.
Andreas Müller:	Yeah. I do sometimes.
Justin Allen:	I just wanted to say, what you mean by artificial is artificial is the illusion and the illusion is the Generally, the illusion is the dream and the dream is that I'm there. And when you say, "I'm there," that comes from trying to describe or understand or know this obviousness, which is, in this case
Androac	Well it's just an experience. The person would

Andreas Well, it's just an experience. The person would

- Müller: just experience itself and say, "Well, I'm here. I am." And yes, it immediately seems like a circumstance that's known. I am.
- Justin Yeah. You don't just say, "I am." Right? You say, Allen: "I am," generally, then you're giving reasons why you are.
- Andreas Yeah. That comes afterwards. Actually, I would Müller: say there can be this sense of "I am" without any kind of processing, at least for moments, for a while, and then comes the processing. And pretty quickly, you end up telling yourself a whole story about the world.
- JustinYeah. And that would be the illusion and theAllen:artificialness of that person's...
- Andreas Yes, it's actually this first sense of presence Müller: which would be artificial.
- Justin Then the other things you're just saying are? Allen:

Andreas Apparently artificial. That's the thing. Müller:

Justin Well, the first thing's apparently artificial. Allen:

Andreas Again. Müller:

Justin The first sense of "I am" is artificial.

Allen:

Andreas Yes. But as a description. Yeah, absolutely. Yep.

Müller:

Justin Allen:	That's an interesting point for me now, that the very initial illusion or the initial artificial moment is the "I am" sense.
Andreas Müller:	Sense. Not the story. Yeah. Actually, that's already information from the brain when you tell the story. Well, "I am," that's already processed. That's actually already the sense of presence processed in the story.
Justin Allen:	Right. So let's just call the very first thing a sense.
Andreas Müller:	Yeah.
Justin Allen:	Then the second thing is the story (both laughing).
Andreas Müller:	Yes. And the story gets more and more
Justin Allen:	Multiplied. The story gets multiplied.
Andreas Müller:	Yes.
Justin Allen:	Yeah. Okay. So the first thing is, as soon as there's a sensed "I" or a sensed "me," that's the first or that's the initial illusion or that's the illusion.
Andreas Müller:	Well, it's an apparent illusion.